AN EVALUATION OF CONFLICT THEORY: THE NATURE OF CONFLICT; MICROCOSMIC AND MACROCOSMIC THEORIES OF CONFLICT; INSTINCTUAL AGGRESSION AND THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

BY

DR . ALFRED ABHULIMHEN-IYOHA

PhD LAW, PhD INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (STRATEGIC STUDIES),MSC POLITICAL SCIENCE(INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS), MPA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, LLM LAW, PGDE EDUCATION, BL,LLB HONS LAW, DIPLOMA CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND PASTORAL COUNSELLING ,+2348055968440

2O21

ABSTRACT

Conflicts within the environment of international relations, whether these are domestic or interstate, have become one of the most intensely perceived security problems of the contemporary world. Their nature is usually violent, accompanied by human casualties, which may escalate to humanitarian crises and may cause enormous material, population and ecological damage. Regions in conflict are the source of population migration, increasing pressure and they become a suitable environment for the formation of radical and terrorist groups. The destructive force of conflicts causes an economic decline of countries and, thus, increases the differences between stable regions and countries and those regions and countries with ongoing conflicts. The resolution and prevention of conflicts within international relations is a multidisciplinary approach, which draws on psychology, sociology, mass communication, development studies, studies of international institutions and political science, security studies and, in particular, on the study of international relations.

INTRODUCTION

Conflicts within the environment of international relations, whether these are domestic or interstate, have become one of the most intensely perceived security problems of the contemporary world. Their nature is usually violent, accompanied by human casualties, which may escalate to humanitarian crises and may cause enormous material, population and ecological damage. Regions in conflict are the source of population migration, increasing pressure and they become a suitable environment for the formation of radical and terrorist groups. The destructive force of conflicts causes an economic decline of countries and, thus, increases the differences between stable regions and countries and those regions and countries with ongoing conflicts.

The term “conflict theory” came into wide use in sociology during the 1960s, when it was seen as an alternative to and rival of functionalism. Initially, the term seemed merely to identify a more politically neutral Marxian perspective, but for some it meant something much broader. The strongest contemporary advocate of conflict theory is Randall Collins. For him, conflict theory includes not only Marx and the Marxists, but also Weber and a number of other social theorists extending back to earlier times. He sees as early forerunners of modern conflict theory such thinkers as Machiavelli and Pareto. Collins (1974), (1975) has done more than any sociologist to develop a synthesized conflict theory that owes more to Weber than to any other sociologist. Sociologists have often regarded Lewis Coser's The Functions of Social Conflict (1956) as a version of conflict theory, but it is more a functionalist analysis of the role of conflict in social life than a use of conflict propositions to explain various social phenomena.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Conflict Theory: Conflict theories, explains why a society is in a state of perpetual conflict because of competition for limited resources. Conflict theory therefore best describes the reasons that best explains why humans and society are in constant conflict.

Nature of Conflict: A conflict is the moment of truth in a relationship-a test of its health, a crisis that can weaken or strengthen it, a critical event that may bring lasting resentment, smoldering hostility, psychological scars.

Microcosmic Theory of Conflict: The concept of microcosm means a small group of individuals whose behavior is typical of a larger social body encompassing it.

Macrocosmic Theory of Conflict: Macrocosmic theories deal with large social and political force.

Instinctual Aggression: Instinct or innate behavior is the inherent inclination of a living organism towards a particular complex behavior. The simplest example of an instinctive behavior is a fixed action pattern (FAP), in which a very short to medium length sequence of actions, without variation, are carried out in response to a clearly defined stimulus. Any behavior is instinctive if it is performed without being based upon prior experience (that is, in the absence of learning), and is therefore an expression of innate biological factors.

Military-Industrial Complex: The military–industrial complex (MIC) is an informal alliance between a nation's military and the defense industry which supplies it, seen together as a vested interest which influences public policy/sector.

CONFLICT THEORY

Conflict theories are perspectives in sociology and social psychology that emphasize a materialist interpretation of history, dialectical method of analysis, a critical stance toward existing social arrangements, and political program of revolution or, at least, reform. Conflict theories draw attention to power differentials, such as class conflict, and generally contrast historically dominant ideologies. It is therefore a macro level analysis of society. Karl Marx is the father of the social conflict theory, which is a component of the four paradigms of sociology. Certain conflict theories set out to highlight the ideological aspects inherent in traditional thought. While many of these perspectives hold parallels, conflict theory *does not* refer to a unified school of thought, and should not be confused with, for instance, peace and conflict studies, or any other specific theory of social conflict.

Modern approaches

Wright Mills has been called the founder of modern conflict theory. In Mills's view, social structures are created through conflict between people with differing interests and resources. Individuals and resources, in turn, are influenced by these structures and by the "unequal distribution of power and resources in the society." The power elite of American society, (i.e., the military–industrial complex) had "emerged from the fusion of the corporate elite, the Pentagon, and the executive branch of government." Mills argued that the interests of this elite were opposed to those of the people. He theorized that the policies of the power elite would result in "increased escalation of conflict, production of weapons of mass destruction, and possibly the annihilation of the human race."

Gene Sharp is known for his extensive writings on nonviolent struggle, which have influenced numerous anti-government resistance movements around the world.. Sharp's key

theme is that power is not monolithic; that is, it does not derive from some intrinsic quality of those who are in power. For Sharp, political power, the power of any state—regardless of its particular structural organization—ultimately derives from the subjects of the state. His fundamental belief is that any power structure relies upon the subjects' obedience to the orders of the ruler(s). If subjects do not obey, leaders have no power. Sharp has been called both the "Machiavelli of nonviolence" and the "Clausewitz of nonviolent warfare." Sharp's scholarship has influenced resistance organizations around the world. Most recently the protest movement that toppled President Mubarak of Egypt drew extensively on his ideas, as well as the youth movement in Tunisia and the earlier ones in the Eastern European colour revolutions that had previously been inspired by Sharp's work. Viz:

- Societies are defined by inequality that produces conflict, rather than which produces order and consensus. This conflict based on inequality can only be overcome through a fundamental transformation of the existing relations in the society, and is productive of new social relations.
- The disadvantaged have structural interests that run counter to the status quo, which, once they are assumed, will lead to social change. Thus, they are viewed as agents of change rather than objects one should feel sympathy for.
- Human potential (e.g., capacity for creativity) is suppressed by conditions of exploitation and oppression, which are necessary in any society with an unequal division of labour. These and other qualities do not necessarily have to be stunted due to the requirements of the so-called "civilizing process," or "functional necessity": creativity is actually an engine for economic development and change.

- The role of theory is in realizing human potential and transforming society, rather than maintaining the power structure. The opposite aim of theory would be the objectivity and detachment associated with positivism, where theory is a neutral, explanatory tool.
- Consensus is a euphemism for ideology. Genuine consensus is not achieved, rather the more powerful in societies are able to impose their conceptions on others and have them accept their discourses. Consensus does not preserve social order, it entrenches stratification, a tool of the current social order.
- The State serves the particular interests of the most powerful while claiming to represent the interests of all. Representation of disadvantaged groups in State processes may cultivate the notion of full participation, but this is an illusion/ideology.
- Inequality on a global level is characterized by the purposeful underdevelopment of Third World countries, both during colonization and after national independence. The global system (i.e., development agencies such as World Bank and International Monetary Fund) benefits the most powerful countries and multi-national corporations, rather than the subjects of development, through economic, political, and military actions.

Although Sears associates the conflict theory approach with Marxism, he argues that it is the foundation for much "feminist, post-modernist, anti-racist, and lesbian-gay liberationist theories."

Types

Conflict theory is most commonly associated with Marxism, but as a reaction to functionalism and the positivist method may also be associated with number of other perspectives, including: Critical theory; Feminist theory: An approach that recognizes women's political, social, and economic equality to men; Postmodern theory: An approach that is critical

of modernism, with a mistrust of grand theories and ideologies; Post-structural theory; Postcolonial theory; Queer theory: A growing body of research findings that challenges the heterosexual bias in Western society; World systems theory and Race-Conflict Approach: A point of view that focuses on inequality and conflict between people of different racial and ethnic categories.

NATURE OF CONFLICT

The Nature of Conflict. A conflict is the moment of truth in a relationship-a test of its health, a crisis that can weaken or strengthen it, a critical event that may bring lasting resentment, smoldering hostility, psychological scars. Conflict is “a disagreement between two or more people who have differences in goals or methods for dealing with a situation”. Conflict can be Normal, Natural, Necessary.

There is, perhaps, nothing more common than conflict. As a mediator, conflict may constructively be viewed as resulting from:

- varied perspectives on the situation;
- differing belief systems and values resulting from participant's accumulated life experience and conditioning; and
- differing objectives and interests**.**

Effectively dealing with conflict requires the expression and management of participants' varying perspectives, interests, belief systems and values. It is important to meet the participants exactly where they are. Hear from them fully before tying to lead them anywhere. You can not effectively move toward resolution until each participant experiences themselves to be heard on "their perspective," "what they want," and "why."

Common Ground - Overlapping Interests and Interdependence

Along with their sometimes too well-known differences, people in conflict share much *common ground,* including:

- **overlapping interests** -- participants share in their own relationship, typically have common friends and colleagues, and also have interest in resolving the conflict in an expeditious and economic way;
- **interdependence** -- no single participant has the ability to unilaterally impose a resolution on another without paying a very substantial price for doing so; and
- **points of agreement** -- even when there are many disputed issues, there may still be a number of points of agreement or possible agreement. The wise mediator assists the parties to identify what they may be easily able to agree on as a foundation for additional discussions.

The Evolutionary Nature of Conflict

Through the integration of participants' perspectives, interests, belief systems and values, conflict and conflict resolution play important roles in individual and social evolution and development. Conflict arises when one or more participants view the current system as not working. At least one party is sufficiently dissatisfied with the status quo that they are willing to own the conflict and speak up with the hope of being able to influence the situation to arrive at an improved condition. Conflict may be viewed as a process we put ourselves through to achieve a new condition and self definition. Through conflict we have opportunities to be creatively self-defining. If nothing else, conflict allows us to do things differently in the future. Through the resolution of conflict, we can, if we choose, evolve and redefine ourselves, our relationships, our community, our society and our world. It is no accident that we most often find ourselves in

conflict with those with whom we spend the most time -- family, friends, business associates, and fellow organizational members. There is a great benefit, in terms of the quality of our lives, in being able to constructively resolve conflict with those around us.

Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Conflict

Conflict should also be recognized as existing at two levels:

- the interpersonal level; and
- the intrapersonal level.

In addition to the typically obvious interpersonal dispute, there almost always exists some measure of intra-personal conflict within each disputing party as that party seeks to assert varied, sometimes contradictory, interests. This inner conflict may be evidenced by confusion, inconsistency or lack of congruity. In this condition, the participant has failed to effectively integrate their various "parts" or "voices" to achieve an effective and comfortable representation of personal interests.

Facilitating a Convergence of Means

Conflict Resolution represents a convergence of means (or arrangements for the future), not necessarily participants' interests or perspectives. Participants will commonly come to support the same arrangement or agreement for very different reasons. Conflict resolution does not necessarily resolve tensions between parties. Conflict resolution may simply sufficiently align matters to allow each participant to make enough progress toward his or her desired ends to prefer declaring there to be a ″a state of agreement″ rather than the uncertain and stressful ″state of disagreement." The idea of conflict is basic to our understanding and appreciation of our exchange with reality--of human action. Conflict can be treated broadly as a philosophical category denoting the clash of power against power in the striving of all things to become

manifest. Or, conflict can be seen simply as a distinct category of social behavior--as two parties trying to get something they both cannot have. Moreover, conflict can be apprehended as a potentiality or a situation, as a structure or a manifestation, as an event or a process.

The concept of conflict is multidimensional; it envelops a family of forms. We select one depending on our analytical purposes and practical problem. Because my concern is to understand conflict as a social field phenomena, I must first consider conflict as a general category. From this most general conception I can work towards comprehending social conflict, and its empirical manifestations. Reality comprises multiform and interwoven potentialities, dispositions, and powers. What aspect becomes manifest depends on the dialectical confrontation between this reality and our perspective, which is a power, an outward directed vector. What we perceive is the result of the conflict between this vector and reality's inward bearing vector of power (e.g., between a baby's cry and what we are focusing on at the moment).

Such is the view of reality provided by the field approach of this book. What then is conflict? Conflict is a balancing of vectors of powers, of capabilities to produce effects. It is a clash of powers. But note. Conflict is not a balance, an equilibrium, of powers. It is not a stable resultant. Conflict is the pushing and pulling, the giving and taking, the process of finding the balance between powers. Thus, I have favored the term dialectical--the moving back and forth in a field of confrontation--to describe perception. For perception is seldom determinate. It is a continual balancing of outward directed and inward bearing vectors of power, a perpetual conflict. Most fundamentally, therefore, conflict is correlative to power. Power, simply, is the capability to produce effects; conflict is the process of powers meeting and balancing. To understand what powers become succeed requires comprehending their conflicts; to understand conflict involves untangling the powers involved.

Conflict is therefore universal. Our very experience presupposes conflict in its generation, and our knowledge, apart from its apriori categories, is based on such conflict. Our learning about ourselves, others, and reality, our growth and development, and our increasing ability to create our own heaven or hell, comes through conflict. The desire to eradicate conflict, the hope for harmony and universal cooperation, is the wish for a frozen, unchanging world with all relationships fixed in their patterns--with all in balance. One in which we cannot hope nor plan for a better tomorrow, but can only follow our inevitable course, with the determined ups and downs of a wooden horse on a merry-go-round.

Levels of Conflict

As a balancing of powers, conflict embodies the levels of potentiality, dispositions, or manifestations. Potentiality is what may become; it is the space of possibilities, as the space of a blackboard is the realm of all the two-dimensional figures and forms that may be drawn on it. Conflict as potentiality is then the space of possible conflicts: the realm of potential opposing vectors of power. For example, the space of our interests (where interests are vectors of power) is a space of potential conflicts; this page of text is a space of potential conflict between the power of these words and the meaning you project onto them; the two-dimensional space of a landscape painting is a potential conflict between the vectors of action in the painting which stand in dynamic tension and the viewer's perspective.

Our reality, then, is a conflict-space. Even our perception presupposes a conflict between inward directed vectors and our active reaching out to sense and comprehend such reality. Are all spaces of potentials, then, conflict spaces? Yes, for all potentials may be opposed; all potentialities have inherent in their space the possibility of conflict. Even a one-dimensional space contains the possibility of opposing vectors, as trains headed for collision on a straight

railroad track. But potentiality is only one level of reality. A second is that of dispositions and powers: of potentialities transformed into tendencies toward specificity and their strength to be so manifest. At this level we can discriminate between two facets of conflict: a conflict-structure of those dispositions opposing each other within the conflict space; and the conflict-situation consisting of opposing powers, and their indeterminate balancing. Clearly, some clarification is required.

Reality is a multidimensional space of potentialities and multifold, divergent, congruent, intersecting, and opposing dispositions. Two such dispositions are oxygen and hydrogen, which have the tendency to form a dynamic balance called water. Water itself has the opposing dispositions to become steam or ice. Normally, in water these dispositions form a structure; they exist with little strength towards conflict. Neither heating the water to boiling nor freezing it alters the structure of conflict, although the disposition of water to become steam or ice is manifested. The structure merely indicates the existence of dispositions which have a tendency to conflict. Thus, slaves and masters, proletariat and bourgeoisie, and peasant and landowner comprise structures of conflict, regardless of the strength of their opposing dispositions.

Within a conflict-structure, however, may exist a conflict-situation. This is a situation in which the opposing tendencies are activated--opposing powers are manifest. Consider water again. If water is contained in a pipe ten meters long with one end heated by a torch and the other packed in dry ice, the opposing dispositions to become steam or ice are activated. That is, they have become opposing powers towards manifestation. Similarly, if both slaves and masters share a normative system legitimizing slavery, as was true in classical Greece, then there exists a structure of conflict, but no conflict-situation. However, let a religion spread which emphasizes the equality and freedom of all people and the evils of slavery, and slaves become conscious of

their exploitation and the masters become aware of the need to protect their interests. Dispositions have become actual opposing powers: a conflict-situation exists.

The final level of reality is of manifestations. This is the level of manifest conflict, of conflict behavior, where the opposition of powers is specific. For water enclosed in a pipe, the simultaneous heating and freezing of the two ends--the situation of conflict--manifests a rapid circulation of water. This circulation reflects the balancing of powers--the struggle of opposite tendencies--within the water. Likewise, secret meetings among slaves and the organization of an escape route manifest the conflict-situation. On this we must be careful, however. This process has three facets: opposing attempts to produce effects, that is, opposing powers; the balancing of these powers; and the actual balance of powers. Now the opposing powers create a conflict-situation at the level of dispositions and powers. On this plane the actual balancing, the process of their clashing, may be partially indeterminate, like the unconscious cognitive balancing in a psychological field which partially underlies our perception, or the movement of molecules in the circulating water. However, aspects of this process may become manifest. We perceive the rapidly circulating water in the pipe (assume the pipe is made of a special glass), slaves may riot or demonstrate against their masters.

Consequently, the balancing process occurs both at the level of dispositions and powers and of manifest effects; the process may involve both the conflict situation and manifest conflict. The thunderstorm which manifests the conflict between hot and cold air systems is but the determinate aspect of the balancing of these two systems. Finally, there is the balance of powers, the momentary equilibrium established between the opposing powers. This balance is manifest, determinate. Much of our perception constitutes such a balance between outward and inward directed powers. Although water may be a balancing between tendencies to become steam or ice,

there is still sufficient balance to manifest the qualities of a liquid. Although there may be a situation of conflict between slaves and masters, a sufficient balance of the opposing powers may exist to manifest the patterns of dominance and subordination.

A balance of powers is no longer a conflict. It is neither a conflict nor manifest conflict. It is a system of manifest effects. Manifest reality therefore has two forms. Manifestations are either a balancing of powers or a balance of powers. Thus, manifest roles, norms, or practices in society evidence a balance among social powers. A court case, however, involving the legality of a particular rule, say of a regulatory agency, manifests a balancing of powers. Conflict is a balancing of powers which can be correlated to potentiality, dispositions, and manifestations. The levels of conflict are shown correlative to these, and the dynamics of each level are shown above. Then the ideas of latent and manifest conflict, much used in the contemporary literature on conflict, are shown in their relationship to these levels. Note that the balance of powers is manifest, but not all manifestations reflect a balance of powers. Some comprise a balancing of powers, i.e., manifest conflict.

MICROSCOMIC AND MACROCOSMIC THEORIES OF CONFLICT

In his significant work man, the state and war, Kenneth N. Waltz distinguished three image of international relations in terms of which we usually try to analyze the cause of war. According to the first image, war is traceable to human nature and behavior. Partisan of the second image seek the explanation of war in the internal structure of the state, and this group includes both liberals and marxis-leninists. The third image postulates the cause of war in the condition known to the classical political theorists (included Kant, Spinoza, Rousseau, and in modern time, Hedlev Bull) as “international anarchy” that is, the absence of those instrument of low and organization that would be efficacious for peace keeping. In other words, a deficiency in

the state system makes it necessary for each state to pursue its own interest and ambitions, and act as judge in its own case when it becomes involved in disputes with another state, thereby making the recurrence of conflict, including occasional wars, inevitable and giving rise to "expectation of war" as a normal feature of the state system. It is a provocative thought that nonexistence of something (an effective peace enforcer) might be a cause of something else, namely, war. In this report, we shall be concerned initially with the "first image" explanations of conflict those microcosmic theories pertaining to individual human nature and behavior and subsequently with the macrocosmic theories that deal with large social and political force.

Microcosmic and macrocosmic theories of human aggression, violence, and war cannot be neatly separated from each other. International war cannot be adequately explained solely by reference to biological and psychological explanations of individual aggressiveness nor can be latter phenomenon be comprehended purely "internally" without reference to social factors. In all fields that study human social behavior, micro and macro approaches must be appropriately blended.

Modern studies of motivations and war

In the twentieth century, social scientists have turned increasingly toward motives, reason and causal factors that may be operative both in individual human beings and in social collectivities even though people are not immediately aware of them and do not become consciously aware of them except as a result of scientific observation and methodical analysis. Why do individuals behave aggressively? Why do state wage wars? The two question are related, but they are not the same. The former pertains to the inner springs of action within individual human beings, the latter to the decision making processes of national governments. Violent revolution constitutes yet another phenomenon, different from individual aggressiveness,

which is rooted in the biological-psychological characteristics of human beings, and from international war, which is highly politised and institutionalized form of learned social behavior. Revolution it self, insofar as it requires organization, leadership, ideology and doctrine, propaganda, planning, strategy, tactics, communications, recruits and supplies, and very often a diplomacy for the acquisition of foreign support, assumes a highly politised character with the passage of time. Thus it requires more of a macrocosmic than a microcosmic analysis.

Psychological and social psychological factors alone might go far to explain instances of anomic violence, such as a food or language riot in India, an outbreak of fighting at a sport event, or a racial disorder at a public beach. But even In these cases, social psychologists would be wary of "the fallacy of the single factor" and social scientists would argue that some instances of apparently anomic violence might involve an element of political organization and can be adequately comprehended only when placed in their total sociological and political context. In all cases of social violence it is probably wise to assume the presence of multiple explanatory factors.

The phenomenon of international war is the most complex and difficult of all to explain. It is impossible to describe the cause of war purely in term of individual psychology, as if it were a case of psychic tensions within individuals mounting to the breaking point and then spelling over into large scale conflict. Analogies between psychologically based explanations of aggression by individuals and explanations of international war confront yet another problem. In the case of war, those who take the momentous decision to lead a state into war do not themselves do the fighting on the battlefield, even tough in an age of total war the distinction between the battlefield and the home front has sometimes been blurred beyond distinction. Conversely, those who actually engage in battle are likely to have had little or nothing to do with

the actual decision to fight. Feelings of hostility, moreover, might indeed be widespread within a nation vis s vis another nation and yet war might be averted by astute statesmanship. By the same token, a government can lead a people into a war for a which there is little enthusiastic support.

Biological and psychological theories

Conflict has an inside and an outside dimension. It a rises out of the internal dimensions of individuals acting singly or in group, and also out of external conditions and social structures. At all levels of analysis, larger organized aggregates of human beings effect smaller aggregates and individuals, and vice versa. Individuals and groups are in constant interaction. Which is more important, the large or the smaller? Scientists from the many disciplines interested in conflict will probably never be able to agree on an answer to this fundamentally important question. The only available solution to this dilemma is to regard social situations and individual inner processes as an organic whole. We shall begin at the microcosmic level.

All living organism have certain fundamental, species specific biological requirements. Those of the members of human society are the most complex of all "these needs include a reasonable pure atmosphere, numerous nutritional requirements. Fresh water, sleep shelter and clothing (or, more, generally, maintenance of body temperature), health care, including sanitation, physical security, procreation and the nurture and training of the young." Over the world as a whole, the greater part of all economic activity is devoted to meeting basic biological needs. Among humans, biological needs quickly shade off into higher psychological needs that are often even more difficult to satisfy sense of belonging, self esteem and prestige, self actualizations, and so forth. Much of the political and economic competition and conflict among human societies is traceable to the fact that the demand for things required to satisfy biological and psychological needs always exceeds the supply. This does not mean that any theory arising

from a Darwinian evolutionary model of the natural selection process necessarily leads to the conclusion that nature is “red in tooth and claw” and that violence aggression and war are inescapable among human societies. Several biologists have insisted that fitness for survival dictates cooperation and mutual aid at least as often as aggressive conflict.

Animal Behavior Studies

In recent decades, one of the most rapidly advancing branches of biological scientific has been ethnology, the study of animal behavior in all its aspect, with particular emphasis on the four basic animal drives of reproduction, hunger, fear, and aggression. Human behavior and animal behavior are quite dissimilar in some respects, though, they may be analogous, and comparison of basic similarities and subtle difference can help us to avoid oversimplified single factor explanations. Thus, although an examination of animal studies can furnish to direct proof as to the way human beings act it can suggest fruitful areas for future research. The advantage of animal investigation is that it admits of a freedom of experimentation that would be impossible in the case of humans, and it permits the scientist to observe several generations of a species within a short time. The principal caveats to remember, of course, are that humans are vastly more complex than even the most highly developed animals, that the computing organism of the human nervous system lends it self to almost unlimited learning and adaptation, and that, above all, human beings exist in a moral spiritual order.

The cause of aggressive behavior in animals are relatively few. Males, for example, fight over food, females, and territory females to protect the young. All exhibit hostility when strange members of their own species are introduced into their midst, when others make off with objects toward which they have become “possessive” and when their expectations have been first aroused and then frustrated. Researchers have found that there is a relationship between

aggressiveness and the production of the male hormone (even though in a few species the female is more aggressive than the male) that within a species, some breeds may be more aggressive than others that the so called instinctive targets of aggression (such as the mouse for the cat) appear to be more a matter of learning than of heredity that fighting within a species may produce intricate patterns of submission and dominance that an animal will fight rather than be deprived of status that repeated success in fighting can make an animal more aggressive and that various can produce predictable alterations in animal aggressiveness. Studies have also indicated that the same principles of learning on which the stimulation of conflict behavior is based may be applied in reverse, as it were, to control and reduce the aggressive urge.

Generally speaking, biologist have been less reluctant than psychologist to speak of "instinct" not so much as an explanation of an inherited pattern of behavior (through genetic transmission) as a short hand description of those behavior differences that are determined by the interaction of heredity and environment. However, a growing number of biologists now prefer the term innate behavior over the older term instinct.

Lorenz Intraspecific Aggression

New light has been cast upon the nature of aggression by Konrad Lorenz. Lorenz recognized that there is a subtle relationship between the two factors of evolutionary adaptation innate behavior and learning in the environment. From studies of aggression in certain species of fish, dogs, birds, rats, deer, and farmyard animals, Lorenz concluded that aggression is something very different from the destructive principle expressed in the Freudian hypothesis of tanathos. According to Lorenz "aggression, the effects of which are frequently equated with those of the death wish, is an instinct like any other and in natural conditions it helps just as much as any other to insure the survival of the individual and the species.

Lorenz found that aggression, as he defined it, occurs primarily among members of the same species, not between members of different species. When an animal of one species kills an animal of another species for food, this is not aggression in killing the prey, the food gatherer exhibits none of the characteristics of genuinely aggressive behavior. The typical aggressive instinct, according to Lorenz, is not interspecific but intraspecific, and can best be illustrated by the tenacity with which a fish, an animal, or a bird will defend its territory against members of its own species. Aggression is seen as serving a species preserving function in the Darwinian sense, because it prevents the members of species from excessive bunching together and spaces them out over the available habitat. Lorenz noted that among animals who hold sway over a particular territorial space, the readiness to offer combat to an intruder is greatest at the center of the individual's territory the part of the habitat with which it is most familiar.

Nonaggressive species do not form love bonds, while all species that exhibit bond behavior are highly aggressive. Some birds and animals are bonded only during the mating and rearing seasons, at which times they are aggressive. Bonding therefore protects the partners against each other and ensures the safe rearing of the young, but it increases the aggressiveness of the male against the territorial neighbor. Lorenz concluded that analogous processes play a significant role in the family and social life of many higher animals and of the human species.

Besides helping to keep the species spread over the widest area, the aggressive urge as manifested in the rival fight, usually between males, contributes to the selection of the fittest for reproduction. But the aim of aggression, Lorenz insists, is to ward off the intruder, to take possession of the female, or the protected. Its object is never to exterminate follow members of the species. Among several species species Lorenz observed a phenomenon he termed the ritualization of aggression, by which he means a fixed motor pattern involving a ceremonialized

series of inciting or menacing gestures by one individual toward off an interloping member of the same species. This form of aggressive expression seems to achieve the positive species preserving purpose of the aggressive instinct without resort to actual violence.

INSTINCTUAL AGGRESSION

Instinct or innate behavior is the inherent inclination of a living organism towards a particular complex behavior. The simplest example of an instinctive behavior is a fixed action pattern (FAP), in which a very short to medium length sequence of actions, without variation, are carried out in response to a clearly defined stimulus. Any behavior is instinctive if it is performed without being based upon prior experience (that is, in the absence of learning), and is therefore an expression of innate biological factors. Sea turtles, newly hatched on a beach, will automatically move toward the ocean. A marsupial climbs into its mother's pouch upon being born. Honeybees communicate by dancing in the direction of a food source without formal instruction. Other examples include animal fighting, animal courtship behavior, internal escape functions, and the building of nests.

Instincts are inborn complex patterns of behavior that exist in most members of the species, and should be distinguished from reflexes, which are simple responses of an organism to a specific stimulus, such as the contraction of the pupil in response to bright light or the spasmodic movement of the lower leg when the knee is tapped. The absence of volitional capacity must not be confused with an inability to modify fixed action patterns. For example, people may be able to modify a stimulated fixed action pattern by consciously recognizing the point of its activation and simply stop doing it, whereas animals without a sufficiently strong volitional capacity may not be able to disengage from their fixed action patterns, once activated.

The theory that human aggression is an innate biological drive similar to sex and hunger. As such, it cannot be eliminated, but must be controlled, for the good of society. The theory is based on observations of non-human species in which aggression is used to maintain territory and fighting is necessary for survival. The theory supports the contentious notion that sport acts as a catharsis providing a safe and socially acceptable outlet for aggression.

Theories concerning the origin of human aggression are all rooted in the long-standing debate of nature versus nurture. While some regarded aggression as a biological and innate phenomenon, others held it to be a pliable behaviour learnt through environmental observations and situational factors. Human aggression is defined as any behaviour that is intently aimed to cause harm to another individual, given that the offender is conscious of the action and the target motivated to avoid the behaviour. The role of instincts in determining the behavior of animals varies from species to species. The more complex the neural system of an animal, the greater is the role of the cerebral cortex and social learning, and instincts play a lesser role.

Normally, we think of aggression as a form of violent behavior directed toward injuring or killing a human being, or damaging or destroying a nonhuman entity. Some writers have distinguished between hostile aggression, the aim of which is to inflict injury, and instrumental aggression, the purpose of which is to secure extraneous rewards beyond the victim's suffering. Do human beings carry within their genetic or psychic structures an ineradicable "instinct" or predisposition for aggression? Given the way in which the debate about instinctive behavior has developed in this century, it will be useful to examine first the positions taken earlier by certain psychologists. Generally, psychologists have long agreed that aggression is to be understood in some sort of stimulus response framework. A basic issue that arose in their field early in this

century was whether aggressive tendencies are innate, instinctual, and ever present in humans, or whether they appear only as a result of externally produced frustration.

The most famous and most controversial of the "instinct" theories was that of the "death instinct" put forth by Sigmund Freud. Originally, Freud was inclined to the view that aggression result from frustration, especially the frustration of the sexual impulse. But after World War I, Freud postulated the existence in the human being of a fundamental errors, or life instinct, and a fundamental tanathos, or death instinct. For Freud, all instinct were directed toward the reduction or elimination of tension, stimulation, and excitation. The motivation of pleasure seeking activity is to attain an unstimulated condition a sort of Oriental Nirvana or absence of all desire. Death involves the removal of all excitation. Hence all living things aspire to "the quiescence of the inorganic world". But the people go on living despite the death instinct, because the life instinct channels the annihilative drive away from the self toward others. Aggressive behavior thus provides an outlet for destructive energies that might otherwise lead to suicide. According to this hypothesis, the recurrence of war and conflict becomes a necessary periodic release by which group preserve themselves through diverting their self destructive tendencies to outsiders. This, in brief, is the psychoanalytic foundation for Freud's view, which he exchanged in correspondence with Albert Einstein that is, a person carries within "an active instinct for hatred and aggression".

Most contemporary psychologists reject Freud's hypothesis of the death wish of the basis for aggression theory. In other words, the theory attributes the cause of present behavior to a future goal, that is, the reduction or removal of excitation. As for the experimental evidence, it was argued that research performed with animals (principally cats, rats, and mice) negates the validity of the notion that all behavior is aimed at tension reduction, inasmuch as "organisms

frequently go out of their way to obtain additional stimulation from their external environment". It should be remembered that Freud never adduced any compelling body of evidence in support of this hypothesis, hence, there is no scientific need to disprove it. Yet Freud's position in the field of psychoanalysis is so dominant, and his influence on modern Western thought so pervasive, that psychologists sometimes seem anxious to discredit this particular aspect of this theory not only because of its scientific weakness but also because of its rather pessimistic connotations for society.

THE MILITARY / INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

The military–industrial complex (MIC) is an informal alliance between a nation's military and the defense industry which supplies it, seen together as a vested interest which influences public policy. A driving factor behind this relationship between the government and defense-minded corporations is that both sides benefit—one side from obtaining war weapons, and the other from being paid to supply them. The term is most often used in reference to the system behind the military of the United States, where it is most prevalent and gained popularity after its use in the farewell address of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 17, 1961.

In a U.S. context, the appellation given to it sometimes is extended to military–industrial–congressional complex (MICC), adding the U.S. Congress to form a three-sided relationship termed an iron triangle. These relationships include political contributions, political approval for military spending, lobbying to support bureaucracies, and oversight of the industry; or more broadly to include the entire network of contracts and flows of money and resources among individuals as well as corporations and institutions of the defense contractors, private military contractors, The Pentagon, the Congress and executive branch.

Dwight D. Eisenhower ends his presidential term by warning the nation about the increasing power of the military-industrial complex. His remarks, issued during a televised farewell address to the American people, were particularly significant since Ike had famously served the nation as military commander of the Allied forces during World War II. Eisenhower urged his successors to strike a balance between a strong national defense and diplomacy in dealing with the Soviet Union. He did not suggest arms reduction and in fact acknowledged that the bomb was an effective deterrent to nuclear war. However, cognizant that America's peacetime defense policy had changed drastically since his military career, Eisenhower expressed concerns about the growing influence of what he termed the military-industrial complex.

The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. Eisenhower cautioned that the federal government's collaboration with an alliance of military and industrial leaders, though necessary, was vulnerable to abuse of power. Ike then counseled American citizens to be vigilant in monitoring the military-industrial complex. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Etymology

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction. This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the federal government. We recognize the

imperative need for this development. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society. In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military–industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Military–industrial complex is a misnomer because (as he considers it) the phenomenon in question "is not specifically military." He asserts, "There is no military–industrial complex: it's just the industrial system operating under one or another pretext (defense was a pretext for a long time)."

Following the Cold War

United States defense contractors bewailed what they called declining government weapons spending at the end of the Cold War. They saw escalation of tensions, such as with Russia over Ukraine, as new opportunities for increased weapons sales, and have pushed the political system, both directly and through industry lobby groups such as the National Defense Industrial Association, to spend more on military hardware. Pentagon contractor-funded American think tanks such as the Lexington Institute and the Atlantic Council have also demanded increased spending in view of the perceived Russian threat.

Current applications

According to SIPRI, total world spending on military expenses in 2009 was $1.531 trillion U.S. dollars. 46.5% of this total, roughly $712 billion U.S. dollars, was spent by the

United States. The privatization of the production and invention of military technology also leads to a complicated relationship with significant research and development of many technologies. The military budget of the United States for the 2009 fiscal year was $515.4 billion. Adding emergency discretionary spending and supplemental spending, brings the sum to $651.2 billion. This does not include many military-related items that are outside of the Defense Department budget. Overall the U.S. federal government is spending about $1 trillion annually on defense-related purposes. The concept of a military–industrial complex has been expanded to include the entertainment and creative industries.

CONCLUSION

Conflict theory is a set of theories that explains where there are various forms of conflict in the society. The study of conflict theories in international relations is therefore fundamental in the present day world, so as to be able to solve the continuous conflicts plaguing various parts of the world till date. Antisocial behavior results from class conflict and social and economic inequality. The conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the world experience. We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes, caused by numerous conflicts worldwide.

REFERENCES

"Definition of military-industrial complex (American English)". OxfordDictionaries.com. Retrieved 3 March 2016.

"Definition of Military–industrial complex". Merriam-Webster. Retrieved 3 March 2016.

"military industrial complex". American Heritage Dictionary. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. 2015. Retrieved 3 March 2016.

"The Military–Industrial Complex; The Farewell Address of Presidente Eisenhower" Basements publications 2006 ISBN 0976642395

Blumberg, Mark S. (2017). "Development evolving:The origins and meanings of instinct". Wiley interdisciplinary reviews. Cognitive science. **8** (1-2). doi:10.1002/wcs.1371

Diplomat, Matthew Brummer, The. "Japan: The Manga Military". The Diplomat. Retrieved 2016-01-22.

Higgs, Robert (2006). Depression, War, and Cold War : Studies in Political Economy: Studies in Political Economy. Oxford University Press, USA. pp. ix, 138. ISBN 9780195346084. Retrieved 3 March 2016.

Ismaylov, G. (2011). Ethnic conflicts and their causes. In Ethnic conflicts and their causes. [online]. Tokyo : Jyochi university, 2011.: <dspace.khazar.org/jspui/.../136/1/Gursel%20G.%20Ismayilov.doc>.

Ivančík, R. & Jurčák, V. (2013a). Mierové operácie vybraných organizácií medzinárodného krízového manažmentu. Liptovský Mikuláš: Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, 2013. 230 s. ISBN 978-80-8040-469-7.

Ivančík, R. & Jurčák, V. (2013b). Peace operations of International Crisis Management. Ostrowiec Św. : Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu I Przedsiębiorczości, 2013. 180 p. ISBN 978-83-936652-6-6.

Ivančík, R. & Nečas, P. (2012). International Security from the View of Postmodern Conflicts on African Continent. Rzeszów : Publishing House Amelia, 2012. 168 s. ISBN 978-83-63359-44-7. IVANČÍK, R. 2012a. Mierové operácie OSN – nástroj medzinárodného krízového manažmentu na zaistenie medzinárodnej bezpečnosti a mieru vo svete. In Almanach – aktuálne otázky svetovej ekonomiky a politiky, 2012, roč. 7, č. 3, s. 120-137. ISSN 1337-0715.:http://fmv.euba.sk/files/Almanach_3_2012_FMV.pdf

Ivančík, R. (2012b). Operácie na podporu mieru NATO – nástroj medzinárodné-ho krízového manažmentu na zaistenie medzinárodnej bezpečnosti a mieru. In Krízový manažment, 2012, roč. 11, č. 2, s. 18-25. ISSN 1336-0019.:http://fsi.uniza.sk/kkm/files/admincasopis/KM%202%202012/08%20Ivancik.pdf

Ivančík, R. (2013a). Vojenské aspekty asymetrie v medzinárodnej bezpečnosti. In Politické vedy, 2013, roč. 16, č. 3, s. 6-37. ISSN 1335-2741.: http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk/userfiles/file/32013/IVANCIK.pdf

Ivančík, R. (2013b). Operácie krízového manažmentu – príspevok Európskej únie k medzinárodnej bezpečnosti. In Košická bezpečnostná revue, 2013, roč. 3, č. 1, s. 32-41. ISSN 1338 – 6956.: http://www.vsbm.sk/data/revue/revue-1-13.pdf>

Ivančík, R. (2013c). Teoretické a terminologické východiská pre skúmania mierových operácií. In Politické vedy, 2013, roč. 16, č. 1, s. 30-57. ISSN 1335-2741.: <http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk/userfiles/file/1_2013/ IVANCIK.pdf>

Jen DiMascio. "Defense goes all-in for incumbents - Jen DiMascio". POLITICO.

Ledbetter, James (2011). "Guest Post: 50 Years of the "Military–Industrial Complex"". Schott's Vocab. New York Times. Retrieved 25 January 2011.

Mandal, F. B. (2010). Textbook of Animal Behaviour. PHI Learning. p. 47. ISBN 978-81-203-4035-0.

Michel Wieviorka (2013). Social conflict, *Current Sociology*, **61**, 5-6, (696).

Plumer, Brad (2013), "America's staggering defense budget, in charts", The Washington Post

Roland, Alex (2009-06-22). "The Military-Industrial Complex: lobby and trope". In Bacevich, Andrew J. The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy Since World War II. Columbia University Press. pp. 335–70. ISBN 9780231131599. Retrieved 3 March 2016.

Shindler, Michael (2018). "The Military Industrial Complex's Assault on Liberty". The American Conservative. Retrieved 26 June 2018.

Sokolowski, Katie (2012). "Wired for behaviors: from development to function of innate limbic system circuitry". Frontiers in molecular neuroscience (1662-5099), 5, p. 55.

The Intercept, 19 August 2016, "U.S. Defense Contractors Tell Investors Russian Threat is Great for Business," https://theintercept.com/2016/08/19/nato-weapons-industry/

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, 11 May 2016, Testimony of M. Thomas Davis, Senior Fellow, National Defense Industrial Association, "U.S. Industry Perspective on the Department of Defense's Policies, Roles and Responsibilities for Foreign Military Sales," http://docs.house.gov/meetings/AS/AS06/20160511/104900/HHRG-114-AS06-Bio-DavisT-20160511.pdf