

While the negotiation of a humanitarian ceasefire is not a direct attempt to resolve conflict, it shares with the theories of Burton, Rothman and others, a common analysis of the underlying causes of conflict. It is not surprising, then, that in method too, even if only incidentally, the process of implementing and carrying out a humanitarian ceasefire results in some of the activity for resolving conflict recommended and utilized by the non-traditional conflict theorists.

One of the purposes of the problem-solving workshops is to provide the opposing parties with insights into their own behaviour and that of their opposites. The aim is to modify the attitudes or realign the perceptions that the parties have of each other. Ultimately, this should contribute to de-escalation of the conflict, extend the range of choices of functional cooperation and present conflict as a problem to be solved, not a contest to be won.⁷⁴

False perceptions of the enemy, and propaganda used to reinforce them, are dysfunctional aspects of most armed conflicts. Warren Ashby, a Quaker who was involved with both India and Pakistan just prior to the outbreak of war between the two in 1965, reported that he had become acutely aware of the distortions, delusions, and falsifications with which each nation looked at each other.⁷⁵ A graphic example of propagandization aimed at reinforcing false perceptions is the following exhortation to the Iranians broadcast on a Tehran radio station during the Iran-Iraq conflict:

The enemy soldier is not human. He is bred from the dirty seed of bestiality. He is a germ of savagery, a hyena in human clothes, a dirty swine with poisoned blood in his veins.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Burton, *supra* note 71, p. 157.

⁷⁵ Yarrow, *supra* note 16, p. 156.

⁷⁶ William Bilski and William Lowther, "Talking Peace in War," *Macleans*, 101:33, 8 August 1988, p. 19.