

## **“Conflict occurs when people take a stand”**

Conflict has a variance of levels. From an argument with a neighbour, or between two differing preachers, alongside the ideological conflict obvious in war all serve to indicate that the extent and definition of conflict varies dramatically. However, for conflict to occur, there must be two opposing sides for that ideological struggle to take root. Whether or not either side is substantially dogmatic or neither is willing to compromise, conflict occurs the moment that disparate peoples attempt to defend or assert what they believe in, and therefore endeavour to force their ideas upon others or repudiate their adversary's conviction. Conflict in this respect can be defined as a form of battle between two opposing groups, where all are given the equal opportunity to defend their freedom, as well as the principles and customs of their way of life.

Oppression is common even today. Such neglectful spite exacted towards certain groups, especially in history past, affirms the notions that conflict does indeed occur when people take action for their beliefs. The Scottish Wars of independence exemplifies the ability most have when challenged. Upon the arrival of the English upon Scottish land during the 13th century to mid-14th century, the Scottish were not in the position to defend themselves, they had an opportunity to take a stand. Despite being heavily outnumbered and our armed, the barons' forces were able to overcome the oppressive tactics of the southern invaders. This is what sparked the conflict that is war. If they had not stood up to attack those persecuting them, the wars would not have occurred, and hence those territorial and ideological battles. Many in both Britain and Scotland at the time no doubt felt strongly about what their country was doing. It is this conviction, the assured moral and patriotic base that gave both sides the strength to either assert their ideas, as did the British, or to defend, as did the protagonist Scots. The beliefs that one is above another may incline certain ethnicities to assert their dominance. Nevertheless, it is the dominance of thinking that creates fervour and national pride upon the idea of war and therefore conflict. Thus, taking a stand and either pushing or preserving your beliefs forces conflict.

Despite the potential of most humans to be given the opportunity to defend themselves, in some cases, such fairness is not considered. The Holocaust propagates this, as millions died with little or no hope of defence. Being unable to hold one's proper beliefs under even subsisting circumstances highlights that for conflict to occur on both sides, both sides need the same opportunity to defend themselves. The Germans were able to assert their doctrines, however, the Jewish amongst many others in death camps were neither physically able to fight back, nor were they capable of even improving their situation. Similar events are replayed thought the ages. The September Massacres of the French revolution explicitly champions the role that defence has in conflict. It was the third year of the French Revolution, the previously first and second estates of the Old Regime were primarily placed in prison. Thousands of clergy, nobles and royalty were arrested due to their wealth and placed in dungeons. However, the convictions of the public, the peasant, proletariat and bourgeoisie classes caused a hatred of these prisoners and resulted in them storming the prisons and slaughtering all those inside. Those incarcerated were not trialled, they were not given a defence of any form. Hence, conflict did not occur when all the people took a stand, because the thousands that were massacred were not given the equal opportunity to fight back. In every battle there is required to be not only an attack by one, but also a defence by another. Although many may die through being attacked by another, unless they can either defend or assert their own freedom, the conflict did not occur as to when people took a stand. As many peoples involved in the

events were unable to take a stand. (Admittedly, even if one was to consider it a conflict of sorts, it could be said that it was them not taking a stand, or being unable to fight back that created a form of conflict.) Assuredly, many have suffered from others attacking them, ergo, with no available defence, the conflict turns to oppression and exploitation. In this regards, conflict only occurs when all involved take a stand, but actions do not progress to conflict when only a minority or majority of people take a stand.

A minority of people though, have the future ability to become a majority. The Bolsheviks in the Russian revolutions advocate this point. More true to today however is homosexuality. To compare the changes in ideologies and reactions to those not of the sexual preference to us has caused heartache and pain for untold centuries. What was considered ethically incorrect 50 years ago is now defended by all those who desire equality. This is because the support of the notion of homosexuality and bisexuality has increased a hundredfold in the preceding decades, and particularly the one that is current. Many have their religious beliefs that incline them to hate, while many others choose to be liberal, they choose to take a stand, or perhaps not to take a stand. Either way, the aid of those who morally want a more accepting society has led to this change. No doubt many have been mocked and ridiculed in times past, but the social acceptance of the public has culminated to the point that for one to be discriminated against not only for sexual attractions but for anything out of their control is seen as disgusting and is shunned. All are involved in this issue, and despite protests and what many deem as religious fanatics attacking the belief of social acceptance, conflict does not ensue. Ideological conflicts may always rage, however, the growth of belief for greater ethics has emerged as the most powerful catalyst that society has experienced. Conflict need not, and due to profitable occasions, has not arisen due to people taking a stand. The potential of the few has been realised in modern times, as made apparent by how conflict may not occur when people take a stand for what they believe in, and for what they see as most beneficial for the soon to be majority.

Notwithstanding, what may appear as barbaric acts has the potential to reveal hidden truths. This is made apparent by Galileo in 'The Life of Galileo'. He took a stand for truth, the church took a stand for tradition and dogmatic interpretation of Holy Scripture. The faith of the church and Galileo was unyielding, to a point. Galileo pursued his investigation of science and astronomy, directly paradoxing the teachings of the church. Despite Galileo's greatest efforts in order to make the truth known, the attacks of the church prohibited him in many manners in attaining the result he wanted. However, he was able to fight back in subtle ways, and was able to hence defend his ideologies. Galileo backing down and not provoking exacerbated phases of hardships, actually prevented further struggle. Despite him recanting, he was given the chance to uphold his appreciation for truth. His actions in pursuing another branch of science in order to preserve his life, stresses the importance that Galileo held to science. Galileo's determined actions, while still maintaining most principles, although not all customs of his life resulted in his decision that taking a stand for future scientific discoveries would result in a more profitable outcome. Galileo's edifice of beliefs allowed him to still take a stand for the truths he wanted to expand, and not tempt future conflict. Therefore, both the church and Galileo acted in regard to their ideas, and each was able to give testimony to their affirmations, but the climactic result ended in little or no conflict between Galileo and the church. Supporting that on occasions, conflict is not formed as a by-product of people taking a stand.

Despite conflict often resulting in extenuated versions of hardship, numerous battles have been established and performed based on one point of view, as one side seems to dominate the other through the medium of violent usurpation. The victim neither attacks nor endeavours to force others, they are merely standing by their way of life. However, the opposite is also ascertained by some specific arguments that can conclude in benefits for all. In these respects, conflict occurs for an array of reasons on a range of levels, not only when people take a stand. Thus, conflict too has the potential to not arise even though groups may take a stand.