

Review Article

Role of Political Leaders to Resolve International Conflicts: Comparing President Barack Obama and President Paul Kagame

Antoine K. Nyagatoma* 

School of Mediation and Conflict Resolution, EUCLID University, Bangui, Central African Republic

Abstract

International conflict is not an unintended outcome of the global system; it is primarily the result of leadership decisions that prioritise force, prestige, and unilateral authority over conversation, negotiation, and collective responsibility. Political leaders play a critical role in determining whether conflicts escalate into violence or become chances for cooperation and peace. This study is based on the premise that leadership is the fundamental cause of both conflict and conflict resolution in international relationships. The goal of this research is to critically explore the role of political leaders in resolving global conflicts through nonviolent, diplomatic means, while also highlighting the adverse effects of leadership failure. The study examines the causes and dynamics of international conflict, its negative social, economic, and humanitarian consequences, and leadership's ability to break cycles of violence. The study takes a qualitative, comparative methodological approach, drawing on historical analysis, secondary literature, and selected case studies, with a focus on the leadership of President Barack Obama of the United States and President Paul Kagame of Rwanda. The analysis indicates that wars and protracted conflicts are overwhelmingly started and sustained by leaders who misinterpret threats, act unilaterally, or prioritize narrow national interests over global security. In contrast, the data show that decisive, principled, and forward-thinking leadership can break down entrenched antagonism. The normalisation of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba under President Obama, as well as the reconciliation process between Rwanda and France under President Kagame, demonstrate that acknowledging historical responsibility, fostering strategic dialogue, and establishing political courage can successfully resolve long-standing conflicts. The article categorically finds that long-term peace is not achieved through military supremacy, deterrence, or institutional rhetoric, but rather through moral leadership, diplomatic engagement, and respect for human dignity. Political leaders are thus more than just actors in international conflict; they are the primary builders. Their willingness—or failure—to take decisive action for peace determined whether the world system devolved into violence or moved towards long-term stability.

Keywords

Political Leadership, International Conflict Resolution, Diplomatic Engagement, Nonviolent Conflict Management and Global Peace and Security

*Corresponding author: nyagatoma17@gmail.com (Antoine K. Nyagatoma)

Received: 13 December 2025; **Accepted:** 25 December 2025; **Published:** 19 January 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

Discussing the role of political leaders to resolve international conflict requires an understanding of who a leader is. Without considering any other definitions given by different scholars, a leader can be defined as a cardinal point of the organization or country, a determinant of the state's life, well-being, and the sustainability of the country's good progress, presently and in the future, supported by other leaders at all levels in the body of the country. Here, it should be precise that leadership is like the whole body; once one nerve is injured, pain is felt throughout the entire system. It is in this regard that the boy's owner or the person in charge would play a prime role in monitoring any slight negative change or pain in the boy's body when a leader fails to understand the content or feels that pain, it will, soon or later, introduce a leadership dilemma that destroys the beauty of the country in the hands of leaders.

According to the book on becoming a leader, they do things that other people have not done or dare not do. They do things ahead of others. They make new things. They make old things new. Having learned from the past, they live in the present, with one eye on the future. And each leader puts it all together in a different way. Leaders must be right-brain, as well as left-brain, thinkers. They must be intuitive, conceptual, synthesising, and artistic, and all these should be done on behalf of the public or society [1].

Furthermore, failure to do so or to think about it leads to conflict that takes over and leads the world into a catastrophe of violence, war, and division within local, regional, and continental communities, and across the globe in politics, diplomacy, and international relations [2, 3]. Therefore, this paper aims to discuss the background of the conflict, global conflicts, the adverse effects of conflicts, the role of political leaders in resolving disputes, and the sustainability of the foundation of peace.

Illustrating the background of the international conflict in this paper, especially as far as international disputes are concerned, in terms of their theory and history. The paper aims to understand the role of the leader in resolving conflict when adopting nonviolent means to end the conflict. Also, the lifestyle of this world and its changing environment has brought it under an insecure situation based on the way each country struggles harder to change its economic structure, security standards, democratic means, diplomatic face on the world map, without forgetting the ambitions of some countries that want to build power so that they can lead others. The nature of wrestling here and there has created instability worldwide.

According to the Understanding Conflict book, during the Cold War, it was often popular to say that because the United States was a democracy and a sea-based power while the Soviet Union was a land-based power and had slave labour camps, America was Athens and the Soviet Union was Sparta locked into replaying a great historical conflict. But such

shallow analogies ignored the fact that ancient Athens was a slave-holding state, wracked with internal turmoil, and that Democrats were not always in control. In practice, these rules of state behaviour are frequently violated because, in the last few decades, Vietnam invaded Cambodia, China invaded Vietnam, Tanzania invaded Uganda, Israel invaded Lebanon, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the United States invaded Grenada and Panama, Iraq invaded Iran and Kuwait, the United States and Britain invaded Iraq, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bombed Serbia because it mistreated ethnic Albanians in the province of Kosovo, to name just a few examples [4]. Here, a practical example is based on how each country's leadership wakes up one day and launches a military campaign against the other or neighbour in the region without employing or emphasizing means of soft power such as dialogue, negotiation a popular voice to resolve the conflict rather than employing heavy artillery, mortars, and other sophisticated weapons alike to destroy the entire country without forgetting the massive loss of human lives just because of one person or two leaders in position who suggested or aggravated the situation that will trigger war outbreak which eventually will bring the people and the country into turmoil life or hostile situation.

It is also clear that leaders, either for self-interest or for national, regional, or continental interests, have triggered most wars. An example is a letter from British Prime Minister Anthony Eden to President Dwight Eisenhower in 1956, which shows how individual leaders can place a country in an abnormal situation.

In the nineteen-thirties, Hitler established his position through a series of carefully planned movements. These began with the occupation of the Rhineland and were followed by successive acts of aggression against Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the West. His actions were tolerated and excused by the majority of Western Europe's population. Similarly, the seizure of the Suez Canal is, we are convinced, the opening gambit in a planned campaign designed by Nasser to expel all Western influence and interests from Arab countries. He believes that if he can get away with this and successfully defy eighteen nations, his prestige in Arabia will be so great that he will be able to mount revolutions by young officers in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq. (We know that he is already preparing a revolution in Iraq, which is the most stable and progressive.) These new Governments will, in effect, be Egyptian satellites if not Russian ones. They will have to place their united oil resources under the control of a United Arabia led by Egypt and under Russian influence. When that moment comes, Nasser can deny oil to Western Europe, and we here shall be at his mercy [4].

This thinking of British Prime Minister Anthony Eden can be taken as a vivid example of a leaders attitude for deciding on the behalf of the entire public community and the decision made in one way or the other that can lead a country into an

abnormal life in all spheres of the country, only to secure its interests by blocking or pre-empting the move of different countries.

Discussing the international conflict requires first understanding its content, which can be defined as hostility between countries or nations, conflict between individuals, and conflict between established institutions within countries worldwide. According to the Understanding International Conflict books, liberals sometimes argue that interdependence means peace and cooperation, but unfortunately, it is not that simple. Struggles over power persist, even in a world of interdependence, because coalitions are more complex and different forms of power are used; the conflicts are often like playing chess on several boards at once [5]. Disputes in the twenty-first century involved both guns and butter. According to the Chinese leader, Mao Zedong (1893-1976), power grows out of the barrel of a gun. After the 1973 oil crisis, the world was reminded that power can also grow out of a barrel of oil [6]. At this point, the situation is clear: the country with resources will be the target, to snatch the available resources or to pre-empt any step that will affect the individual country's interests [4]. Based on the discussion above about the background of the conflict, individuals can say that, despite the factors that cause war, the conflict persists. It is clear from the above that leaders are the ignition of the local or international conflicts.

2. International Conflict

Tackling the international conflict at this stage will continue the background outlined above. Still, to enrich the scope of this study, we will use the example of the Middle East to show how conflict can arise when some countries seek to forge a new life for their country, while others see the move as a threat. According to the understanding of international conflict, the Middle East has often seen appeals to Pan-Arabism and odd situations in which countries suddenly announce they are forming a union, as Egypt and Syria did in 1958 to form the United Arab Republic, or as countries as disparate as Libya and Morocco did in 1989. Over time, however, the forces of the state have prevailed over these pan-nationalist movements. For example, Egyptian nationalism, which focused on the state, gradually became stronger in public opinion than Pan-Arabism. But the gradual process is far from complete, as much of the postcolonial world has been disrupted by economic change and modern communications. Political leaders tried to control this postcolonial discontent. However, some used national appeals, others Pan-Arab appeals, and others fundamentalist religious appeals, all of which contribute to the complexity of the forces driving conflict in regions like the Middle East. The failure of states in the area to modernise effectively explains why some of their citizens turned toward the fundamentalism and terrorism promoted by the Al Qaeda network, which would be considered as a result of fighting back for this change [4]. This

conflict in the Middle East will likely continue, since neither regional nor internal communities are being used as the sole means to resolve it.

Discussing the international conflict requires first understanding its meaning; in one explanation, it can be described as hostility between countries or nations, or as the conflict between individuals and established institutions within countries worldwide. According to the Understanding International Conflict book, liberals sometimes argue that interdependence means peace and cooperation, but unfortunately, it is not that simple. Struggles over power persist, even in a world of interdependence, because coalitions are more complex and different forms of power are used; the conflicts are often like playing chess on several boards at once. Disputes in the twenty-first century involved both guns and butter. According to the Chinese leader, Mao Zedong (1893-1976), "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun." After the 1973 oil crisis, the world was reminded that power can also grow out of a barrel of oil. At this point, the situation is clear: the country with resources will be the target, to snatch the available resources or to pre-empt any step that will affect the individual country's interests [4]. When leaders across the world perceive Chinese leader Mao Zedong's leadership, it means the entire world would be in a state of conflict or war over supremacy, superpower, or interests, which can be achieved through a soft approach rather than physical means or approaches that do not help the universe.

In addition, consider Vietnam, which has been the site of a 30-year war in the twentieth century. In the course of a single generation, five American presidents misperceived reality in Indochina and substituted their phantoms, first called fear and later called hope. These fears and hopes obscured reality until they produced a nightmare that could not be denied, whereby America entered into the longest war and most divisive conflict domestically since the Civil War. Also, in 1948, America's concept of its world role changed profoundly because crisis followed crisis, from Berlin to Greece, and Czechoslovakia and the division between East and West crystallised and hardened, where the concepts of an iron curtain and containment came to pervade the entire American view of foreign affairs. The chasm between East and West appeared deeper day by day, and President Truman, the architect of NATO, began to see himself.

Furthermore, according to the Journal of Conflict Resolution, the crisis that followed the nationalisation of the assets was the leader of an embattled free world resisting the expansion of ruthless totalitarianism [7]. The nature of war, most of the time, is unnecessary because it serves no specific purpose, but instead protects the prestigious image of a certain president in the name of the country. The Suez Canal was the product of a longstanding relationship between Egypt and Great Britain, but its nationalisation posed particular problems for the major European powers. Having Nasser control the canal and, therefore, two-thirds of European oil shipments from the Gulf was a threat to the security of the West in gen-

eral and to that of Great Britain and France, in particular [8]. This kind of feeling, especially when it comes to interest, also brings global instability, thereby leading the international community into an insecure environment. These interests can be pursued through diplomatic moves, especially negotiation.

Visualising the effects of international conflicts at this stage will need to highlight some of them and how they affect the public, the world, or the global community, especially socially or economically. By way of social aspect, war kills people, destroys infrastructure, steals peace and hope, leads to an intended migration, internally displaced people, long-time refugee issues, disconnects people from the way of social living, creates disability, orphanages, widows, stress that puts people in the hospital, to name but a few. According to Joan Barceló, highlights on the long-term effects of war exposure on civic engagement indicate that short-term consequences of war are dreadful, including the destruction of physical infrastructure, the weakening of economic and political institutions, and the obvious loss of human lives, among others [9]. In contrast, the dramatic short-term consequences of war are self-evident, whereas there is no consensus on its long-term effects on societal and developmental outcomes. Also, conventional wisdom holds that war inevitably and drastically disrupts development and social cohesion, creating a global disaster [9]. There are several adverse effects of conflict; however, those mentioned above were given as a building example for the subsequent part of the MP to illustrate how leaders abuse their role in the office, which, in the end, denies the world community the opportunity to consume or enjoy their stay in the universe.

Additionally, the adverse effects of the conflicts have impacted the community in many areas. According to the United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU WIDER), conflict and violence are not only immediate but also continue to affect multiple generations. Impacts can be on economic access and activity, health, and social stability. These impacts, many of which are passed on to children, can have social, economic, and health consequences for future generations [10]. So, after visualizing some of the conflict implications to areas of traditional and human security as a consequence or the result of leaders who passively not responding to the need of resolving the conflict has brought this study to the next part that will discuss the role of leaders to resolve disputes which is the central part that will unfold the response a leader to resolve the crisis or conflict.

3. Methodology

This study uses a qualitative, descriptive research design to investigate the influence of political leadership on international conflict resolution. The methodology, grounded in political science and international relations, prioritises leadership studies, conflict-resolution theory, and diplomatic practice to capture the complexities of decision-making processes that influence conflict escalation or de-escalation. The

research relies entirely on secondary sources, including scholarly publications, peer-reviewed journal articles, policy papers, official speeches, and historical documents. These materials provide both the theoretical foundation and empirical evidence needed to examine the causes of international conflict, its multifaceted repercussions, and leaders' ability to influence outcomes through nonviolent means [11]. The approach is informed by critical international relations perspectives, including realism, liberalism, and conflict resolution theory, which are used to contextualise leadership behaviour within broader systemic and institutional frameworks.

The investigation is centred around a comparative case study approach [2]. The leadership techniques of Presidents Barack Obama and Paul Kagame are explored as examples of leadership-driven conflict resolution. These cases are chosen for their unique geopolitical contexts, historical significance, and observable diplomatic consequences, such as the normalisation of US-Cuba relations [10]. And the Rwanda-France reconciliation effort. The comparison focuses on leadership strategies, diplomatic decisions, and conflict management and resolution methods, including discussion, negotiation, and reconciliation.

Thematic and interpretive data analysis are used to identify repeating patterns in leadership behaviour, conflict management, and peace-building outcomes. Although the study does not pursue statistical generalisation, it does advance analytical generalisation by providing insights into broader issues in international conflict resolution and the critical role of political leadership in maintaining global peace and security.

4. Results

4.1. Role of President Barack Obama and Paul Kagame to Resolve the Conflict

As discussed in the other part of the paper, especially in the background, international conflict and adverse effects of the conflict parties, we indicated how the changing nature of the environment has brought the globe into insecure life, forging a certain unity of a particular region and then creates a threat to another part of the world. As discussed in the international conflict section, it negatively affects the universe across all spheres of life, before embarking on President Obama and President Kagame as two leaders to compare or as examples of other leaders to resolve the international conflict. We will take another example of two leaders who decided to forge a new life in their country. In 1985, with the rise of a new Soviet leader, the United States of America (USA) and the Soviet Union were in conflict after World War II. The USA and the Soviets both advanced their technology to defend themselves against external threats. Still, in December 1987, Gorbachev and Reagan met in Washington and signed the first absolute disarmament accord in the post-war era. The two leaders signed the documents, exchanged pens, smiled warmly, and

shook hands, moved by the occasion. Also, Gorbachev called the three-day Washington summit a significant event in world politics, and Reagan declared that the meeting lit the sky with hope for all people of goodwill, followed by the removal of the US as a major threat to European allies, and the Soviet Union removed a significant threat to its territory [7].

The above two leaders, in the absence of their predecessors after World War II, took the lead in recognising the importance of ending the conflict by giving priority to the international community, the most precious commodity you cannot purchase in any global market: peace. So, this good example has led me to another leader, who will be discussed under this paper's heading.

The first leader is African-American, Barack Hussein Obama, 44th president of the United States from 2009 to 2017, took over the office when America conflicted with Cuba, whereby this conflict had taken almost fifty years, with other country engagements in Iraq, Afghanistan and Iran. Since there was a lot of conflict at the time of taking over the office, we will take one conflict that lasted longer than others, which is the Cuba and America conflict. This was the long-standing conflict. During the joint press conference of Cuban President and US President on March 21, 2016, President Raúl Castro showed how, on December 17, 2014, both Cuba and the US announced their decision to re-establish diplomatic relations by considering the art of co-existing with their differences in a civilised manner.

President Raul further said that promoting links that benefit both countries and peoples should focus on what brings us closer, not on what pulls us apart. This gesture illustrates how any step taken by leaders can restore hope, humanity, and love among global citizens. When President Obama took over the stage said I am pleased that I am joined on this trip by so many Cuban Americans. For them, and the more than two million proud Cuban Americans across the United States, it was a moment filled with great emotion. Just these two leaders, what they did on behalf of their people brought back a tremendous change within the American and Cuban People and even across the globe [12].

In addition, this kind of change is given by leaders who are willing to visualise the importance of nonviolent moves. In his victory speech, President Obama promised a collaborative administration that would include Republicans. And he spoke of the need for sacrifice as the country faces its many challenges [1]. This argument against quitting shows a level of commitment not to surrender humanity to yesterday or historical background, which is characterised by enmity, jealousy, or hatred based on ethnicity, religion, or any other belief, which acts as a block to positive change. According to the Columbia School of International Public Affairs, Center on Global Energy Policy, President Obama's December 2014 announcement that the United States would normalise diplomatic relations with Cuba and open trade and commercial ties that had been severed for more than five decades marked a radical change in US policy toward the island [13]. President

Obama's diplomatic approach to ending the conflict with Cuba or any other country is a remarkable and commendable attitude, a quality of every leader, especially when it comes to conflict resolution.

The approach of Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda, to resolve the conflict will be different from the Barack Obama, former President of the USA because Paul Kagame is the person who joined different guerrilla wars such as National Resistance Army (NRA) which started in 1981 and late alone liberated Uganda in 1986 navigating through life challenges just pursuing a way of returning to his country. President Paul Kagame, together with other Rwandans, joined the Rwanda Patriotic Front/Army (RPF), which had a military wing that launched a liberation campaign on October 1, 1990. As the title of the paper indicates, it will dwell on international conflict. After the RPF captured the country through a journey of four years, towards the last four months of the conflict, a single group of people (Tutsi) was targeted, and almost a million were killed. It is alleged that France had some involvement, especially in arming and supporting the Rwandan government. According to a foreseeable genocide report on April 19 2021 [14, 15], the Rwandan government did not cease to press France for military equipment, including the requested anti-aircraft defence system, after the two presidents' meeting in April 1990. At the same time, other problems beyond the perceived security threat posed by Tutsi refugees were becoming increasingly pressing for Habyarimana and his administration [16]. In a personal view, if France had denied this move, then there would have been no mass killing of one social group in April 1994. Also, following the attacks of the Rwanda Patriotic Army (RPA) in some parts of the country, France decided to send thirty (30) military trainers who would travel to the Ruhengeri and Gisenyi area to toughen the Rwandan military apparatus, and combat aircraft would fly visibly over sensitive Rwandan regions, as well as deploy a Military Instruction Assistance Detachment (MIAD) [16]. Despite different writers and reports, France denied its role in the Rwandan Genocide against Tutsi, and this brought conflict between the two countries.

Furthermore, France has not made documents available to justify the big no of not being involved in the Rwandan conflict, which at a later stage concluded by genocide against Tutsi. The report has underlined the evidence that arms support may have given or continued. The example is on April 15 1994, just one day after Operation Amaryllis, which left Tutsi in the hands of man-slaughtersers. Also, the French army intelligence bureau met with the Rwandan defence attaché in Paris at the latter's request to inform the French government of the army's urgent need for ammunition, particularly 60mm mortar shells [16]. In addition to the above, the paratroopers detachment, Force Noroît, was deployed in October 1990, depending on the rhythm of the war. However, according to French authorities, Force Noroît had a strictly defensive mission, including the defence of expatriates and the securing of the airport, and was deployed in and around

Kigali [14]. France's failure to provide reliable evidence to support its claims and its continual denial of them created diplomatic tension between Rwanda and France for almost two decades.

Following the Rwandan President's travel to France on March 17 2021, to attend an international conference, French President Emmanuel Macron paid his first state visit to Rwanda on May 27, 2021. At the Kigali Genocide Memorial, Macron acknowledged the role and involvement of the French in the Rwandan conflict which resulted in Genocide against Tutsi and conveyed a will or desire to fight genocide ideology and its refusal whereby this move resurrected died diplomatic life between two countries whereby good diplomatic relations was given a chance to rebirth once among within two countries. The French President's visit to Rwanda opened a new chapter in bilateral ties between the two countries. The commitment of two heads of state defused a long-standing diplomatic conflict and paved the way for a new template of future diplomatic life, closing a long-standing page of conflict between countries and giving good relations a chance to take the lead. Therefore, these diplomatic steps reaffirm that leaders can create conflicts or resolve them. Furthermore, it is this line that President Paul Kagame's ability to settle the matter with France without forgetting the role of France in the Rwandan conflict, but to step forward and build on bad history while forging a new one for the interest of Rwandan and France People who still need to pursue their dreams with hope to live and enjoy the abundance of the universe.

4.2. Analysis Made from the Paper

As discussed, the concepts include background, international conflict, the adverse effects of conflict, and the role of leaders in resolving disputes, which are the essence of this paper. The lifestyle of this world and its changing environment, like diplomatic dynamics that are based on world leaders' attitudes, behaviour, leadership approaches, or leadership styles, in one way or another, have brought the universe into insecure situations or an unfavourable life. Also, given how each state struggles more to transform its economic structure or its life, security dynamics are a democratic concept in any country. The international conflicts have been influenced by initiatives bad or good in one of the world member states like North Korea nuclear warhead move or ambition, Russia plan to re-emerge again as superpower country, Israel and Palestine conflict to name but few have created insecure at a continental level even across the world due to leaders failure to reason together of which to adopt so that their can resolve conflict which soon or later can reconcile international community. Also, it is the responsibility of world leaders to see beyond the lines of personal interest, one country's interests, or influence to secure benefits for the international community. This can be achieved when leaders at all levels across the globe work in line with humanity's imperatives. These imperatives can be obtained by leaders

who are willing to attack or fix the isolated problem through negotiation, dialogue, or nonviolent means, as the only weapons to employ when pursuing the desired interest. The example here is Egypt, which tries to control the Nile water by force. According to the resource wars manual, military force has been regularly employed in northeast Africa to enable Egypt to exercise dominion over the upper reaches of the Nile River and its principal tributaries. Because areas outside Egyptian territory supply all the Nile's water and because Egypt possesses no other significant water source, Egypt's rulers have consistently sought to control the river's headwaters to ensure that no foreign power tampered with its natural flow. Although the ancient Egyptians were unable to locate the river's ultimate source, they traced its path into present-day Sudan and mounted periodic campaigns to conquer the area. The British copied this behaviour when they established a protectorate over Egypt in the mid-nineteenth century, and Egypt's modern leaders have continued the practice ever since [17]. This example has been taken from the African continent, where people wake up in the morning and start conflicting with sister-country leadership instead of employing negotiation as a front. The other example is Ukraine and Russia, where currently people are suffering heavy casualties caused by the disproportionate power of guns in the face of the leaders of Russia and Ukraine due to the failure of the two leaders to strike a balance of interests [18].

In addition, political tensions between Russia and Ukraine continued on many issues. These included also those related to the status of Crimea [18, 19], the division of the Soviet Black Sea Fleet between the two states, the basing rights of the Russian Black Sea Fleet in Sevastopol, and the Russian use of military facilities on Crimea. The decision to annex Crimea at an opportune moment was probably made in 2008 after NATO, at its Bucharest summit, promised Ukraine (and Georgia) future membership in the Alliance. The situation changed abruptly on February 22, 2014, when a group of high Ukrainian officials closely connected to the Russian security services unexpectedly fled Ukraine, presumably out of fear for their lives. The temporary power vacuum, the state take-over by groups supported and some financed by the West, and the general confusion offered an ideal opportunity for the Kremlin to carry out the latest version of its contingency plans for annexing Crimea [19]. Furthermore, Ukraine's independence has been the most difficult for Russians to accept [19]. This attitude of superiority undermines the right of each country to decide its own course of action, and it would be the most likely military course of action by Russia against Ukraine if it chose to take a new direction.

5. Conclusion and Policy Implications

By way of conclusion, we have discussed the background of international conflict, visualised it at the global level, its adverse effects, and the role of leaders in resolving it. Instead of spending money buying an arsenal and training the military

to respond with hard power, it would be better to train world citizens and leaders in nonviolent means and negotiation approaches so that all can agreeably share available resources. For instance, the United States has been involved in training efforts to develop an African Crisis Response Force, a multinational contingent composed of troops from several countries, available for regional peacekeeping operations [17]. Why have these efforts been reallocated in one area of physical force? It is our understanding that significant effort should be made in the area of soft power, such as training leaders to advance peace through discussion, dialogue, mediation, and negotiation at the local, regional, and continental levels. We think this can be a better option to cripple negotiations of positive behavioural change towards the cardinal point of peace, as we have discussed with two leaders, President Barack Obama of the USA and President Paul Kagame of the Republic of Rwanda, on their extraordinary efforts to underscore the importance of human dignity, peace, love, unity, and reconciliation. There are other leaders, like Jimmy Carter, who tirelessly worked for peace. According to the award-winning Nobel Prize in 2002, the former USA, during the acceptance speech, sent an important message to world leaders that should serve as a guiding principle, as indicated below in a quote.

Global challenges must be met with an emphasis on peace, in harmony with others, with strong alliances and international consensus. President Jimmy Carter, Nobel Prize Acceptance, 2002.

Furthermore, other leaders who well adopted peace deals to give the world a sense of safety are Gorbachev and Reagan, who, in December 1987, met in Washington and signed the first comprehensive disarmament accord in the post-war era. Two peacemakers signed the documents, exchanged pens, smiled warmly, and shook hands, marking a significant shift in hostility between the two countries. At this point, it is clear that willing leaders can create a safer and more secure environment in the universe. It is on this note that leaders are the architects of conflict resolution as well as the culprits of world peace and violence. As a student of mediation and conflict resolution, I believe that without a nagging heart and mind, as well as the recognition that world citizens need peace. Leaders can resolve local and international conflicts. What was learned from this experience of conflict is that no constitution, strategy, or policy can resolve disputes. Still, only a leader's loving heart can serve as a sophisticated, mass-destruction weapon to resolve conflicts and reconcile the international community. Finally, in my concluding remarks, let the voice of defenceless world citizens, innocent civilians, lose their valuable lives in the hands of appointed or elected world leaders.

Abbreviations

MIAD	Military Instruction Assistance Detachment
------	--

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NRA	National Resistance Army
RPA	Rwanda Patriotic Army
RPF	Rwanda Patriotic Front
UNU WIDER	United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research
USA	United States of America

Author Contributions

Antoine K. Nyagatoma is the sole author. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] W. G. Benis, "On Becoming a Leader". Basic Books, 2009.
- [2] A. K. Nyagatoma, "Hybrid Peace Architecture: Integrating Traditional And International Mediation For Sustainable Conflict Resolution", Volume 7, Issue 6, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i06.63710>
- [3] P. Rahman and S. Mehnaz, "International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)," SSRN Journal, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5054029>
- [4] S. A. Samson, "Joseph Nye, Jr.: Understanding International Conflicts Study Guide" 2009. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/gov_fac_pubs/163
- [5] A. K., Nyagatoma, "Local Justice, Global Image: The Abunzi Mediation System as Soft Power in Post-Conflict Rwanda", 2025. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, Volume 7, Issue 6 (November–December 2025). SSRN Journal, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i06.63710>
- [6] H. Pang, "VISUAL MAO ZEDONG: IDEOLOGICAL IDEALS AND RHETORICAL ORDEALS", 2010. Washington State University.
- [7] J. G., Stoessinger, "Why nations go to war (pp. 188-90)", 2010. St Martin's Press.
- [8] J. Gowa, "Politics at the Water's Edge: Parties, Voters, and the Use of Force Abroad" 1998, International Organization 52, no. 2: 307-324.
- [9] J. Barceló, "The long-term effects of war exposure on civic engagement," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., vol. 118, no. 6, p. e2015539118, Feb. 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015539118>
- [10] T. Lin and G. Mavrotas, "A Contract Perspective on the International Finance Facility", 2004. WIDER Research Paper No. 2004/60.

- [11] K. Mross, C. Fiedler, and J. Grävingholt, "Identifying Pathways to Peace: How International Support Can Help Prevent Conflict Recurrence," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 66, no. 1, p. sqab091, Feb. 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqab091>
- [12] "Joint press conference of Cuban President and USA President (March 21, 2016) retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-201600168/pdf/DCPD-201600168.pdf>, on December 2024.
- [13] P. E. Harrell, "CUBA: US SANCTIONS POLICY AFTER THE EMBARGO", 2016. Center on Global Energy Policy, New York.
- [14] J Eriksson., H., Adelman, J., Borton, H., Christensen, K., Kumar, A., Suhrke, & L. Wohlgemuth, "The international response to conflict and genocide Lessons from the Rwanda experience, Synthesis Report. Copenhagen: Steering Committee for the Joint Evaluation of Emergency assistance to Rwanda", 1996.
- [15] J., Karuhanga, "New report details France's role in Genocide against Tutsi", 2021. Retrieved from <https://francegenocidetutsi.org/FranceRoleInGenocideAgainstTutsiTnT20April2021>, October 2025.
- [16] "New report details France's role in Genocide against the Tutsi." 2021. Retrieved from <https://.org/RwandaFranceRviveTiesTnT27December2021.pdf>, on May 2025.
- [17] M. Klare and B. S. Zellen, "Resource Wars: Energy, Resource Conflict, and the Emerging World Order with Michael T. Klare; Strategic Insights, v. 7 issue 1, 2008. <https://hdl.handle.net/10945/11246>
- [18] N. Chitadze, "The Role of U. S. in the Russian-Ukraine Conflict Since the Period of Crimea Occupation till 2022," *HUM*, vol. 11, no. 2, Dec. 2022, <https://doi.org/10.31578/hum.v11i2.492>
- [19] A. Bebler, "Crimea and the Russian-Ukrainian Conflict", 2015. *Romanian J. Eur. Aff.* 15: 35.