GENS 202: PEACE STUDIES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

<div style="text-align:center">

CHAPTER ONE

AN INTRODUCTION TO PEACE STUDIES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION
</div>

1.0   **Introduction**

This chapter deals with definition, the subject matter, the scope and factors that contributed to the growth of the discipline as an academic field of study.

1.1   **Objective**

At the end of this chapter, students would understand the definition of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution, the subject matter, the scope and factors that have contributed to the growth of the discipline as an academic field of study.

1.2   **Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution**

Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution is an interdisciplinary field of study with varying themes including but not limited to analysis of conflict; management of conflict; resolution of conflict; non-violent sanctions; peace paradigms, peace building, peacekeeping, peace enforcement; social and economic justice; war's causes and conduct; and a variety of conceptions of international and domestic security (Miller, 2005:60). Dugan (1989) sees it as a social science field that identifies and analyses violent and nonviolent behaviours as well as the structural mechanisms attending conflicts (including social conflicts) with a view towards understanding those processes which lead to a more desirable human condition. It is a direct response by scholars who were determined to advance the understanding of causes of conflict and help in shifting the orientations of men and leaders from war related concerns, calculations and strategies towards a new world order (Zabadi, 2009:85). The study of peace and conflict resolution has become indispensable due to the consequences associated with conflict that affect unity, development and social cohesion. In fact, it is one of the most interesting field of study in social sciences and humanities.

1.3   **The Scope of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution**

Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution as an academic field of study draws from Political Science, Sociology, History, Anthropology, Theology, Psychology, Philosophy, Law and other disciplines to understand the causes of violent conflict; develop ways to prevent and resolve war, genocide, terrorism, gross violations of human rights; and build peaceful and just systems and societies (https://kroc.nd.edu/about-us/what-is-peace-studies). It encompasses the study of political, economic, and social systems at the local, national, and international levels, as well as examines ideology, culture, and technology as they relate to conflict (Klare, 1994). The field is variously known as 'peace and conflict studies', 'peace and security studies', 'peace and world order studies', 'justice and reconciliation studies', and other similar variations (Klare, 1994).

1.4   **The Subject Matter of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution**

Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution is an academic field of study that analyzes the causes of war and systemic oppression, and explores processes by which conflict can be managed so as to maximize justice while minimizing violence (Klare, 1994). The field addresses some of the most enduring and intractable problems confronting humanity. It is primarily concerned with inculcating knowledge that is directly or indirectly link to increasing development and reducing conflict, both within specific societies and in the wider international community. It is also concerned with an analysis of the origins, types, causes and nature of violent conflicts within and between societies and how conflicts can be managed, resolved and prevented. This is because the world has never been in absolute peace but in permanent tension.

1.5   **Development of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution as an Academic Field of Study**

Peace studies and conflict resolution as an academic discipline, developed in Europe in the late 1940s and 1950s with strong root in the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland and Iceland) (Francis, 2012:15). This was at the periods of the Cold War, when the development of nuclear weapons and the conflict between the superpowers seemed to threaten human survival. A group of pioneers from different disciplines saw the value of studying conflict as a general phenomenon, with similar properties whether it occurs in international relations, domestic politics, industrial relations, communities, families or between individuals. A handful of people in North America and Europe began to establish research groups to develop these new ideas. The following factors and events generally contributed to the growth of the discipline:

1.5.1   **Contribution of Realist Peace Philosophers**

The contributions of peace philosophers such as Sun Tzu, Niccolo Machiavelli, Alighieri Dante, Thomas Hobbes and a host of other philosophers to critical issues about peace. They devised schemes for their rulers on how best to overcome military advances of other States. According to these philosophers, people are by nature selfish, competitive, and domineering changing human nature is an utopian aspiration. To them, war could only be avoided only to the advantage of others. In contemporary international politics, realist writers such as E.H Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, Henry Kissinger etc. viewed the nation-state as the most important actor on the world stage since it answers to no higher political authority.

States are supreme: they have supreme power over their territory and populace, and no one stands above them wielding the legitimacy and coercive capability to govern the international system. This makes the struggle for power (national interest) competitive. Thus, making the international system anarchic and each State engage in self-help for its own survival and feel uncertain about its neighbours' intensions (Kegley & Raymond, 2010:29-30). Despite providing solution on how states can defend themselves, there were shortcomings with the realist postulations. First, there is only little

value added to peace and conflict resolution when violence is seem to be resolvable; and second, the excessive emphasis on state as the most important political actor which overlooks the role of non-state actors in controlling conflicts.

1.5.2 The two World Wars (World War I and World War II)

The World War I occurred from 1914-1918 and by the time it ended, nearly 10 million people had died; and the World War II occurred from 1939-1945. At the end of the Second World War, 53 million people died during the six years of fighting (Kegley & Raymond, 2010). Equally important to note was the undeletable experienced dropping of " Little Boy atomic bomb" on Hiroshima and " Fat Man atomic bomb" on Nagasaki – Japan by the United States on 6th August and 9th August, 1945 that killed between 90,000 and 166,000 people in Hiroshima and over 40,000 people in Nagasaki (Sherwin, 2005:58).

1.5.3 The formation of International Organizations (League of Nations and the United Nations [UN])

Prior to the First World War, there was no mechanism to prevent war except the " balance of power" which was associated with unprincipled power politics that proved to be ineffective. In an effort to stop further destruction of life and property and perhaps possible extermination of humanity, a League of Nations from the advocacy of Woodrow Wilson and other idealists with a purpose of collective security was established in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference. The League failed to prevent the Second World War and the reasons given for its failure were that: (a) the great powers then (Great Britain, France, the United States, Italy and Japan) gave lip service to the idea of collective security introduced by the League and secretly believed in the old idea of the balance of power; (b) the inability of the League to checkmate the rise of Nazism in Germany and Fascism in Italy; and (c) the non-participation of United States in the League (Okeke, 2006:68).

On the other hand, the United Nations was founded out of the failures of the League of Nations to prevent World War II with 51 representatives of various nations on June, 26, 1945 in San Francisco, United States. The primary responsibility of the UN is the maintenance of international peace and security. The UN charter permitted any of the Security Council' s five permanent members (United States, Russia, Great Britain, France and China) to veto and thereby blocked proposed military actions (Kegley & Raymond, 2010:274). The establishment of these two international organizations was borne out of the bitter experiences of the two World Wars and this contributed to the growth of the discipline as an academic field of study.

1.5.4 The Cold War between USA and former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) from 1945-1991; and the Vietnam War (1955-1975)

The Cold War is defined as the existence of some form of tension without direct physical confrontation among nations. However, there are accounts of indirect confrontation by proxy to

secure national interests. For forty-five years, the Cold War was at the center of world politics (Painter & Leffler, 2005:1). The tragedy of the Second World War from 1939-1945 produced two superpowers, the United States of America and the then Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), each superpower led an ideological, security and economic bloc with which it confronted the other as well as exerted global influence. Thus, the USA was the leader of the capitalist economic bloc of the western countries while the USSR led the communist bloc of Eastern countries in a tight bipolar international system.

The Cold War was conducted in several dimensions, which included security pacts and alliances, the main were the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. NATO led by USA was founded in 1949 to oppose and deter Soviet power in Europe and its counterpart in Eastern Europe led by Russia formed Warsaw Pact in 1955 and disbanded in 1991 (Goldgeier, 1999). The superpowers proceeded to impose strict compliance among their members to the rules of conduct laid down, and tried to bring the uncommitted parts of the world behind them (Zabadi, 2009:87). The cold war endangered world peace, particularly as the two nations, each supported by their satellite states, were militarily and economically the strongest in the world. The period was characterized by tension, conflicts, wars, fears and unprecedented insecurity in the world.

On the other hand, the Vietnam War between 1955-1975 with a devastated impact on the populace which was one of the most controversial and divisive wars fought during the period of the cold war. It was also one of the longest that killed approximately 1,353,000 people with thousands wounded (Westheider, 2007). These necessitated for scholars to delve into peace research which invariable contributed to the growth of the discipline.

1.5.5 Peace Activism inspired by Ghandi and Rev. Martin Luther King (Jr)

The impact of the World War II gave rise to peace activism in India in form of civil disobedience against colonialism, racism and violence championed by Mahatma Ghandi. He was one of the most influential spokespersons known for peace and non-violent resistance in the 20th century (Asirvatham, 2010). Employing nonviolent civil disobedience, Gandhi led India to independence and inspired movements for civil rights and freedom across the world. He was the first to apply the principle of nonviolence on a large scale. One of his remarks widely quoted was "there are many causes that I am prepared to die for but no causes that I am prepared to kill for" (Geary, 2007:87).

On the other hand, Rev. Martin Luther King (Jr) led a Civil Rights Movement in the United States of America. King was an American Baptist minister and activist who was a leader in the Civil Rights Movement. He is best known for his role in the advancement of civil rights using nonviolent civil disobedience based on his Christian beliefs. The Civil Rights Movement encompasses social movements in the United States whose goals were to end racial segregation and discrimination against African Americans and to secure legal recognition and federal protection of the citizenship

rights. The movement was characterized by major campaigns of civil resistance. Between 1955 and 1968, acts of nonviolent protest and civil disobedience produced crisis situations and productive dialogues between activists and government authorities.

1.5.6 Establishment of Peace Research Centres and Institutions

The foundations of the field were laid in Europe in the 1950s and 1960s with the founding of several peace research institutes and centres. Some of the oldest and most prestigious peace research institutions include the Peace Research Institute Oslo; the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Sweden; Peace Research Institute Michigan, North America; the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Sweden etc. Work by academics such as Johan Galtung and John Burton, and debates in fora such as the Journal of Peace Research in the 1960s reflected the growing interest and academic stature of the field (Wallensteen 1988; Barash & Webel, 2013:26). Growth in the number of peace studies programs around the world was accelerated during the 1980s, as scholars became more concerned about the prospects of nuclear war. As the Cold War ended, peace and conflict studies courses shifted their focus from international conflict towards complex issues related to political violence, human security, democratization, human rights, social justice, welfare, development and producing sustainable forms of peace (Harris, Fisk, and Rank, 1998; Miall, Ramsbotham, & Woodhouse, 2005). Today, Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution is being taught in higher institutions of learning across the globe.

1.6 Why This Course?

It is obvious that, over centuries, conflicts have erupted at various levels (national, regional and international) with various degrees of impact on human and property. Europe fought the 30 year's war which culminated with the treaty of Westphalia in1648, then there was the French revolution, the American war of Independence, the first (1914-1918) and second world (1939-1945) wars, the cold war and proxy wars, etc. We must note that most of these wars and conflicts, to more or less a degree, were game changing, i.e. they led to some forms of change that was either positive or negative.

Although, conflict is inevitable world over, Africa illustrates a case of a continental terrain where the magnitude of conflicts, its dimensions and consequences have threatened peace, unity and development. Wars, armed violence and insecurity continue to blight Africa, contributing to human suffering (Greene, 2006:v). The 1994 genocide in Rwanda, Civil War in Darfur, ethnic cleansing in Burundi, Uganda, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Central African Republic and apartheid and xenophobia in South Africa etcetera.

In Nigeria for instance, conflicts such as the Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970), Maitatsine, Boko Haram insurgency, Niger-Delta Militancy, Southern Kaduna Killings, Banditry, Kidnapping ethno-religious/communal conflicts and political violence led to destruction of lives and property etc

are instances of violent conflicts that push us to wonder why, or, more importantly, how do we avoid these kinds of violent conflict. Therefore, the systematic study of how to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts became imperative. It is therefore imperative to digest the following:

1. **Understanding the link between violence and progress**: There is a notion advanced by groups like liberation theologists, terrorist and liberation movements that violence is a necessary and right tool of progress. In this course we would examine this claim so that safe paths of progress can be highlighted.

2. **Handling Clash of civilizations**: As our world has become smaller and closer because of globalization, the rate of friction between different people has increased. And with this has come conflicts of different magnitude. Examples include the ThisDay disturbances in Nigeria, xenophobia in South Africa, etc.

3. **Knowing the acceptable limits of conflict to accept**: a key assumption in this course is that while conflict is inevitable in society, violent conflict is avoidable. If conflict is described at a very basic level as disagreement in interests, beliefs and values, then conflict is bound to happen in very diverse societies like Nigeria. But should we allow conflicts to degenerate to violent conflicts? Knowing the dangerous points as well as how to handle and resolve a brewing conflict is a major goal of this course.

REFERENCES

Asirvatham, E. (2010). *Political Theory*. S.Chand: New Delhi.

Barash, D.P. and Webel, C.P (2013). *Peace and Conflict Studies*. SAGE Publications.

Dugan, M. (1989). "Peace Studies at the Graduate Level." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science: Peace Studies: Past and Future*. 72– 79.

Francis, D.J. (2012). Peace and Conflict Studies: An African Overview of Basic Concepts. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. University Press.

Geary, J. (2007). *Geary's Guide to the World's Great Aphorists*. Bloomsbury: USA.

Goldgeier, J. (1999). *Not Whether But When: The Decision to Enlarge NATO.* Brookings.

Greene, O. (2006). Introduction. In: Buxton, J.; Greene, O. and Salonius-Pasternak, C. (eds). *Conflict Prevention, Management and Reduction in Africa*. A Joint Project of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs & the Centre for International Cooperation and Security.

https://kroc.nd.edu/about-us/what-is-peace-studies. Accessed on 22nd January, 2016.

https://sipa.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/peaceandconflictresolution%20-%20DONE2%20sg.pdf. Accessed on 22nd January, 2016.

Harris, I.; Fisk, L.J. and Rank, C. (1998). "A Portrait of University Peace Studies in North America and Western Europe at the End of the Millennium." *International Journal of Peace Studies*. Vol. 3, No. 1.

Kegley, C.W & Raymond, G.A. (2010). *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics*. Macmillan: USA.

Klare, M.T. (1994) (ed). *Peace & World Security Studies: A Curriculum Guide*. Lynne Reiner Publishers.

Malu, S.V..L (2009). ECOMOG: A Peace Keeping Operation in Perspective. In: Jonah, G.J. and Zabadi, I.S. (2009). *Peace Support Operations in the New Global Environment: The Nigerian Perspective*. National Defence College: Abuja.

Miall, H.; Ramsbotham, O. & Woodhouse, T. (2005). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*: Polity Press: USA.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. University for Peace.

Okeke, G.S.M (2006). International Institutions and World Peace. In: Adegbulu, F. (ed). *Topics and Issues in International Relations*. Babcock University Press: Nigeria.

Painter, D.S and Leffler, M.P (2005). The international system and the origins of the Cold War. In: Painter, D.S and Leffler, M.P (eds). *Origins of the Cold War: An International History* (2nd edition). Routledge: New York.

Sherwin, M.J. (2005). The Atomic Bomb and the Origins of the Cold War. Painter, D.S and Leffler, M.P (eds). *Origins of the Cold War: An International History* (2nd edition). Routledge: New York.

Wallensteen, P. (ed.) (1988). *Peace Research: Achievements and Challenges*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Westheider, J.E (2007). *The Vietnam War*. Greenwood Press: Connecticut.

Zabadi, I.S. (2009). Conflict Resolution in the New Global Environment: The Role of the Nigerian Military. In: Jonah, G.J. and Zabadi, I.S. (2009). *Peace Support Operations in the New Global Environment: The Nigerian Perspective*. National Defence College: Abuja.

CHAPTER TWO

MAJOR CONCEPTS IN PEACE STUDIES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

2.0   **Introduction**

This chapter deals with the conceptual definitions of major concepts in Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution.

2.1   **Objective**

The essence of this chapter is to facilitate the students' understanding of basic concepts of the course some of which include: Peace, Resolution, Conflict, Conflict Resolution, Human Rights, Violence, Security and Terrorism.

2.3.   **Peace**

Peace in human relations denotes societal harmony and the absence of conflict, discord, hostility or war (Imobighe, 2006). Francis (2012:17) defines peace as absence of war, direct violence, injustice, fear, anxiety, conflict, suffering and; presence of respect and tolerance in the society. Peace embodies justice, love, righteousness, discipline, compassion and forgiveness (Mbachu, 2009:83). This means where there is peace, there is justice. Johan Galtung in defining peace, he outlines two dimensions: ' negative peace' , i.e, the absence of direct violence, war, fear, and conflict at individual, national, regional and international levels; and ' positive peace' , i.e., the absence of unjust structures, unequal relationships, justice and inner peace at individual level (Francis, 2012:18). Therefore, the greatest living asset man has today is peace which is an absolute necessity, lacks of it, is however, dangerous to human existence.

2.4   **Resolution**

Resolution is a formal or informal statement of an opinion agreed by a committee or council or act of settling problem or dispute (Usman, 2014:100). Resolution of conflict implies that the deep-rooted sources of conflict are addressed so that changing behaviours are no longer violent; attitudes are no longer hostile, and structures are no longer exploitative. The term is used to refer both to the process (or the intention) to bring about these changes and to the completion of the process. The process of conflict, diagnosing its nature and applying appropriate methods in order to: diffuse the negative emotional energy involved; enable the conflicting parties to understand and resolve their difference; resolve the differences so as to achieve solutions that are not imposed, which have been agreed by all the key parties, and which address the root cause of the conflict (Ndiomu cited in Onumajuru, 2005:19). Resolution therefore, is an act of settling disagreement between and among disputants. It could be individuals, communities or nations.

2.5   **Conflict**

Conflict from the Latin for ' to clash or engage in a fight' is a confrontation between two or more parties aspiring towards incompatible or competitive means or ends (Miller, 2005:22). Coser (1968:232) defined conflict as a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources, in which the aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain the desired values but also to

neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals. The term represents a disharmony, antagonism, or hostility in a relationship, which could arise due to incompatibility of the chosen goals (Imobighe, 2006). It is an existing state of disagreement or hostility between two or more people (Nicholson, 1992). Conflict can equally be said to be a situation in which two or more human beings desire goals which they perceive as being obtainable by one or the other but not both (Akpan, 2006:38). This definition implies that there must be at least two parties, each party mobilizing energy to obtain a goal, desired objective or situation, and each party perceiving the other as a barrier or threat to that goal. Though conflict may not be necessarily negative at all times.

Conflicts may, perhaps paradoxically, promote and increase peace and diminish violence if the conflicting parties negotiate in good faith to reach solutions to problems that are achievable and tolerable, if not ideal (Webel, 2007:8). Conflicts are unavoidable aspects of human interaction. They arise from the pursuit of divergent interests, goals and aspirations by individuals or groups. Conflicts appear historically inevitable and may be socially desirable if they result in personal and/or political progress (Webel, 2007:8). According to Picard (2002:3) individuals and groups engage in conflict for the purpose of gaining something that is perceived to be in short supply, or over needs that appear incompatible. In as much as the society cannot stops pursuing scarce resources, politics, interest, ideology, valued goals and objectives, conflict too is unavoidable. This is obvious because in the process of human interactions, competition and disagreement, if not well manage lead to conflict, violence and war.

2.6 **Conflict Resolution**

Conflict Resolution also known as " Dispute Resolution" is a process of resolving a dispute or conflict permanently. It is also refers to a variety of approaches aimed at resolving conflicts through the constructive solving of problems distinct from management and transformation of conflict (Miller, 2005:25). It encompasses the use of nonviolent resistance measures by conflicted parties in an attempt to promote effective resolution (Roberts & Garton, 2009). It has traditionally referred to measures attempting to resolve the underlying incompatibilities of a conflict, including attempts to get the parties to mutually accept each others' existence (Wallensteen, 2002). Conflict resolution therefore, denotes the act of settling dispute permanently.

2.7 **Human Rights**

Human rights are the freedoms to which all individuals are entitled as human beings. Today the United Nations, African Union, ECOWAS and majority of nation-states acknowledged that human rights apply to all people at all times. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in article 1-30 include: right to life, liberty and security of person, right to freedom of movement and residence within borders of each state, right to own property, right to freedom of opinion and expression, right to freedom of religion, right to association, all are equal before the law and are entitled without any

discrimination of the la, no one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile etc. However, these fundamental rights are not absolute because they have limitations as where ones right stop that is where others right begin.

2.8 Violence

Violence is an act against individual or group with the intent to cause injury or death. It is a physical onslaught meted out on an individual or a group. The World Health Organization (WHO) (2002) defines violence as " the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation" . The definition is all encompassing; it covers a wide range of acts, going beyond physical acts to include threats and intimidation. Besides death and injury, the definition also includes the myriad and often less obvious consequences of violent behaviour, such as psychological harm, deprivation and mal-development that compromise the well-being of individuals, families and communities. The typology used in the World report on violence and health divides violence into three broad categories, according to who commits the violent act: self-directed violence; interpersonal violence; and collective violence.

1. **Self-directed Violence:** is that inflicted by a person upon himself/herself. This is sub-divided into suicidal behavior and self-abuse. Example suicidal thoughts, attempted suicide or para-suicide, deliberate self-injury, completed suicide, self mutilation (Uzuegbunam, 2009:591). Suicidal behaviour ranges in degree from merely thinking about ending one's life, to planning it, finding the means to do so, attempting to kill oneself, and completing the act (World Health Organization, 2002:5).

2. **Interpersonal Violence:** This type of violence is divided into two subcategories: Family and intimate partner violence – that is, violence largely between family members and intimate partners, usually, though not exclusively, taking place in the home such as wife battering, killing, child abuse, sexual harassment (Uzuegbunam, 2009:591); and community violence – this is a violence between individuals who are unrelated, and who may or may not know each other, generally taking place outside the home. The former group includes forms of violence such as child abuse, violence by an intimate partner and abuse of the elderly. The latter includes youth violence, random acts of violence, rape or sexual assault by strangers, and violence in institutional settings such as schools, workplaces, prisons and nursing homes (World Health Organization, 2002:5).

3. **Collective Violence**: Is the instrumental use of violence by people who identify themselves as members of a group against another group or set of individuals, in order to achieve political, economic or social objectives. It takes a variety of forms: armed conflicts within or between states; genocide, repression and other human rights abuses; terrorism; and organized violent crime. The

typology also captures the nature of violent acts, which can be physical, sexual or psychological or involve deprivation or neglect. The typology also considers the relevance of the setting, the relationship between the perpetrator and victim, and – in the case of collective violence – the possible motives for the violence (World Health Organization, 2002:5). Also, Johan Galtung distinguishes three types of violence relevant to the understanding of peace conditions that create unpeaceful situations or 'peacelessness'.

(a)   **Direct Violence**: i.e physical, emotional, and psychological violence;

(b)   **Structural Violence**: i.e deliberate policies and structures that cause human suffering, death, and harm; and

(c)   **Cultural Violence**: i.e cultural norms and practices that create discrimination, injustice, and human suffering (Francis, 2012:18; Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall, 2011).

2.9   **Security**

Security generally implies a sense of protection, safety from harm or indeed even survival in the face of some kind of threat (Haynes, Hough, Malik & Pettiford, 2011:493). Igbuzor (2004) defines security as the existence of conditions within which individuals in a society can go about their normal daily activities without any form of threat to lives and property (Igbuzor, 2004). It is a state in which an individual or collectivity feels free from threats, anxiety, or danger. While, on the other hand, insecurity according to Beland (2005) is a state of fear or anxiety due to absence or lack of protection. Security has become a big issue in Africa today because of the various forms of carnage, brutality, pogroms and even genocide associated with incessant civil wars and other forms of violent conflicts on the continent (Nnoli, 2006:7).

2.10   **Terrorism**

Terrorism is notoriously difficult to define, since the term is often used to refer to generic acts of violence committed by dangerous and determined or diluted criminals (Norton, 1995:206). According to Shafritz (1998) terrorism is highly visible violence directed against randomly selected civilians in an effort to generate a pervasive sense of fear and thus affect government policies; or violence against representatives of a state (e.g police, politicians, diplomats) by those who wish to overthrow its government. It is a violent actions inflicted upon secondary targets that may be conducted by an individual, group, or government with the wider purpose of attracting attention, gaining support, or forcing concessions from the primary target on personal or political issues (Miller, 2005:75).

It consists of a series of acts intended to spread intimidation, panic and destruction of a population (Kuper & Kuper, 1999). Perpetrators of terrorism normally select, either purposefully or indiscriminately, illegitimate secondary targets—that is, non-combatants and civilians. These targets are 'intermediaries' used by terrorists to manipulate the primary target and subsequently to achieve

an objective. The modes of operations include bombings, hijackings, assassination, murder, kidnapping, hostage-taking, arson, biochemical attacks, exotic pollution, rail derailment, threat, extortion, armed attack, ambush/barricade, arms' smuggling etc. The most dastardly terrorist groups in the world include: Al-Qaeda, The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) known as Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), Al-Shabab, Boko Haram etc.

REFERENCES

Akpan, N.E (2006). The Concept of Conflict in International Relations. In: Adegbulu, F. (ed). *Topics and Issues in International Relations*. Babcock University Press: Ilishan-Remo.

Akpuru-Aja, A. (2009:21). Basic Concepts of Conflict. In: Ikejiani-Clark (ed). *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution in Nigeria: A Reader*. Spectrum Books Limited. Ibadan.

Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Societal Beliefs in Times of Intractable Conflict: The Israeli Case. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. Vol. 9. Pp. 22-50.

Beland, D. (2005). The Political Construction of Collective Insecurity: From Moral Panic to Blame Avoidance and Organized Irresponsibility. *Center for European Studies, Working Paper Series 126*.

Coser, C. (1968). *The Function of Social Conflict.* New York: Free Press.

Francis, D.J. (2012). Peace and Conflict Studies: An African Overview of Basic Concepts. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. University Press.

Haynes, J.; Hough, P.; Malik, S. and Pettiford, L. (2011). *World Politics*. Pearson Education Limited: Lagos.

Imobighe, T.A (2006). Peace and Conflict Resolution in a Democratic Nigeria. In: Maduagwu, M.O. and Mohammed, A.S. (eds). *The Challenges and Prospects of Democratisation in Nigeria*. National Institute Press: Kuru.

Jha, U.C. (2014). *Armed Conflict and Environmental Damage*. Vij Books India Pvt Ltd: New Delhi.

Kriesberg, L. (1995). *Intractable conflicts.* Paper presented at the conference organized by the Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research at Tel-Aviv University, Israel.

Kuper, A. and Kuper, J. (1999). *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. London: T.J International Ltd.

Lukman, S. (2013). Intra- and Interstate Conflicts. In: Saliu, H.A & Aremu, F.A. (eds). *Introduction to International Relations*. College Press & Publishers Limited: Ibadan.

Mbachu, O. (2009). Democratisation and Conflict in Nigeria. In: Mbachu, O. and Eze, C.M. (eds). *Democracy and National Security: Issues, Challenges and Prospects*.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. University for Peace.

Nicholson, M. (1992). *Rationality and the Analysis of International Conflict.* Cambridge.

Nnoli, O. (2006). *National Security in Africa: A Radical New Perspective*. SNAAP Press Ltd. Enugu.

Norton, A.R. (1995). " Terrorism" . In: Esposito, J.L. (ed). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World. New York*: Oxford University Press.

O'Connell, M.E. (2008). Defining Armed Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Security Law*, Vol. 13. Pp. 393-400.

Onumajuru, E.V. (2005). " United Nations Peacekeeping Operation and Conflict Resolution in Africa" . *Being a Research Project Submitted to the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research Programme of Correspondence Instruction for the award of the Certificate-of-Training in United Nations Peace Support Operations. New York.*

Picard, C.A. (2002). *Mediating Interpersonal and Small Group Conflict*. Ottawa: the Golden Dog Press.

Sandole, D. (1998), " A comprehensive mapping of conflict and conflict resolution: a three pillar approach" . In: *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 5/2, http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/sandole.htm.

Shafritz, I.M. (1988). *The Dorsey Dictionary of American Government and Politics*. Chicaco: The Dorsey Press.

Uzuegbunam, A.O. (2009). Domestic Violence in Nigeria. In: Ikejiani-Clark, M. (ed). *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution in Nigeria: A Reader*. Ibadan: Spectrum Book Limited.

Wallensteen, P. & Sollenberg, M. (2001). ' Armed Conflict 1989– 2000' . *Journal of Peace Research* 38(5): 629– 644.

Webel, C. (2007). Introduction: Toward a philosophy and metapsychology of peace. In: Webel, C. and Galtung, J. (eds). *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

World Health Organization (WHO) (2002). *World report on violence and health: summary*. Geneva.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORIES OF CONFLICT

3.0   Introduction

This chapter examines various theories of conflict. It provides explanation on why conflicts occur in societies and how to resolve them.

3.1 Objective

At the end of this chapter, students should able to identify, explain and apply these theories in solving societal conflicts.

3.2 Theories of Conflict

A theory is a set of statements that purports to explain a particular phenomenon (Kegley & Raymond, 2010:29). Theory is a set of interrelated propositions that explains why certain events occurred. Theory provides a map, or frame of reference, that makes the complex, puzzling world around us intelligible. This implies that theories of conflict are explanations stating a relationship between variables involved. Theories vary in assumptions and each offer different causal claims on conflict in the society. There exist various theories of conflict, among which are:

3.2.1 Structural Theory of Conflict

This theory has two main sub-orientations; the first is the radical structural theory represented by the Marxist dialectical school with exponents like Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Vladimir I. Lenin and other scholars from developing societies. The second is the liberal structuralism represent by Ross (1993), Scarborough (1998) and Johan Galtung (1990) on structural violence. The structural theory sees structural defects, either internally generated or externally conditioned, as the main causes of conflict in society. The central argument is that violence or conflict is a phenomenon that is build in human societies according to how they are structured and organized. The theory focuses on internal and external forces that affect the structure and the way societies are organize to propose that conflict arises because of a deep-rooted structural dysfunction. Structuralisms thus sees incompatible interests based on competition for resources which in most cases are assumed to be scarce, as being responsible for social conflicts (Collier, 2002:2).

It should be noted that radical political economists, political theorists, sociologists, psychologists and even African revolutionaries such as Amilcar Cabral, Kwameh Nkrumah and a host of Underdevelopment and Dependency Theorists have argued along the perspective of structural conflict in their analysis of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, particularly in the context of the experience of most African States before and after independence. Most Radical Structural Theorists employ Marxist's Historical and Dialectical Materialist interpretation of society in order to understand the causes of conflict. To resolve conflict or overt violence, this perspective argues that the exploitative economic relationship in capitalist societies needs to be changed through a revolution or a radical transformation in the pattern of global economic relations. In its liberal version, Structuralism emphasizes how the competing interests of groups tie conflict directly into the social,

economic and political organizations of society as well as the nature and strength of social networks within and between community groups (Ademola, 2005).

Johan Galtung argues that whenever economic and political discrimination and lack of tolerance in plural societies are embedded in human social relationship, conflicts are bound to be higher than in societies where opposite social relationship is established. Liberal Structuralists also argued that other factors such as overpopulation, economic underdevelopment, demographic and uninterested social and political institutions are also responsible for the emergence of internal conflicts.

3.2.2 Marxist Theory of Conflict

The Marxist theory is an offshoot of the Marxian explanation of society. Society is divided into unequal classes: the one is strong, rich and noble and bears the tag of bourgeoisie, who controls the instrumentality of state; while the other is deprived, socially deflated, financially infantile and is called the proletariat. Marx emphasized the factor of the economy, which he elaborated to formulate two different classes – those who own the means of production and those who sell their labour and are exploited by the owners of these means of production (Otite, 2004:4). There is a constant struggle between the two, but he that has the financial muscle controls both the state and the poor, and that is the structure of society.

Marx, Engel and Lenin saw the dominance of the state by the organized private sector as the reason why tension between the rulers and the ruled persisted (Nnoli, 2006:29). Conflict is perceived to be inherent in the relations between these classes (Otite, 2004:5). Thus, the Marxist stand is that the state is itself a product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms (Lenin, 1917). The state is therefore structured to be in a perpetual state of conflict. The rich controls the state as well as means of production. The rich thus grows wealthier at the expense of the poor, who lives at his mercy and is implicitly embittered by the development. The central argument of Marxism is that capitalism is at the heart of the state, and that same capitalism is exploitative and oppressive and has been responsible for the polarization of the society (and state) into two incompatible classes.

3.2.3 Idealist Theory of Conflict

Idealists are generally characterised as a set of theorists who believed in the idea of progress and the possibility of an evolution in international relations that would give rise to a more peaceful world (Bull, 1972). Idealism emphasizes international law, morality, and international organizations, rather than power alone, as key influences on international events (Nardin & David, 1992). The proponents of idealist believed that violence aggravates rather than solves conflicts in the international system. According to the idealists for the world to be in constant peace, they posit that the creation of international organisations is the only way to promote the ideal of peace and security among nation-states in the international system. This led to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles,

creation of the League of Nations 1919 and The United Nations 1945 as well as other International Organisations.

3.2.3 Realist Theory of Conflict

The proponents of realist theory includes: Sun Tzu, Niccolo Machiavelli, Alighieri Dente, Thomas Hobbes, Hans J. Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, Henry Kissinger etc. Realism (or political realism) is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. The exercise of power by states toward each other is sometimes called realpolitik, or just power politics. Basic to the fundamental principle of the realists is the resolve that human nature is characterized by conflict, struggle and competition and that the world is a battle field where the fittest survives (Mbaegbu, 2016).

The Chinese strategist Sun Tzu argued that moral reasoning was not very useful to the state rulers of the day, faced with armed and dangerous neighbors. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival (Sun Tzu, 1963). Realist is mainly use to explain conflicts in international system. It is associated with the actual behaviour of states in international relations in the pursuits of " National Interest" . It is also associated with self-interest inherent in human nature in the processes of social relations and maintains that the existence of nation-states pursuing incompatible national interest (power) in an anarchic international system is at the root cause of conflict.

Realists believe that the international system exists in a state of anarchy a term that implies not complete chaos or absence of structure and rules, but rather the lack of a central government that can enforce rules (Bull, 2002). According to this theory nation-states are the major actors in international system while non state actors are regarded as insignificant. The national interest of states is largely defined by economic reasons at the international arena, and since economy is a system of cost reduction in production and distribution processes and then prudence, states have little or no moral attachment in protecting another state's interest more than its own in the course of pursuing their national interest.

3.2.4 Biological Theory of Conflict

The proponents of this theory include Charles Darwin, Cesare Lombroso, Thomas Hobbes, Saint Augustine, Rev. Thomas Malthus, Sigmund Freud etc (Ademola, 2012:46). Biological theory of conflict believes that human beings have a long tradition of being evil and violent in nature and since man's ancestors were violent beings, and humans evolved from them, humans too bear their genetic violent makeup. It explains further that human nature is genetically transferred from generation to generation. Just as parents can genetically transfer their godly qualities and ingenuity to their offspring, so can the evil nature of man be genetically transferred to their offspring. The biological theories have given rise to what may be referred to as the innate theory of conflict, which

contends that conflict is innate in all social interactions, and among all animals, including human beings (Ademola, 2006).

3.2.5 Frustration-Aggression Theory of Conflict

The theory is propounded by John Dollard; Leonard W. Doob; Mowrer Orval Hobart; Sears Robert R. (1939) and further developed by Neal E. Miller (1948), Leonard Berkowitz (1969) and Aubrey Yates (1962). The thrust of the theory is that aggression is always a consequence of frustration stemming from inability to fulfill needs (Dougherty and Pfaltzgrate Jr, 1990:266). The frustration aggression theory states that aggression increases if a person feels that he or she is being blocked from achieving a goal (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer & Sears, 1939). The theory therefore postulates that conflict is the outcome of frustration, where the legitimate desires of an individual are denied either intentionally or unintentionally by the way society is structured; the feelings of disappointment can lead to such a person to express his anger through violence. This frustration can then turn into anger and then aggression when something triggers it. When expectation fails to meet attainment, the tendency is for people to confront others they can hold responsible for frustrating their ambitions or someone on whom they can take out their frustrations.

3.2.6 Human Needs Theory of Conflict

The proponents of this theory include: Abraham Maslow, John Burton, Marshall Rosenberg, Manfred Max-Neef etc. According to Burton (1987) one of the pioneers of the human needs theory, opines that the pursuit of human needs can, indeed, lead to disputes and conflicts in circumstances where there is a scarcity of goods, roles or other rewards to satisfy the sought after needs, and where no alternative "satisfiers" are immediately available. The main thrust of the theory is that all humans have basic needs, which they seek to fulfill, and failure caused by other individuals or groups to meet these needs could lead to conflict (Rosati *et al*, 1990 cited in Faleti, 2006:51).

Human needs theorists argue that conflicts and violent conflicts are cause by unmet human needs (Danielsen, 2005:3). He also stated, " Violence occurs when certain individuals or groups do not see any other way to meet their need such as protection, identity, recognition, participation and understanding, respect and consideration for their needs. Rosenberg cited in Danielsen (2005:3) states that violence is a tragic expression of unmet human needs, implying that all actions undertaken by human beings are attempts to satisfy their needs. Conflict emanates in society if the basic needs for survival such as protection, food, shelter, water etc of the people are not provided or met. A successful and final resolution of any conflict must involve satisfying those needs of the parties involved that are being frustrated by existing conditions and relationships.

3.2.7 Psycho-Cultural Theory of Conflict

According to the psycho-cultural conflict theory, identity is the most important need in the hierarchy of human needs and, when denied, results in violent conflict. The satisfaction of one's basic

needs is intricately related to his/her identity. The thrust of the theory is that identity based on ethnicity explains the main reason for conflicts in society. Cultural ethnocentrisms believe that their culture is superior to any other culture irrespective of whether they are presently in their own countries or host states. Consequently, anything that goes contrary to their culture can be a source of conflict. Irobi cited in UKEssays (2008) posits that when an ethnic group has a history of being stereotyped and discriminated based on their ethnic identity from another group, it results in violent conflict since ethnic identity remains part and parcel of the entirety of an individual.

Ethnic groups which have been discriminated against and stratified into lower class citizens always habour a feeling of marginalization of their identity and this produces strong feelings of hatred and resentment towards the other group which did the discrimination. This is what Richardson Jr. & Sen cited in UKEssays (2008) call 'victim mentality'. Psycho-cultural conflict theorists like Ross (1997) and Horowitz (1998) cited in UKEssays (2008) believe that conflicts, which are cause by identity are usually dangerous, violent, intractable and highly protracted, and often very difficult to resolve. This is because identity which is at the centre of the conflict, " is an unshakable sense of worth, which makes life meaningful and includes the feeling that one is physically, socially, psychologically and spiritually safe" (Faleti, 2006:51). When this feeling of safety (identity) is threatened, there is a defensive reaction aiming at protecting this at all costs and the result is violent conflict, which becomes a matter of life and death.

3.2.8 **Economic Theory of Conflict**

The main thrust of this theory is that material benefit (profit making enterprise in periods of war) forms the basis for conflict in society. Some people benefit from conflict and may not want to see the end of conflict. Collier (2003:4) pointed out that some people (commonly referred to as " conflict entrepreneurs") actually benefit from chaos; while overwhelming majority of the population is affected by the negative impact of conflicts. The leaders of armed formations that are actually perpetrating the violence often profit from the conflict (Ademola, 2006). Arms producing countries such as United States benefit most from the sale of arms and ammunitions in period of wars.

3.2.9 **Systematic Theory of Conflict**

This theory provides a socio-structural explanation for the emergence of violent social conflicts. The position of this theory is that reason(s) for any social conflict lie in the social context within which it occurs…systematic factors that lead to changes in people' s material comfort include environmental degradation that reduces access to sources of livelihood, uncontrolled population growth especially in urban centres, resource scarcity and its allocation through lopsided political process and competition, the negative effects of colonial and Cold War legacies, breakdown of cherished values and traditions that play crucial social control functions, widespread poverty in the

midst of plenty, the domination and marginalization of minority groups by those in the majority, and ethnicity (Ademola, 2006).

3.2.10 Social Learning Theory (SLT) of Conflict

Social Learning Theory of Conflict is founded by Albert Bandura. SLT is based on the idea that people learn from one another by means of observation; imitation; and modeling. According to Bandura, imitation involves the actual reproduction of observed motor activities (Bandura 1977). This implies that human beings learn violent behaviors from interactions with others in a social context. It is via observing the behaviors of others, people develop, assimilate and imitate similar behaviors particularly if their observational experiences are positive ones or include rewards related to the observed behavior. In societies ridden by wars, conflicts, squabbles and insecurity, children imbibe and imitate criminal behaviours they experienced regardless of whether they are appropriate or not which they later reproduce.

3.2.11 Scapegoat Theory of Conflict

The term scapegoat has Biblical origins, coming from the Book of Leviticus. In the book, a goat was sent into the desert carrying the sins of the community. So, a scapegoat was originally understood as a person or animal that symbolically absorbed the sins of others and carried them away from those who committed them (Crossman, 2019). The scapegoat theory refers to the tendency to blame someone else for one's own problems (Macionis & Plummer, 2008). This theory implies that a person becomes so frustrated in his or her efforts to achieve a desired goal that he or she tends to respond with aggression (Mothibi, Roelofse & Tshivhase, 2015). Crossman (2019) defines scapegoating as a process by which a person or group is unfairly blamed for something they didn't do and as a result, the real source of the problem is either never seen or purposely ignored. Example of scapegoating theory was "the Ghana Must Go violence" on Ghanaians during 1980s for economic misfortune in Nigeria and the recent xenophobic attacks on African foreigners living in South Africa on the pretext that they commit crimes and take away jobs meant for South Africans.

REFERENCES

Ademola, F.S. (2006). Theories of Social Contract. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Spectrum Books Limited: Ibadan.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. *84* (2): 191.

Bull, H. (1972). The Theory of International Politics. In: Porter, B. (ed). *The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics 1919-1969*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton, J. (1987). *Resolving Deep-Rooted Conflicts: A Handbook,*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Collier, P. (2002). *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy.* Washington: The World Bank,

Crossman, A. (2019). "Definition of Scapegoat, Scapegoating, and Scapegoat Theory: The Origins of the Term and Overview of its use according to Sociology". *ThoughtCo*. Accessed from thoughtco.com/scapegoat-definition-2026572 on 20th March, 2021.

Danielsen, G. (2005). *Meeting Human Needs, Preventing Violence: Applying Human Needs Theory to the Conflict in Sri Lanka.* USAL.

Dollard, J.; Doob, L.W.; Miller, N.E.; Mowrer, O.H., and Sears, R.R. (1939) *Frustration and Aggression.* New Haven: Yale University Freer.

Dougherty E.J and Pfaltzgrate Jr, L.R. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*, second edition. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Faleti, A.S. (2006). " Theories of Social Conflict," in Best, G. S (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.

Horowitz, T. (1998). " Philosophical Institutions and Psychological Theory" . In: DePaul, M.R. and Ramsey, W. (eds). *Rethinking Intuition: The Psychology of Intuition and its Role in Philosophical Inquiry*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Lenin, V.I. (1917). *The State and Revolution: Marxist Theory of the State.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Mbaegbu, C.C. (2016). Realism, Idealism and Crisis Resolution in Nigeria: A Philosophical Study. *Mgbakoigba, Journal of African Studies. 5 (2):* 61-71.

Mothibi, K.A.; Roelofse, C.J. & Tshivhase, T. (2015). Xenophobic attacks on foreign shop owners and street vendors in Louis Trichardt Central Business District, Limpopo Province. *Td The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa. 11* (4):151-162.

Nardin, T. & David, R.M. (1992). *Traditions of International Ethics* (eds). Cambridge.

Nnoli, O. (1980). *Introduction to Politics*. Fourth Dimension Publishers: Enugu.

Otite, O. (2004). On Conflicts, their Resolution, Transformation, and Management. In: Otite, O. & Albert, I.O. (eds). *Community Conflicts in Nigeria: Management, Resolution and Transformation*. Ibadan: Spectrum Book Limited.

Sun Tzu (1963). *The Art of War Translated by Samuel B. Griffith*. Oxford.

UKEssays (2008). Psycho-Cultural Conflict Theory. Retrieved from http://www.ukessays.com/essays/politics/the-psycho-culturaal -conflicts

CHAPTER FOUR

FORMS, TYPES AND CAUSES OF CONFLICT

4.0   **Introduction**

This chapter examines various forms, types and causes of conflict. It provides explanation on nature, types and causes of conflict.

4.1 Objective

At the end of this chapter, students should be able to identify various forms, types and causes of conflict in society.

4.2 Forms of Conflict

4.2.1 Non-violent Conflict

A non-violent conflict is define as a situation in which at least two parties, or their representatives, try to pursue their perceptions of mutually incompatible goals by undermining, directly or indirectly, each other's goal-seeking capability (Sandole, 1998). Conflicting interests can be pursued without violence or coercion. When the conflict already exists, this means only an absence of violent methods employed by parties in their struggle to resolve their incompatible differences over issues that are important or relevant to them. Parties do not use force against each other. Yet, the existence of non-violent conflict must be noticed and recognized by the outside world, as well as at least by one of the involved parties. In addition, it should be stressed that violent escalation of every conflict evolves from a non-violent phase of the conflict.

4.2.2 Violent Conflict

Violent conflict is a situation in which at least two parties, or their representatives, attempt to pursue their perceptions of mutually incompatible goals by physically damaging or destroying the property and high-value symbols of one another (e.g. places of worship, national monuments, farmlands, property etc); and/or psychologically or physically injuring, destroying, or otherwise forcibly eliminating one another (Sandole, 1998). Conflict enters a violent phase when parties go beyond seeking to attain their goals peacefully, and try to dominate damage or destroy the opposing parties' ability to pursue their own interests.

4.2.3 Armed Conflict

Armed conflict, according to Francis (2012) is the resort to the use of force and armed violence in the pursuit of incompatible and particular interests and goals. Armed conflicts are generally defined as the use of armed forces by one or more states against another state or several states (international armed conflict) or between one or more armed groups against their own government or between armed groups themselves (non-international armed conflict) (Jha, 2014:5). He further divided armed conflicts into two: (a) armed conflict involving two or more opposing states and (b) armed conflict between governmental forces and non-governmental armed groups or between such groups only.

Wallensteen and Sollenberg (2001) defined armed conflict as a contested incompatibility which concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of

which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths. O'Connell (2008) sees armed conflict as the presence of organized groups engaged in intense armed fighting. It involves the use of 'light' or 'heavy' weapons that can cause massive destruction. The worst form of armed conflict includes mass murder and genocide against unarmed civilians. Examples of armed conflicts include Nigeria's Civil War, South Sudan Civil War; Vietnam War, Afghanistan War, Iraq War, Syrian War etc.

4.2.4 Intractable Conflict

Intractable conflict refers to conflict that linger and last for long time, and in most cases defy several efforts aimed at resolution. Bar-Tal (1998:2) opines that intractable conflicts are characterized as protracted, irreconcilable, with vested interests in their continuation, violent, zero-sum nature, total, and central. They are demanding, stressful, exhausting, and costly both in human and material terms. Examples of intractable conflicts include Conflicts between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland, Turks and Kurds in Turkey, India and Pakistan in Kashmir, Israel and Palestine, Israeli-Arab conflict in the Middle East etc. Kriesberg (1995) gives four features that characterize the extreme cases of intractable conflicts and Bar-Tal (1998:6) added three features to make it seven:

1. **They are protracted**: Intractable conflicts persist for a long time, at least a generation; attempts to resolve such conflicts have failed and the parties have accumulated animosity, hatred and prejudice.

2. **They are perceived as irreconcilable**: Parties involved in intractable conflicts view their goals as radically opposite and irreconcilable. Each side sticks to its own goals, perceiving them as essential for own survival; neither side sees a possibility of making concessions, or anticipates a peaceful resolution to the conflict. Both sides expect that the conflict will last indefinitely.

3. **Parties have an interest in the conflict's continuation**: The parties engaged in the intractable conflict make vast military, economic and psychological investments, which later impede its resolution. These investments include military training, development of military industries, and formation of an ideology to buttress the conflict. Having vested interest in the conflict, individuals and groups have great difficulties changing the perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors which perpetuate the conflict.

4. **Intractable conflicts are violent**: Wars are fought, limited military engagements take place, and terrorist attacks occur with fluctuating frequency and intensity. Over the years not only soldiers are wounded and killed, but often civilians are also hurt and civil property is destroyed. Intractable conflicts also frequently create refugee problems and atrocities may be perpetrated by either or both sides.

5. **They are perceived as being of zero sum nature**: Parties engaged in the intractable conflict perceive any loss suffered by the other side as their own gain, and conversely, any gains of the other

side as their own loss. Each side tries to inflict as many losses as possible on the opponent and to prevent any gains (Ordeshook, 1986).

6. **They are total**: Intractable conflicts are perceived by the parties involved as concerning needs or values that are absolutely essential for the party's existence and/or survival. Therefore, intractable conflicts address a plurality of issues such as territory, resources, identity, economy, culture, religion, etc.

7. **They are central:** Members of a society involved in an intractable conflict are preoccupied constantly and continuously with it. This preoccupation reflects its centrality in the cognitive repertoire of society members (Bar-Tal, Raviv, & Freund, 1994). This centrality is further reflected in the saliency of the conflict on the public agenda.

These seven characteristics described only the most extreme cases of the intractable conflict. It can be assumed that less extreme cases have fewer characteristics, since conflicts differ in their intensity, severity, and extensity.

4.3   Types of Conflict

4.3.1   Inter-State Conflict

Inter-State Conflict is conflict between two or more nation-states. It is also a conflict in which regular armed forces of two sovereign states are pitch in armed hostilities. The most prominent examples were the two World Wars, the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq conflict, the Ethiopia- Somalia War over Ogaden Region, Mali-Burkina Faso War, Morocco-Algeria war, Ethiopia-Eritrea war, the British-Argentina conflict over Falkland Island, India-Pakistan over Kashmir, Russia and Ukraine over Crimea etc. On the other hand, intrastate or internal conflict is an armed conflict in which the regular armed forces of a sovereign state engaged in armed hostilities with either regular or irregular bands or forces of one or more rebels groups from within the State (Lukman, 2013:171). For examples Nigerian government and Boko Haram, Syrian Government and ISIS, Somalian Government and Al-Shabab.

4.3.2   Ethnic Conflict

Angstrom (2000:25) defines ethnic conflict as "organized large-scale violent conflict among ethnic groups of which at least one has not achieved statehood or is not in possession of the state apparatus. It is a conflict between people of different ethnic groups, tribes or nationalities (Akpan, 2006:40). According to Osaghae (1992) ethnicity refers to a social formation resting upon culturally specific practices and a unique set of symbols and cosmology. It denotes a group of individuals who consider themselves or are considered by others, to share common characteristics, which differentiate them from other collectivities within a society. Ethnic conflict is communal in nature because it is usually between neighbouring communities or tribes. It is a conflict between groups or people defined by their common heritage, language, lineage, geographical location and or culture. Ethnicity and

ethnic conflicts have acquired a bad reputation of the potential inherent in ethnic conflict to split society into different states (Nnoli, 1998:26).

Examples of the major ethnic/communal conflicts in Nigeria include: Ife-Modakeke in Osun State (1999-2000); Yoruba-Hausa in Shagamu, Ogun State; Tiv-Jukun in Wukari - Taraba State (1999-2001); Jukun/Chamba and Kuteb in Taraba State (1999); Ijaw and Itsekiris of Warri in Delta State (1999); Itsekiri-Urhobo in Delta State (1999-2000); Aguleri-Umuleri in Anambra State (1999); Ijaw-Ilaje in Ondo State; Basa-Egbura in Nasarawa State; Hausa-Yoruba clashes in Idi-Araba - Lagos State etc (Fagbemi & Nwankwo, 2002, Imobighe, 2006, Isa, 2001, Maduagwu, 2006, Ogbara, 2002). In Gombe State there are communal conflicts between Kaltungo-Dadiya, Dadiya-Waja, Kaltungo-Shongom-Billiri etc.

4.3.3 Religious Conflict

Religious conflict entails conflict arising from religious differences or between different religious groups. It is a type of conflict that arises between two or more different faith. The most glaring example of such conflicts is that between Moslems and Christians in Northern Nigeria (Akpan, 2006:40). Gwamna (2011) stated that the genesis and manifestation of ethno-religious conflict in Nigeria began with the 1987 Kafanchan riot, and that this introduced a dangerous dimension of religious crisis between Christians and Muslims. However, Opeloye (2001) traced the history of Muslim-Christian conflicts in Nigeria to the 1979 controversy over the status of Sharia in the nation's legal system. According to him, this development has caused mutual suspicion, rivalry, acrimony, discord and hostility amongst the religious adherents.

Examples of these religious conflicts include: 1980/1982 Kano Religious Riots (Maitatsine) which claimed between 200 and 500 persons as well as wanton destruction of private and public properties; 1982 Maiduguri Religious Riots (Maitatsine) with estimated casualties of 450 persons alongside the destruction of places of worship and public buildings; 1982 Kaduna Religious Riots with casualties estimated between 40 and 50 persons alongside the destruction of private and public properties; 1984 Gongola State (Jimeta) Religious Uprising (Maitatsine); 1987 Kafanchan Religious Riots (Maitatsine) with 25 persons killed; 1987 Kaduna Religious Riots with estimated of over 200 causalities; 1987 Zaria Religious Riots over 200 persons were killed; 1991 Bauchi Religious Riots with casualties of 50 to 100 persons; 1991 Tafawa Balewa Religious Riots with casualties of over 100 people; 1995 Kano Religious Riot – 17 persons killed; 2001 Kano Religious Riot with 150 causalities; Yelwan Shendam Religious crisis with 73 casualties; 2004 Kano Religious Riot with 30 persons killed (Fayeye, 2006:69, Tilde, 2011:1-7). Also, the conflict between Hindus and Moslems in India, Sunni and Shiites in Iraq, Jews and Moslems in Israel, Muslims Brotherhood and Coptic Christians in Egypt Seleka rebels and anti-balaka militia in Central Africa etc.

4.3.4 Political Conflict

Political conflict arises because of desire to capture state power using violence. Politics is a struggle for power through competition, but when not manage properly conflict bound to occur. Political Conflict has two dimensions: political violence and electoral violence. Anifowose (1982:4) defines political violence …" as the use of threat or physical act carried out by individual within political system against another individual or individuals and/or property with the intention to cause injury or death to persons and/or damage or destruction of property and whose objectives, choice of target or victims, surrounding circumstances, implementation and effects have political significance that is tend to modify the behavior of others in the existing arrangement of power structure that has some consequences for the political system".

Political violence is carried out in the struggle for the acquisition of political power for examples the 1962 Action Group Crisis; the 1981 Kaduna State Executive-Legislative crisis while electoral violence is a form of violence that is perpetrated in the course of political activities, including before, during and after a period of election (Karim, 2011). Electoral violence includes among others acts such as: thuggery, use of force to disrupt opponents' political meetings or voting at polling stations, the use of dangerous weapons to intimidate voters and others, or to cause bodily harm or injury to any person connected with electoral processes. Example, the 1965 Western Region election crisis and the 2011 post-election violence in Nigeria.

The difference between political violence and electoral violence is that political violence is broader than electoral violence. Political violence encompasses all forms of violent acts, which occur in different kinds in the political system irrespective of their democratic credentials while electoral violence is just a subset of political violence (Lukman and Abubakar, 2013:50). Most periods of elections in developing democracies are marred with electoral violence as a result of electoral malpractices, fraudulent practices, rigging, inter/intra party crises etc.

4.3.5 Economic Crises

Economy has to do with production, management, distribution and consumption of scarce resources of a nation. Economic conflict refers to a situation when a country's economy is characterized by underproduction and overconsumption, deficit in balance of trade, economic recession, debt crisis, inflation etc.

4.3.6 Indigenes/Settlers Conflict

Human Rights Watch (2013) defines indigene as ethnic groups that can trace their ancestry to those regarded as the original inhabitants of an area while settlers are all other people in that area; regardless of how long they or their families have lived there. Settlers are relegated to permanent status of second-class citizens and are often denied access to opportunities in their areas of residence such as political appointment, employment, admission etc. For instance, many of the violent

communal conflicts in Nigeria have centred on this division. Among these are the persistent eruptions of conflict in Jos, the state capital and its environs in 2001, 2002 and 2010 with the Hausa and Fulani on one side, and the Anagutas, Afisare and Birom on the other side (UCDP, 2011). The latter three groups are considered indigenous to the area, while the Hausa and Fulani are seen as more recent settlers to the area (Human Rights Watch, 2001). Therefore, manifestation of indigenes versus settlers is the question of land ownership and the right of occupancy.

4.3.7 Farmers/Herdsmen (Pastoralist) Conflict

Conflict between farmers and pastoralists is also one of the types of conflict in Nigeria. The herdsmen mostly Fulanis constantly move around the nation in search of grazing land for their cattle and willing to sacrifice their own life in defense of their cattle, so also the farmers in protecting their crops. According to de Haan (2002) destruction of crops by cattle and other property (irrigation equipment and infrastructure) by the pastoralists themselves are the main direct causes for conflicts cited by the farmers, whereas burning of rangelands and fadama and blockage of stock routes and water points by crop encroachment are important direct reasons cited by the pastoralists. Another cause of farmer-herdsmen conflicts is increasing rate of cattle theft, which, according to de Haan (2002) is often accompanied by violence.

Other perceived causes of farmer-herdsmen conflicts include inequitable access to land, diminishing land resources, antagonistic values among user groups, policy contradictions, and non-recognition of rights of indigenous people (Adisa, 2011a). The relationship between these two groups i.e farmers and herdsmen has been characterized by tensions that usually led to violent conflict resulting into lost of lives and properties. In recent times, there have been cases of farmers/herdsmen attacks in Southern Kaduna, Taraba, Agatu in Benue, Enugu, Ekiti etc. The farmers-herdsmen conflicts have resulted in loss of lives and destruction of properties. Conflict between arable crop farmers and cattle herdsmen over the use of agricultural land is still pervasive in Nigeria, and portends grave consequences for rural development. It has demonstrated great potential to affect various aspects of rural life (Adisa, 2012:114).

4.3.8 Minorities versus Majorities Conflict

Some ethnic groups feel dominated and marginalized by other ethnic groups. Domination in this context refers to the superior and advantageous position occupied by some ethnic groups to the detriment of other ethnic groups who are deprived or discriminated in the distribution of national wealth, offices, resources, opportunities and sharing of political power. These create tensions and conflicts between the minorities and the majorities. There were various policies introduced by government in Nigeria to address and manage this conflict such as: state and local government creation, federal character, quota system, rotational power shift etc.

4.3.9. Insurgency

Insurgency is an attempt to take control of a country by force (Honby, 2006). An insurgency is a group of actors that uses violence to contest the sovereignty of the established regime with the aim of political change (Lammers, 2017). It is a condition of formalized resistance or revolt against a governing authority in which the perpetrating parties are not initially recognized as belligerents (Gandy, 2015). Insurgency means an uprising aimed to overthrow or takeover powers of constituted authority through violent behaviours (Danbaba, 2020). Therefore, the goals of insurgents are always motivated by the desire to take over control of political authority of a State.

4.3.10 **Militancy**

According to Mufti cited in Malik (2013) militancy means the use of violence to achieve "some end or to express hatred or contempt for some group of people. Malik (2013) defines militancy as an aggressive and hostile action or an armed struggle by an individual or a group to enforce their will upon others, irrespective of the latter's acceptance. Militants believe in violence to defend what they believe to be true or their right. The struggle may be against a group, community, occupation forces, or the established authority of the state who they believe are against their self-proclaimed ideology. Militancy is mostly triggered by the need for resource control, elimination of marginalization, fight against oppressive policies and social injustice.

4.3.11 **Banditry**

Banditry is a form of conflict perpetrators by criminals who attack, kill, main and kidnap civilians at homes, workplaces, schools, roads, market and other public gatherings with light or sophisticated weapons. Bandits are generally regarded as outlaws and desperate lawless marauders who do not have a definite residence or destination, and they roam around the forest and mountains to avoid being detected or arrested.

4.3.12 **Mutiny**

Mutiny is an act of disobedience in the military or an uprising in the security forces against its high command or against the Commander-in-Chief, usually aimed at dismantling established order and which may result in the toppling of government (Folarin, 2015). When an act of mutiny fails, the culprits usually face a Court Marshall (a military court) where sentences vary from dismissal to death of the mutineers.

4.13　**War**

Von Clausewitz (1911) defines war as "an act of violence intended to compel our opponents to fulfill our will". He emphasizes that war is nothing but a continuation of political intercourse, with a mixture of other means. Russell (1916) defines war as conflict between two groups, each of which attempts to kill and maim as many as possible of the other group in order to achieve some

object which it desires. War though unnecessary there are tendencies that states are allowed to go to war. This is referred to " just war" .

The Just war is two divided into two: Jus ad Bellum (the right to make war) and Jus in Bello (the laws of war). The Jus ad Bellum is conditions necessary for the pursuit of war in order to limit damages and wanton destruction. It Jus ad Bellum has six conditions for going into war and they are: (i) for just cause; (ii) right intension; (iii) public declaration of war by a proper authority; (iv) last resort; (iv) probability of success and (vi) proportionality while Jus in Bello seeks to limit warfare by following the rules of engagement particularly in respecting human rights to each individual participant. Jus in Bello has five stipulations and breaking of any of them is considered a morally reprehensive action. They are: (i) discrimination and non-combatant immunity (e.g prisoners of war); (ii) proportionality (iii) prohibited weapons; (iv) prohibition of means of *mala in se* (evil in themselves e.g rape, genocide, ethnic cleansing); and (v) reprisal

There are two categories of war i.e international war (world war) and civil war. The international war or world war that is fought between and among nations-states e.g World War I and World War II while the Civil War is fought within a geographical entity of a State e.g Nigeria' s Civil War, Liberia' s Civil War, Democratic Republic of Congo' s Civil; Central African' s Civil War; Sudan Civil War etc. However, whatever the motives for going into war, the end result is that it leads to wanton killings, destruction of property, waste of resources and causing psychological trauma to the populace.

4.4   Causes of Conflict

Conflict arises when there is sharp disagreement between parties over incompatible goals. For instance, people can fight over land, ideology, religion, politics, marginalization, property etc. The following are some of the causes of conflict in the society.

4.4.1   Resources

The struggle over scarce resources is one of the major causes of conflict in society today. The struggle for access to and control over important resources (as water, oil, gold, diamonds, productive land etc) is at the root causes of conflict (Andales-Escano, 2015:222). Perhaps, it is intuitive that natural resources could become conflict issues, but less obvious is the role that resources may have in specific instances of a given conflict. According to Jakkie (2001) conflicts are driven by poverty, underdevelopment, a lack of economic diversification, and by political systems that marginalize large parts of the population. Ownership, inequities in the distribution, utilization and management of resources results in poverty and underdevelopment which in return causes of conflicts Inequities in the distribution, use, needs, desires, and consequences of resources management have been sources of tension in international and intrastate disputes (Andales-Escano, 2015:222).

According to Alabi (2010:312) resources as a cause of conflict refers to all forms of human possessions such as land, money, power and influence that are often in limited supply. This cause conflicts in three major ways: when it is not enough to go round everybody/people fight for the little that is available; people fight over resources when what is available is unjustly distributed or allocated; it is believed that excessive lack (poverty) makes; people to become pliable instruments in the hands of conflict entrepreneurs.

4.4.2 Land

Land is among the scarce resources in the world. Land is probably the most important resource needed by Man for his day-to-day existence (Adisa, 2012:99). This is because all human activities farming, shelter, grazing etc take place on the surface of the earth. According to Otite and Ogionwo (2006:260) access to and use of land resources are critical factors in economies of many Africans. Land is not only crucial for rural people who have their livelihood based in agriculture, but also a basis of wealth and power (Alawode, 2013:58). Land conflict occurs when two separate entities or communities feel like both have a legal claim to a piece of land. This may be a disagreement about property that created two or more rightful owners. Claims and counter claims to land for settlement and for farming or hunting are common sources of conflicts among urban and especially rural peoples.

Land conflicts are major causes of wars and disagreements, which are mostly driven by culture, religion and ethnic nationalism (Garko, Muhammad & Bala, 2014:136). Dunmoye (2003:17) in a survey of conflicts in the Middle Belt Zone of Nigeria traced the cause of communal conflicts in the zone to land or boundary disputes. The right of ownership and competition of land has been a major cause of conflict between the indigenes and the settlers. Population growth has worsened the situation in recent times particularly in Nigeria.

4.4.3 Pluralism

Pluralism is the existence of a diversity of more than one thing. Pluralism has been a source of conflict in Africa. More than 90% of African countries are heterogeneous in nature. A plural society is a society divided by segmental cleavages, and it exists where political divisions follow very closely with lines of objective social differentiation. Segmental cleavages may be of religious, ideological, political, cultural or regional stratification. As Lijphart (1977) observed, deep social divisions and political differences within plural societies are held responsible for instability and breakdown of law and order. Plural societies are susceptible to conflicts.

4.4.4 Politics

Politics is the struggle for power to control and manipulate others. Vernon Dyke defines politics as " a struggle among actors pursuing conflicting desires on public issues. Robert Dahl cited in Anifowose (1999:4) sees politics as a struggle among actors pursuing conflicting desires on public

issues. Nnoli (1980:12) defines politics as all activities that are directly or indirectly associated with the emergence, consolidation and use of state power. In this regard, the control of state power is what makes politics competitive and the competition to capture state power becomes the source of conflict as each ethnic, religious or ideological group try to undo and outdo one another.

Conflict also arises because of advantages attaches to politics, and because of the advantages attach to it, the quest for power has been intense. The political contests, which are supposed to be competitive, are mostly characterized by desperation to acquire or to retain power at all costs. For instance, the electoral process in developing democracies has been characterized by political violence such as thuggery, assassinations, kidnapping, arsons, harassment, intimidation etc. These misadventures have often been catastrophic leading to decimation of innocent lives, disruption of economic activities, and destruction of properties among others (Ewetan & Urhie, 2014). Politics has been at the root cause of most conflicts particularly in Africa.

4.4.5 **Religion**

Religion, much more than ethnicity, is a difficult concept to define and conceptualize. Egwu (2001) notes that this is not only because of the problem of objectivity encountered by the scholars because of the emotion-laden nature of the concept but also because of the difficulty of penetrating the inner essence of religion. Connelly (1946) opines that religion should be seen in terms of the sacred and spiritual. He asserts further that religion originates in an attempt to represent an order, beliefs, feelings, imaginings and actions that arise in response to direct experience of the sacred and the spiritual.

Yinger (1994) defines religion as a system of beliefs and practices by means of which a group of people struggle with the ultimate problem of human life-suffering, injustice and meaninglessness. Religious conflicts generally arise when religious beliefs are viewed differently within and/or between different perspectives. Nigeria is prone to religious crises have left hundreds of Nigerians dead. Some of these religious crises are intra religious faith based.

REFERENCES

Adisa, R. S. (2011a). Management of Farmer-herdsmen Conflict in North-Central Nigeria: Implications for Collaboration between Agricultural Extension Service and Other Stakeholders. *Journal of International Agricultural Education and Extension.* 18 (1): 60-72.

Adisa, R.S. (2012). Land Use Conflict Between Farmers and Herdsmen – Implications for Agricultural and Rural Development in Nigeria. In: Adisa, R.S. (ed). *Rural Development-Contemporary Issues and Practices.* Accessed from http://www.intechopen.com/books/rural-development-contemporary-issues-and-practices/land-use-conflictbetween-famers-and-

herdsmen-implications-for-agricultural-and-rural-development-in www.intechopen.com. On 23rd February, 2017.

Akpan, N.E (2006). The Concept of Conflict in International Relations. In: Adegbulu, F (ed). *Topics and Issues in International Relations*. Babcock University Press: Ilishan-Remo.

Alabi, A.O. (2010). Management of Conflicts and Crises in Nigeria: Educational Planner's View. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*. 2(6): 311-315.

Alawode, O.O (2013). Determinants of land use conflicts among farmers in southwestern Nigeria. *Journal Research in Peace, Gender and Development (JRPGD)*. Vol. 3(4). Pp. 58-67.

Andales-Escano, C. (2015). Peace building Model in Diverse Conflict Lines in Southern Philippines. In: Ha, H. (ed). *Land and Disaster Management Strategies in Asia*. Sprinter. New Delhi: Springer.

Angstrom, J. (2000). The Sociology of Studies of Ethnic Conflict: Explaining the Causal Status of Development. In: *Civil Wars*. Vol. 3, No.3. Pp.23-44.

Anifowose, R. (1982). *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. London: NOK Publishers.

Anifowose, R. (1999). The nature and scope of Political Science. In: Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, R. (eds). *Elements of Politics*. Sam Iroanusi Publications: Lagos.

Bull, H. (2002). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics.* Columbia.

Connelly, P. (1946). *The treatise on the gods.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Danbaba, S.T. (2020). *Gender, Suicide and Insurgency: An Examination of Boko Haram Female Suicide Bombers in Nigeria 2014-2018*. Being a paper presented at a Conference Organised by Nigerian Defence Academy in collaboration with Victims Support Fund on Insurgency and Counter-Insurgency in Nigeria: Critical Perspectives on Boko Haram at NAF Conference Centre & Suites, Kado, Abuja, Nigeria from 16th-20th March, 2020.

Dunmoye, R. A. (2003). " General Survey of Conflicts in the Middle Belt Zone," . In: Africa Peace Review, Special Edition. *Journal of Centre for Peace Research and Conflict, National War College*. Abuja: Nigeria.

Ewetan, O.O & Urhie, E. (2014). Insecurity and Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development Studies*. Vol.5, No. 1, 2014, Pp. 40-63.

Fagbemi, K. & Nwankwo, O. (2002). The Aguleri and Umuleri Violence. *In: Hope Betrayed? A Report on Impunity and State-Sponsored Violence in Nigeria*. World Organisation Against Torture & Centre for Law Enforcement Education: Lagos. Pp.51-68.

Fayeye, J.O. (2006). The Social Construction of Aggression: A Review of Inter-Religious Conflicts in Nigeria. In: Saliu, H.A; Jimoh, A.; and Arosanyin, T. (2006). *The National Question and Some Selected Topical Issues on Nigeria*. Vantage Publishers: Ibadan.

Folarin, S.F. (2015). Types and Causes of Conflict. *Journal of Political Science*. 1-12.

Francis, D.J. (2012). Peace and Conflict Studies: An African Overview of Basic Concepts. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. University Press.

Gandy, M.L. (2015). *The Politics of Insurgency*. An unpublished Ph.D Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park USA.

Gwamna, J. G. (2011). *Religion and Politics in Nigeria*. African Christian textbook.

Honby, A.S. (2006). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Human Rights Watch (HRW) (2001). *Jos: A city torn apart*. New York: HRW.

Imobighe, T.A (2006). Peace and Conflict Resolution in a Democratic Nigeria. In: Maduagwu, M.O. and Mohammed, A.S. (eds). *The Challenges and Prospects of Democratisation in Nigeria*. National Institute Press: Kuru.

Isa, M. K. (2001). The state and institutional responses to ethnic conflict in Nigeria: The case of Jukun/Chamba and Kuteb communal conflicts of Takum Local Government, Taraba State. *Africa at crossroads: Complex political emergencies in the 21st Century*, UNESCO / ENA. http://www.ethnonet-africa.org/pubs/crossroadskabir.htm

Jakkie, C. (2001). " Regional Conflict and Poverty in Southern Africa" , *Paper presented at Southern African regional Poverty Network Conference held at the Human Sciences research Council*. Pretoria, 26 April.

Karim, A.A (2011). " The Youth and Electoral Violence and Implication for Human Security in Nigeria" . In: Isaac, O.A. and Nathaniel L.D. (eds). *Democratic Elections and Nigeria' s National Security*. Ibadan: John Arches Publishers Ltd.

Kegley, C.W & Raymond, G.A. (2010). *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics*. Macmillan: USA.

Lammers, J.W.J. (2017). *Defining Insurgency: Framework of Conditions, Causes and Consequences applied to the Dutch Revolt*. Evolution of Insurgency King' s College London.

Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in Plural Societies; A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lukman, S. and Abubakar, A. (2013). Electoral Violence and Democratic Sustenance in Nigeria' s Fourth Republic: Insights from the 2011 Post-election Violence in Northern Nigeria. Journal of Democratic Studies. Volume 4. Pp. 47-72.

Maduagwu, M.O (2006). An Agenda for Peaceful Coexistence in a Democratic Nigeria. In: Maduagwu, M.O. and Mohammed, A.S. (eds). *The Challenges and Prospects of Democratisation in Nigeria.* National Institute Press: Kuru.

Malik, M.A. (2013). Militancy in Pakistan: Rebottling the Genie. USAWC Strategy Research Project.

Oakland, K. (2005) " Race and Racism." *Daily Kos* from http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly on 8/1/17.

Ogbara, N, (2002). The Ife-Modakeke Crisis. In: *Hope Betrayed? A Report on Impunity and State-Sponsored Violence in Nigeria*. World Organisation Against Torture & Centre for Law Enforcement Education: Lagos. Pp. 36-50.

Opeloye M. O. (2001). *Building bridges of understanding between Islam and Christianity in Nigeria*. Ikeja: free enterprise publishers ltd.

Russell, B. (1916). *Why men fight*. The Century Co.: New York.

Tilde, A. (2011). *100 acts of terror in Nigeria*. Accessed 02/01/2017.

Yinger, M. (1994). *Ethnicity*. New York: State University Press.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE NIGERIAN CIVIL WAR (BIAFRAN WAR), BOKO HARAM INSURGENCY, NIGER DELTA MILITANCY AND BANDITRY IN NORTHERN NIGERIA

5.0   **Introduction**

This chapter examines Nigerian Civil War, Boko Haram Insurgency, Niger Delta Militancy and Banditry in Northern Nigeria.

5.1   **Objective**

At the end of this chapter, students should be able to know various conflicts in Nigeria and how to avoid future occurrence.

5.2   The concept of Civil War

A civil war is an armed conflict that has caused more than one thousand deaths; challenged the sovereignty of an internationally recognized state; occurred within the recognized boundaries of that state; involved the state as one of the principal combatants; included rebels with the ability to mount an organized opposition; and involved parties concerned with the prospect of living together in the same political unit after the end of the war (Elbadawi, & Sambanis, 2000a). Gersovitz and Kriger (2013) define civil war as a politically organized, large-scale, sustained, physically violent conflict that occurs within a country principally among large/numerically important groups of its inhabitants or citizens over the monopoly of physical force within the country.

5.2.1   The Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970)

One of the major events that shook the foundation of Nigeria after the independent in 1960 was the 30 months civil war also known as Biafran War from 1967 to 1970. At independence, Nigeria was divided into three regions: the Northern region, the Western region and the Eastern region and later in 1963 Mid-western region was created out of the Western region. The remote and immediate causes of the civil war includes the military coups d' état and counter coup of January 15, and July 29, 1966 and its attendant ethnic connotations; the regional election crisis in Western region in 1965; the Tiv riots of 1964; the Federal Elections of 1964; the killing of the Igbos living in Northern Nigeria from May to September 1966; the structural imbalance of the Nigerian federation; the asymmetrical distribution of power among the various ethnic and geopolitical groups; the unruliness of the politicians of the first republic, the egoistical and radical pursuit for power some military personnel, replacement of federalism with unitarism by General Johnson Aguiyi-Ironsi etc.

The military coups d' état of January 15, 1966 led mutinous Nigerian soldiers under the leadership of Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu and Emmanuel Ifeajuna killed 22 people including Senior Politicians and Senior Army Officers and their wives. Prominent among them are the Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Premier of Northern region - Sir Ahmadu Bello (Sardaunan Sokoto), Premier of Western region Samuel Ladoke Akintola, Finance Minister Festus Okotie-Eboh, Brig. Samuel Ademulegun, Brig. Zakariya Maimalari, Col. Ralph Shodeinde, Col. Kur Mohammed, Lt. Col Abogo Largema, Lt. Col. James Pam, Lt. Col. Arthur Unegbe etc. However, it can be noted here that the coup plotters did not succeed in taking over power and Major General Aguiyi-Ironsi was made to takeover. In July 28th, 1966 there was another counter-coup that was masterminded by Lt. Col. Murtala Muhammad and many northern military officers as a reaction to the killings of Northern politicians and officers in the January coup. This led to the killings of Nigeria' s first

military Head of State General Johnson Aguiyi-Ironsi and Lt. Col. Adekunle Fajuyi - the Governor of the Western Region. This coup brought Lt. Colonel Yakubu Gowon as the Head of State.

However, Lt. Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu who was the Military Governor of the Eastern Region refused to recognize Lt. Col, Yakubu Gowon as the Head of State and Supreme Commander of the Nigeria Army. This immediate cause of the civil war led to the declaration of state of Biafra (mainly the Igbos extraction) on May 30th 1967 by Lieutenant Colonel Odumegwu Ojukwu to excise the eastern region out of Nigerian federation. This declaration led to an effort by the federal government of Nigeria to truncate Ojukwu's desire to ensure the survival of Biafra and secession of the Eastern region that started the civil war in 1967. Hence, the Nigerian Civil War was an attempted succession of the Igbos extraction to self-proclaim Republic of Biafra.

5.2.2   The End of the Civil War and Policies of National Integration

The Biafran war came to an end when its leader Lt. Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu fled to Cote d'ivoire and the Biafran surrendered in 1970 via a speech on 12 January, 1970 by Biafra's Chief of Army Staff, Major General Phillip Effiong who declared openly that the "people of Biafra" consent to the authority of the Federal Military Government. In an effort to heal the wounds, Biafra was reabsorbed into Nigeria and General Yakubu Gowon described the "*war as no victor and no vanquished*". By the end of the civil war, Nigeria was confronted with numerous nation-building challenges. In order to address these nation-building challenges, Yakubu Gowon introduced the 3Rs which means *Reconciliation, Reconstruction and Rehabilitation*. The Gowon administration also created National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) on 22 May, 1973 as part of the 3Rs to engage Nigerian graduates in nation building, development and to poster unity among young after the civil war.

5.2.3   Lessons and Consequences of the Civil War

The lessons from the Nigerian Civil War are both positive and negative. On the positive aspect, the war was able to solidify Nigeria as indivisible one entity and led to creation of more states and local governments while the negative side includes: the loss of lives and property (an estimated 1.3 million people killed); retardation of development, persistent ethnic animosities and distrust.

5.3   Boko Haram

Boko Haram is a Hausa name given by those outside the sect, which means, "Western education is forbidden in Islam". Its original name is Jama'atu Ahlissunnah Lidda'awati wal Jihad, meaning, a 'People Committed to the Propagation of the Prophet's Teachings and Jihad'. Most of its members are from the Kanuri tribe; it has small followers among other ethnic groups in the Northeast and other parts of Nigeria (Forest, 2012). It also draws members from neighboring countries such as Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Sudan (Lawal, 2009).

5.3.1   Origin of Boko Haram

There are different versions to the understanding of when Boko Haram started. Onuoha and George (2015) and Amnesty International (2015) traced the origin of the sect to 2002. However, Nigeria security forces date the origin of the sect to 1995 when Abubakar Lawan established the Ahlulsunna wal' jama' ah hijra in University of Maiduguri, Borno State. It flourishes as a non-violent movement until Mohammed Yusuf assumed leadership of the sect in 2002 when Lawan left Nigeria to Saudi Arabia to further his education.

Boko Haram under the leadership of Mohammed Yusuf, on 24th December, 2003 attacked and occupied Police Stations in Geidam and Kanamma in Yobe State raising the flag of the Afghanistan Taliban over buildings for several days before they were dislodged by security agents (Danbaba, 2019). In 2009, police shot Boko Haram members in a funeral procession to bury one of their members. The leader of the sect, Mohammed Yusuf in a video threatened the government with reprisals and riots erupted in Maiduguri. More than 800 people died in the clashes between the security forces and the sect members. Nigerian military arrested Mohammed Yusuf on 30th July 2009 and handed him to police but unfortunately he was killed under the Police custody. With the killing of Mohammed Yusuf, Boko Haram went underground, re-organised, and resurfaced in 2010 vigorously (Mohammed, 2014).

5.3.2 Boko Haram Ideology

Boko Haram' s ideology is often described as comprising two stances: opposition to democracy and rejection of Western-style education (Thurston, 2006). It is based on extreme Islamic teaching, which rejects most Western ideas and institutions as un-Islamic (Onuoha, & George, 2015). The sect portrays the world in terms of an epic struggle between good and evil, and they are convinced in their own revealed truth from God (Forest, 2012). The group seeks to impose total Sharia, or Islamic law, though this does not reflect the opinions of all Muslims in Nigeria. Therefore, all those who opposed it were seen as " unbelievers" and legitimate targets of violence (Amnesty International, 2015).

In his preaching, Yusuf criticized northern Muslims for participating in what he believed to be an illegitimate state and encouraged his followers to protest and withdraw from society and politics (Johnson, 2011). To this effect, Boko Haram ruthlessly implemented its ideology by attacking barracks, schools, markets, churches, mosques, checkpoints, and other public places killing and injuring soldiers, police, civilian Joint Task Force, clerics and innocent civilians because of their relationship with secular authority.

5.3.3 Causes of Boko Haram

There are different views and controversies on the causes of Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria. However, prominent among them are: religious fundamentalism, social and economic exclusion, unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, injustice, politics and bad governance.

5.3.4 Effects of Boko Haram Insurgency

The effects of Boko Haram insurgency particularly from 2009 when the insurgents started their destructive attacks include: destruction of schools, hospitals, houses, markets, mosques, churches, cultural heritage, police stations, military barracks, roads, transportation, telecommunications, trade, investment, agriculture and tourism which cannot be accurately quantified. Estimates of the negative impacts of the crisis include approximately 14.8 Million people adversely affected (The Presidential Committee on the North East Initiative, 2016). Nigeria Security Tracker (NST) documented that 37,530 people have been killed (Campbell & Harwood, 2018).

The United Nations Refugee Agency estimates that the conflict has displaced 2.4 million people. Nigerian officials estimate economic losses to be upwards of $9 billion (Munshi, 2018). Damages on education revealed that more than 600 teachers have been reported murdered and 19,000 displaced, 1,200 schools have been damaged and destroyed (OCHA, 2016). More than 20,000 children separated from their parents or guardians (Nigeria - Child Protection Sub Working Group, 2015). This shows how bad conflict and war retard the growth and development of a nation.

5.4 Niger Delta Militancy

The Nigeria Delta region became the hub of Nigerian economy after the discovery of oil in large quantity in 1970s. The region is the hub of oil and gas production in Nigeria that accounts for 95 percent of foreign exchange earnings, 95 percent of national budget, 80 percent of government revenue and over 80 percent of national wealth (Tell, 2008). Whereas the oil produced in the Niger delta is the life blood of the Nigerian economy, oil has failed to translate to regional prosperity and development in the Niger delta (Kimiebi, 2010).

This led to the emergence of militant groups such as Egbesu Boys, the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND) led by Henry Okah, the Niger Delta Peoples Volunteer Force (NDPVP) led by Asari Dokubo and the Niger Delta Vigilante led by Ateke Tom. There are also other smaller armed militia groups such as the Tombolo Boys (TTB), Joint Revolutionary Council (JRC), Matyrs Brigade (MB) and Icelanders Coalition for Military Action (ICMA) (Ogege, 2011). These militant groups seek redress to the economic and environmental degradation in the Niger Delta region. The activities of these groups included kidnapping of foreign nationals working with the oil companies, oil pipe line vandalization, sea piracy, and destruction of oil facilities in the region thereby creating insecurity for Nigeria. For instance, between 2004 and 2009, over 600 expatriate workers were kidnapped and over 57 armed attacks were launched on oil installations (Ikein, 2009).

5.4.1 Causes of the Niger Delta Militancy

The full militancy in the Niger Delta started in 2006 and the causes of the militancy are alluded to massive environmental degradation, political and economic marginalization, bad

governance, poor infrastructural development, youth unemployment, corruption and activities of the oil companies.

5.4.2 Effects of the Niger Delta Militancy

The Niger Delta Militancy has caused damage to the economy of Nigeria that cannot be financially quantified. The activities of the militants affected Nigeria's foreign direct investment, destruction of oil facilities, kidnapping of oil workers for ransom and caused more damages to the environment of the Niger Delta region.

5.5 Banditry in the Northern Nigeria

Banditry has become a major security threat in Nigeria in recent times. What began as conflict between pastoralists and farmers over land has recently developed into rural banditry with heavy human and economic cost, ranging from the sexual assault of women and girls, attacks on villages, to cattle rustling, amongst others. The bandits traversing Benue, Plateau, Niger, Kwara, Nassarawa, Zamfara, Kaduna, Sokoto, Kebbi, Kano are involved in crimes such as armed robbery and kidnapping. Recent reports show how the bandits wielding weapons are perpetrating heinous crimes in Zamfara, Kaduna, Katsina, Niger and Sokoto. These bandits storm rural villages in numbers killing, rustling cows, kidnapping, carrying theft and raping women.

According to various reports by a committee set up to find solutions to banditry in Zamfara State, supervised by the Inspector-General of Police, Mohammed Abubakar, reported a total of 6,319 deaths including women and children between June 2011 and May 2019 in the State. Additionally, an estimated 4,983 women were widowed, 25,050 children orphaned, and 190,340 others internally displaced between June 2011 and May 2019 in Zamfara State. In Katsina State, over 2,000 people have been killed, 500 communities destroyed and over 33,000 people displaced. Further reports also revealed that over 10,000 cattle were lost, while 2,688 hectares of farmlands and 10,000 houses destroyed within 2011 and mid-2018 in Zamfara State. Also, the State recorded the loss of 147,800 vehicles and motorcycles between June 2011 to May 2019. In November 2019, an estimated 4,000 people were also internally displaced in Shiroro LGA of Niger State alone (WANEP, 2020).

Added to the killings and ransacking of rural villages in Zamfara, Niger, Sokoto, Kaduna and Katsina is the massive kidnapping of schools children for ransom Kankara (Katsina), Kagara (Niger), Jangebe (Zamfara), College of Forestry Mechanisation Mando (Kaduna). This has become worrisome to the education sector in Northern Nigeria. The activities of the armed bandits portend a great danger to the economic and development of Nigeria.

REFERENCES

Campbell, J. and Harwood, A. (2018). *Boko Haram's Deadly Impact. Council on Foreign Relations*. Accessed from https://www.google.com on 3th March, 2021.

Elbadawi, A.I. & Sambanis, N. (2000a). "How Much War Will We See? Estimating the Prevalence of Civil War in 161 Countries". *World Bank Working Paper*.

Danbaba, S.T. (2009). Boko Haram Suicide Attacks in Nigeria: An Assessment of Demography and Motivation of the Suicide Bombers. *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference, Northeastern Nigeria*. Nigerian Political Science Association Northeast Zone.

Gersovitz, M. & Kriger, N. (2013). What is a civil war? A critical review of its definition and (Econometric) consequences. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *28* (2). Accessed from https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkt005 on 21st March, 2011.

Hassan, I. (2015). Preface. In: Kuna, M.J. & Ibrahim, J. (eds). *Rural Banditry and Social Conflicts in Northern Nigeria*. Abuja: Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD).

Ikein, A. (2009) " The Potential Power of West African Oil to the Economics and Energy security Interest of Euro-America in the 21st Century" . *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa. 10* (3): 540-556.

Kimiebi, I. E. (2010). *Oil, Militancy and Political Opportunities in Niger Delta*. Retrieved from http://kimiebi.blogspot.com on 21st March, 2021.

Ngozi, N.; Emmanuel, A.O and Clara, E. (2012). Militancy and Insecurity in the Niger Delta: impact on the inflow of foreign direct investment to Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review. 2* (1): 23-37.

Nigeria - Child Protection Sub Working Group (2015). What do We Know About Unaccompanied and Separated Children. *reliefweb*. Accessed from Nigeria-child-protection-sub-working-group.cp-swg.what-do-we-know-about-unaccompanied on 3rd March, 2021.

OCHA (2016). *Humanitarian Response Plan,* http://reliefweb.int/report/nigeria/nigeria-2016-humanitarian-response-plan-january-december-2016.

Ogege, S. (2011) " Amnesty Initiative and the Dilemma of Sustainable Development in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria" . *Journal of Sustainable Development*. *4* (4): 101-108.

Save the Children (2016). *Building a Safe and Prosperous Future for Nigeria' s Children through Education*.

The Presidential Committee on the North East Initiative (2016). *Rebuilding the North East - The Buhari Plan: Emergency Humanitarian Assistance Social Stabilization and Protection Early Recovery (Initiatives Strategies and Implementation Frameworks)*. Vol.1.

WANEP (2020). Addressing Armed Banditry in the North-West Region of Nigeria: Exploring the Potentials of a Multi-Dimensional Conflict Management Approach. *Policy Brief*. Accra Ghana.

CHAPTER SIX

MECHANISMS OF RESOLVING CONFLICT

6.0   **Introduction**

Conflict is an inevitable part of human relations and when it occurs, it should be managed properly to avoid its destructive effects. This module explains how to manage, resolve, prevent conflicts and restore confidence in conflict societies. It also looked at Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) as a non-conventional and least expensive method of resolving conflict.

6.1   **Objective**

This chapter intends to expose students to some mechanisms of resolving, managing, and preventing conflict, which include conflict resolution, conflict management, peace building, conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacemaking, adjudication and alternative dispute resolution. It will equip students with useful skills to manage, restore, resolve, build and terminate conflict using non-

conventional peaceful methods of settling disputes such as: adjudication, arbitration, mediation, traditional/community based activities, good governance, collaboration, negotiation and conciliation.

6.2 Conflict Resolution

Conflict resolution encompasses the use of nonviolent resistance measures by conflicted parties in an attempt to promote effective resolution *(*Roberts & Garton, 2009). It is a way for two or more parties to find a peaceful solution to a disagreement among them. The disagreement may be personal, financial, political, or emotional. Conflict resolution is essentially aimed at intervention to change or facilitate the course of a conflict (Otite, 2004:6). When a dispute arises, often the best course of action is negotiation to resolve the disagreement. It is borne out of the belief that conflict cannot be left alone. It needs to be put under control by interacting with the parties to develop common generalization or principles and practices that will return cordial relationship against violence. It applies to every stage of conflict. It has no hard and fast rules. So, conflict resolution is specific to a particular conflict case, but the general thrust is to help parties develop common norms, rules and regulations on utterance, attitudes, actions and aspirations to allow peace reign, rather than for violence to reign (Akpuru-Aja, 2009:21). Conflict resolution provides an opportunity to interact with the parties concerned, with the hope of at least reducing the scope, intensity and effects of conflicts (Otite, 2004:6).

6.3 Conflict Management

Conflict Management refers to measures that limit, mitigate and/or contain a conflict without necessarily solving it (Swanström and Weissmann, 2005:25). Best (2005:95) sees conflict management as, " the process of reducing the negative and destructive capacity through a number of measures and by working with and through the parties involved in that conflict" . It is a long-term mechanism of resolving intractable conflict and control of disagreement that could lead to war. It is a successful tool for resolving short-term or long term conflicts that creates foundation for effective conflict resolution.

6.4 Peace Building

Peace building is a post conflict action predominantly diplomatic and economic that strengthens and rebuilds governmental infrastructure and institutions in order to avoid recourse to armed conflict (Kegley, 2010:274). It is an intervention that is designed to prevent the start or resumption of violent conflict by creating a sustainable peace. It is also refers to a process of restoring normal relations between people that require the reconciliation of differences, offering apology and forgiveness on past harm or misdeed (Usman, 2014:100). Peace building activities address the root causes or potential causes of violence, create a societal expectation for peaceful conflict resolution, durable peace; reconciling opponents; preventing conflict from restarting; integrating civil society;

disarmament, demobilization, reintegration, creating rule of law mechanisms; rebuilding governmental institutions and stabilizing society politically and economically.

6.5 Conflict Prevention

Conflict Prevention is a term coined by Peace Researchers in order to denote the relevant mechanisms put in place to avert the reoccurrence of conflict, particularly in places where conflicts or wars occurred. Lund (2002) defines conflict prevention as " any structural or intercessory means to keep intrastate or interstate tension and disputes from escalating into significant violence and use of armed forces, to strengthen the capabilities of potential parties to violent conflict for resolving such disputes peacefully, and to progressively reduce the underlying problems that produce these issues and disputes" . It is a set of instruments used to prevent or solve disputes before they have developed into active conflicts. The term is also used to refer to different crisis intervention efforts made to reconcile parties and groups involved in disputes or war. This normally happens in the aftermath of armed conflicts when the parties involved agree to a ceasefire, and in this context the prevention of any possible relapse is bargained. Swanström and Weissmann (2005:19) divided conflict prevention into two categories: direct prevention and structural prevention.

(a)   Direct conflict prevention refers to measures that are aimed at preventing short-term, often imminent, escalation of a potential conflict. Dispatch of a mediator or the withdrawal of military forces is examples of direct prevention.

(b)   Structural prevention focuses on more long term measures that address the underlying causes of a potential conflict along with potentially escalating and triggering factors. Economic development assistance or increased political participation are examples of structural prevention.

6.6 Peace Keeping

The term ' peacekeeping' was coined by UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld in reference to the UN Emergency Force (UNEF1) sent to the Suez Canal in 1956. Peace keeping is defined by the International Peace Academy " as the prevention, containment, moderation and termination of hostilities between or within States, through the medium of third party intervention, organized and directed internationally using multinational forces of soldiers, police, and civilians to restore and maintain peace" (Malu, 2009:160). It involves coordinated efforts to ensure stability and relative normalcy in the aftermath of otherwise extremely volatile and chaotic situations (Miller, 2005:62). It is also an international effort to ensure that peace is restored in conflict-ridden societies through a combination of different support initiatives responsible for a wider range of task such as humanitarian assistance, policing, human rights and electoral monitoring, social and economic rehabilitation and reconstruction. The purpose of Peace Keeping is to pursue parties involved in

conflict to stop the conflict and to identify the need for reaching a lasting peace with the support and assistance of international community.

6.7   **Peace Enforcement**

Peace Enforcement is an operation undertaken to end military or violent exchanges or acts of aggression, with or without the consent of one or more parties to the conflict, to create a permanent and viable environment and guarantees for such conditions (Miller, 2005:59). This include the use of armed force to maintain international peace and security in situations where the security council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression (Onumajuru, 2005:x). It is provided in Chapter VII of the Charter, and may be needed when all other efforts fail.

6.8   **Peacemaking**

Peacemaking is a peaceful settlement processes such as good offices, conciliation, and mediation, designed to resolve the issues that led to armed conflict (Kegley & Raymond, 2010:274). It is a diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to negotiate a settlement of their dispute through such peaceful means as those foreseen under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter (Onumajuru, 2005:x). Peacemaking is central to all peace processes and in general conducted by the diplomatic community. It goes beyond peacekeeping to actually deal with the issues that caused a conflict.

6.9   **Adjudication**

Adjudication is non-violent method, which involves the use of courts and litigation processes. It is a peaceful means of resolving conflict and disputes. Parties to conflict may in this respect decide to resolve their disagreement to the court of judicial process with legal representatives, solicitors or advocates. The aggrieved party who chooses this nonviolent method is ready to take the verdict or judgement of the presiding judge of competent jurisdiction either good or bad or either in its favour or against it. The judgement is binding and will be legally enforced through the state apparatus for resolving conflicts. This means of resolving conflicts is usually marked with winner and loser, bitterness and joy as the case may be. Legal counsels are engaged in adjudication processes. Counsel to the parties involved in conflicts will present their cases through addresses, giving information, arguments, claims, evidences, cross-examinations, proofs, witnesses with the aim of winning after hearing and judgement delivered (Adejimola, 2009:006). The court gives verdict at the end; judgment is binding on all parties, as it will be enforced accordingly.

6.10   **Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)**

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is a non-conventional peaceful method of settling disputes using least expensive methods. It is also a wide range of procedures and approaches other than litigation that aim to identify resolutions to conflicts that will be mutually accepted by the constituent parties (Miller, 2005). ADR is specifically means to serve as an alternative to the official

conventional means of settling disputes. ADR has evolved and been tailored to address conflicts in political and international affairs, civil and human rights, corporate and commercial interests, and community and family issues. The non-conventional methods of resolving conflict within the range of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) include:

6.10.1 **Peace Mediation**

Peace Mediation is a method of conflict resolution that requires the use of a third party (Intermediary) (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall, 1999:22). It is a voluntary, informal, nonbinding process undertaken by an external party that fosters the settlement of differences or demands between directly interested parties in which the parties retain control over the outcome. The aim of peace mediation is to ensure returns of normalcy. A mediator is someone who mediates between conflicting parties and does not have the power or authority to coerce them to accept the verdict. A mediator could be an individual, groups of individuals, or countries.

6.10.2 **Arbitration**

Arbitration is a technique for the resolution of disputes outside the courts. The parties to a dispute refer it to arbitration by one or more persons (the "arbitrators", "arbiters" or "arbitral tribunal"), and agree to be bound by the arbitration decision (the "award"). A third party reviews the evidence in the case and imposes a decision that is legally binding on both sides and enforceable in the courts (Arthur & Sheffrin, 2003:324). It is also seen as a procedure in which a dispute is submitted, by agreement of the parties, to one or more arbitrators who make a binding decision on the dispute. It is a mechanism for resolving conflicts in a form of third party intervention whereby the disputants identify their grievances and demands, fix a procedural process, and willingly submit the decision of outcomes, which are to be final and binding, to an external entity. The contending parties often select the majority of the members of the third party, which normally takes the form of a tribunal. The third party is usually presented with arguments and evidence from both sides, but the process can vary according to the pre-established procedures. Although similar to adjudication, arbitration is informal, private, economical, and relatively quick (Miller, 2005:16).

6.10.3 **Collaboration**

Collaboration is defined as the mutual engagement of participants in a coordinated effort to solve a problem together (Lai, 2011:2). It is based on constructive co-operation and dialogue between parties in conflict. It involves the parties in conflict to work on their own desires to resolve the conflict. It is borne out of the personal conviction of the parties concerned that adversarial relationship is not going to help matters on the long run, that it is better to create suitable environment for friendly relations.

6.10.4 **Conciliation**

Conciliation is a voluntary process in which the parties to a dispute agree to avail a neutral and impartial third party to assist them in resolving their differences. It is a peaceful means of settling disputes arising between parties by choosing a conciliator to reach a dispute settlement through approximating different points of view without extending his role to issuing a binding decision for the disputants (Mousa, 2005:25). Conciliation is not considered a legal or judicial means adopted to resolve disputes arising between parties; rather it is the most feasible mechanism by which decision is made through the parties' agreement and consent (Kassem, 2014:1036). Conciliator do this by lowering tensions, improving communications, interpreting issues, encouraging parties to explore potential solutions and assisting parties in finding a mutually acceptable outcome. Conciliation can also contribute to maintaining agreements and preventing future conflicts over other issues. The impartiality of the third party is central to the conciliation process (Miller, 2005:22).

6.10.5 **Negotiation**

Negotiation is the process whereby the parties within the conflict seek to settle or resolve their conflicts (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall, 2008:29). It is a bargaining process that involves discussion, give and take between two or more disputants who seek to find solutions to common problems. It encompasses explicit processes of dialogue designed to bring both sides' objectives into harmony (Tuck, 2016:21). It could be between two people, workers, employers, groups, communities, nations etc. It can be beneficial to both parties (commonly called win-win or cooperative bargaining) or confrontational (commonly called win-lose or adversarial bargaining). Negotiation is governed by pre-established procedures, between representatives of parties involved in a conflict or dispute.

As a technique in the management and resolution of conflict, negotiation is conducted on various grounds: to identify common interests and develop unilateral or multilateral initiatives in pursuit of objectives, to de-escalate a conflict situation, or to formulate mutually satisfactory solutions towards resolution of a given conflict. The process involves numerous skills and tactics, including bargaining, compromise, and concessions, among others. Outcomes may range from authorized documents to informal agreements to new or adjusted procedures to institutional arrangements (Miller, 2005:51).

6.10.6 **Conflict Settlement**

This suggests agreement over the conflict issues, which involves compromise or concession from both sides. Neither side may be able to achieve all of their goals, but the initial disappointment may be offset by the mutuality of the compromise. Settlement is often the quickest solution to a difficult or violent situation; its effectiveness is temporary because the underlying relationships and structures that have caused the conflict are not addressed. Thus, conflicts that have reached settlements are often reopened later (Onumajuru, 2005:ix).

6.10.7 **Good Governance**

According to Johnston (2004) good governance is a competent management of a country's resources and affairs in a manner that is open, transparent, accountable, equitable and responsive to people's needs. It implies presence of rule of law, safeguard of human rights, and existence of honest and efficient government, accountability, transparency, predictability and openness. According to Kukah (1998) good governance meant governance that is responsible, accountable and transparent in policy formulation and implementation. Good governance also embodies certain standard principles: transparency, accountability, civic participation, achievement of results and impact (Asobie, 2012:7).

Good governance is also the steering capacity of public institutions and agencies to work efficiently in response to collective public choice, such that the standard of living and security of citizens are not open to severe criticisms. If a government fails to meet the increasing burdens put on it by the process of social mobilization, a growing proportion of the population is likely to become disenchanted, alienated and disaffected from the state, even if the same language, culture and basic social institutions were shared by the ruler and the alike (Nnoli, 1980:289). Good governance therefore focuses on improving the function of the government or the quality of public regulation based on transparency, accountability, fairness, justice, tolerance and inclusiveness. This generally resolves and minimizes conflict.

6.10.8 **The traditional/community-based activities**

This is a typical African process. It is a traditional variant of the formal court system where witnesses can appear to give evidence. The mediators assume both the role of adjudicators and legal representatives before giving award or fine. It could also take the form of rendering community services and other activities to resolve conflict amicably.

REFERENCES

Adejimola, A.S. (2009). Language and communication in conflict resolution. *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 1(1). Pp. 001-009.

Arthur, S. and Sheffrin, S.M *(2003). Economics: Principles in action. Upper Saddle River*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Asobie, H.A. (2012). Conceptual, Theoretical and Empirical Issues on the Interface between Corruption, Governance and Development. In: Mohammed, H. Aluaigba, M.T. and Kabir, A. (eds). *Corruption, Governance and Development in Nigeria: Perspectives and Remedies*. Becons Prints and General Enterprises: Kano.

Best, S.G. (2005). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa – A Reader (Ed.).* Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.

Garko, A.B.; Muhammad, M.; and Bala, S. (2014). Geographic Information System (GIS): A Tool for Minimizing Land Conflicts in Nigeria. In: Muhammad, M.; Bogoro, S.; Haruna, M.A and Buba, R. (eds). *Issues on Peace and Conflict Resolution*. Ahmadu Bello University Press Ltd: Zaria.

Johnston, M. (2004). *Good governance: Rule of law, Transparency and accountability*. Colgate: University New York.

Lai, E.R. (2011). *Collaboration: A Literature Review - Research Report*. Pearson.

Lund, M. (2002). " Preventing Violent Intrastate Conflicts: Learning lessons from experience" . In: Tongeren, P.; Hans van de Veen & Verhoeven, J. (eds). *Searching for Peace in Europe and Eurasia: An Overview of Conflict Prevention and Peace building Activities*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Kassem, T. (2014). Conciliation Mechanism: An Amicable Mechanism to Settle Business Disputes Advantages and Disadvantages. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*. Vol.2. Pp. 1035: 1043.

Kegley, C.W & Raymond, G.A. (2010). *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics*. Macmillan: USA.

Kukah, M.H.(1998). " Democracy and Good Governance" . In: Ayodele, E. (ed). *Africa: National Unity, and Development*. Ibadan: Sibon.

Malu, S.V..L (2009). ECOMOG: A Peace Keeping Operation in Perspective. In: Jonah, G.J. and Zabadi, I.S. (2009). *Peace Support Operations in the New Global Environment: The Nigerian Perspective*. National Defence College: Abuja.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. University for Peace.

Mousa, M.I. (2005). *International Commercial Conciliation and the Change of the Prevalent View about the Means Settling the International Trade Disputes*. Alexandria: New University Press.

Nnoli, O. (1980). *Introduction to Politics*. Fourth Dimension Publishers: Enugu.

Onumajuru, E.V. (2005). " United Nations Peacekeeping Operation and Conflict Resolution in Africa" . *Being a Research Project Submitted to the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research Programme of Correspondence Instruction for the award of the Certificate-of-Training in United Nations Peace Support Operations.* New York.

Otite, O. (2004:6). On Conflicts, their Resolution, Transformation, and Management. In: Otite, O. & Albert, I.O. (eds). *Community conflicts in Nigeria: Management Resolution and Transformation*. Spectrum Books Limited: Ibadan.

Ramsbotham, O; Woodhouse, T. & Miall, H. (2008). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Policy.

Roberts, A. and Garton, A.T (eds) (2009). *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swanström, N.L.P. and Weissmann, M.S. (2005). Conflict, Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management and beyond: a conceptual exploration. *Concept Paper*.

Tuck, C. (2016). *Confrontation, Strategy and War Termination Britain' s Conflict with Indonesia*. Routledge: USA.

Usman, A.Y. (2014). Islam and Conflict Resolution: Methods and Applications. In: Muhammad, M.; Bogoro, S.; Haruna, M.A and Buba, R. (eds). *Issues on Peace and Conflict Resolution*. Ahmadu Bello University Press Ltd: Zaria.

Wallensteen, P. (2002). *Understanding Conflict Resolution War, Peace and The Global System.* London: Sage Publishing.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

7.0   **Introduction**

The chapter defines International Organisation and highlights some of the intervention operations in Africa by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), African Union (AU) and United Nations (UN).

7.1   **Objective**

At the end of the chapter, the students should be exposed to the meaning and the role of international organizations in Peace Keeping.

7.2   **Meaning of International Organisation**

Plano and Olton (1979:288) defined international organisation as a " formal arrangement transcending national boundaries that provides for the establishment of institutional machinery to facilitate co-operation among members in security, economic, social, or related fields" . It can be

also defined as a formal institution established by sovereign states through a consensus, and a solid structure, with a view to pursuing the common interest of its members.

7.3   **Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)**

The formation of ECOWAS was first visualized by Nigeria and Togo between December 10 and 15, 1973. In effect, the government of West African states " agreed in general on necessary institutions (and provisions) of the Nigeria-Togo initiative for a community and possible areas of cooperation as well as taxonomies and nature of various levels of integration such as institutions of the community, trade, customs, immigration, industrial harmonization, monetary and financial matters. ECOWAS has 15 member States that include: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Cote d' ivoire, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Togo. One of the roles played by ECOWAS in the management of conflict in West Africa was the establishment of Economic Community of West Africa States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) as a multinational peacekeeping/peace enforcement agency.

The provisions of ECOMOG facilitated regional conflict resolution efforts initiated by ECOWAS. ECOMOG was inaugurated in May 1989 in Banjul, by the Heads of Government of African States, on the recommendation of the Standing Mediation Committee (SMC), which reviewed the deteriorating security situation in Liberia under the then President Samuel Doe. ECOMOG team comprises of military units and technical experts from ECOWAS member States. ECOMOG was principally responsible for the restoration of peace in Liberia in 1997 and stability in Sierra Leone in 2001 (Abubakar, 2009). ECOWAS through ECOMOG undertake sub-regional peace keeping such as the ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in Liberia with troops from Nigeria, Ghana, Gambia and Sierra Leon; the ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in Sierra Leone; and the ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in Guinea Bissau.

7.4   **African Union (AU) formerly known as Organisation of African Unity (OAU)**

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) was formed at a meeting of 32 African Heads of State in Addis Ababa in May 1963. The broad objectives of the OAU were to promote political cooperation in the struggle to liberate the entire African continent from colonialism and white oppression. In doing that, OAU sought, as well, to advance African development efforts to liberate the continent from poverty by promoting economic development of its constituent member countries (Moshi, 2013:42).

The Organisation of African Union (OAU) was transformed after several meetings to African Union (AU) in July, 2002 in Durban South Africa. Africa witnessed armed conflicts with devastating impact on people and resources since independence. This prompted the OAU/AU to undertake some regional peace operations such as OAU Peacekeeping Operation in Chad 1981; the African Union

(AU) Mission in Burundi (AMIB) 2001; the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) 2004 (Galadima, 2006).

7.5   United Nations (UN)

The United Nations (UN) is an international organization whose stated aims are to facilitate cooperation in international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights, and achieving world peace. Its main purpose is the control of war like nations and the establishment of harmonious world order for mutual interdependence of nations. This is borne out of the bitter experiences of World War I and II. In an effort to stop further destruction of life and property and perhaps possible extermination of humanity, the UN charter, states as its primary responsibility, the maintenance of international peace and security (Okeke, 2006:69). The UN was founded in 1945 after World War II to replace the League of Nations, to stop wars between countries, and to provide a platform for dialogue. The headquarters of the United Nations is in Manhattan, New York City, United States. At its founding, the UN had 51 member states and there are now 193 member States.

The maintenance of public security, civil services, and cease-fire agreements in war and conflict zones at international level is spearheaded by the UN or regional military, police, and civilian forces with the consent of the nation-state on whose territory these forces are deployed (Miller, 2005). Peace Keeping Operations were launched by the United Nations in 1948 when the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) was set up in Jerusalem to oversee the truce in the Middle East, and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

The United Nations through its Peace Support Operations contributed to peace and stability in many African countries by establishing and signing UN operations in Africa such as: United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC) 1960; United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM I) 1988; the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) 1991; The United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM III) 1995; United Nations Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM I) 1991; United Nations Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM II) 1992; United Nations Mission in Cote d' Ivoire (MINUC I) 2003; United Nations Observer Mission Uganda-Rwanda (UNOUR) 1993; United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) 1993; United Nations Aouzou Strip Observer Group (UNASOG) 1994; United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) 1989; The United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) 1985; United Nations Organisation Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) 1999; The United Nations Operations in Cote d' Ivoire (UNOC I); The United Nations Mission in Sierra Leon (UNAMSIL) 1999; UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) 2000; The United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), 2004; The UN Mission in Burundi (ONUB) 2004 (Galadima, 2006).

REFERENCES

Abubakar, A.A. (2009). Peacekeeping in West Africa: The Nigerian Experience: In: In: Jonah, G.J. and Zabadi, I.S. (2009). *Peace Support Operations in the New Global Environment: The Nigerian Perspective*. National Defence College: Abuja.

Galadima, H.S. (2006). Peace Support Operations in Africa. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Spectrum Books Limited: Ibadan.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. University for Peace.

Okeke, G.S.M (2006). International Institutions and World Peace. In: Adegbulu, F. (ed). *Topics and Issues in International Relations*. Babcock University Press: Nigeria.

Plano, J.C and Olton, R. (1979). *The International Relations Dictionary*. Kalamazoo, MI: New Issues.

CHAPTER EIGHT

PEACE AS A VEHICLE OF UNITY AND DEVELOPMENT

8.0   **Introduction**

The chapter discusses the link between peace and unity as ingredients of development, as it is difficult for a nation to develop in a situation of conflict, violence and war.

8.1   **Objective**

At the end of this chapter, students are expected to understand the link between peace, unity and development. They should able to know and explain the effect of conflict and violence on unity and development of a nation.

8.2   **Meaning of Unity**

Unity is the foundation of human team spirit. It comes from the word ' unit' which means compressed, compact, solid, dense, associated (mixed, joined) and into one, integrated, strong (tough, intact) and resilient (Dewan Dictionary, 2000). It can be defined as the state or quality of being in

accord; harmony; agreement; and or quality of being one or united into a whole. It is a state of being undivided or unbroken by bringing together an identity or coincidence of interests, purposes, or sympathies among the members of a group. Within this context, unity could be described as a situation whereby ethnic groups, religious groups and people from different locations live in harmony triggered by bond of national identity. Without unity there will be hardly any meaningful development or progress.

8.3 Meaning of Development

According to Rodney (1973:1) development is a many-sided process implying for the individual, skills and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being. The process involves the development of tools, skills and the mobilization of required resources for development purpose. Olomola (1997:41) defines development as advancement through progressive changes in economic, social, cultural, technological and political conditions of a society leading to an improvement in the welfare of the citizens. Asobie (2012:7) opines that development is the process by which a people participate in defining and achieving higher civilization for themselves.

For Seers (1969:5) it is the creation of conditions for the realisation of human personality and this implies a reduction in poverty, unemployment and inequality. Development therefore entails opportunities for improving peoples' standard of living, their employment and incomes, health, education, security and general welfare that is basic to the dignity of human personality. According to Okojie (1997:262) the factors that lead to development are peace, security and stability of government while conflict and violence undermine development both at the national and international levels.

8.4 Peace as a Vehicle for Unity and Development

Just as there can be no lasting peace without development, so development efforts cannot succeed without a stable, peaceful environment (Boutrous Boutrous – Ghali, former UN Secretary General). Stan (2004) and Chandler (2007) argue that development cannot be achieved in any nation where there are conflicts, crises and wars. Where conflicts are high, development is often very elusive, and where development has attained or is appreciating expansion and high growth rate, conflict is often very low or decreasing. The far-reaching purpose of peace in society is enhancement of development, which implies provision of governmental infrastructure, social amenities, improvement of standard of living, security and so on. There is no doubt that there exists a relationship between peace and development while conflict is considered as an obstacle to unity and development because of its destructive impact. Conflicts have the capacity to severely constrain development by destroying infrastructure, interrupting production process and diverting resources away from productive uses (Adetula, 2006).

Conflict impinges on unity and development in many ways. It leads to loss of lives, destruction of property, governmental infrastructure, gross abused of fundamental human rights; displacement and refugees, scares local and foreign investors, erodes social cohesion; creates disharmony, discord, disunity and breeds fear and suspicion etc. Conflicts also divert scarce resources away from social services, disrupt trade, and contribute to the breakdown of family structures and have grave psychological consequences as women and children are traumatized or become accustomed to a culture of violence. Conflict has become an everyday occurrence in contemporary world, particularly in Africa with serious implications as no development of whatsoever can take place in an unfriendly environment.

8.5   A case study of Nigeria

Nigeria is made up of a very complex multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multilinguistic and multi-religious society. This, in itself, should have been an advantage and a veritable factor for national unity, national integration and national cohesion. Unfortunately, this plurality in culture, language, ethnicity and religion turned to be the very source of conflicts. In all parts of Nigeria today, there are communal, ethnic, religious and political conflicts that manifest in various forms and are accompanied by ferociousness and destructiveness such as Boko Haram Insurgency; Biafra agitation for self-succession led by Nnamdi Kanu's Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB); Herdsmen/Farmers clashes; Military/Shiites clashes; Niger-Delta Avengers; ethno-religious and political violence constitute threats to the nation's security, unity, development and harmonious peaceful coexistence. In recent times, these conflicts have become more recurring and pervasive with unprecedented consequences.

8.6   A case study of South Sudan

South Sudan, which separated from Sudan in 2011 after 40 years of civil war, is drawn into a devastating new conflict in late 2013 triggered by a power struggle in the ruling party with preexisting ethnic and political fault lines turned violent. The civil war started when President Salva Kiir from the ethnic Dinka, the largest ethnic group in the country sacked his Vice President Riek Machar of Nuer the second largest ethnic group in July 2013 after he had announced his intention to contest the presidency. Riek Machar was accused by President Kiir of planning a coup, and was removed from his position as Vice President. This led to the formation of Sudan People's Liberation Movement-in-Opposition (SPLA-IO) out of Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLA). Fighting first erupted between the two sides in the South Sudanese capital, Juba, in December 2013.

The main protagonists in South Sudan war have been the government of President Salva Kiir of Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLA) and its' allies; and former Vice-President Riek Machar of Sudan People's Liberation Movement-in-Opposition (SPLA-IO) and his backers. Both

sides have been backed by a range of armed groups, over which they have exercised at best partial control (Lunn, 2016:4). Horrific human rights abuses have been committed and the violence which first is politically motivated has taken on an increasingly ethnic character. Civilians have been routinely targeted in the conflict, often along ethnic lines, and the warring parties have been accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity. The war have displaced more than 2.7 million people, including roughly 200,000 who are sheltering at U.N. peacekeeping bases in the country.

Over 1 million South Sudanese have fled as refugees to neighboring countries (Blanchard, 2016). An estimated 50,000 people have been killed as a result of the fighting (Lunn, 2016:4). According to UNICEF (2014), out of an estimated 748,000 internally displaced children, 400,000 children are out of school; more than 11,000 children have been recruited into armed groups and forces; and over 6,600 children have been separated from their families. The South Sudan conflict has been one of the most dastardly conflicts that threaten peace and development in recent times in Africa.

8.7   **A case study of Syria**

Since its independence from France in 1946, Syria has passed through many periods of political instability. Increasing Arab nationalism fuelled many military coups, until the Syrian Corrective Revolution in 1970 brought the Arab Socialist Ba' ath Party and Hafez Al-Assad to power. The new regime was autocratic, one-party, and very totalitarian, meaning that any opposition was to be repressed. The President fully and directly controlled the military and security apparatus, which controlled the public administration including the Baath Party itself, the Council of Ministers, the People' s Assembly (the Parliament), the judiciary, all trade unions, the media, and the economy. With Hafez Al-Assad' s death in 2000, his son Bashar Al-Assad took office as Syria' s leader (Berzins, 2013:1).

The Syrian civil war is the deadliest conflict the 21st century has witnessed so far. The conflict began in 2011 as a result of peaceful protests that erupted in Syria which had genesis from the "Arab Spring revolts" that toppled Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and Mummur Ghadafi of Libya. The Syrian government, led by President Bashar al-Assad, responded to the protests by killing hundreds of demonstrators and imprisoning many more. This act led to the formation of the Free Syrian Army, a rebel group aiming to overthrow the government. Over 450,000 Syrians have been killed in the fighting, more than a million injured and over 12 million Syrians - half the country's prewar population - have been displaced from their homes.

8.8   **Developing a Culture of Peace**

A culture of peace, as defined by UNESCO is all about the values, attitudes and forms of behaviour that reflect respect for life, for human beings and their dignity and for all human rights, the rejection of violence in all its forms and commitment to the principles of freedom, justice,

solidarity, tolerance and understanding between peoples, groups, and individuals (Ekwueme, 2004:21). Ekwueme (2004:27) further stressed that a culture of peace can be achieved when citizens of the world understand global problems, have the skills to resolve conflicts and struggle for justice non-violently, live by international standards of human rights and equity, appreciate cultural diversity, and respect the earth…such learning can only be achieved with systemic education for peace. The culture of peace cannot be achieved without educating the citizens on the skill of how to prevent and resolve conflicts constructively hence, the need to inculcate the spirit of tolerance through impacting the knowledge of peace in schools, colleges, universities and other higher institutions.

REFERENCES

Adetula, V.A.O (2006). Development, Conflict and Peace Building in Africa. In: Best, S.G. (ed). *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Spectrum Books Limited: Ibadan.

Asobie, H. A. (2012). Conceptual, Theoretical and Empirical Issues on the Interface between Corruption, Governance and Development. In: Mohammed, H. Aluaigba, M.T. and Kabir, A. (eds). *Corruption, Governance and Development in Nigeria: Perspectives and Remedies*. Becons Prints and General Enterprises: Kano.

Berzins, J. (2013).*Civil War In Syria: Origins, Dynamics, and Possible Solutions. Strategic Review* no. 07.

Blanchard, L.P. (2016). *Conflict in South Sudan and the Challenges Ahead*. Congressional Research Service.

Chandler, D. (2007). *The Security-Development Nexus and the Rise of Anti-Foreign Policy. Journal of International Relations and Development*. Vol. 10, 362-386.

Dewan Dictionary. (2000). *Dewan Dictionary: 3rd Edition*. Malaysia, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Ekwueme, L. (2004). Institutionalizing a culture of peace through the Arts. In: Arinze and Ben-Iheanacho (eds). *Nigeria: A Cultural Perspective to Peace Advocacy*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.

Lunn, J. (2016). War and peace in South Sudan: March 2016 update. *Briefing Paper*. No. 7532.

Rodney, W. (1973). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, London and Tanzanian Publishing House, Dar-Es-Salaam.

Seers, D. (1969). 'The Meaning of Development'. *International Development Review*. 11(4): 3-4.

UNICEF (2014). '*South Sudan Humanitarian Situation Report*'. No. 44, 21 October.