



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: PCR 261

COURSE TITLE: CULTURE, VALUES AND CONFLICTS IN WAR

**COURSE
GUIDE**

**PCR 261
CULTURE, VALUES AND CONFLICTS IN WAR**

Course Team Monsuru Adegboyega Kasali (Course Developer/Writer) - University of Ibadan
Dr. Ifeanyi I. Onyeonoru (Course Editor) - University of Ibadan
Oyedolapo B. Durojaye (Course Coordinator) - NOUN



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

National Open University of Nigeria
Headquarters
14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way
Victoria Island, Lagos

Abuja Office
5 Dar es Salaam Street
Off Aminu Kano Crescent
Wuse II, Abuja

e-mail: centralinfo@nou.edu.ng
URL: www.nou.edu.ng

Published by:
National Open University of Nigeria

Printed 2013

ISBN: 978-058-424-2

All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS	PAGE
Introduction	iv
What you will Learn in this Course.....	iv
Course Aims	v
Course Objectives	vi
Working through this Course.....	vii
Course Materials	viii
Study Units	viii
Set Textbooks	ix
Assignment File	xi
Presentation File.....	xi
Assessment	xi
Tutor-Marked Assignment.....	xi
Final Examination and Grading	xii
Course Marking Scheme	xii
Course Overview.....	xii
How to Get the Most from this Course.....	xiv
Tutors and Tutorials	xv
Summary	xvi

INTRODUCTION

PCR 261: Culture, Values and Conflicts in War is a three-credit unit course. It is a compulsory course for all undergraduate students of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution of the university. The course is recommended for any other student particularly those in the School of Arts and Social Sciences, who may have interest in the study of Peace and Conflict Resolution. The course can also be taken as elective or required course by other students whose main discipline is not Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution.

The course shall consist of 20 units, which include the meaning of war, conceptual definition of the culture of war, evolution of culture of war, and culture of war from the perspective of the United Nations. Other areas of discourse are violence modelling and violent behaviour, agents of violence/aggression modelling, ethnicity, religion, ideology, morality of war and just war, philosophy of pacifism, culture of peace, laws of war and war crime among others.

The course material draws its major case studies from the continent of Africa with particular reference to Nigeria with the aim of ejaculating your desire towards developing viable analytical and conceptual framework for addressing the conflict problems in Nigeria and elsewhere.

The course has no compulsory pre-requisites for it to be registered for. The course guide informs us on what this course is all about, what you should appreciate in each unit, what text materials you shall be using and how you can make best use of these materials. The course guide also informs you of the need to take tutor-marked assignments seriously. However, necessary information on the tutor-marked assignments shall be made known to you in a separate file, which will be sent to you. This course is also supported with periodic tutorial classes.

WHAT YOU WILL LEARN IN THIS COURSE

The overall aim of PCR 261: Culture, Values and Conflicts in War is to introduce you to the meaning of war, and prominent areas of inquiry and issues in the discourse of culture, values and conflicts in war. Your understanding of Culture, Values and Conflicts in War will enable you to explain some basic concepts in the study of war.

In fact, the course will also expose you to various relevant issues in the history and study of war as well as techniques and traditions of peace and conflict transformation. PCR 261 is a very interesting course as it stimulates our understanding of how belief systems, values, social

orientation - among several other social attitudes constitute habits of war and violent behaviour. The issues of culture and values have continued to enjoy growing interest in the field of peace and conflict resolution.

Therefore, this course is significant as it shows how war has also impacted on the culture and values of state and non-state actors in relation to their inter-relationships and individual interests. In the quest to address culture of violence and war, a lot of individual and institutional (both lateral and multilateral) initiatives have been adopted to promote social networks, that can guarantee peaceful co-existence.

However, efforts to engendering peace practice are very important because it is only through peace than sustainable development can take place in any country. There is also need to promote peace-generating values among the state and non-state actors. This, we can achieve through civil education, democracy, respect for fundamental human rights, poverty alleviation among others, to remove the incentive(s) of violence in the conflict behaviour of state and non-state actors. The culture of peace demands that parties should resolve their conflict through non-violent and peaceful ways for effective conflict transformation.

COURSE AIMS

The main aim of this course is to expose you to the basic concepts, issues, and practice that have attracted a great attention among scholars and policy makers, which explain the prevailing culture and values of war that dominate affairs of man at all levels of interaction, from intra-personal to global.

The study also draws its searchlight on the issues in war discourse, which have continued to attract contestations, debates and intellectual conflict among scholars. These issues have remained subjects of conflict in the conceptual and theoretical positions of scholars. This course also acknowledges a number of peace initiatives undertaken by (inter) governmental and nongovernmental organisations.

However, we shall achieve this task by looking at various peace building efforts or undertakings made by both the state and non-state actors. It is our belief that our study on peace initiatives of various actors cannot be complete if we fail to discuss various mechanisms of peaceful resolution of conflict. It will amount to academic sabotage, if no chapter or unit in a course like this, is reserved to explain the issue and importance of mainstreaming gender in peace process. The course is also aimed to:

- describe war and its features
- conceptualise the culture and examine its relationship with war
- study the origin of war culture from pre-historic period to modern time
- differentiate between the culture of war and culture of peace
- explain the institutional definition and response of the UN to culture of war
- examine the impact of violence modelling on the habits of war and culture of violence, as well as various agents of violence modelling
- suggest how ideological, religious, and ethnic values and the subjective perceptions that accompany them constitute habits and culture of war and violence
- clarify what constitute a justification of war
- illustrate the relationship between war crime and the laws of war
- distinguish the various dimensions of war
- define various dimensions of peace building
- stress the importance of peaceful approaches in conflict resolution
- demonstrate the relevance of peacekeeping in the mitigation of (continued) armed hostility between warring parties
- state various elements of peace building
- analyse the gender perspective in peace building
- evaluate the efforts and activities of state and non-state actors towards peace building and promotion of culture of peace and
- appreciate the importance of increasing women participation in peace process.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

With utmost desire to achieve the aims set out above, the course has some set of objectives as demonstrated in all the units of the course. Each unit has its own objectives. Objectives are always included at the beginning of every unit to assist you in the appreciation of what he or she will come across in the study of each unit to facilitate his or her better understanding of the course – PCR 261 (Culture, Values and Conflicts in War).

You are therefore advised to read these objectives before studying the entire unit(s). Thus, it is helpful to do so. You should always look at the unit objectives after completing a unit. In this way, you can be sure that you have done what was required of you by the unit.

Stated below are the wider objectives of this course as a whole. By meeting these objectives, you should have achieved the aims of the course as a whole.

At the end of the course, you should be able to:

- describe war and its features
- conceptualise the culture and examine its relationship with war
- study the origin of war culture from pre-historic period to modern time
- differentiate between the culture of war and culture of peace
- explain the institutional definition and response of the UN to culture of war
- examine the impact of violence modelling on the habits of war and culture of violence, as well as various agents of violence modelling
- suggest how ideological, religious, and ethnic values and the subjective perceptions that accompany them constitute habits and culture of war and violence
- clarify what constitute a justification of war
- illustrate the relationship between war crime and the laws of war;
- distinguish the various dimensions of war
- define various dimensions of peace building
- stress the importance of peaceful approaches in conflict resolution
- demonstrate the relevance of peacekeeping in the mitigation of (continued) armed hostility between warring parties
- state various elements of peace building
- analyse the gender perspective in peace building
- evaluate the efforts and activities of state and non-state actors towards peace building and promotion of culture of peace
- appreciate the importance of increasing women participation in peace process.

WORKING THROUGH THIS COURSE

In completing this course, you are required to study the whole units, and try to read all (or substantial number of) the recommended textbooks, journals and other reading materials including electronic resources. Each unit contains self-assessment exercise(s) and you are required to submit his or her assignment for the purpose of assessment.

At the end of the course, you shall be examined. The time of the final examination and venue shall be communicated to you in due course by

relevant school authorities. Below are the components of the course and what you are required to do.

COURSE MATERIALS

Major components of the course include:

1. Course Guide
2. Study Units
3. Textbooks
4. Assignments File
5. Presentation Schedule.

It is incumbent upon you to get your own copy of the course material. You are also advised to contact your tutorial facilitator, if you have any difficulty in getting any of the text materials recommended for your further reading.

STUDY UNITS

In this course there are 20 units. They include:

Module 1

Unit 1	Meaning of War
Unit 2	Culture of War: Conceptual Definition
Unit 3	Evolution of Culture of War
Unit 4	Sources of the Culture of War
Unit 5	The United Nations and Culture of War

Module 2

Unit 1	Violence Modelling and Violent Behaviour
Unit 2	Agents of Violence Modelling
Unit 3	Ethnicity and Value of War/Violence
Unit 4	Religion and Value of War/Violence
Unit 5	Ideology and Value of War/Violence

Module 3

Unit 1	Morality of War and Just War
Unit 2	Philosophy of Pacifism
Unit 3	The Dimensions of War
Unit 4	Laws of War and War Crime
Unit 5	Culture of Peace

Module 4

Unit 1	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict I
Unit 2	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict II
Unit 3	Peacekeeping
Unit 4	Peace Building
Unit 5	Gender Perspective in Peace Building

The first five units are centered on the meaning of war and definition of culture of war. This set of units also explains the evolution of culture, its sources and the response of the United Nations to problem of violent habits and war culture. The following set of five units explains how cultural values of war and violence are learnt by the people through imitation of aggressive models or violent personalities, the relationship between ethnicity, religion and ideology and value of war. The module shows how the three concepts stated above can constitute values of war.

The next set of five units discusses few of the issues in war discourse that have attracted great conflict and debate among scholars such as the morality of war and just war, philosophy of pacifism, laws of war and war crime. The dimensions of war as well as culture of war were also covered in this same module:

The last five units explain peaceful resolution of conflict, peacekeeping, peace building and gender perspective in peace building. In each of the unit you have at least one self-assessment exercise, which helps you to know how far you have progressed in understanding the content of each unit. These self-assessment exercises and tutor-marked assignments create a great opportunity for you to achieve the overall objectives of the course.

SET TEXTBOOKS

The following textbooks are recommended to you. The first four textbooks are compulsory for your study of this course.

Albert, I.O. (2001). *Introduction to Third Party Intervention in Community Conflict*. Ibadan: PETRAF/John Archers.

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An Agenda for Peace*. New York: United Nations.

Bush, K. (1998). "A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment of Development Projects in War Zones." Ottawa: The Peace-Building and Reconstruction Programme Initiative, Working Paper, IDRC.

- Desch, M.C. (1996). *War and Strong States, Peace and Weak.*
- Fry, D.P. (2005). *The Human Potential for Peace: An Anthropological Challenge to Assumptions About War and Violence.* Oxford University Press.
- Gat, A. (2006). *War in Human Civilisation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, C. (1999). *Modern Strategy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, R. (2002). “The Theories of War in an Era of Leading-Power Peace.” In: *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1, (March).
- Kelly, R. C. (2000). *Warless Societies and the Origin of War.* USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Mansson, K. (2005). “Integrating Human Rights.”
- Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies.* (2nd ed.). University for Peace (Africa Programme).
- Montagu, A. (1976). *The Nature of Human Aggression.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mueller, J. (1989). *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War.* New York: Basic Books.
- Nations Peace Building Activities: “Developing Gender Justice Best Practices.” In: *Gender Justice in Post Conflict Countries in East, Central and Southern Africa.* Advocacy Magazine, Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria/UNIFEM, September.
- Osiander, A. (1994). (quoting Georges Clemenceau December 29, 1918). *The States System of Europe, 1640-1990.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Otterbein, K. (2004). *How War Began,* Texas: A&M University Press. Publishers, Inc.
- Reychler & Paffenholz, T. (Eds). Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.
- Reychler, L. (2001). "From Conflict to Sustainable Peace Building: States?" *International Organisation*, 50 (Spring).

www.cia.org www.dfid.gov.uk
www.en.wikipedia.org
www.globaleducation.edna.edu.au
www.idasa.org.za
www.peacemakers.ca

ASSIGNMENT FILE

In this file, you will find the necessary details of the assignments you must submit to your tutor for assessment. The marks you get from these assignments will form part of your final assessment in this course.

PRESENTATION SCHEDULE

The presentation schedule included in your course materials gives you the important dates for the completion of tutor-marked assignments and attending tutorials. Remember, you are required to submit all your assignments by the due date. You should guard against falling behind in your work.

ASSESSMENT

There are two aspects to the assessment of the course. First are the tutor-marked assignments; second, there is a written examination. In tackling the assignments, you are expected to apply information and knowledge acquired during this course.

The assignments must be submitted to your tutor for assessment in accordance with the deadlines stated in the assignment file. The work you submit to your tutor for assessment will count for 30% of your total course mark. At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final 3-hour examination. This will also count for 70% of your total course mark.

TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

There are 20 tutor-marked assignments in this course. You need to submit four assignments out which the best three will be used for your assessment. These three assignments shall be 30% of your total course mark.

Assignment questions for the units in this course are contained in the Assignment File. You should be able to complete your assignments from the information and materials contained in your set textbooks, reading and study units. However, you are advised to use other

references to broaden your viewpoint and provide a deeper understanding of the subject.

When you have completed each assignment, send it, together with TMA file to your tutor. Make sure that each assignment gets to your tutor on or before the deadline. However, in case of being unable to complete your work on time, contact your tutor before the submission deadline of assignments elapses to discuss the possibility of an extension.

FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination of PCR 261 will be of three hours and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination shall consist of questions which reflect the type of self-testing, practice exercises and tutor-marked problems you have come across. All areas of the course will be assessed.

You are advised to revise the entire course after studying the last unit before you sit for the examination. You will find it useful to review your tutor-marked assignments and the comments of your tutor on them before the final examination.

COURSE MARKING SCHEME

This table shows how the actual course marking is broken down.

Table 1: Course Making Scheme

Assessment	Marks
Assignment 1 – 4	Four assignments are to be submitted, out of which the three best shall be considered at 10% each, making 30% of the overall scores
Final examination	70% of overall course marks
Total	100% of course marks

COURSE OVERVIEW

This table brings together the entire units contained in this course, the number of weeks you should take to complete them, and the assignments that follow them.

Table 2: Course Overview

Unit	Title	Week's Activity	Assessment (End of Unit)
	Course Guide	1	
	Module 1		
1	Meaning of War	1	Assignment 1
2	Culture of War: Conceptual Definition	2	Assignment 2
3	Evolution of Culture of War	2	Assignment 3
4	Sources of the Culture of War	3	Assignment 4
5	The United Nations and Culture of War	4	Assignment 5
	Module 2		
1	Violence Modelling and Violent Behaviour	5	Assignment 6
2	Agents of Violence Modelling	6	Assignment 7
3	Ethnicity and Value of War/Violence	6	Assignment 8
4	Religion and Value of War/Violence	7	Assignment 9
5	Ideology and Value of War/Violence	7	Assignment 10
	Module 3		
1	Morality of War and Just War	8	Assignment 11
2	Philosophy of Pacifism	9	Assignment 12
3	The Dimensions of War	10	Assignment 13
4	Laws of War and War Crime	11	Assignment 14
5	Culture of Peace	11	Assignment 15
	Module 4		
1	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict I	12	Assignment 16
2	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict II	13	Assignment 17
3	Peacekeeping	14	Assignment 18
4	Peacebuilding	15	Assignment 19
5	Gender Perspective in Peacebuilding	16	Assignment 20
	Revision	17	
	Examination	18	

HOW TO GET THE BEST FROM THIS COURSE

In distance learning the study units replace the university lecturer. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suit you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to a lecturer.

In this same way that a lecturer might set you some reading to do, the study units tell you when to read your set of books or other materials. Just as a lecturer might give you an in-class exercise, your study units provide exercises for you to do at appropriate points.

Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit and how a particular unit is integrated with the other units and the course as a whole. Next is a set of learning objectives. These objectives shall let you know what you should be able to do by the time you have completed the unit. You should use these objectives to guide your study. When you have finished, the units you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If you make a habit of doing this you will significantly improve your chances of passing the course. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources.

Remember that your tutor's job is to assist you. When you need help, don't hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

1. Read this Course Guide thoroughly.
2. Organise a study schedule. Refer to the 'Course Overview' for more details. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments related to the units. Whatever method you chose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates for working on each unit.
3. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything you can to stick to it. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind with their course work. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor know before it is too late for help.
4. Turn to unit 1 and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.

5. Assemble the study materials. Information about what you need for a unit is given in the ‘Overview’ at the beginning of each unit. You will almost always need both the study unit you are working on and one of your set books on your desk at the same time.
6. Work through the unit. The content of the unit itself has been arranged to provide a sequence for you to follow. As you work through the unit you will be instructed to read sections from your set books or other articles. Use the unit to guide your reading.
7. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study material or consult your tutor.
8. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit’s objectives, you can then start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to pace your study so that you keep yourself on schedule.
9. When you have submitted an assignment to your tutor for marking, do not wait for its return before starting on the next unit. Keep to your schedule. When the assignment is returned, pay particular attention to your tutor’s comments, both on the tutor-marked assignment form and also on what is written on the assignment. Consult your tutor as soon as possible if you have any questions or problems.
10. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unity) and the course objectives (listed in this Course Guide).

TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are between eight and 12 hours of tutorials provided in support of this course. The dates, time and venue of these tutorials shall be communicated to you. The name and phone number of your tutor will be made known to you immediately you are allocated a tutorial group.

Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, keep a close watch on your progress and on any difficulties you might encounter and provide assistance to you during the course. You must mail your Tutor-Marked Assignments to your tutor well before the due date (at least two working days are required). They will be marked by your tutor and returned to you as soon as possible. Do not hesitate to contact your tutor

by telephone, e-mail, or discussion board if you need help. You will definitely benefit a lot by doing that. Contact your tutor if:

- you do not understand any part of the study units or the assigned readings
- you have difficulty with the self-tests or exercises
- you have a question or problem with an assignment, with your tutor's comments on an assignment or with the grading of an assignment.

You should make an effort to attend the tutorials. Thus, it is the only opportunity you have to enjoy face to face contact with your tutor and to ask questions which are answered instantly. You can raise any problem encountered in the course of your study. To gain the maximum benefit from course tutorials, prepare a question list before attending them. You will learn a lot from participating in discussion actively.

SUMMARY

PCR 261 aims to expose you to basic ideas, philosophy, practice and efforts in peace building. As you complete this course, you should be able to answer the following questions:

- What is war?
- What are the features of war?
- What are the categories of war?
- What is culture?
- What is the connection between culture and war?
- What is culture of war/violence?
- What are the sources of the culture of war/violence?
- How does violence modelling promote violent behaviour?
- How do religion, ethnicity and ideology constitute values of war/violence?
- How can you explain the laws of war and war crime?
- What are the dimensions of war?
- What are the tasks and elements of peace building?
- In what way(s) does a particular violent action constitute a just war?
- How does peacekeeping contribute to conflict resolution?
- Is there any significant impact played by women through their participation in peace process in Africa?
- What are the elements of peace building?
- What are the challenges posed by arms proliferation to post conflict peace building in Africa?
- Who is an offender of war crime?

Finally, you are advised to read the course material appreciably well in order to prepare fully and not to be caught pants down by the final examination questions. So, we sincerely wish you success in your academic career as you will find this course (PCR 261) very interesting. You should always avoid examination malpractices!



**MAIN
COURSE**

	PAGE
CONTENTS	
Module 1	1
Unit 1 Meaning of War	1
Unit 2 Culture of War: Conceptual Definition.....	11
Unit 3 Evolution of Culture of War	21
Unit 4 Sources of the Culture of War	31
Unit 5 The United Nations and Culture of War	41
Module 2	46
Unit 1 Violence Modelling and Violent Behaviour	46
Unit 2 Agents of Violence Modelling	55
Unit 3 Ethnicity and Value of War/Violence	66
Unit 4 Religion and Value of War/Violence	77
Unit 5 Ideology and Value of War/Violence	88
Module 3	99
Unit 1 Morality of War and Just War	99
Unit 2 Philosophy of Pacifism	109
Unit 3 The Dimensions of War	118
Unit 4 Laws of War and War Crime	125
Unit 5 Culture of Peace	136
Module 4	150
Unit 1 Peaceful Resolution of Conflict I	150
Unit 2 Peaceful Resolution of Conflict II	161
Unit 3 Peacekeeping	171
Unit 4 Peace Building	180
Unit 5 Gender Perspective in Peace building	186

MODULE 1

Unit 1	Meaning of War
Unit 2	Culture of War: Conceptual Definition
Unit 3	Evolution of Culture of War
Unit 4	Sources of the Culture of War
Unit 5	The United Nations and Culture of War

UNIT 1 MEANING OF WAR

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
	3.1 Definition of War
	3.2 Features of War
	3.3 Categories of Warfare
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor-Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

War has remained the engine of international politics and relations particularly among the powerful nations. It creates viable network of opportunities in the distribution of values not without having implications on the boundary of their relations as well as their internal arrangements. Wars nonetheless vary in intensity. We have **high intensity warfare** and **low intensity warfare**. High intensity warfare is between two superpowers or powerful countries fighting for political goals. Low intensity warfare involves counterinsurgency, guerilla warfare and specialised types of troops fighting revolutionaries. In this unit, we shall examine the definition of war and other important objects of discourse as regards the meaning of war.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define the term war
- describe the features of war
- explain the categories of warfare.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Definition of War

The term war is often given some interpretative connotations ‘whose meanings, rarely examined’ (Smith, 1989:23). War has remained a regular feature in human civilisation. It often splices the relationship between parties, and in spite of its virulence and danger to continued existence of man, war has remained recalcitrant in human history.

According to Braden and Shelley (2000:69), “War has been as analogous to disease in its spread and effect. It has been likened to natural disasters in its impact on society’s structures.”

War splices every century, race, continent, nation, society and culture, which makes it pretty impossible to study human history without taking a look at the activities and actions of man, which have aroused a violent conflict behaviour as well as the role played by upsurge of war situation in shaping the relationship among various state and non-state actors.

Thus, considering the foregoing, one tends to agree with Clemenceau as quoted by Andreas Osiander (1994:265), “From the most remote ages onward, the peoples have perpetually assailed one another for the satisfaction of their appetites and their egoistical interests and their fears.”

War can also be defined as protracted state of violent, large-scale conflict involving two or more parties. War is aggression and counter-aggression whose chief property is large scale destruction both in human and material terms within the context of time and space. According to Carl Von Clausewitz, “It is of course well known that the only source of war is politics ... war is simply a continuation of political intercourse, with the addition of other means” (Clausewitz, 1982: 119).

War may also be described as open armed conflict between nations or states or between parties in the same states, facilitated by force of arms for various purposes. The conceptualisation of war has remained problematic in international relations. It has been greatly flexible and dynamic. Thus, there exist specific parameters to define the concept of war.

According to Professor Tunde Adeniran (1982: 123), war involves, “... common agreement, that is distinct from peace, and it is characterised by military activity, high social and political tension, and the breakdown of normal relations. War could result from a deliberate and carefully calculated decision.... It could also be a choice among alternative

courses of action and could be only course one is left it. It is a phenomenon which affects everybody and all nations, irrespective of ideologies, and irrespective of the level of economic and political development.”

The experience of the 20th century has shown that the century recorded more war with incomparable human casualty than the previous centuries put together. According to Gray (1999), the century produced two world wars, a handful of international wars, cold war, anti-colonial insurgency, ethnic violence among others. The century also marked the beginning of sophisticated and lethal technology in weaponry and prosecution of war. The emergent war technology has presented the world as unsafe not only to man but also the general ecosystem.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is war?

3.2 Features of War

Clausewitz in his axiom argues that the relationship between means and objectives of war involves a situation where the latter remains paramount throughout the war. Clausewitz also describes the war environment in his ‘climate of war’ as having four features, which include **danger, exertion, uncertainty** and **chance**, concluding that war is both deadly and a gamble. To stimulate our better understanding of the subject matter, it is quite imperative to examine the above mentioned features of war as presented by Clausewitz.

Danger of war

On danger of war, no one will disprove the damaging and destructive implication of war not only on human beings and material resources but also on the entire ecosystem. The tendency for mutual destruction is high. The danger of war is not limited to the combatants but also extends its virulence and social venom to parties not directly involved in the conflict or not involved at all.

A good example is the Sierra Leone Civil War, which began in 1991 where several thousands of innocent civilians lost their lives as more than two million people (well over one-third of the population) were displaced. Neighbouring countries became hosts to a significant number of these displaced persons as refugees while trying to escape the civil war.

The civil war was initiated by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) led by Foday Sankoh. The rebel group (RUF) launched its first bloody

campaign into Eastern Kailahun of Sierra Leone from Liberia on March 23, 1991. In less than five months, the crisis had generated about 107,000 refugees who fled the conflict into Guinea (Adebajo, 2002:90). Foday Sankoh was the head of the military wing of the RUF that included in its ranks Burkinabes and members of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) under the tutelage of Mr. Charles Taylor.

The civil war in Sierra Leone featured conscription of children by the RUF rebel group in the recruitment of its army, sexual slavery, murder of non-combatants among other war crimes. Nevertheless, such acts were tantamount to the contravening various international conventions and protocols guiding the conduct of war.

However, it is not surprising that the chief co-conspirator in such shameful and dastardly act, Charles Taylor is now facing trial at The Hague over alleged war crime offence, and if he is found guilty he may spend the rest of his life in prison.

It is important to note that not all the leaders of the RUF particularly the intellectuals among them supported the rebel strategy adopted by Sankoh. Many of them berated and condemned forced recruitment of children but many of these dissenting voices were brutally murdered by Foday Sankoh. The war led to the collapse of all state structures with attendant socio-political disorder and structural cataclysm.

A numbers of scholars have blamed the upsurge of the crisis basically on the irrational desire of the political gladiators to exclusively enjoy the control of Sierra Leone's diamond industry (Hirsch, 2000: 15). The endemic poverty, which reigned supreme among the mass public also contributed. Thus, the majority of people were subjected to marginal survival as chronic penury remained their second nature.

The 1999 Lomé Agreement failed to restore any peace in the country due to strategic advantage it gave to the RUF rebels as Foday Sankoh was put in charge of the mineral resources of the country while the diamond trade was under the control of the rebels. The attempt made by the United Nations (UN) to reduce the rebels' control of the diamond fields was greeted with resurgence of the civil war.

The RUF resorted to carrying out an offensive campaign against the UN troops, and the intervention of the British troops saved the country from the persistent bestiality in the hands of the rebels. The military success recorded by the British troops could be said to be responsible for the call made by the local people, praying that the Great Britain should recolonise them.

The military grandeur of the British troops really assisted in the restoration of peace in the country. The rebel leader was captured and the British left a training team to rebuild the armed forces of Sierra Leone as effective institution for sustainable post conflict state security. The British actions were instrumental to eventual American intervention in Liberian war. It is a fact that the termination of armed hostility in Liberia has really helped in providing stability at Sierra Leone's borders and restoring normal market forces to the diamond trade.

The danger of war in West Africa could be observed in the volume of refugee generation in the region, which has increased trans-border crime, armed robbery and wide circulation of small arms and light weapons among the civilian population making the prevailing atmosphere of peace a fragile one. The number of small arms in Nigeria has increased tremendously since the outbreak of war in Liberia in the early 1990s.

The inherent danger in the outbreak of war in any country is instructive to the activities of the neighbouring countries in making sure that peace is restored in the warring state because of the potentials of such war, in spreading to the neighbouring countries. The Great Lake region is a good example where war has become an infectious disease plaguing the countries in the region, which makes the region the highest generator of refugee flow on the African continent. The region has had the lion share in the flows of refugees in Africa. The countries that we find in this region include Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo), Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Uganda. All these countries at one time or the other have contributed to the production of refugees in the region except Tanzania (see Afolayan, 2003; Evans, 1998; UNHCR, 1991).

Exertion

Exertion is the act of putting some power or faculty into vigorous action. War saps energy, it involves mental, physical, and socio-economic strength. Soldiers are disciplined and drilled for the task they will face in the theatre of war. It is not surprising that anybody recruited into the military must be physically fit and be emotionally stable. War is not a joke, it is a serious business!

There are some light weapons that ordinary man cannot carry. Not every adult can withstand operating an AK-47 rifle because of the pressure it exerts. Not only the physical strength that is required in any anticipated successful military campaign, the troops or belligerents must also have an advantage in the area of tactical support capabilities, which puts the mental object at work.

Also, war consumes a lot of socio-economic resources. In Iraq war, the US and its allies must have spent nothing less than \$30 trillion apart from human casualty being recorded almost weekly, if not daily, on the side of their (the US and its allies) troops. The war has really sapped the economy of the US to the extent that the country is said to be on the verge of economic recess.

Uncertainty

The power relation between the armed gladiators is viewed to often determine the outcome of a violent hostility. In a case whereby there is asymmetric relation in the power equilibrium of the disputing parties, average person will believe that the outcome of such conflict will always be in favour of the stronger party. It is often believed that in a situation of armed conflict between a great power and a weak nation, considering the military capability and mobility, and strategic superiority enjoyed by the former over the latter, the former (great power) would be victor.

Carl Von Clausewitz disagreed with the above notion, arguing that war is not only risky business but also coloured by uncertainty. The fiasco suffered by the US in the Vietnam war as well as the failure of the US and its allies to conclude the war in Iraq have given credence to the argument articulated by Clausewitz.

Despite the asymmetric power relation between Iraq and the US led allied forces; the war in Iraq has remained more prolonged than expected. This explains why a number of scholars in the fields of politics and conflict studies fondly say that the US and its allies have only succeeded to win the war but not the battle. This is because the war has moved from conventional to unconventional violence. The number of the US troops being injured or killed on weekly basis by the local militants through guerilla war strategy is considerably high.

Another example of uncertainty in the outcome of war was the Sino-Japanese War. The Sino-Japanese war was the first major international war involving China after 1860. The war was between China and Japan. The relationship between the duo had never been cordial even before the outbreak of the war. The cause of their armed hostility was the control of Korea. Korea had been a tributary of China for a long time. China was displeased with the bilateral diplomacy entered into between the Seoul government and Japan, an age-long rival.

The bilateral diplomacy became further cemented in the following years. Then emerged a clash of influence between China and Japan, when the former wanted to continue maintaining its traditional influence in Korea, the government of the latter was all out to consolidate the diplomatic relation between her and the Seoul government.

The gladiatorial posture was maintained by the duo: China and Japan until the emergence of full blown war between them in 1894. The war lasted for one year. Due to the size of the Chinese army and its naval superiority in the region, one would have thought that China would win the war convincingly but to the surprise of the entire world, Japan won the war. By 1895 a treaty was entered into - the Treaty of Shimonoseki which held that:

China had to recognise the independence of Korea and had to cede to Japan the Island of Formosa, Pescadores Islands, and the Liaotung Peninsula (Strayer *et al.* 1961:318)

The world experience has shown that uncertainty is not limited to the outcome of war but it also curries every aspect of war policy. A good example was the Fashoda Crisis. England and Egypt were in control of Sudan, and due to the local revolt led by "Madhi" Muhammed Ahmed, Britain decided to withdraw its administration of the State (Sudan). The Madhi's followers then took-over the political administration of Sudan. Britain quickly rescinded its decision to leave Sudan, when she noticed that the French and Belgian were extending their imperial expedition towards Sudan, knowing full well that its interest was likely to be jeopardised for no more reason than the headwaters of the Nile being controlled by the Sudan. By 1896, the British and Egyptian forces under the tutelage of Lord Kitchener began to reintroduce imperial administration in the Sudan. In 1898 Kitchener's imperial exploration approached the fort of Fashoda on the Nile, and discovered that French forces had already annexed the Sudan to France. Then, there emerged a tension between the British and French forces for the control of the Sudan.

The French rethought the war option because it considered its non-readiness to engage the British forces in naval war. Therefore, the French had no other option than to leave the Sudan. By 1899, Britain and Egypt had established joint control of what later became the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The French conceded to England not because of the fear to enter into war with England *per se* but the uncertainty that underlies war articulation.

Chance

Chance can be referred to as unknown or the undefined cause of events not subject to calculation. According to Clausewitz, war is a game of probability, or simply put, a game of luck. **War Weariness Hypothesis** makes us to understand that a country at war will definitely get tired and such country may lose an enthusiasm or zeal for a while which is likely to restore an atmosphere of peace. If we take a critical look at this argument, we may support Clausewitz from the perspective that **Party A**

may decide to engage **Party B** in war while **Party B** had just experienced a protracted war situation with another party, and entering any prolonged war with **Party A** may be considered by it (Party B) as uncalled for, if it can make concessions that may not largely affect her interest for restoration of peace.

An example of this, is the anti-colonial armed struggle between the imperial forces of Portugal and the Mozambican liberation movement - Frente de Libertacao de Mocambique (FRELIMO). FRELIMO was formed in 1962 and began its guerilla operations in 1964. Their mission was basically to wrestle political power from the Portuguese colonialists for independence of Mozambique. At the time the anti-colonial struggle was going on in Mozambique against the Portuguese colonial force, Guinea Bissau's Partido Africano de Independencia Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGI), Guinea Bissau's armed liberation movement was also waging war against Portuguese colonialists in its home country. The two anti-colonial insurgent movements, FRELIMO and PAIGI took the risk of waging war against the Portuguese forces knowing that war weariness may set in, coupled with political challenge Portugal was facing at home. It was believed that those two reasons might have forced the Portuguese to accept their fate in the battle for supremacy. Eventually, Portugal had to abandon the countries.

Sometimes, the above-mentioned calculation may not work, considering the activities of Germany after World War I Germany was sanctioned and faced a great penalty for war-mongering. But the country still undertook a very risky adventure by going into another war in the realisation of the Nazi Lebensraum project as well as other variables.

Nonetheless, it took the whole Europe by surprise that despite the defeat Germany suffered in World War I and its consequences on her, the country still embarked on offensive mission, which snowballed into World War II. Adolf Hitler took the risk to launch the German race into racial eminence and superiority but he, his Nazi Gestapo and the entire Germany became the victims of their own (war) policy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss any three features of war.

3.3 Categories of Warfare

There are two major categories of warfare. These include conventional warfare and unconventional warfare. For conventional warfare, it involves well-identified, armed confrontation between parties. A good example is the Iraq war, we mean the early part of the war when the

allied forces led by the US and Britain engaged the Iraqi regular soldiers and irregular forces in an open military campaign. This open armed confrontation is supposed to be devoid of application of weapons of mass destruction as mandated by the laws of war and several other conventions.

Unconventional warfare refers to any armed conflict that does not involve the parties engaging in an open confrontation. This category of warfare is often adopted mostly in a situation whereby the combatants have asymmetric power relation. After the defeat of the Iraqi forces in an open armed hostility, many of the soldiers from Iraq's side that survived the military onslaught by the allied forces went underground.

Many of the old Iraqi guards are responsible for the guerilla offensive being carried out against the allied forces as well the local people. The reign of terror pervades the entire post-Saddam political landscape in Iraq. This category of warfare usually involves tactics like raiding, terrorism, insurgency, guerilla, even, as well as nuclear, chemical or biological warfare.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the categories of war?

4.0 CONCLUSION

War remains a subject, which attracts growing attention among scholars, policy-makers and militarists. The history of human civilisation has been plagued with war despite the underlying contradictions, which war possesses. Are we to talk of the dangers inherent in war or its impact on man and ecosystem or unpredictable nature, or its huge cost in human and material terms? There is no doubt that the recent development in modern warfare has instructed a paradigm shift in the study of war. Researchers now consider the totality of war experience as well as its social and cultural implications. One of the reasons for the cultural change in the study of war is the growing threat constituted by non-state actors to both national and international security.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to x-ray various definitions of the term war. We also buttressed our conceptual explanation of the term (war) with reference to some war events within African and non African perspectives to stimulate our better understanding of the subject matter.

Apart from the conceptual definition, we also described various features of war with credence to the intellectual contributions to the study of war by Clausewitz. We also explained categories of warfare: conventional and unconventional.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Explain various features of war, drawing your case-studies from Africa's theatre of war.
- ii. Write a short note on: asymmetric war; symmetric war; high intensity war; and low intensity war.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Adebajo, A. (2002). *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG, and Regional Security in West Africa*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Adeniran, T. (1982). *Introduction to International Relations*. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.
- Afolayan, A.A. (2003). "Dynamics of Refugee Flows and Forced Repatriation in Africa." *African Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, June.
- Braden, K.E. & Fred, M. S. (2000). See www.awl-he.com
- Clausewitz, Carl Von (1982). *On War*. London: Penguin Books.
- Evans, G. (1998). "Responding to Crisis in the African Great Lakes." *Forced Migration Review*, No. 1.
- Gray, C. (1999). *Modern Strategy*. Oxford University Press.
- Hirsch, J.L. (2000). *Sierra Leone: Diamonds and the Struggle for Democracy*. Lynne Rienner Publishers (December 1).
- Osiander, A. (1994). (Quoting Georges Clemenceau December 29, 1918). *The States System of Europe, 1640–1990*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, R.S. (1989). *Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-Colonial West Africa* (2nd ed.). London: James Currey Ltd.
- Strayer, J.R., Hans, W.G. & Harbison, E.H. (1961). *The Course of Civilisation* (Volume Two). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.
- UNHCR (1991). *Refugee Survey Quarterly*. Geneva.

UNIT 2 CULTURE OF WAR: CONCEPTUAL DEFINITION

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Describing Culture
 - 3.2 Explaining the Relationship between Culture and War
 - 3.3 Describing the Culture of War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The definition of culture has remained a very difficult task and there is no consensus among scholars, philosophers and politicians as the exact properties, culture as a concept should include. Thus, there is no universally accepted definition of the term culture. It is more difficult to define culture of war because of its complex nature. Killing is not only peculiar to war situation. This is because it can also be used for purpose of maintaining peace and order in any given society. In this unit, we shall be focusing on the conceptual explanation of culture and culture of war with the aim of drawing a nexus between the two concepts.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define the term culture
- explain culture of war.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Describing Culture

Culture is often used by sociologists to describe the way of life of a society. The concept was adapted from social anthropology, and it was referred to in the late 19th century by E.B. Tylor as, “That complex which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs and other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society (Tylor, 1871).”

In the study of primitive people and their respective cultures, anthropologists observed that there is strong social rapport between man and his culture. There is a debate among the behavioural sciences as regards the issue of whether man is the only animal that creates and uses culture. The answer to this question will largely depend on the scope within which culture is defined. If culture is defined as a complex of learned behaviour patterns, thus, one will not find it difficult to agree that other animals too have tendency to create and use their own culture as man does.

Meanwhile, those of us who watched the film ‘Lion King’ should have seen how Lion King tutored its child the hunting skills and fighting strategy. Several other animal species nonetheless educate their little ones what they themselves learned in order to survive.

However, if society is made up of social institutions and activities, then culture can be described as that social mechanism, which according to Barnard and Burgess (1996: 57), “defines the values and beliefs that underly those institutions, activities and form that take, whether they are the family, education, religion, or even what is acceptable to eat and the way it is eaten.”

We are still on the definition of culture. Hinde also adds his voice, holding that, “when we talk about human culture, we refer to differences between societies in matters as the tools and artifacts made, their knowledge of and beliefs about nature, their cosmology, customs, values, laws and so on (Hinde, 1987: 3).”

Giddens also sheds more light on the definition of culture, and according to him, “Culture consists of the values the members of a group hold, the norms they follow, and the material goods they create. Values are abstract ideals, while norms are definite principles or rules which people are expected to observe. Norms represents the ‘dos’ and ‘don’ts’ of social life (Giddens, 1989: 31).”

Culture affects virtually every aspect of one’s life and like most people, you may not be well aware of this. It is the totality of what we do, think and feel as a people. Culture includes the way we dress, our marriage customs and family life, our pattern of work, religious ceremonies as well as leisure pursuits. It also includes the goods we create and which become meaningful for the members of the society. According to Giddens, these goods may include ‘bows and arrows, ploughs, factories and machines, computers, books, dwellings’ (*ibid*). Thus, culture is taught, learned and shared among members of a society.

According to Sitaram (1970:2), culture can be defined as: “the sum total of the learned behaviours of a group of people which are generally considered to be the tradition of that people and are transmitted from generation to generation.”

Schein, (1995:267-277) gives a more comprehensive description of culture. According to him, culture has basic properties or elements, which include the following:

- Observed behavioural regularities in the interaction among people. These are subjects of the people’s language, customs and tradition as well as their various ritual practices.
- The acceptable standards or norms among the members of a particular group.
- Espoused values which are the expressed and widely communicated principles and values that the group strives to achieve.
- Formal philosophy, which serves as a platform through which members of a group are guided in their ideology and principles towards other group(s).
- Habit of thinking, mental models as well as linguistic paradigms form the basis for the cognitive gauge through which the perception, thought and language of the members of a group are channeled. It is also a framework through which the upcoming members of the group get internalised with the group’s values.
- Shared meanings, which denote the evolving understanding fashioned by the members through their inter-personal interaction.
- “Root metaphors” or integrating symbols that inform the emotional and aesthetic appreciations as well as the general aspect of material artifacts of the group.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define the term culture.

3.2 Explaining the Relationship between Culture and War

Culture involves a learning process. It is a product of permutation. Racial or ethnic characteristics may be regarded as an element of culture. Culture can be expressed from the perspective of intangible

items like artwork, food, and dress among others. It can also be in form of social network or mental construct such as language, religion, ideology, to mention a few.

Culture has been proved to be a veritable tool in the conduct of armed hostility. Culture with its various elements often contributes in the creation of enemy image that can be supported by unfolding events. Culture creates identity in the context of “we” vs. “they” in which the notion of “enemy” becomes manifest. According to Keen (1986): “In the beginning we create the enemy. Before the weapon comes the image. We think others to death and then invent the battle-axe or the ballistic missiles with which to actually kill them.”

Several early anthropologists drew a connection between the culture and war to a collection of traits. In doing this, they studied the diffusion, or spread, of these traits from one society to another. These traits may include thirst and love of honour, protection, etc. The disparity in the traits as exhibited by various societies explains why some societies engage in the act(s) of war more than the others. This theoretical view about the relationship between culture and war has been criticised by many. This is because it fails to explain the factors responsible for the disparity in the spread of the traits.

Cultural evolution seems to explain the nexus between culture and war within the context of interaction between the material culture and social institutions and beliefs. Thus, culture is a complex network of social habits and values, which develops social and political institutions that shape the attitude of individual towards war and aggression. For better, for worse, a major factor that explains the interaction between culture and war is ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism can be described as “the tendency to look at the world primarily from the perspective of one's own culture.”

Ethnocentrism usually involves the belief by an individual that his/her own culture and/or ethnic group is the best. This belief also includes subjective perception of one's culture as being superior to any other one(s). For instance, one of the main factors responsible for the outbreak of World War II was the attempt by Nazi Germany to show the entire world that the German race was the most superior in the world.

Ethnocentric ideology makes one to judge other people's culture from his/her own cultural imperatives. In doing so, one tends to be subjective by failing to see any aspect(s) of other people's culture superior to his/her own. The ethnocentric interaction between the Western world and the Arab has been one of the major sources of conflict between the duo. The Western world believes that its culture is the most superior in

human race while the Arabs too believe that their culture and civilisation are not only the most superior but also the greatest gift that God has bequeathed on mankind.

The ethnocentric ideology and thought makes one to allocate worth to various cultures but he/she gives the greatest worth or highest value to his/her own culture. This explains the relationship among the competing ethnic groups in Africa and elsewhere. Ethnocentric articulations have resulted in a series of wars and bloodsheds in the region and elsewhere. There is no doubt that ethnocentrism is very dangerous and capable of generating tension in the relationship among people who belong to different ethnic groups and cultures. This is because:

A person who is born into a particular culture and grows up absorbing the values and behaviours of the culture will develop patterns of thought reflecting the culture as normal. If the person then experiences other cultures that have different values and normal behaviours, the person finds that the thought patterns appropriate to their birth culture and the meanings their birth culture attaches to behaviours are not appropriate for the new cultures. However, since a person is accustomed to their birth culture it can be difficult for the person to see the behaviours of people from a different culture from the viewpoint of that culture rather than from their own.

The growing nationalism that dominates the affairs of multi-ethnic societies like Nigeria can be linked to cultural bias and ethnocentric attitude of various ethnic groups, which has created a client-patron network. The client-patron system nevertheless moulds the behaviour of the ruling elites such that state issues are addressed from sectional perspective. This situation is very likely to make popular nepotism (van den Berghe, 1981).

Therefore, there will be intense rivalry among the competing ethnic groups such that each will strive to have comparative advantage over the others in the control of state resources and power. In this case, ruling elites and ethnic leaders will always drum-up support among their kinsmen in their struggle to control state institutions. In doing this, a number of techniques are applied ranging from pacific/democratic expression, subtle agitation to violence.

It is important to know that culture can create an enemy posture between two or more parties who articulate different cultural habits and there is tendency that such a situation can lead to war/violent situation among the parties. In addition, persistent violent conflict behaviour can also become emerging culture. A number of variables may contribute to the

culture of war. These attributes, we shall discuss in the later part of this module.

In his view about the impact of culture in (armed) social conflict, Weaver (1998:72) argues:

When people from different cultures come together there is often misunderstanding and conflict caused by these differences. We can often explain why people from other cultures behave as they do if we have a more comprehensive understanding of their culture. And, we can often understand why we behave as we do if we are aware of our own culture. More importantly, we can articulate why misunderstandings and conflict will take place when we understand the process of inter-cultural communication.

The difference in the pattern of cultural behaviours of various parties does not singularly constitute war situation. Though, the incident of conflict is most not unlikely. The fact is that there is no way that conflict will not crop-up in the inter-group relations, which may result from the peculiar cultural characteristics of these groups. For instance, a group may share culture of slapping one another as an exchange of pleasantries while people that belong to another group may see it as an assault. If there is mutual understanding, inter-cultural dialogue and effective communication among the parties, the incident of destructive conflict may be prevented by the parties.

3.3 Describing the Culture of War

Culture of war implies a set of norms, values and attitudes, which constitute a war behaviour among state and non-state actors. The values involve the characteristics of party in relation to her intrinsic desire to use violence in achieving her political goals. When these cultural values become institutionalised, the behaviour of war becomes a normal tradition or custom. Enemy image norms can also build a viable platform for culture of war. According to Miller (2005), norms are: “explicit prescriptions, or rules, for human (inter)actions or a recognised implicit pattern of behaviours that are ‘normatively’ driven. In either case, norms can develop spontaneously or through purposeful construction. Regardless, violations are usually subject to formal or informal sanctions. Most norms become accepted when adherence to them brings individuals some benefit, and subsequent imitation can eventually lead to institutionalisation. Whether the norm is formulated spontaneously or purposefully can be crucial.”

Keegan (1993) nonetheless makes a lucid difference between 'primitive' and 'modern' warfare. He is of the opinion that war has, however,

become a curse; and the situation demands for cultural transformation where a new culture needs to be engendered such that culture of violence will be replaced with culture of peace and inter-cultural dialogue.

However, it is only through this cultural change that war can become obsolete and less popular in the contemporary global system. This view dominates Keegan's intellectual discourse. Keegan goes further in his discussion on the culture of war, saying that **introduction of professional armies** in modern theatre of war has really helped human race to address the Hobbesian nature of warfare in the primitive era where war was 'all against all'. The disciplined, obedient and law-abiding properties that characterise the professional armies constitute the hallmark of human civilisation (Keegan, 1993: 384).

We may argue against the position articulated by Keegan because the events of modern warfare are no different from the situation of bestiality of primitive warfare if not worse. This is evident in the level of collateral murder that dominates modern warfare where harmless and innocent civilians are being killed. From Americas to Europe through Asia, Oceania to Africa, mass murder of non-combatants (civilians) has become fantasy of warfare in contemporary time, and thus: "With the civilian death toll in Iraq estimated at over 654,000, a recognition that collateral damage is nothing more than a rhetorical contrivance that trivialises the murder of innocent human beings, should be of moral concern to us all. Inherent in modern war-making practice is the conviction that there is a significant moral difference between killing innocent civilians in an attack such as that on the World Trade Center and killing noncombatants during a military response to such an attack. This conviction is clearly demonstrated in a myriad of Israeli reprisals against Palestinian terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and in the US war in Vietnam, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq."

The concept and practice of 'collateral damage' emerged from the age-long Doctrine of Double Effect (DDE), which was developed by Catholic casuists during the Middle Ages. The DDE distinguishes between the anticipated effects of a particular act of violence from those that are inadvertent, however foreseen.

The Doctrine tries to measures moral validation of any violent action based on ethical justification of intention and the relevance of such intention to moral values and responsibility. You may however agree that the DDE morally distinguishes killing as an unintended from murder, claiming only the latter as absolutely prohibited.

Considering the foregoing, you may agree with me that DDE holds that if there is ‘good’ intention, which can stand the test of moral validation, killing non-combatants or civilians by armed groups is ethically acceptable. This position draws a line between murder and collateral damage. According to the members of this school of thought (DDE) the former (murder) is not ethically permissible while the latter (collateral damage) can be said to be morally acceptable.

However, the question is, can there be any moral justification for killing innocent civilians and non-combatants for the purpose of meeting the desired goals that precipitated the war situation in the first instance? This question, we have failed to (adequately) answer.

Apart from various local legislations, there are several international instruments (laws) notably the Laws of Wars. International law prescribe great penalty for any acts of war that violate any section of the instrument (laws of war) as regards the relation between warring parties on one hand, and non-combatants/innocent civilians on the other hand. As student of peace and conflict resolution, you will be exposed to various laws guiding the conduct of war, or simply put the laws of war in the later part of this instructional material.

Meanwhile, both powerful and weak nations are culprits of collateral damage. It is not surprising that many of the great powers especially the US often adopt DDE as war strategy where civilians are being killed with impunity. Is it not surprising and ridiculous to see the Israeli forces at the Gaza Strip with a mission to launch anti-terrorist raids on Palestinian settlements, killing non-combatant Palestinians particularly women and children?

It is pathetic that DDE has become the fundamental element of modern warfare where combatants often direct their aggression much more against civilian population than against themselves. This is evident in various situations of armed conflict in every part of the contemporary world system.

Unequal power relation between belligerents and civilians tends to be responsible for the unlimited aggression advanced against civilians in most theatres of war because they (civilians) have nothing to defend themselves. Various dastardly acts such as killing, rape, and maiming are often committed against these non-combatant civilians with impunity by warring parties.

In addition, acts of brutality are boundless when directed towards civilians and persons not regarded as equal. It is also important to note that modern warfare due to the lethal nature of many of the military hardware and weapons, the effects of aggression may appear limitless

not only to civilians but also to the warring parties due to very destructive nature of modern weapons.

In Sierra Leone, Revolutionary United Front (RUF) led by Sankoh, which claimed that it was fighting for the betterment of the local people turned its aggression against the people it claimed to be advancing their cause. The rebels often claimed that the civilian victims were only felled by bullets during cross fires with government forces. Are deliberate murder, gang-rape, maiming and forceful conscription of civilian population especially as they affect the children, parts of cross-fires with government forces?

There is no gainsaying that the activities of most rebel movements in Africa are criminal because these groups often abandon their political goals to pursue ‘selfish’ material benefits as evident in Sierra Leone where hot chase for diamonds by the rebels led to various criminal activities by the rebels and their foreign co-conspirators. It was not surprising that many of the local people were captured and subjected to forced labour (slavery) by the rebels to work on diamond fields.

Extreme cruelty and bestiality have become visible properties of modern warfare as it was evident in the primitive age. Reckless killing and other horrendous acts have become emerging cultural values of war. A good example was the extreme brutality that followed the retreat of Napoleon’s troops by the Cossacks. Some of the Napoleon’s troops that were not fortunate enough to have crossed the Beresina River before the bridge was burnt down by Napoleon to prevent hot pursuit of the enemies, were slaughtered like rams. The gory picture of slaughtering incidence forced Clausewitz to inform his wife about grave inhumanity and recklessness that dominated Cossacks’ war policy. In his words: “If my feelings had not been hardened it would have sent me mad (quoted in Keegan, 1993:8).”

Culture of war has evolved over time, and it has featured from one generation to another. The introduction of professional armies was thought to be good omen and a viable alternative to address the problem of massification of violence where all members particularly male adults of a group were expected to partake in violent action against their enemies. Our recent experience in Africa has shown that modern warfare is now taking a primitive form.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Civilians are now forcefully conscripted into rebel forces as well as national armies. The incidence of child soldier has become phenomenal on the continent (Africa). The principle of total war has undermined the relevance of Africa’s traditional code of honour in recent time. In

traditional African society, it was not only forbidden to exclude women, children and the elderly ones from partaking in war but it was also not permissible to harm them by the combatants.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to define the term culture. Culture is not only a way of life but it is the totality of the attitude, values and norms shared by the members of any social group or society. Culture also involves the way these people dress, their technology, music and general lifestyle. After conceptually defining culture, we went further to explain culture in terms of war-behaviour (culture of war).

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What is culture of war?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Barnard, A. & Burgess, T. (1996). *Sociology Explained*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1989). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keegan, J. (1993). *A History of Warfare*. London: Hutchinson.
- Keen, S. (1986). *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. University for Peace.
- Schein, E.H. (1995). “Defining Organisational Culture.” In: Wren, J.T. (Ed.). *The Leader’s Companion: Insight into Leadership through the Ages*. New York: The Sage Press.
- Sitaram, K.S. (1970). “Intercultural Communication: The Way and Why of It.” International Communication Association, Division V, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 7-8.
- Tylor, E.B. (1871). *Primitive Culture*. Murray.
- Van den Berghe, P. L. (1981). *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Weaver, G.R. (1998). “Contrasting and Comparing Cultures.” In: Weaver, G.R. (Ed.). *Culture, Communication and Conflict: Readings in Intercultural Relations*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster Publishing.

UNIT 3 EVOLUTION OF CULTURE OF WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Prehistoric Period
 - 3.2 Ancient Period
 - 3.3 Medieval Period
 - 3.4 Renaissance/Gunpowder Period
 - 3.5 Industrial Period
 - 3.6 Modern Period
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The origin of war and its attendant culture in human history has remained a very controversial discourse. A number of scholars are of the view that incident of war has been an age-long event. The world has been experiencing war since some five thousand years ago while the rise of states has ‘helped’ to add ‘finesse’ to it, as it became an extension of state policy.

The values of war “spread to peaceful hunter-gatherers and agriculturists” (Otterbein 2004: 31-32). Gat (2006) argues that war originated in the hunter-gatherer past. On the origin of war, some war historians hold that war has always been with us while others maintain that there is lack of sufficient evidence of existence of war in the prehistoric past of human civilisation, supporting their claim with the continued existence of non-violent, peaceful and non-military communities (Kelly, 2000). In this unit, we shall focus on the evolution of the culture of war.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the character of warfare in pre-historic and ancient times to appreciate the origin of war
- explain the medieval and renaissance and gunpowder periods in war history

- describe the industrial and modern warfare, particularly as they have contributed to militarisation and arms proliferation.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Prehistoric Period

The beginning of prehistoric wars has remained a controversial discourse and great debate causing intellectual war between anthropologists and historians. Originally war was likely to basically involve small-scale raiding. The world has however, experienced a tremendous change in the character and spirit of wars. The change can be traced to the rise of the state dated back to over 5000 years ago.

The introduction of agriculture can be said to have brought a competition among the pre-historic people and there was absence of government in the real sense of it to maintain law and order. Incident of war was likely to become manifest when there was famine in which the demand for food was greater than the available food supply, considering the subsistence nature of the agriculture then. Human instinct would definitely set-in, that is struggle for survival would dominate the relationship among men. That would lead to attack and counter-attack.

Lawrence H. Keeley in his work, *War Before Civilisation*, in his research finding, maintains that no less than 87 percent of tribal societies engaged in more than one war in a year while 65 percent of the societies engaged in protracted and continuous war with attendant huge causality figure.

The earliest societies did not have any formal economic relation and political order. Every society tasked its able-bodied adult members - notably young men to defend the territorial integrity of their society. These able-bodied men also performed a function of conducting raids on any enemy society.

Meanwhile, this period experienced no professional military institution. Warfare, during this period only involved the use of fists, sticks and stones, yelling distance, clubs and spears in the prosecution of war action. By 12000 BC war technologies such as arrows, maces, and slings were developed.

3.2 Ancient Period

This period was dominated by the Mediterranean nations, and notable among them were Greece and Roman Empire. Greece engaged its arch rival Persian Empire in bloody armed struggle, the war that posed a

great challenge to the entire Europe. Roman Empire also engaged Persia in armed hostility, which was referred to as Roman-Persian Wars.

The North African city of Carthage also conducted a series of military animosity against Rome in three wars where Rome emerged as the Victor in both wars, which confirmed the superiority of Roman Empire in the Mediterranean. Rome under the tutelage of Julius Caesar also made its first imperial incursion into Britannia.

In Africa, Egypt was very prominent during this period. In 3100 BC the ancient Egypt became united courtesy Menes. Menes was traditionally the first king of Egypt and the father of the first dynasty of Egypt. The end of the old kingdom experienced an era of instability which continued until the Mentuhotep II repositioned the administration of the Kingdom about 2055 BC to usher in a Middle Kingdom.

A transition was experienced, resulting from the invasion of the Hyksos who introduced the war chariot. It is important to know that the Hyksos can be referred to as a dynasty of kings of Egypt, probably Syro-Semitic origin who ruled at Memphis between 1685 BC and 1580 BC.

The chariot was introduced as a new war technology. It was introduced by Hyksos or as fondly called Shepherd Kings was incorporated into the military strategy and policy of the Egyptians who succeeded in sacking the invaders towards the beginning of the New Kingdom in the 16th century BC.

The new kingdom of Egypt became a power to reckon with both at regional and global levels. Its political and military influences extended to Eurasia, the Aegean, also to the major part of the Levant. Egypt's imperial influences also covered the Euphrates River, Libya and Sudan.

In the ancient time, warfare usually involved personal and direct physical combat between gladiators. Bow and arrow, knife, cutlass, clubs and *juju* (in African context) were freely used to pursue war policy and action. Enemies would shoot or throw arrow at one another in the prosecution of war.

The use of elephants in warfare was also prominent in ancient period. War elephants were sometimes brought in for fighting in ancient warfare. This innovation was first adopted in India and later it became popular in Europe. The Romans and Persians exploited this military tactic effectively in waging war against each other. War elephants were also featured in the Battle of the Hydaspes River.

With the war experience of the gladiators and the quest to gain military supremacy over each other's enemy, innovation kept increasing in the tactics and method of warfare. In an effort at reducing the effectiveness of arrows, armour and shields were developed as instruments of war.

The Huns would shoot the arrows against their enemy-combatants and while doing that they would position themselves in such a way that would afford them an opportunity to hide or rather take cover to avoid the enemy's counter-offensive. They devised this strategy to limit casualty rate from their own side while decimating the ranks of their enemy-combatants. Chariots pulled by animals like ox, donkey, and later the horse were invented around 2,000 BC (Anthony, 1995).

The chariot was a very effective military invention when considering its speed advantage in the prosecution of war. Thus, one man would control the direction of the chariot while the second man with a bow would shoot arrows at enemy soldiers. Warfare and military expeditions have been areas of central focus in ancient history as substantial research inquiries have been conducted on the importance of conquests, technological innovations among other variables in examining war and its attendant implications on human civilisation.

Military policy was one of the fundamentals of the relations among various societies, particularly, as it affects the conduct of their affairs in the face of competition and rivalry over scarce resources within the confines of time and space. This view is instructive if we consider the frequent outbreak of inter-personal and inter-communal skirmishes that dominated affairs of the Ancient societies.

Thus, there was always an increase in the conflict relations among people and communities when famine greeted the planting season. The little agricultural products were heavily competed for, which usually attracted violent hostilities among the ancient people. In the prosecution of war in ancient time, people and societies kept manufacturing more weapons and armour on large scale. War began to be viewed as viable object of political grandeur, as military conquest became a veritable instrument for political dominance of almost every ancient society.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What was the state of war in ancient period?

3.3 Medieval Period

Medieval period, which is also known as dark ages experienced dramatic changes in every aspect of human relation and civilisation.

There was further change in the tactics and weapons of warfare. During this period, the world passed through technological, cultural, social, and economic transformation. New weapons were invented as cavalry and artillery experienced some changes in their functionalities.

The use of armored cavalry became the most prominent feature of every battle. In Africa, several empires like Fulani Empire adopted medieval tactics and weapons but when such tactics and weapons had become obsolete in Europe. China, towards the start of the 15th century, changed its armies from massed infantry to cavalry based forces, imitating the steppe nomads.

Bows and arrows were often used by combatants. Egyptians shot arrows from chariots effectively. The crossbow was developed around 500 BC in China, and was used a lot in the Middle Ages. The English/Welsh longbow from the 12th century also became important in the Middle Ages. It helped to give the English a great early advantage in the Hundred Years' War, even though the English were eventually defeated. The weapon dominated battlefields for over a century.

Feudalism was established, which gave birth to the springing-up of a large army of landlords in Europe and elsewhere. Landlords often owned castles to protect their territory. Some of the notable wars that dominated the medieval ages may include the *Crusades*, which involved a number of armed hostilities carried out under the guise of Christianity against the Muslims and Russia aimed at bringing back the Jerusalem and the holy land under the Christendom.

The Islamic Arab Empire extended its influence from the Middle East through North Africa to Central Asia and Europe. The expansion was not without military campaigns. The Mongolia Empire also enjoyed a considerable imperial influence during this period, the empire extended its influence to Eastern and Central Europe. Many European armies became casualties of the superior military power of the horde.

Kievan Rus', a Russian region came under the control of the Mongols after several centuries of military combats. The end of the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) marked the end of medieval period. The war was basically between England and France, which ended in favour of the latter.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss war in medieval period.

3.4 The Renaissance/Gunpowder Period

The gunpowder weapons were military innovation of **Song Dynasty** (in China). Due to the ferocious and deadly nature of this new military technology, the face of warfare passed through a great transformation. Gunpowder put the superior relevance of cavalry on the battlefields to questioning. The technology spread to Europe and every part of the world.

The invention of gunpowder technology marked the beginning of the disaster in human history and civilisation. Soldiers were assembled as they carried out their bestiality in big formations under the tutelage and directive of Generals and/or any other war commanders. The soldiers directed their guns against the enemy troops. Bullets were fired to decimate the ranks of the enemy-cavalry while arrows and swords as well knives were also applied to complete the damage on the enemy.

In the 10th century, the invention of gunpowder led to many new weapons that were improved over time. Black powder was used in China since the 4th Century but became popular as a virulent tool of warfare in the 11th century. Guns were used freely in war to damage the enemy-camp. Towards the middle of the 15th century, guns were held in one hand, as the explosive charge was ignited by the other hand. Later, the matchlock was introduced, which was popular until around the 1720s. The matchlock was later replaced by the flintlock.

Cannons were first introduced on the battlefield by Europe in the early 14th century, and its effectiveness dominated the Hundred Years' War. The first cannons were simply welded metal bars in the form of a cylinder, and the first cannonballs were made of stone. By 1346, at the battle of Crécy, the cannon had been used; at the Battle of Agincourt they would be used again (Calvert, 2006)

This period also experienced a corrosive erosion of medieval values not only in warfare but also in the entire social formation and structure. There was collapse of feudal system and the city-states were replaced by larger states as imperial conquests tremendously increased. The military institution underwent a reform with the establishment of professional standing army. This period also featured the development of field artillery, battalions, infantry drill among others.

3.5 Industrial Period

This period featured more advanced technology in warfare and small arms increased in patronage not only among the trained soldiers but also the society at large. Recruitment of soldiers took a new dimension.

Congscription was introduced to complement the professional soldiers, in the face of increasing armed struggle.

Empire-building dominated the era as well as other political variables that were responsible for the popularisation of war policy. Conscription became phenomenal in military history of this period. It was surprising that Napoleon Bonaparte adopted this war strategy in the prosecution of Napoleonic Wars. Also, the process of industrialisation through industrial revolution marked the end of the feudal system where there was a hegemonic rivalry and hostility between the landlords of the feudal society and the emerging bourgeois.

Submarine was introduced during this period. Thus, the earliest form of submarine was invented in 1624 by Cornelius Drebbel. It could go to depth of 15 feet. Isaac Peral built the first war submarine in 1885. Bayonet was another weapon that featured greatly in this period. It was named after Bayonne (city) in France where it was first manufactured in the 16th century. Bayonets have enjoyed high patronage in modern warfare as it was widely used by the infantry soldiers. It is used often in infantry charges to fight in hand-to-hand combat. It was General Jean Martinet that introduced the bayonet to the French army. Bayonets have continued to feature in war, even in contemporary time.

In the 18th century, the use of balloons became noticeable in warfare. It was originally introduced in Paris (1783). The first balloon could travel over eight kilometers. Before its introduction, military scouts could not properly monitor the movement of the enemy troops. Balloons enabled a party to observe and monitor the movement of the enemy troops because they could see the whole ground very well from the sky. The military scouts used the balloons to alert their troops about the movement of the enemies, so that surprise attack would be completely prevented.

Total war also featured greatly in this period, which was characterised by higher casualty rate in warfare. The destruction of enemies without military reservations, and massive damage were perpetuated on mankind. The children were not spared in the armed hostilities as the entire ecosystem became a victim of war. Large scale killing and holocaust became good strategies of warfare aimed at sapping the power base of the enemy state to prevent the enemy-camp from engaging in future war. An example was Philip Sheridan's burning of the Shenandoah Valley. It is important to note that the concept and principle of total war was European innovation.

3.6 Modern Period

Modern warfare attracted more virulence and destructive effect on the society at large. Science and technology moved to greater level in human history. More advanced technology that greeted this period precipitated a situation where war has reportedly become the highest killer of man. The massive destruction and large-scale killing that dominated the industrial period could also be noticed in modern warfare, even in higher magnitude.

The support given to technological advancement, particularly as it affected the conduct of war, by the government and civilian-business men gave rise to the creation of industrial military complex, which gave birth to commercialisation of war. Example of such military corporations was Lockheed Martin Corporation in the United States. Several military tactics came into existence, particularly the use of terrorism in breaking the ranks of the opponent-gladiators became more noticeable.

A variety of war technologies were invented and used freely more often in the prosecution of war combatant-states. Some of the technological innovations in warfare in this period may include sub-marine, more virulent bombs, air-bombers, armoured-tanks, more assaulted riffles among others.

This period also featured the development of special forces, global information grid, active electronically scanned array, space warfare, cyber warfare, nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons, ballistic missiles and war-heads to name a few. Machine guns were introduced in the 19th century. By the beginning of the 20th century, automatic rifles and light machine guns were invented. Chemical weapons greeted the eruption of World War I.

The Germans used gas-filled shells at the Battle of Bolimov on January 3, 1915, with less harmful effect but the chlorine version proved to be very lethal, which was applied in the Second Battle of Pyres by Germany (Keegan, 1999:73). The strategic relevance of the aircraft carrier was proved in the battles between the United States and Japan like the Battle of Midway.

Modern warfare has continued to attract technological advances. Ballistic missiles and cruise missiles have also joined the league of the virulent war technologies in modern warfare. Nuclear submarine was invented in 1955. This meant submarines no longer had to surface as often, and could run more quietly. They evolved into becoming underwater missile platforms.

Cruise missiles were invented in Nazi Germany during World War II. Tanks can move faster than an infantryman, about five hundred meters a minute. Rockets are also playing an active role in modern warfare. It is very fast; whence it is shot, it is gone with very high velocity. Missile launcher also plays very prominent role in modern warfare.

War intelligence has become much more sophisticated than it used to be in the previous periods with the creation of spy intelligence satellite. This will make it easy to monitor the activities of enemy-state. This technology is presently enjoyed by great power and very few middle powers.

The period has also presented the vulnerability of every state in the face of armed conflict where the so-called great powers have one time or the other become preys in the hands of the so-called weak nations. This is evident in the military fiasco suffered by the US in Vietnam War, and even in the current Iraq war where militia and local dissidents have continued to launch offensives on American troops with attendant decimation in the ranks of the US troops.

Casualty rate of the allied troops in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars has exposed the vulnerability of every state. International terrorism has become a great challenge to the entire human race. Commercial aircrafts have become veritable tools of warfare as evident in 9/11 terrorist incident in the United States.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Describe the development in modern warfare.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The outcome of war has attracted greater uncertainty, as mutual destruction has become the order of the day. Countries don't need large army to conduct war, as attention is now geared towards technology of war. A small amount of hydrogen gas can rapidly decimate a large population in time and space. War is harmful to the survival of man and his environment but it has remained regular feature of human history and civilisation.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to examine various periods in the evolution of the culture of war. We have discussed the pre-historic and ancient warfare and their cultural values. We went further to describe

other pre-modern periods in the history of war culture. We also explained the values and the underlying character of modern warfare. The study presents an analytical insight in the study of war as well as various developments that have characterised the conduct and culture of war.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the medieval warfare.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Anthony, D.W. (1995). *Horse, Wagon & Chariot: Indo-European Languages and Archaeology Antiquity*.

Keegan, J. (1999). The Battle of the Frontiers and the Marine: The First World War. New York: Random House, Inc.

Kelly, R.C. (2000). *Warless Societies and the Origin of War*. USA: University of Michigan Press.

Otterbein, K. (2004). *How War Began*. Texas: A&M University Press.

UNIT 4 SOURCES OF THE CULTURE OF WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objective
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Sources of the Culture War: Discourse
 - 3.2 Instinctual Aggression
 - 3.3 Military Industrial Complex
 - 3.4 Population Outburst
 - 3.5 Relative Deprivation
 - 3.6 Power Asymmetry
 - 3.7 Values
 - 3.8 Identity
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

War or violence has remained a regular feature in the history of man. It curries every phase of human history, affecting every culture, race as well as class. There is no way the relationship among various parties will not generate a conflict situation. Thus, peace theorists see nothing bad in conflict but they advance for creative ones rather than destructive conflicts, which constitute an element of war.

Knowing the adverse effects of war, why has situation of war remained persistent at every level of state and non state interactions (relations)? What are the factors responsible for this culture of war? This question is what this unit is hoped to answer. So, let's cruise into the depth (*modus operandi*) of this unit. If you are ready, let's go friend!

2.0 OBJECTIVE

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss various sources of culture of war

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Sources of the Culture War: Discourse

War in its aesthetic interpretation and creativity has painted every level of human relations (ranging from community, state to international) socio-political and economic intercourse with different colours while some of these colours add finesse to conflict relation among state and non-state actors. Meanwhile those conflicts without any finesse tend to be destructive and violent, and those (conflicts) with fine colours are creative and positive. War has remained a common phenomenon in the history of mankind. The relationship among state and non-state actors is adorned with some destructive values and attitudes, which nonetheless promote the culture of peace. Violence has become a way of life.

However, knowing full well the destructive nature of the culture of war, it is pertinent to discuss the factors responsible for it. These factors are numerous but we shall be discussing some of them in this unit. Misunderstanding usually creates an avenue for conflict to go destructive (negative conflict) but if there is mutual understanding the conflict will definitely take a creative form (positive conflict). Positive conflict is often essential for development and inter-group harmony.

The enemy image norms that pervade the political landscape of African continent are a product of the artificiality of its boundary. Strange bed fellows were brought together via the imperial construction of the Berlin Conference, which formalised the politics of sphere of influence and colonialism of Africa by European imperialists. The artificial boundary and seed of disharmony planted by the Europeans are some of the factors responsible for the culture fratricidal and ethno-religious wars, which have been tormenting Africa. This ugly situation has resulted in litany of killings, maiming, arson, rape and sexual abuse, underdevelopment, genocide, among other tragedies.

There are several sources of the culture of war. The list is so long that, it will be difficult to exhaust it in this lecture. Notwithstanding, we shall be discussing some of these factors responsible for the culture of war that dominates the affairs of men and nations, which calls for cultural transformation and value orientation to incorporate and promote those values that advances culture of peace.

3.2 Instinctual Aggression

The idea behind this source of the war culture holds that the root cause of violent armed conflict is the offshoot of the remaining instinct of aggression of man, which nature has imposed on him. The civilisation

and development that man has enjoyed have not been sufficient to wipe-out this human instinct of aggression completely. It is the remaining instinct of human aggression that has survived from man's primitive stage that is responsible for the war situation in the contemporary global system.

3.3 Military Industrial Complex and Professional Armies

Another major source of cultural habits of war is the emergence of military industrial complexes in which some powerful groups or entrepreneurs have a great interest in military expenditure to make their 'ends meet'. The introduction of professional 'warriors' is also responsible for cultural values of war and violence.

These professional 'warriors' have imbibed a set of subcultures, learning values and skills that are entirely different from those we have in civilian setting. These soldiers are housed in barracks, which are secluded and distant from civilian outlets, and whose conducts are most times regulated by separate laws. Their major task is to defend the territorial integrity of the state. They also earn their living through the combatant services they render to their employer (state).

The sophisticated nature of modern war technology has really affected war policy where focus has been shifted from the size of troops to lethality of the military hardware and training. It is no exaggeration that military industrial complex plays great role in the acculturation of war habits in modern time. Industrialisation of violence has become the order of the day. A lot of weapons manufacturers, mostly from developed countries have become active participants in national politics because of the importance they ascribe to government policies in relation to their business. A government whose policies are driven by radical pacifism will definitely adorn the owners of military industries. There is no doubt that low patronage can lead to downsizing of the employees in these industries while a number of people will become unemployed.

Since the end of the World War II, there has been growing military and defense spending by most countries. The ideological rivalry, which greeted the Cold War era reinforced arms struggle and armament that dominated the world politics at that time. Military industrial complex has become a very tool of strategic economic management among several major powers. It is not surprising that since year 2000, spending and investment in the military industrial complex in the United States has been "enormous" such that legislators fiercely resist defense cuts that affect their districts. In 2002, the sizes of labour in the military industrial complex were about 166,000 (about 15% of the workforce). It

is reported that in the year 2001, about \$7.06 billion arrived in U.S. Department of Defense payroll, pensions, and procurement contracts—and Washington State was only seventh among the fifty states in this regard. Overall, U.S. spending on defense acquisitions and research is equal to 1.2% of the GDP.

The aim of these great powers is to create animosity or unhealthy rivalry among the parties in some of these developing countries where the atmosphere of peace is very fragile, causing the parties to drum up support for violent engagement (war). The character of modern war goes beyond the use of fists, yelling, and other primitive tactics. The military power of any party is basically determined by the comparative advantage it enjoys in military capability and mobility rather than the size of its troops.

Considering the foregoing, the parties will need to acquire arms in the prosecution of their violent-agenda (war). By doing this, the manufacturers of weapons will enjoy increase in the sales of their articles as more people may be employed in the process. By extension, the military industrialists' home governments will enjoy more income coming from that sector of the economy accruing from tax and the productive engagement of the local people. Thus, what is lost by the warring nations is gained by the arms and weapons manufacturers and their home or host governments.

3.4 Population Outburst

Population explosion can also be responsible for the culture of armed conflict or war. This occurs when population grows at geometric progression or rate while available resources (particularly the basic ones like food and shelter) grow at arithmetic progression or rate. This shows that population is far greater than the available resources. In this kind of situation the politics of 'survival of the fittest' becomes the order of the day.

One basic problem of 'survival of the fittest' model is that it has a tendency to promote cultural values and attitudes of unethical rivalry and war. This view is supported by Thomas Hobbes in his work, *Leviathan* where all men in state of nature, waged war against one another as a means of survival.

The case of Nigeria is a good example where the available resources at independence could take care of the population at that time but after the oil regime of the 1970s, agriculture and some other important sectors of the economy like manufacturing industry were abandoned by successive administrations in the country. The local food production was, however,

not sufficient to cater for the growing population as Nigeria resorted to relying majorly on importation of food and other agricultural produce to feed its teeming population, resulting in the balance of payment deficit.

The disproportion in the food demand and supply informed (during the Shagari administration) the nefarious activities of some food importers and their cohorts in government in hoarding food items. Therefore, artificial scarcity was created for the purpose of making more profits through the inflation. It is not surprising that the period in question marked the genesis of religious violence in the history of post colonial Nigeria (Lubeck, 1991: 182-191).

Population appears to be a veritable source of armed conflict especially if its growth is not checked. Population outburst tends to overstretch the available resources. This view is also shared by Robert Kaplan. He argued that population would constitute a great threat to human race, creating a situation of “anarchy” in no distant future (Kaplan, 1994: 46).

In developing countries, particularly Africa, there has been exceedingly growing population due to high birth rates. The population outburst has had an enormous impact on the socio-economic institutions as well as food. The existence of youth bulges in most countries has made the matter worse. Youth bulges can be described as “extraordinary large youth cohorts relative to the adult population” (Urdal, 2004: 1). The presence of youth bulges in Africa was corroborated by Kaplan’s observation during his visit to West Africa. According to him: In cities in six West African countries I saw [...] young men everywhere - hordes of them. They were like loose molecules in a very unstable social fluid, a fluid that was clearly on the verge of igniting (Kaplan, 1994: 46).

Bearing in mind the foregoing, you may agree that high (youth) population is capable of promoting culture of war and militancy especially where the state fails to provide them some basic needs. Uncontrolled population growth tends to “strain social institutions such as the labour market and the educational system”, creating frustration that can also generate tension and violence (Urdal, 2004:1).

3.5 Relative Deprivation

Relative deprivation is the root of most of the internal wars particularly in sub-Saharan Africa (DFID, 2001). It is therefore a fundamental source of the culture of war. Rebellion and insurrection are very likely to erupt in a political system where people feel they receive far less than they ought to enjoy in the distribution of state resources.

Thereby, the disadvantaged people or groups may challenge the government and when nothing is done to address their plight by the ruling class; there is tendency for upsurge of violence in varying degree. The disadvantaged groups may rebel against the (unfavourable) system by resorting to the use of violence and/or any other insurgent approaches like sabotage, bombings, kidnapping of government officials among others, as alternative means to achieve their objectives most especially when peaceful approach has failed them.

These marginalised groups are often tempted to adopt the use of violence as a means to meet their ultimate goal, which is improved condition of living or poverty alleviation or justice in the distribution of state resources. The psychological response to the problem of endemic poverty and servitude can provoke a rebellious and violent behaviour promoting a culture of war.

Even, if there is improvement in the condition of living of the marginalised group that has been subjected to a long period of deprivation, there may still be tendency that such age-long deprivation would have created a culture of insatiability among the members of the (marginalised) group.

However, the point we are trying to make here, is that these disadvantaged set of people may develop a kind of attitude in which it will be very difficult to satisfy them. No matter the amount of improvement in the living conditions of these groups, they will continue asking for more as they become inconsiderate in their demands. In such situation war and violence have become a way of life.

The foregoing explains the activities of the leaders and youths of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria where a long period of deprivation and marginalisation have produced the problem of ‘immoderate expectations’ among these people. The federal government of Nigeria and the political leadership in respective states in the region have found it difficult to satisfy the people of the region.

The psychological consequences of relative deprivation are responsible for the violent attitude of the youth in the Niger Delta where systematic and apparent disorder have become the regular feature of the region. The situation of commercialisation of violence is also manifest in the region, rampant among the youths who (in commando style) engage in hijacking, sabotage, kidnapping among other violent techniques.

3.6 Power Asymmetry

Unequal power equilibrium among parties can often lead to culture of war. The strategic advantage possessed by a party can force other party to adopt some destructive tactics with a view to balance the power structure. States often gang up against their powerful neighbour for the purpose checking the rising military power of the advantaged state.

Meanwhile, the aim basically, may be to forestall any military aggression that such power disparity may likely produce, as culture of war is somehow articulated. This is because the state with military superiority can easily question the territorial sovereignty of the other states to extend its ‘sphere of influence’.

In this case, the small or weak states would likely form an alliance to challenge the military superiority of more powerful state with a view to breaking its ranks and reducing its military capability such that no state will enjoy unlimited military power, capable of posing a threat to its neighbours.

3.7 Values

There are several ways through which conflict can be resolved, which can be categorised into two: violent and peaceful means. Every group or state usually has two set of values: Core and Shell values. These values can promote culture of war.

The Core values can be described as those values, which are very important to the group or state. These core values cannot be compromised by the group or state, and it is obligatory on the leadership of the group or state to defend these very essential values by using all available means including violence.

The problem of core values is one of the major factors responsible for the recalcitrant nature of Palestinian-Israeli conflict as regards the control of Jerusalem. Symbolic nature of Jerusalem as cradle of Christianity has been making it difficult for Israel to hand-over this holy place to Muslim dominated Palestine.

One may think that it should not be difficult for Israel to withdraw its state administration in Jerusalem owing to the fact that majority of the Jews are non-Christians but Judaists. The truth is that the shadow parties advancing Christian ideology, who are at the same time foreign allies of Israel will discourage such concession. It will appear absurd to advance the relevance of Christendom when the spiritual headquarters of

Christianity falls within the jurisdiction of Muslim dominated Palestine. As we all know, charity begins at home.

There is tendency for eruption of violence in the conflict relation between two or more parties when they (the parties) are both laying claim to the same resources, which fall within their core values. Each party may try to outsmart each other by means of aggression to finally put the conflict to rest or to resolve the conflict. Parties in conflict will first seek to resolve their differences through some other available means, most preferably the peaceful ones, but war will be last resort.

The Shell values, on the other hand, are also important. They include such values, which the group or state seeks to satisfy but can be compromised due to less relevance the group or state ascribes to them. These values can also promote culture of war.

The battle between the West and Arab dissidents is not basically religious but an inter-cultural conflict. Here, religion is a secondary factor. The West actually advances Christian posture basically because modern Christianity is an offshoot of western civilisation and creation.

Religion can be regarded as shell value but which is capable of propelling attitude of violence due to its tendency to transit into core value. This is because there is no way western civilisation can be preserved without safeguarding Christian principles. Similar relationship also exists between Arab civilisation (core value) and Islamism (shell value).

3.8 Identity

The collective identity of group usually binds together the members of such group. In Nigeria, the people of south west region see themselves first as descendants of *Oduduwa* before considering themselves as Nigerian. It is not misleading to say that in most of multi-ethnic states, particularly in Africa, people usually accord preference to their ethnic groups' interests above the interest of the nation, as state-building has become a very difficult task.

Identity problem is responsible for the emergence of most of the internal or civil wars in sub-Saharan Africa due to the nature of African state as an artificial entity with very weak state institutions. Thus, African state is colonial creature foisted on the people of different socio-cultural background and linguistic make-up who are strange bed-fellow.

The attitudes of inter-ethnic rivalry have produced emotions and sentiments where overall national interest is being sacrificed on the altar

of patrimonial network. The allocation of state resources is done through the principle of patron-client, which derives its inspiration from the existing patrimonial formation.

This problem has attracted extreme cases of culture of violence and total war tactic as evident in the theatres of war on the continent in the last ten years, where conduct of armed hostilities has been in total variation to the Africa's code of honour. The code of honour of traditional African society made it incumbent upon the combatants to exclude the children, women and the aged from the conduct of war and to suffer no harm in any war situation but now contrary is the case. According to DFID (2001: 10): "The most disturbing aspect of conflict in Africa is the increasing use of extreme violence In the conflicts in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Mozambique, Northern Uganda, Sudan and Angola, violence has taken appalling forms. Mutilation, torture of women and children, violent rituals and the forcible involvement of relatives, children and spouses in killing and rape are used as a means of waging war primarily by militia groups and by some state proxies. In some instances, such violence is part of ritual that binds militia groups together."

Since the end of cold war, Africa has been experiencing ugly situation of fratricidal bloodletting and inter-ethnic rivalry where civilians are being killed, maimed, raped or enslaved for being members of a particular ethnic group or another. The genocide in Rwanda is still very fresh in our memories where people (Hutus and Tutsis) that had been living together peacefully for several decades became palpable enemies while machetes and guns became objects of inter-ethnic conflict relation. It was a nightmare! The crisis in Darfur (Sudan) is another tragedy that Africa currently faces. There is no way one will discuss the subject of identity without explaining how ethnicity and ideology constitute identity challenges and problems. We have, therefore, offered to use two units to focus on the two concepts in the latter part of the course material.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List any five sources of the culture of war.

4.0 CONCLUSION

There are several factors responsible for the culture of war and some of which have been discussed in this unit. Every situation of armed conflict derives its source from a number of factors. Sometimes, only one factor may be responsible for the upsurge an armed conflict while two or more

factors can also be responsible to the emergence of another armed conflict.

Peace facilitator should know that, it is pertinent to identify various values that promote culture of war before a framework can be developed to address the scourge of violence in a given political system. Efforts should be geared towards transforming the enemy-image values in the conflict relation between parties to those values, which appreciate more the needs of the disputants rather than their positions.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss some of the factors that can be responsible for the eruption of any armed conflict or war on one hand, and promotion of the culture of war and violence on the other. The list of these sources is very long and endless but we have been able to discuss some of them.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Identify any three sources of the culture of violence in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- DFID (2001). *Causes of Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa*. October.
- Kaplan, R.D. (1994). "The Coming Anarchy." *Atlantic Monthly*, 273(2).
- Lubeck, P.M. (1991). "Islamic Protest under Semi-Industrial Capitalism." In: Olupona, J.K. & Falola, T. (Eds). *Religion and Society in Nigeria: Historical and Sociological Perspectives*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Urdal, H. (2004). *The Devil in the Demographics: The Effect of Youth Bulges on Domestic Armed Conflict, 1950-2000*. Social Development Department, the World Bank.

UNIT 5 THE UNITED NATIONS AND CULTURE OF WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The United Nations and the Culture of War
 - 3.2 Characteristics of the Culture of War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Culture of war that dominates the relations among various state and non-state actors has begged for more questions than answers. The world is enveloped with war and violence of varying degrees. Generation of refugees is phenomenal while a litany of killing, maiming and inhumanity that characterise modern theatres of war is abominable. Therefore, world leaders and other stakeholders have realised the need to conceptualise and develop a viable framework to address the culture of war that bedevils the entire global system. It is against this background that we shall focus on institutional policy action of the United Nations as regards the culture of war.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the United Nations resolutions of the culture of war
- discuss the characteristics of the culture of war.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The United Nations and the Culture of War

The term “United Nations” was first mentioned by the United States President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The name (United Nations) became a popular vocabulary in international politics on the 1st of January, 1942. Its origin could be traced to the outbreak of the World War II when 26 countries came together to fight against the aggression of the Axis Powers, and thus:

In 1945, representatives of 50 countries met in San Francisco at the United Nations Conference on International Organisation to draw up the United Nations Charter. Those delegates deliberated on the basis of proposals worked out by the representatives of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States at Dumbarton Oaks, United States, in August-October 1944. The Charter was signed on 26 June 1945 by the representatives of the 50 countries. Poland, which was not represented at the Conference, signed it later and became one of the original 51 member states.

Resulting from the failure of the League of Nations to prevent the outbreak of the World War II, the need to establish a more virile organisation which can guarantee world peace and security was conceived. Thus, on the 24th October 1945, the United Nations officially came into existence. The United Nations resolutions on a culture of peace are centered on study of the values, attitudes and behaviours that are necessary for a culture of war and violence. As a student or practitioner in the field of peace and conflict resolution, you may ask: What are the basic sources of culture of war?

In response to the prevailing culture of war, the eight characteristics of a culture of war were considered foremost. The attempt by the UN to provide a "conceptual framework" to address "the deep cultural roots of war and violence" led to the adoption of document **A/53/370**. This document, however, provides "the basis for a coherent strategy for a transformation to a culture of peace and non-violence." The documents also affirm, "There has never been a war without an 'enemy', and to abolish war, we must go beyond and supersede enemy images with ***understanding, tolerance and solidarity*** among all peoples and cultures."

The UN, recognising the negative impact that war culture can have on global peace and security has considered it necessary to outline those habits that can promote the culture of war. It is believed that it is only when this is done that the world body can come up with a document that changes those negative habits for positive ones. Therefore, the document would assist in providing alternatives in transforming the enemy-posture that usually precipitates a violent situation in the conflict relation among the state and non-state actors. For instance, in the last two decades, sub-Saharan Africa has produced more than ten wars as it has become the 'most conflict-ridden region in the world' (DFID, 2001: 9).

There is doubt that culture of war is much more visible in Africa than any other continent in the world. The region accounts for no less than one third of the world refugees. The situation of using children in the conduct of armed conflict on the continent is the most disturbing. Child

soldering is a recent development and emerging element of the culture of war in Africa. The experience of wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone was not pleasant at all, as young children and teenagers became instruments of bestiality and sexual slavery. These young children were guided or tutelaged by the adult combatants to kill, maim and even rape adult (females).

The inherent danger in the culture of war especially as it involves the issue of internalisation of destructive habits by children is capable of creating intermittent violence in any society. Thus, children exposed to violence suffer a multitude of psychological problems including increased aggression, emotional problems, mental illness, depression and anxiety (Buka, *et al.* 2001; Koposov, *et al.* 2003; Osofsky, 1995; Buckner *et al.* 2005). Physical abuse or violence on child involves “assaults on children, such as kicking, biting, shaking, punching, or stabbing, that produce pain, cuts, welts, bruises, burns, broken bones, and other injuries” (Berk, 2003: 587).

However, victims of abuse are likely to internalise the culture of violence, which makes their temptation for aggression against others most likely (Buckner, Beardslee, and Barsuk, 2004: 413; Buka, *et al.* 2001: 302; Shahinfar, Kupersmidt, and Matza, 2001: 139). Possibly, an act of aggression among these young children may be for the purpose of deriving a form of empowerment and attempt to protect themselves from further traumatic experiences (Pelcovitz, *et al.* 2000: 366). As abused children grow up, these pathological response patterns of aggression often result in the internal and external “intergenerational transmission” of violence (Buckner, Beardslee, and Barsuk, 2004: 413).

In awareness of the danger that characterises the culture of war has necessitated the world body to take some proactive measures by articulating a number of peacebuilding initiatives and legal instruments to address the violent conditions that the culture of war is likely to produce not only among the state actors but also the non-state actors. Some of the instruments designed to limit the destructive effects that war culture may have on human race are the Laws of War, Conventions on Human Rights, Arms Limitation Treaties among others. Various segments of the world population and nations all over the world have responded to the question by cataloguing variously the characteristics of the culture of war or rather various variables that constitute culture of war. The lists on the elements of culture of war are however not the same from country to country. In the next segment of this unit, we shall outline these characteristics of the culture of war.

3.2 Characteristics of the Culture of War

Apparently, the culture of war and violence exists and are recognised worldwide. Despite the dissimilarities in the culture of war from one country to another, there is a consensus that generally there are eight basic characteristics of the culture of war. These include:

- Power based on force/belief that violence works/military training
- Enemy images/ intolerance and prejudice against people who are different/extreme patriotism/religious intolerance (suspicion and fear)
- Authoritarian governance/corruption/obedience to orders from the top down (subservience and fear)
- Propaganda/Secrecy/Government control of media/Militaristic language/Censorship
- Armaments/Armies/War preparations/Military industry
- Disregard for human rights (people living in fear)
- Profiting from the exploitation of people and nature within and/or between countries (greed), and
- Male domination and power/patriarchy.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List any six characteristics of the culture of war.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The transition from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace and non-violence requires a great commitment from all and sundry. Both the state and non-state actors will have to appreciate to conduct themselves in such way(s) that repudiate or discourage the habits of violence and enemy-imaging norms in order to promote the culture of peace.

Various peace-promoting ideals and institutions should be further enabled in our appreciation of the culture of peace as alternative platform to the irresponsible, inhuman and nihilist culture of violence.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, in stimulating our better understanding of the subject matter, we described the term culture as it concerns the United Nations. We went further to highlight various characteristics of the culture of war.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What do you understand by culture of war?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Berk, L.E. (2003). *Child Development*. Boston: Pearson Education (6th ed.).

Buckner, J.C., William, K.B. & Ellen, L.B. (2004). "Exposure to Violence and Low Income Children's Mental Health: Directed, Moderated and Mediated Relations." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74.

Buka, S.L., et al. (2001). "Youth Exposure to Violence: Prevalence, Risk, Consequences." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71.

DFID (2001). "The Causes of Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa", Framework Document (October).

Koposov, R.A., Vladislav, V.R. & Martin, E. (2003). "Sense of Coherence: A Mediator between Violence Exposure and Psychopathology in Russian Juvenile Delinquents." *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 191.

Osofsky, J.D. (1995). "The Effects of Exposure to Violence on Young People." *American Psychologist*, 50.

Pelcovitz, D. et al. (2000). "Psychiatric Disorders in Adolescents Exposed to Domestic Violence and Physical Abuse." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70.

Shahinfar, A.; Janis B.K. & Louis, S.M. (2001). "The Relation between Exposure to Violence and Social Information Processing Among Incarcerated Adults." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*.

MODULE 2

Unit 1	Violence Modelling and Violent Behaviour
Unit 2	Agents of Violence Modelling
Unit 3	Ethnicity and Value of War/Violence
Unit 4	Religion and Value of War/Violence
Unit 5	Ideology and Value of War/Violence

UNIT 1 VIOLENCE MODELLING AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Violence and Social Learning
 - 3.2 Aggression Modelling: Theoretical Analysis
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The relationship between social learning and violence has remained a growing subject of interest. Discourse on the culture of violence and war are very diverse, which calls for the analysis of various types of violence and the contexts within which such violence is being evoked. Violence and war are twin sisters, which have featured prominently in human civilisation.

In spite of their underlying negativities, they have remained visible and refused to disappear from one generation to the other, state to state, century to century. Our discourse on the subject - culture of war cannot be complete, if we do not look at how violence has tended to become a social habit among the people. This task forms the basis of this unit.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the relationship between social learning and violence
- explain theoretically the aggression modelling.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Violence and Social Learning

Violence is defined conceptually from different perspectives by various scholars. In conceptualising violence, we often look at the act itself, the process through which it is exhibited, and its relationship to other variables. Violence is wider in scope than war because the former is always present in later while the latter always happens in extreme cases where violence is escalated. In this case, violence is the independent variable while war is dependent.

However, violence usually involves individual actor(s) or group(s) engaging in the application of force or the use of aggression to achieve particular purposes. Sometime, a violent person may not have a definite goal in his exhibition of violent attitude. Violence may be a way fun-making, just to derive self-satisfaction.

Violence is any action that is destructive, in which great amount of physical force is being exerted. Violence includes such actions like murder, arson, rape, kidnapping, among others. There are two types of violence: **Inward** and **Outward**.

The inward violence involves such destructive action(s) that is directed against a person or people within same group. For instance, most times when there are inter-religious skirmishes, some moderate Muslims are often attacked physically by their fellow Muslim brethren for protecting Christians in their domain against any physical aggression. If such thing happens, we call it inward violence.

Outward violence occurs when the physical attack is targeted towards outsiders or the people who are not in the same group with the belligerents. Thus, this destructive conflict relation dominates inter-ethnic affairs in Africa. The fundamental factor responsible for the violence that characterises inter-ethnic conflict relation on the continent (Africa) can be ascribed to the culture of aggression, which is often a product of violence-modelling where aggressive models (ethnic jingoists) tutelage or teach the young members of the society, values of hatred and hostility against their so-called enemy-ethnic group(s).

Man by his nature is a social animal. He learns the culture of his society as a vehicle of functioning effectively as a member of his society. This explains the importance of social learning in the relationship among the people in a given society.

Social learning can be described as the process through which one acquires knowledge and skills that establish in him social patterns of response to external stimuli. It also involves a course of action which modifies one's social behaviour through one's interaction with the environment. One's experience tends to have influence on the moulding of his behaviour to socially act in a particular way or the other. Modelling involves step by step accumulation of skills, and various skills already acquired are then put together at the climax of the learning process (Skinner, 1957).

Behavioural learning is so germane in social sciences, and it is not surprising that it has attracted a wide spectrum of research undertakings. Behavioural learning or modelling is a fundamental approach of human learning. Thus, modelling may afford one to live above the 'trial and error' learning process (Bandura, *et al.* 1961). Bandura, *et al.* (1961) goes further to say "watching a model perform some skill may prevent us having painstakingly make mistake after mistake in our attempts to acquire the skills ourselves" (quoted in Gross, 1999: 246).

It is basically through modelling that children acquire language skills to function well as members of a society, and without modelling it will be quite impossible to achieve such fit in social engineering. Observational learning affords young members of the society the opportunity to acquire several model responses in several settings, even where models are not really interested in getting the children internalised with their norms. For instance, a person smoking at a public place may not intend to preach the 'aesthetics' of smoking to the people or teach them how to smoke *per se* but to yield to the call of his addiction, or simply put, to enjoy himself in one of the best ways he thinks. If the person in question is a very stylish smoker, he will handle his cigarette in a majestic way, dignifying cigarette as a wonderful refreshment object rather than a serial killer.

Consequently and unfortunately, some of the passers-by may fall in love with the way the man in question smokes. Some of them who are smokers already may look for the nearest place to satisfy their smoking appetite too. Some other passers-by who are not smokers may take to smoking to unravel the 'delight' secret in smoking as a social habit.

Considering the foregoing, it will not surprise us seeing young children engage in smoking habits. Most habits are nonetheless cultivated through modelling and socialisation. If you watched the film, 'Naked Weapon', you would see how the young ladies, who were abducted in the film, imbibed the culture of violence and killing. The ladies, in the film, were forced to see the world from another perspective - war of all against all. Their captors mandated them to kill one another for the

purpose of having the last lady that survived the bestiality become a hit-woman or assassin that would work for the syndicate group. In doing so, the ladies modelled the culture of violence as exhibited by their captors for survival.

Another example of violence modelling could be found in the theatres of war in Africa in recent time. The young children that were usually excluded from prosecution of war and aggression in the traditional African society, have often had been included in the recruitment of rebel forces as evident in Sierra Leone and Liberia.

These young male children were taught and guided by adult combatants the culture of aggression. They sometimes gave the children guns and forced them to kill their relatives, even parents (charity begins at home!). The act was to motivate these young children the habits of killing and extreme aggression. These young children were also made to see themselves as superior to adults, as they were, in several cases, made to have forced sex with adult females, taking liquor, and even hard drugs like cocaine.

Skinner presents a contrary view about the relationship between learning and violence. He argues that learning cannot be functional if there is no reinforcement. We may disagree with him because learning can possibly take place without reinforcement. In this case, a person's exposure to a model's behaviour is substantial enough for learning to take place. According to Howe (1980), "If all learning depended upon the reinforcement of existing responses, it would be difficult for a person to acquire new behaviours. Fortunately, mechanisms for learning exist ... making it possible for new things to be learned without it being necessary to wait for each activity to be produced by the individual learner. One way to learn is through watching other people behave, and in this way we can acquire habits, skills, and knowledge without having to directly experience the consequences of every single action People are able to gain access to a much wider range of abilities than would be possible if all learning depended upon the reinforcement of behaviour."

Learning of violent behaviour can take place without reinforcement because the learners watch closely the activities of the aggressive models in the acculturation of the violence. I could remember one of my students saying that when he was a little boy, after he finished watching "Spiderman" movie, he tied his mother's wrapper round his body like his model, Spiderman. Thereafter, he went to the first floor of their house and jumped down. Rather than flying like his model, Spiderman, the poor boy landed himself in the hospital. He was, therefore, adorned or decorated with Plaster of Paris (POP) after breaking one of his arms.

Again, in those days, after watching James Bond films, little children would come out acting live movies. These children took different roles, typical of their models in the film. One would say, I am the (protagonist) actor, while the other would accept the role of a villain who they often referred to as ‘boss’. These children would follow the pattern of behaviour of the characters in the film, and improve on it.

Many of the children would ask their parents to buy toy guns for them for the live performance of the violent scenes they saw in movies. In the course of doing so, there is tendency that these little children would begin to see violent behaviour as pleasurable adventure. But they tend to be skeptical about the nobility in violence, if in the film, they see violent people being punished. Simply put, there is a tendency that the culture of violence will be discouraged among these children, if the violent people or villains in the movies always suffer tragic end.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is the relationship between social learning and violent behaviour?

3.2 Aggression Modelling: Theoretical Analysis

Aggression is any particular kind of social behaviour, which is imbibed and sustained in the same way we internalise other forms of social actions and behaviour (Bandura, 1973). This social learning approach to the study of aggression holds that aggression accumulation is a social learning process rather than instinct as advanced by Thomas Hobbes, Sigmund Freud among others. There is no doubt that the nature-nurture debate has really every aspect of violence and war discourse. Though our central focus is how culture of violence is transmitted from person to person and from one generation to the other. We agree that our theoretical explanation of aggression modelling cannot be complete, if we fail to discuss the view of those scholars who believe that culture of violence is instinctual or it is a product of human nature.

Human nature theory

In early modern Europe, it was believed that war was inherent in mankind, meaning that war formed part of human nature. The experience of war in civilised states is being an offshoot of the wars of savages. This view is expressed in the Hobbesian theory.

This theory is credited to the intellectual artistry of Thomas Hobbes. Thomas Hobbes in his theoretical construction articulated in his social deterministic description, that man by his nature is warlike. The man is egoistic as he is controlled by an *animus dominandi* consisting of three passions. Hobbes drew his theoretical inspiration from the Thucydides.

According to him (Hobbes): “.... in the nature of man, we find three principal causes of quarrel. First, **competition**; second, **diffidence**; third, **glory** (see Slomp, 1990:565-586).”

The selfish attitude of man is responsible for his desire to always have comparative advantage over other men. Therefore, there is always a competition among them. This competition is capable of resulting in war situation because every man will do everything he can do including the use of violence to achieve his desires. Diffidence is explained as an attempt by man to avoid a situation whereby his interest will be undermined. And in doing this, several measures are put in place, which may include the use of violence. The third passion is the man’s thirst for glory. Everyman wants to be a great achiever, and he can do anything to accomplish glory even if it will involve the use of violence.

These three passions are responsible for the rivalry among men as each tries to gain relative advantage over the other, which often results in violent hostilities and culture of war. The scenario is evident in his state of nature, which was a “state of war”. This theory stresses the importance of war in the maintenance of peace and security of any state. It is expected of every state to uphold the principle of defensive war such that before the enemy carries out its attack, the state should act fast to undermine the military capability of the enemy. Thus, the theory advocates for “principle of first attack” as a war strategy.

According to Rousseau, man cannot be said to be naturally violent because the state of nature was very peaceful. There was no aggression among men as people lived with one another in harmony. The affairs of the people were regulated by ‘golden’ rules and there was peace among the people. Ovid and Seneca: the primitive and natural state was a peaceful golden age where general good of the people was the order of the day. Meanwhile, values of violent hostility and warfare erupted in human social intercourse when there was a rise of (individual) property acquisition and inequality.

The rise of property and inequality propelled the situation of war and violence among men against communal philosophy and absolute pacifism that characterised the golden age. Rousseau, therefore, concluded that war is not inherent in human nature. Man has only cultivated or learned the habits of violence as a result of the emergence of modern state. The main factor responsible for man’s inhumanity against fellow man is not located in human nature but in human nurture.

Social learning theory

Social learning theory (SLT) is of the view that a number and varying degree of conditions could be responsible for aggressive behaviour. These conditions may include "... Provocation by others, heightened physiological arousal, environmental stressors, and lasting attitudes and values (Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1961: 545-82).

According to this theory (SLT), the most veritable condition is symbolic models, which involve exposure to live or filmed violent scenes. The theory further opines that violent attitude is neither a subject of inner drive of man for violence nor his internal forces or ever present external stimuli.

Social learning theory (SLT) holds that "people only aggress under appropriate social conditions, which tend to facilitate such behaviour (Bandura, *et al.* 1961: 575-582). It is further argued that in as much as violent behaviour is a product of a learning process, it is therefore susceptible to 'modification', through alteration or removal of the conditions, which usually fertilise aggressive behaviour.

The relationship between violence and behavioural learning is reinforced when there is very little or no measure taken to punish or sanction violent actions. This explains the spate of high profile killings that dominate political affairs of Nigerian state. For instance, policemen shoot and kill innocent citizens with impunity because there has not been any adequate measure to sanction such a dastardly act.

The worst case scenario is dismissal and imprisonment of the erring policemen. After staying in prison for little time, such callous people are granted amnesty. Had it been that the nation repudiates in totality culture of violence and inhumanity, such culprits of murder should be made to face the highest penalty to discourage reoccurrence of such faceless aggression.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. Is reinforcement a necessity before learning can take place? Discuss.
- ii. Distinguish between human nature theory and social learning theory as these relate to violence modelling.
- iii. According to the Hobbesian theory, there are three passions that are responsible for the culture of violence among men. What are these passions?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Aggressive models have a great impact on the social behaviour of members of any society. People learn violent behaviour like every other form of social behaviour. People look at the aggressive models and watch closely their violent values to imbibe the culture of aggression. Young students on university campuses who are members of secret cults usually imitate aggressive models of their choice. Some of them see gangster rappers like Tupac, Dr. Dre and Notorious BIG as their aggressive models. When you observe such students, they listen to songs that preach violent attitude. Some of them even give themselves their models' nicknames or names as the case may be.

The issue of total war in Africa is a product of imitating European tradition of warfare. In traditional African society, reckless killings and wanton destruction in human and material terms were forbidden. It is not customary to kill elderly people because they are the representatives of history and gods of the land.

Our colonial experience has really changed all that. War in Africa has assumed highest degree of bestiality in recent time. The character of war-making is now modelled after European war tradition of mass killing and unlimited destruction. This is one of the reasons why it has been difficult to achieve genuine reconciliation between warring parties in modern theatre of war in Africa.

The concept and practice of child soldier was European but Africans only imbibed such a dastardly act from Europe. Modelling is one fundamental factor through which one learns several social habits including those values of violence and war directly from somebody else rather than trying to do things in a trial and error manner.

Here, one will master a particular course of action from the model (trainer), and consolidate on what has been learned from such model to achieve greater perfection. This also explains how people internalise or learn the habits of violence. Some people go into assassination business, and they master the business of killing not basically through their 'trial and error' efforts but by studying the activities of the violent models. They learn many acts of killing through media and movies, books and live models (veterans in the business), and they master the models' tactics and develop on them.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the relationship between violence and social learning. Thereafter, we went to explain the human

nature theory in relation to violence modelling discourse. We agreed more with the scholars who subscribe to the view that violent behaviour is a function of social learning. We explained social learning theory as it relates to violence/aggression modelling. In the next unit, we shall be focusing on various agents of violent/aggression modelling.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Explain social learning theory in relation to violence modelling.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A., Dorothea, R. & Sheila, A.R. (1961). "Transmission of Aggression through Imitation of Aggressive Models", *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62(3).

Gross, R. (1999). *Key-Studies in Psychology*. (3rd ed.), London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Howe, M.J.A. (1980). *The Psychology of Human Learning*. Harper Collins Publishers.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal Behaviour*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Slomp, G. (1990). "Hobbes, Thucydides and the Three Greatest Things." *History of Political Thought* 11.

UNIT 2 AGENTS OF VIOLENCE MODELLING

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objective
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Agents of Violence Modelling
 - 3.2 Profitisation of Violence
 - 3.3 Media and Movies
 - 3.4 Forced Conscription
 - 3.5 Ruthless Administration/Government
 - 3.6 Street Culture
 - 3.7 Book and Literary Works
 - 3.8 Toys and Games
 - 3.9 Militarism and Militarisation
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Violence as we have discussed in the last unit, is another form of social behaviour, which can be learnt the way we imbibe other forms of social behaviour. Culture of violence is visible in every generation, various levels of human interactions and relations. Cultural habits of aggression and violence can be said to be peculiar only to human race. Take a visit to animal kingdom, you will then imagine, what offence a man has committed to be referred to as animal. In furtherance of our intellectual discourse on violence modelling, we shall be discussing its various agents. Please, you are advised not to get yourself confused! The concepts of violence and aggression in this instructional material mean the same thing. We use them interchangeably.

2.0 OBJECTIVE

At the end of the unit, you should be able to:

- discuss various agents of violence modelling.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Agents of Violence Modelling

There is a long list of means through which violent behaviour can be learnt. In this unit, we shall be focusing on some of these means. Though, it is pretty difficult to exhaust all the available means contributing to the acculturation of violent habits in this lecture (due to constraint we have in time and space). We shall nevertheless, do justice to the subject by discussing some of the major avenues through which values of violence are imbibed.

3.2 Profitisation of Violence

According to Jill Eagle, a psychology lecturer at the University of the Witwatersrand, young people learn cultural values of violence when they notice that perpetrators of violence are not punished. Consequently, the moral values are replaced with values of aggression because it is observed that society celebrates violent people.

Jokingly or unjokingly, Nigeria is now said to be celebrating violence as positions of personal assistants in the executive cabinet are left for ‘area boys’ and masters of violence. If the allegation is true, many young people wishing to work in government circle will be left with no option but to acculturate the culture of violence.

It is pathetic that since the inauguration of the fourth republic of the country, violent engagement has become a viable economic enterprise where one can make brisk business. The political warlords now have apprentices or trainees who wish to master the economics of violence to make ends meet.

It is quite amazing that criminals drive flashy cars, build mansions in government reservation areas, marry very beautiful wives, and above all are supported spiritually by the clerics and witch doctors. This social abnormality is responsible for the increasing wave of crime and criminality in the country where violence has become a way of life. Crude violence has become a veritable platform to secure electoral victory in most African countries including Nigeria.

In South Africa, a gangster working for car stealing syndicate in Johannesburg was interrogated on why he enjoyed engaging in violent crime, he said: “I was born in a cruel world, I'm living in a cruel world, and I'll die in a cruel world. I haven't got money so what must I do? I must steal that car to get money to support my wife and children and my brothers. They are all looking up to me.”

(See www.news.bbc.co.uk/Afrina/cultureofviolence.htm).

3.3 Media and Movies

The media have contributed in no small measure in the modelling of violent attitude. A lot of research studies in the last thirty years have shown that viewing violent video teaches values of violence. It also encourages aggressive behaviour and criminality among the people especially the adolescents. Almost on daily basis, locally made home videos are aired by most of the television stations in the country. Incidentally, more than 60% of these films are characterised by violent scenes. Even, most of the foreign films shown on these television stations are also violence-oriented.

The ritual killings and violent attitude that dominate most of the local films can be said to be one of the major factors responsible for the culture of violence among the student secret cultists in various institutions of higher learning in the country. Repeated airing of such films may reinforce violent habits in young people, which is responsible for the increasing wave of crime and aggressive behaviour among the lads.

In the study carried out by Bandura, *et al.* (1961), 96 children ranging from ages three to five were subjected to research scrutiny under three conditions: "... after first being frustrated by the removal of the promise of the attractive toys and later being observed during a 20 minute period when they played, individually with toys which included a Bobo doll and a mallet. Instead of a non-aggressive model, there was a filmed aggressive model. The filmed model produced the most imitative aggression, followed closely by the live model, with the non-aggressive model way back in the third place (quoted in Gross, 1999)."

Bearing in mind the foregoing, one will realise that there is great danger in the media violence in the internalisation of culture of war and violence by the people particularly the adolescent youths. If one has experienced robbery scenes in Nigeria, one will notice that the bandits carry out their operations in "commando" style, typical of the 'Rambo' movie starring Sylvester Stallion where the leading actor, Stallion would carry heavy machine gun shooting at his targets while bandaging his arms and shoulders, even waist with ammunitions in frightening way. The film shows how a single person killed more than 500 enemies. Such film model is capable of according the violent youths to have the mind to face any security agencies that challenge them. I could remember in the past, when armed robbers heard police siren and took to their heels; but the reverse is the case now. The fear of armed robbers is the beginning of wisdom to many of the security personnel in Nigeria considering the sophisticated nature of the bandits' arms and weapons.

Violent scenes as covered on the television news can also be veritable avenue through which violent behaviour can be learned. Almost on daily basis, we see shootings, killings and maiming on CNN. The combatants (violent models) engage one another in armed hostility and such event is often covered live by many of the cable television stations. The bottom-line, therefore is that events portrayed on television news have generated copycat crimes, including mass murder, terrorism, hijackings, workplace violence, product tampering, hate crimes and suicide. Following the Littleton terrorism, hundreds of acts of mimicry have been reported across the U.S. The succession of school killings are themselves examples of copycat events. The widespread publicity that followed similar crimes in other locales provides a relentless supply of examples of how to conduct assault operations on schools. The notoriety perpetrators receive can itself be a motivator for others to imitate violent acts.

3.4 Forced Conscription

Conscription into government or rebel forces can also promote the culture of violence. During conscription, people are being taught the art of killing and other forms of aggression. The conscripted people learn various acts of violence from the trainer-models who demonstrate physically how such violent activities can be carried-out.

Live violent models are often imitated by conscripted persons. This view is evident in the activities of the rebels in the Liberian crises where young children were conscripted to kill, maim and rape. Those young children became wilder than their adult trainers (models).

3.5 Ruthless Administration/Government

Cruel regime is likely to popularise the cultural values of violence, militarism and aggression among its people. For every action, there is a reaction. If a particular regime subjects its people or those opposing its policies to indefinite animalism, there may be reaction to retaliate violent action of the government forces with greater degree of violent aggression.

This dimension of violent conflict relation is evident in the Israeli-Palestinian clash. The more the Israeli forces attack the Palestinian settlements, the more the Palestinian dissidents adopt more aggressive measure to balance the situation of terror between the two parties. The repressive policy of the Israeli government is responsible for the popularity militancy is gaining in the Middle East.

The shoot-out between the militants and the government forces in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria is a product of repression and marginalisation suffered by the people of this region majorly under the regime of late General Sani Abacha. During the Abacha administration, each time, the people of the area came to demonstrate against the evils and deprivations they suffered, the military regime would send troops to suppress any form of civil disobedience in the region. This situation has led to the culture of violence among the youths in the region.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List the four agents of violence modelling discussed so far.

3.6 Street Culture

Streets are perhaps seen as places which evolve within a complex network of social relations and contradictions (Massey, 1994). In conceptual terms, ‘street’ is often referred to as urban public space, which is habitually used by young people as a platform for identity building (Mathew, Limb and Taylor, 1999). Street is also regarded as a social mechanism for corrupt ‘ethos’ (Valentine, 1996).

In addition, streets allow young children to have access to a great amount of ‘freedom’ and ‘expression’ through which some of these lads escape adult tutelage or parental guidance. It is no gainsaying that such parental guidance may inhibit their freedom as dictated by socio-cultural fulcrum. It is through adult tutelage that adolescent excesses of the young children are checked by the elders.

Nonetheless, streets have become avenues through which young people internalise deviant behaviour, anti-social norms and culture of violence. Many of these lads imbibe deviant values and violent attitude to basically avoid being repudiated by other youths in the group or simply, for the fear of social exclusion. It is pertinent to note that ‘boys learn to be tough and engage in fighting from a young age’ (van Blerk, 2006:54).

3.7 Book and Literary Works

People imitate habits of violence from some of the books they read. There are many of such books where violent or aggressive models are given so much prominence. People read books sometime and become different persons entirely. In as much as people read religious books and they drop all they become pious, people can also imitate violent models in the books they read. The violent behaviour demonstrated by the aggressive models may draw their passion towards putting into practice those values of violence as learnt from the models.

Some of the books promote culture of violence to the extent that they present spilling of human blood or act of killing as pleasurable adventure. Killing of someone's perceived enemies is presented in some books as sacrosanct and desirable. Books with 'Mafia' storyline will definitely present several violent scenes and celebrate the art of killing.

It was not surprising, when one of the worst despots and ruthless leaders in the history of Africa was asked about the book he had read that he loved most. He said it's the Prince, written by Nicollo Machiavelli. The Book, the Prince is literary work, which presents values of deception, murder, and oppression as some of basic conditions for attainment and consolidation of political power.

Machiavelli prescribed some conditions through which political power can be sustained. He advised rulers to always separate morality from politics and the use of assassins and strike force is one of the conditions. He also advised the leaders to always replace the members of their killer squads, and they should also try to eliminate them if there is need for that. This is because, according to Machiavelli, some of the assassins may be prostitutes as they will continue to ransom you for material gains. In a situation like that it is advisable to some other people to eliminate such prostitute assassins.

Many tyrants follow Machiavelli's advice as presented in his book religiously; even if it will be necessary to kill one's mother to acquire political power, Machiavelli said there is nothing bad in so doing. Thus, it is the end that justifies the means! This means that if you succeed in your beast-like actions, the actions are good. If good intention fails to accomplish positive result, Machiavelli said such good intention is amoral. So, one can use evil means for good end.

3.8 Toys and Games

Toys and games are also agents of violence modelling. Small children who play with toy guns may be on the verge of deriving joy from shooting their perceived enemies as live models. Sooner than later, these lads may begin to see art of shooting or killing as fun-making. When they become adults, some of them may be adventurous to put into reality the shooting habits they have developed from childhood.

As a matter of fact, this may explain the increasing incidence of shooting in schools by adolescent youths in the United States. Some little children have been reported to have brought real guns to their respective schools, mistaking such guns for toys. At break time, they would start shooting, and before one could know what was going on, a number of other school children might have been killed in the process.

Games are also veritable avenues through which violent behaviour is learnt by people especially young children. Games like Combat, Bomber Man, 10 Yard Fighter, Karate, Gun Smoke, Battle Life, Fire Dragon among others teach people not only art of defending oneself from attack from other party or parties but also values of violence. Many young children, even some adults love playing these games.

Here, the most interesting thing is that, it is the violent disposition displayed in these games that often attract the people's affection towards playing these games. One can imagine, when a father is tongue-lashing his son for a misdeed, the son replies the father with a request to engage him in a karate bout. Though, it is laughable but it happens. This kind of habit is more exhibited by male children than the female ones. Children will always like to put into practice what they have learned from the aggressive models in the games.

3.9 Militarism and Militarisation

Militarism and militarisation are other agents of violence modelling. For clarity, it is imperative that we conceptualise the two terms for our better understanding of the subject. Militarism is a 'modern term' that has eventually become very prominent with the development of industrialism and capitalism.

Militarism can be defined as a system, which accentuates and enhances or promotes military ideas and thought. It is a situation whereby jingoistic spirit is fostered among the people in a given society. Militarism can also be described as the relationship between society and its war-preparedness. It involves high military expenditure.

On the other hand, militarisation is the process through which people internalise the habits of application of force. The use of force may be productive (positive) or counter-productive (negative). The experience of military incursion in Nigerian politics has really affected the psyche of Nigerian people towards culture of violence and militarisation.

It is no news that the ethno-centric hegemony within the military circle and reprisal mutiny that followed the first coup led by Major Kaduna, an Army officer of Igbo extraction, resulting in the murder of the Prime Minister, Tafawa Balewa and other prominent people, almost brought the country (Nigeria) into disintegration. The northern military officers felt that it was a conspiracy against the north by the south-east to relegate the region (north) in the scheme of things.

The inter-ethnic suspicion within the military circle among other factors plunged the country into civil war (1967-1970). Again, the long sojourn

of the “Khaki Boys” in Nigerian politics has given birth to a new subculture among the Nigerian populace. The attitude and psyche of the people have become militarised.

Violence and force characterise every aspect of our national life. When we see two people engage each other in an argument in a public place, what we often hear them saying are, “do you know who I am?”, “I will deal with you”, “I go slap you”, “I will lock you up”, “I go kill you and nothing go happen”, “bloody civilian!” etc. Military vocabulary has now become popular among the civilian population.

Though, it is criminal to abuse other persons physically, people still go about keeping *koboko* (horse whip) in their cars. This is visible in most of our major roads in Nigeria. You may see two people hit each other’s car, and the next thing you will notice is that, after a little argument, one of them will just go into his car and bring out a *koboko*. He will then start whipping the other person as if the person is a goat.

We often observe this violent attitude in many of the bus stops in most major cities in the country. The most palpable victims are commercial bus drivers. Whenever, these drivers fail to oblige the financial request from the transport union staff (area boys), they are molested and beaten with sticks like erring bulls.

Meanwhile, some people may trace such violent habits to a number of factors including culture. But, the bottom line is that it is the military ideas, which civilians have imbibed is responsible for such violent behaviour. The barbaric way in which arms are being displayed by security operatives in the public makes the people to acculturate values of violence.

In countries like Finland, it is very difficult for members of the public to see arms anyhow. In Finland, the Police hardly go about with arms. People in Nigeria see arms as common items, and that is why illegal arms are very many among the civilians. The result of the circulation of illegal arms among civilian population is increasing crime rate and culture of militancy.

Militarisation that accompanied the struggle by the local people against the apartheid regime in South Africa is responsible for the culture of violence that is very rampant in that country. The local people under the tutelage of the ANC led by Nelson Mandela were forced to imbibe the violent behaviour of their White rulers in their determination to liberate themselves from the shackles of racial discrimination and ethnocentric bestiality that characterised the apartheid regime.

Eventually, apartheid regime was uprooted after a long bloody battle. The youths that were used for the struggle later became idle. Insurgency is over, and many of them have been finding it difficult to engage in productive labour in post-apartheid South Africa. Consequently, in the entire world, South Africa is in the first position in violent and criminal activities such as murder, rape, car snatching, among others. The widely reported murder of international reggae star, Lucky Dube by some armed robbers in the country is a point of reference.

Militarism is also a viable agent of violence modelling. There is no doubt that our military experience in Nigeria has really affected every aspect of our national life. The civil war that visited Nigeria in 1967 has created a sub-culture of inter-ethnic hatred not only between the Igbos and the rest of the nation, but among various nationalities that constitute Nigerian state.

The aftermath of the war has not really created any genuine sense of reconciliation and ‘general good’ among various ethnic groups in the country. This instructs the emergence of several ethnic militia groups that adorn the nation. The experience of the Igbos resulting from the war has been responsible for the collapse of their traditional values of communal good, which has been replaced with selfish interest by their leadership.

The activities of the government for post conflict reconstruction and recovery failed to address fundamental sources of the violent conflict and engender true reconciliation among the people. Well, it is not too late to reconcile all the warring nationalities in the country.

Moreover, the issue of militarism can also be observed in our private lives. In schools, students are gathered on the assembly grounds for morning spiritual devotion and matters arising in school. The last thing the students will be asked to do is to march like soldiers. That process reinforces the military habits, which students experience in different places, even their homes.

Several religious houses also encourage the habits of militarism. Some of the clerics go about with body guards. These private guards are members of the religious societies, and they have special uniforms like regular soldiers. Though, these guards don’t usually carry rifles or guns like state security personnel but sometimes they are equipped with knives and swords like ancient warriors.

Considering the foregoing, we should be less surprised that the so-called religious leaders like Reverend King have so much power to carry-out any punishment against any member of their congregation. There are

prisons and private law enforcement agents at places of worship in Nigeria. An erring member can be brought out and flogged in the full glare of the whole congregation. This is of course, one thing that a number of social institutions have learnt or copied from the military institution in Nigeria.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is the relationship between militarism and militarisation in the discourse of violence modelling?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Aggressive models have a great impact on the social behaviour of members of any society. People learn violent behaviour like every other form of social behaviour. Apart from direct war experience, people learn values of violence through various avenues or means. Out of the whole avenues, the media is one of the most viable tools for the promotion of violent habits among the people. Through films, one may know the names of different weapons, their degree of lethality and destructiveness.

People watch films and documentary almost on daily basis. Several violent scenes are shown. On cable television stations in particular, violent scenes are always reported and shown for public consumption (viewing). Violence in the Middle East and elsewhere is always reported as part of news items. These violent scenes are not always screened and parents are not even advised by these television operators to take their little children away from the TV sets because they are about to show some violent scenes.

Television activities as regards news coverage can promote culture of violence. There is no adequate regulation of their activities as it concerns the issue of which age bracket can watch particular news items or the other. General audience viewing of news can somehow promote values of violence and learning of violent behaviour. Young children should not be allowed to watch violent scenes on the news items.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss various agents of violence modelling. Some of the agents include profitisation of violence, the media and movies, toys and games, militarism and militarisation.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. To what extent do various agents of violence modelling contribute to the culture of violence among adolescent youths in your locality?
- ii. Media and movies are the most veritable agents of violence modelling. Discuss and draw your case-studies from your locality.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Bandura, A., Dorothea, R. & Sheila, A.R. (1961). "Transmission of Aggression through Imitation of Aggressive Models." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62(3).

Gross, R. (1999). *Key-Studies in Psychology*. (3rd ed.). London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mathew, H., Limb, M. & Taylor, M. (1999). "Reclaiming the Street: The Discourse of Curfew." *Environment and Planning*, A 31.

Valentine, G. (1996). "Angels and Devils: Moral Landscape of Childhood." *Environment and Planning Society and Space*, 14.

Van Blerk, L. (2006). "Diversity and Difference in Everyday Lives of Ugandan Street Children: The Significance of Age and Gender for Understanding the Use of Space." *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 32(1).

www.bimedia.org/statementonTvnews/cultureofwar Retrieved on 24th December, 2007.

www.news.bbc.co.uk/Afrina/cultureof violence.htm. Retrieved on 6th December, 2007.

UNIT 3 ETHNICITY AND VALUE OF WAR/VIOLENCE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Ethnicity as a Value of War/Violence
 - 3.2 Case Study of Inter-Ethnic Violence: Rwandan Experience
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The issue of ethnicity has become the most viable factor, which explains the social reality of post-colonial African state. In the colonial experience of African people, colonisers failed to put into consideration the issue of cultural differences of various ethnic groups before lumping them together in (colonial) state formation. This anomaly has constituted one of the greatest challenges of post-colonial Africa.

Ethnicity nonetheless involves ideology, which is guided by primordial affections while collective consciousness among the people is based on their common histories, ancestors, cultural values, beliefs, norms and traditions. In an attempt to preserve, consolidate and advance (promote) these cultures and values by one ethnic group or another the problem of ethnocentrism occurs.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain how ethnicity has constituted a value of war and violence in the Third World
- discuss the danger of inter-ethnic hatred and violence in war discourse, using Rwandan crisis as a case study.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Ethnicity as a Value of War/Violence

Ethnicity has been one of the regular features of most of the Third World societies. Africa has had more than lion share in ethnic-induced wars and violence. The problem of ethnic violence has continued to

plague the human race. The problem has attracted a litany of killings, and other violent values.

In the last four decades, the experience in Africa has shown that the continent has recorded a long list of ethnic violence and hostilities. The inter-ethnic rivalry has led to a number of war situations on the continent. Some of these wars may include the ones in Sudan, Nigeria, Rwanda, Burundi, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Somalia, Angola, among others (Horowitz, 1985).

Meanwhile for a better understanding of the subject matter, it is quite imperative to know what ethnicity is all about. If you are asked by your tutorial facilitator about what you know about the concept of ethnicity, what can you say? Oh! Are you sure that your definition (of ethnicity) is correct? Well, let me help you, my friend.

First, I would like you to know that there are several definitions of ethnicity. A number of scholars have contributed on the subject of ethnicity particularly as it relates to governance, democracy and violence. In Africa, some of these scholars may include Eghosa Osaghae, Rotimi Suberu, Victor Isumonah, John Mbaku, Pita Agbese, Isaac Albert, Mwangi Kimenyi, N. Kofele-Kale, Peter Ekeh, A. Jegu, B. Berman among others.

Second, it is interesting to know that despite the huge amount of challenge, which ethnicity has had on governance, justice and peace in Africa, very few scholars have seen the need to study this subject. It is no news that ethnic violence is one of the most fertile sources of destruction, murder and other violent values that plague African race. So, we need to appreciate the few scholars who have continued to dedicate their time and resources to study of the subject particularly as it concerns inter-ethnic rivalry and violence.

Now, let us define ethnicity. According to Chazan, Lewis, Mortimer, Rothchild and Stedman, ethnicity can be described as: "A subjective perception of common origins, historical memories, ties and aspirations.... Ethnicity ... has its foundations in combined remembrances of past experience and in common inspirations, values, norms, and expectations (Chazal, *et al.* 1999: 108)."

Chabal and Daloz define ethnicity as: "A dynamic, multi-faceted and interactive cluster of changeable self-validated attributes of individual-cum collective identities. There is no 'single' ethnicity out there cast in stone forever. There are ways of defining oneself and others in accordance with a set of beliefs, values and subjective perceptions which

are both eminently malleable and susceptible to change over time (Chabal and Daloz, 1999:56)."

Considering the foregoing, one will be worried that ethnicity has not changed for productive ends in Africa despite its susceptibility to change as argued by Chabal and Daloz. Some people blame the prevailing inter-ethnic hatred on the continent on the artificiality of African state (Ekeh, 1975). Post-colonial African boundaries are really artificial or man-made. They are products of Berlin conference in which imperialists, many of whom had never stepped their feet on the soil of Africa, deliberated and resolved to partition and butchered the continent like a bull in a slaughter house.

In the process, kinsmen were separated along different state arrangements, and people with no cultural affinities or rather strange bedfellows were forcefully brought together under the same state(s). If we support this school of thought, then, we are likely to say that colonialism is responsible for the inter-ethnic skirmishes that dominate state of affairs in post-colonial Africa.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the state of Africa is one that is crisis-ridden, which is laid on the foundation of economic exploitation, political repression and cultural oppression as well as inter-ethnic hostility (Chazan, *et al.* 1999). The fact is that the underlying source of Africa's predicament is not located in its artificiality as a state.

It is however, prejudicial to say that the problem of war and violence that bedevils African race is only as a result of the way the colonial boundaries were arbitrarily drawn or how people of different origins and cultures were brought together. The main factor responsible for the social violence that characterises Africa is the character of the African state itself.

The truth of the matter is that it is not only the African state that is artificial. Rather, it is virtually all world boundaries that are artificial. Apart from that, most countries in the world are also multi-ethnic. The predatory and repressive character of African state is the root source of inter-ethnic conflicts that bedevil the continent. Patron-client relation dominates the socio-political and economic realities of African state.

According to Chabal and Daloz: "We all have an ethnicity. In the West, it is normally subsumed under citizenship, though, as in the Basques of Spain, there are exceptions. In Africa such sentiments are usually salient and more consequential because of the nature of the evolution of contemporary African politics (Chabal and Daloz, *ibid*)."

In his reaction to the position of popular Ibadan School of thought, which is of the view that colonial experience of Africa is just an episode in the evolution of African state and thereby cannot unilaterally be responsible for the existing cataclysm that the continent faced after independence. Peter Ekeh argues that the colonial experience of African state and the epochal impact of such experience are the basic factors that explain the problem of alienation and politics of exclusion that dominate the affairs of African state. These factors explain why African people oblige and accord sub-structures and primordial associations greater loyalty than the state with adverse implication on state legitimacy (Ekeh, 1975).

The destructive nature of inter-ethnic conflict relation in Africa cannot be blamed on a single factor. There are several factors responsible for such destructive conflict behaviour among various ethnic groups in several African countries. John Mbaku provides us with these various factors as follow: “Institutional arrangements that (1) failed to adequately constrain the power of government; (2) did not guarantee economic freedoms; (3) failed to provide procedures for the peaceful resolution of the conflicting interests of the various ethnic groups within each country. In fact, in many instances, the laws and institutions adopted, allowed some ethnic groups to dominate governance and the use of governmental structures to enrich themselves at the expense of the rest of society. Unable to become part of the ruling coalition, and thus excluded from effective and full participation in economic and political markets, many of the excluded ethnic groups turned to violence as a way to minimise further marginalisation (Mbaku, 2001:59-60).”

Elites in Africa often fly the kite of ethnicity to appropriate political and economic resources from the state. This view is also shared by Chazan *et al.* (1999: 127), according to them: “Ethnoregional leaders, often members of the dominant class themselves, may make different uses of ... ethnic appeals to gain support for their claims upon the state. As they mobilise these identities for their political purposes, they help to shape which particular identity, or mix of identities, comes to the fore.”

Ethnic identity appears to be more fertile in post-colonial Africa, in the allocation of resources, which has resulted in the rat-race competition and struggle among various ethnic nationalities for the control of the state. This situation has therefore led to inter-ethnic confrontations and hostilities. The elite manipulation of politics through ethnic patronage is not new in Africa. The proliferation of ethnic based political movements and parties has been in existence since pre-colonial era. Political parties were formed along ethnic lines (see Wallerstein, 1967: 500).

The situation of ineffective state building as well as informal rules guiding the control of state power and institutions has reinforced ethnic loyalty among the people. Elites being aware of this situation have continued to evoke ethnic identification to foster national party loyalty on the basis of ethnic association. Therefore, electorates often make their electoral decisions or mandate based on ethnic consideration rather than ideology. Political elites usually advance ethnic identity as a strategy to achieve (more) political popularity among their people. They promise their ethnic communities socio-economic and political benefits for electoral support.

However, the ability of political elites to acquire political power is interpreted as a conspiracy by the ruling ethnic group to regulate other ethnic groups(s). In this case, elites mobilise support within and occasionally outside the ethnic domains to dislodge the ruling ethnic group from power. Sometimes, the rivalry and competition that characterise among the control of state institutions create tension.

The increasing inter-ethnic rivalry informs the growing tension on the continent, resulting in violent clashes among various nationalities. The nationalist insurgencies, which pervade the entire political landscape on the continent have become a source of worry. There are two major basic forms of nationalist armed conflict or war in post-colonial Africa, and these include **separatist war or secessionist war and irredentist insurgencies or war**. In separatist war, violence is carried out by a nationalist group to secede from an existing state to form another one, which excludes other nationalities.

A good example of secessionist war was Biafra War (1967-1970) where the eastern region of Nigeria attempted to secede and declared the Republic of Biafra. The agonies, pains and destruction of life and property resulting from the civil war with the Ibos having a lion share, make a genuine reconciliation a great challenge in post war Nigeria. The scar of the war has somehow created values of ethnic violence in the country; however, some Ibos remain adamant on their secessionist agenda.

The Movement for the Actualisation of Sovereign State of Biafra (MASSOB) is at the forefront of the secessionist campaign. The (violent) activities of the group are seen by the government as a threat to national peace and security. There is need, by various nationalities, to appreciate one another due to the benefits all the ethnic groups will enjoy, if we continue to fortify the spirit of the unity in our diversity. Such commitment will foster the actualisation of our common aspiration.

Irredentism involves act(s) and/or activities of a nationalist group in trying to extend their customary sphere of influence to their kinsmen who are dwelling in an area located in another country's territory. In most cases, historic demarcation of boundaries due to war or conquest usually did not take into consideration natural lines.

In Africa, we find people who share cultural affinity and who are also in the same ethno-linguistic configuration, separated due to colonial experience, and they can be found in two or more countries rather than being together in the same country. The nature of colonial boundaries as inherited by the African people at independence has been a source of the structural confusion and cataclysm, promoting the culture of war that characterises the continent and one good example is Ogaden war which the people of the Somali region in Ethiopia with the support of their kinsmen in Somalia have been waging against the government of Ethiopia for the independence of their region.

Different cultures, ethno-linguistic networks and nationalities were forcefully brought together to form a nation-state while those with similar socio-cultural background were separated and whose boundary is shared by two or more countries against their wish.

In attempt to unite themselves with their kinsmen who are found residing in another country due to structural dislocation propelled by colonial boundary, the affected people may decide to take to violent nationalist struggle to annex the area, which their kinsmen reside that falls in another (country's) territory for reunification agenda.

The military adventure of this nationalist group will definitely pose a threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the target country, and the government of such country will also act accordingly to launch a resistance against the activities of the irredentist movement.

In a situation like this, it is very likely that there will be upsurge of violence or war in the articulation of claims and counter-claims by both parties.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. Explain any four sources of inter-ethnic violence in Africa.
- ii. Name any five scholars that have contributed to study of ethnicity in Africa.
- iii. Discuss the two forms of nationalist war in post-colonial Africa.

3.2 Case Study of Inter-Ethnic Violence: Rwandan Experience

You may wonder why the choice of Rwandan crisis as our case study in our discourse on ethnicity as a value of war and violence. Many of us may have not been opportune to watch the film, “Hotel Rwanda”. If you have watched the film, you may not be wrong to conclude that, if there still exists at all such ‘state of nature’ as expressed by Thomas Hobbes, it must be in Africa. The Rwandan crisis was a show of man inhumanity to man, or rather gargantuan bestiality and inter-ethnic carnage.

The origin of the inter-ethnic massacre in Rwanda could be traced to inter-communal hostilities of 1959-1962 (Prunier, 1995). During that period, many Tutsis were forced to go on exile in Congo and Uganda. Some of the Tutsi exiles gave military assistance to Yoweri Museveni to hijack power in Uganda in 1986.

Later, the insurgent Tutsi exiles began to launch military incursion against the government of Rwanda, culminating in the outbreak of genocide in the Rwanda. We will discuss the origin and events that led to the drama of genocide, which portrayed African race as barbarian in short while.

The incident nonetheless attracted wide criticism among the world population. The war was a nightmare in the history of Africa. Mass murder that was put into play in the Rwandan crisis somehow corroborated the view(s) of some racist and Eurocentric scholars who believed that nothing good could come out of Africa. These scholars see Africa as the motherland of negativities such as poverty, corruption, primitivism, ethno-religious bigotry among others.

Historically, Tutsi cattle rearers migrated to Rwanda from the Horn of Africa in the 15th century. Little by little, the Hutu inhabitants became subservient to the Tutsi settlers. Thereafter, the Tutsis instituted a monarchy headed by a *Mwami* (king) and a feudal hierarchy of Tutsi nobles and gentry.

Under a new agreement known as *ubuhake*, the Hutu farmers agreed that they and their descendants would render services to a Tutsi lord in return for the loan of cattle and use of pastures and arable land. Since then, Tutsis became the master to the indigenous Hutus in feudal set-up. By 1899, Rwanda became a German protectorate but the German imperialists were later chased away by the Belgian forces from Zaire in 1915 and took colonial possession of the country.

The League of Nations authorised that Rwanda and Burundi should be annexed by Belgium as the territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Ruanda-Urundi became a UN trust territory with Belgium as the administrative authority after World War II. By 1950s a number of reforms were carried out by the Belgian imperialists, in which democratic governance was engendered in the existing political structures.

This colonial policy agenda met heavy resistance from the Tutsi quarters, believing that such democratic policy would put their (Tutsi's) hegemony in check. Through the military support, the Hutus revolted and overthrew the Tutsi monarchy in November, 1959. Two years later, the Party of the Hutu Emancipation Movement (PARMEHUTU) won an overwhelming victory in a UN-supervised referendum.

Resulting from the Hutu revolt, close to 200,000 Tutsis fled to neighbouring countries in 1959. The PARMEHUTU government was formed as a result of the September 1961 election, and was granted internal autonomy by Belgium on January 1, 1962. By June 1962, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution, which brought the Belgian trusteeship to an abrupt end. The country was granted full independence to Rwanda (and Burundi) effective July 1, 1962.

Gregoire Kayibanda, leader of the PARMEHUTU Party, emerged as Rwanda's first elected president, leading a government chosen from the membership of the directly elected unicameral National Assembly. Reconciliation and Peaceful resolution of inter-ethnic conflict, improvement of socio-economic status of the masses as well as integrated development of Rwanda formed the ideals and agenda of the Kayibanda regime.

Unfortunately, the Kayibanda regime was short-lived. On the 5th day of July, 1973, there was military intervention in politics via the coup led by Maj. Gen. Juvenal Habyarimana. On assumption, the new military government strangulated the entire civilian political machineries including the National Assembly and a total ban was placed on all political activities in the country.

In the year 1975, Habyarimana established the National Revolutionary Movement for Development (MRND) and its main aims to include promotion of national peace, unity and development. In December, 1978, Rwandans went to the polls in which new constitution was approved and Habyarimana emerged as president. He was re-elected subsequently in 1983 and 1988 as a sole candidate. Due to public criticism, Habyarimana declared in 1990 to transform the one-party state structure of the Rwanda to a multi-party democracy.

On October 1, 1990, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), a group of Rwanda exiles majorly constituted by the Tutsis marched into Rwanda from their base in Uganda. The RPF accused the government of refusing to allow true democratic governance and lackadaisical attitude of the government towards (adequately) reintegrating over 500,000 Tutsi refugees scattered all over the world led to the civil war.

The civil war lasted for two years. By July 12, 1992 the government and the rebel representatives signed a truce in Arusha, Tanzania to end the bloodshed. A roadmap to address the root causes of the armed conflict was drawn. The aim was to facilitate a peace accord and power-sharing, and authorising a neutral military observer group under the auspices of the defunct Organisation for African Unity. A ceasefire took effect July 31, 1992, and political talks began August 10, 1992.

In a controversial circumstance, the presidential plane carrying President Habyarimana and his Burundi counterpart was shot down by a rocket on the 6th of April, 1994 as it prepared to land in Kigali, Rwanda. Both presidents were however confirmed dead. Thereafter widespread brutality and mass murder of Tutsis rented the air in Rwanda where the Hutu military and militias embarked on genocidal mission.

In the process the prime minister, her 10 Belgium bodyguards and several hundreds of thousands Tutsis and Hutu moderates were massacred. Over two million Rwandans mostly the Tutsis fled the country with attendant increase in refugee flow in the region.

Most of the killings were carried out by the militia - *Interahamwe*. Hutus were also called upon to kill their Tutsi neighbours and relations through government sponsored radio. Husbands, wives, nuns, farmers, artisans, educated, in fact people of all professions and large segment of Hutu public were culprits of that dastardly act. It was a nightmare!

The RPF rebels reacted swiftly but unable to prevent the mass killings. They engaged the Hutu dominated government forces in armed hostility and eventually the RPF emerged victorious. The RPF captured Kigali on the 4th of July, 1994, as the war came to an end on the 16th of July, 1994. Before then, French forces landed in Goma, Zaire, in June 1994 on a humanitarian mission. The French troops were deployed throughout southwest Rwanda in an area they called "Zone Turquoise," quelling the genocide and stopping the fighting there.

Though too late, the international community intervened with a relatively large humanitarian relief efforts and peacekeeping operation, UNAMIR. The United States, one of the largest donors failed to respond appropriately, having very little interest in Africa, possibly for strategic

reasons. If Rwanda had been accorded similar attention the US gives to the Middle East, the humanitarian disaster in that war-torn country would have been minimal.

The UN peacekeeping forces remained in the war-torn country till 8th of March, 1996. Many of the perpetrators of the genocide are now facing trial for war crimes and crime against humanity. Due to the long list of genocide suspects, the government of Rwanda had to bring *gacaca*, a customary legal framework into play to quickly bring the culprits of the genocide awaiting trial to justice.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly discuss the origin of the Rwandan genocide.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The issue of ethnicity has remained a very visible feature of the continent of Africa. Ethno-violence has overtaken most of the countries in Africa. Ethnicity has been the tool often adopted by the political elites in their pursuit of the state power and resources. The flag of ethnicity is flown in the federal and various states' capitals in Africa in the allocation of state resources.

Primordial loyalties and prevailing subjective perception that characterise ethnicity in Africa and elsewhere, cannot be the underlying factors responsible for the enemy-image that dominates inter-ethnic relation on the continent. The weak state structure, endemic poverty, winner-takes-all philosophy, institutional deficiencies among others propel inter-ethnic rivalry. The general attitude of political elites reinforces the inter-ethnic hatred that we experience in Africa.

The inter-ethnic bloodshed and genocide that greeted Rwanda in the early 1990s dominated world headlines at that time. The genocidal situation was responsible for the death of several hundreds of thousands of innocent Tutsis civilians and moderate Hutus. Several other atrocities were also committed by Rwandan government at that time.

In fact, it is paramount for the people and government of Africa to live above primordial sentiments and subjective perception as well as enemy image among various ethnic nationalities that dominate the state of affairs on the continent. It is no gainsaying that the problem of ethnicity can be regarded as a veritable source of underdevelopment and bad governance on the continent.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to show the relationship between inter-ethnic hatred and culture of war and violence. We explained how ethnicity constitutes a value of war. In our attempt to buttress our point on the danger embedded in the destructive inter-ethnic conflict, we adopted the Rwandan crisis as our case study.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Explain how ethnicity constitutes a value of war, drawing your case study from any of the Africa's theaters of war.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Chabal, P. & Jean-Pascal D. (1999). *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*. Oxford: James Currey for the International African Institute.
- Chazan, N. et al. (1999). *Politics and Society in Contemporary Africa*. (3rd ed.). Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Ekeh, P.P. (1975). “Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 17, Nos. 1-4.
- Governance in the Third World. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Horowitz, D. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, University of California Press: Berkeley, CA.
- Mbaku, J.M. (2001). “Ethnicity, Constitutionalism, and Governance in Africa.”
- Prunier, G. (1995). *The Rwandan Crisis: A History of Genocide, 1959-1994*. London: Hurst.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1967). “Class, Tribe, and Party in West African Politics.” In Lipset, S.M. & Rokan, S. (Eds), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross Nation Perspective*. New York: The Free Press.

UNIT 4 RELIGION AND VALUE OF WAR/VIOLENCE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Definition of Religion
 - 3.2 Basic Elements of Religion
 - 3.3 Religion and Violence
 - 3.4 Catalysts of Religious Violence
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The relationship between religion and violence has really attracted increasing interest and inquiry among scholars. Violence is a product of uncontrolled conflict trend. The issue of violent religious conflict in world system has become a source of worry not only to religionists but to the world at large.

It is against the background that study on religion and violence has attracted great attention among the academia and public analysts. A number of research contributions have been made by conflict analysts, social scientists, religionists, historians among others in studying a wide range of issues on the subject matter. The nexus between religion and violence involves a variety of distinct issues and relationships that require application of different types and levels of theoretical explanation. The definition and elements of religion, as well as how religion copulates with violence are the bases of this unit.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define the term religion
- describe various elements of religion
- discuss the relationship between religion and culture of violence on one hand, and religious violence on the other hand and
- explain various catalysts or factors that promote religious violence.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Definition of Religion

There has never been one definition of religion that has completely summed up what religion is. Simply put, there is no universally accepted definition of religion. Virtually all the available definitions fail to describe the whole meaning of religion. But, each definition has contributed in our understanding of what religion is all about.

The term religion trod its semantic path into the English usage (fully) in the 13th century. The word was borrowed from Anglo-French word *religun* in the 11th century. In Latin, religion is *religio*, meaning “reverence for God or the gods, careful pondering of divine things, piety, the *res divinae*” (see <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/religion>). The term "religion" refers to both the personal practices related to communal faith and to group rituals and communication stemming from shared conviction.

Religion usually involves a set of common beliefs and practices, which are generally accepted and advanced by a group of people in form of prayer, ritual and norms. Religion can be defined as a philosophical system, which addresses basic questions regarding personal and communal origins, purpose and destiny. According to Lindbeck religion remains: “A kind of cultural and/or linguistic framework or medium that shapes the entirety of life and thought ... it is similar to an idiom that makes possible the description of realities, the formulation of beliefs, and the experiencing of inner attitudes, feelings, and sentiments (Lindbeck, 1984: 33).”

The definition of religion as articulated by Lindbeck shares the view of sociologists and anthropologists who believe that religion is an abstract set of ideas, values, or experiences, which grew out of cultural intercourse among the people. This view does not subscribe to the argument that religious belief refers to the belief in God but a set of myths and sacred convictions that are accepted and believed by the adherents.

The *Encyclopedia of Religion* (2005, 7692-7701) also describes religion thus: “In summary, it may be said that almost every known culture involves the religious in the above sense of a depth dimension in cultural experiences at all levels - a push, whether ill-defined or conscious, toward some sort of ultimacy and transcendence that will provide norms and power for the rest of life. When more or less distinct patterns of behaviour are built around this depth dimension in a culture, this structure constitutes religion in its historically recognisable form.

Religion is the organisation of life around the depth dimensions of experience - varied in form, completeness, and clarity in accordance with the environing culture.

In the Penguin Dictionary of Religions (1997), religion is defined as: “A general term used ... to designate all concepts concerning the belief in god(s) and goddess(es) as well as other spiritual beings or transcendental ultimate concerns. The basis for religious beliefs, doctrine and creed is often expressed through myth, scripture and idealistic/theological assumptions.”

Religion is described by Karl Marx as “opium of the people” (see www.baylor.edu/~Scott_Moore/texts/Marx_Opium.html). In this case, people are often blind with transcendent manipulations in which people sacrifice reason for faith. The Marxist definition of religion explains the values of religious fatalism, which dominate the socio-cultural society of Nigeria. It is not surprising that people ignorantly resign to fate whenever they suffer any socio-economic misfortune.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is religion?

3.2 Basic Elements of Religion

- a. Beliefs
- b. Rituals
- c. Subjective Experience
- d. Community.

Beliefs

One of the hallmarks of religion is a belief in supernatural beings and forces. They can take a variety of forms, not all of which are found in every religion. Beliefs usually fall into one of five categories: animatism, animism, ancestral spirits, gods or goddesses, and minor supernatural beings.

Animatism is a widespread belief, especially in small-scale societies. Here, there is a belief in a force that is inherent in all objects, plants, and animals (including people) to different degrees. Some things or people have more of it than others and are, therefore, potentially dangerous. A belief that natural objects are animated by spirits is *animism*.

A belief in *ancestral spirits* is consistent with the widespread conviction that humans have at least two parts - a physical body and some kind of non-physical spirit or soul. Most religions maintain a belief in powerful

supernatural beings with individual identities and recognisable attributes. These beings are usually thought of as *gods or goddesses*.

Minor supernatural beings are not spirits, gods, humans, or other natural beings. People do not pray to them for help. Yet these beings have some supernatural capabilities.

Rituals

Rituals describe the formal and symbolic imperatives of a given religion. Symbolic attachment remains the fundamental element that defines the activities of every religion. Thus, rituals include spiritual meditation, prayer, chanting, and sacraments among others.

Subjective experience

This is the product of beliefs and rituals. A set of beliefs and practices which serve to subordinate us to something superior or holy in order to justify the events that control our lives. In Islam as well as several other religious societies or sects, it is believed that anything that happens to man be it good or bad is an act of God.

Even, if a man is killed by a fellow man, God has destined it that way. This subjective perception may raise a morality question. People are likely to perpetuate evils and such evils may enjoy religious validation. This explains the activities of several terrorist organisations that fly religious banners, using religion to justify their dastardly acts. Any member of such sects that dies or is harmed in the articulation of their violent agenda, it is often said that such people are martyrs or heroes who will be blessed by God with paradise.

Community

Religious communities usually have some basic elements. Religious communities should have leaders (gurus/ priests/founders) and followers (disciples). Apart from leadership and fellowship essentials of religious communities, there must also be hierarchies, obedience and discipline, historical relationship to past generations (origins of the community).

Thus, there is no way Muslims will talk about their religion without reference to their leader, Prophet Mohammed and his disciples such as Othman, Abu, and the rest. In addition, Sheiks, Alfaz and other Muslim scholars that have contributed in one way or the other to growth of the religion from one generation to another, are also recognised by adherents of Islam. This view is shared by almost all the religions in the world.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the basic elements of religion?

3.3 Religion and Violence

Conflict has been a subject of rapidly growing interest and concern in peace and conflict studies, social sciences and humanities, which has attracted studying a wide range of issues on the subject matter. Conflict remains a regular feature in human history and it is found at every level of state and non-state relations.

The nature of any conflict depends largely on its character, which is either creative or destructive (Albert, 2001:3). Creative conflict is healthy for the relationship among the state and non-state actors. Destructive conflict is normally “characterised by violence whether in its physical, psychological or structural connotation (Albert 2001:4).

Religious violence is a term that covers all activities in which religion forms the subject or object of individual or group violent behaviour (Wellman and Tokuno, 2004: 291-296). It involves all aspects of violence that have religious motivations. Articulation of religious violence is not only targeted against non-members of a particular sect but members of this same sect can launch a violent attack on one another, not without religious intent.

Violent religious conflict or religious terror has become an event or issue of great interest in the study of human history. The emergent culture of violence or mass destruction, which characterises religious conflict long after the ‘Crusades era’ often transcends objective explanation.

In the last ten years, no less than four hundred thousand innocent civilians have been killed in religious terror worldwide. Of this figure, Nigeria accounts for about fifty thousand deaths. Religious violence has become one of the greatest challenges of mankind.

Religion that is supposed to promote peace and salvation among various adherents has become a veritable tool of pestilence, rape, injustice, suppression, animalism and fraud in Nigeria and the world at large. Religious values are now manipulated by anarchists to perpetuate violence and terror.

Religious violence is of course, a cultural process that can be interpreted in different contexts. For instance, sectarian violence may be a subject of agitation by one religious society to minimise or reject socio-economic marginalisation it suffers. For instance, the Sunni movement in Iraq sees post-Sadam administration in the country as anti-sunni because the state power and major political positions are now being enjoyed by the Shiite Brotherhood.

These two religious sects have long history of intra-religious hatred. Political authority and policy are given subjective connotations and each party fights for hegemony. It is not surprising that Saddam regime enjoyed widespread popularity among the Sunni Muslim population in Iraq and elsewhere despite the ruthless, draconian and insensitive nature of the regime.

The reason was just because Saddam Hussein was a member of the Sunni movement. The atrocities committed by the Saddam administration received very little or no condemnation by the Sunni population. All the good policies of Saddam regime did not receive tangible appreciation from Shiites' camp, because the Shiites saw him (Saddam) as enemy of their sect and faith.

Religions can be manipulated by extremists to motivate or incite their fellow members to persecute outsiders or non-members who they see as enemies for transcendent reasons. Some of these extremists call for violence against their perceived enemies for non-transcendent reasons. For instance, the bloody conflict between Israel and Palestine may look religious to an ignorant person. The basic truth is that the crisis is geo-political. It is conflict over the ownership of land.

Violence is also carried-out individually or collectively for religious hegemony. We are all aware of the Medieval Crusades when a lot of atrocities and killings were carried-out by some so-called Christian fundamentalists against non-Christians and heretics. We should be aware of the violent activities of *assassin*, an extremist Muslim sect of the 11th century. The sect habitually used murder as a war tactic against the crusaders and moderate Muslim leaders.

Violent organisations such Al-Qaeda use religion as a viable platform to win public sympathy. They also used religion as source for the recruitment of their 'army' to fight the West and other perceived enemies. The underlying motive behind such a violent agenda against its perceived enemies is more political than religious.

Religion is often used as an instrument by jingoists to amass support and sympathy in their prosecution of violence against their enemies. Governments are also culprits of such public deception. If you are very watchful, Mr. George Bush Jr., most times refers to members of the so-called terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda as Islamic fundamentalists.

What Mr. Bush hopes to achieve is to present the war against these groups as liberation of Christianity against enemies' attack (Islamic fundamentalists). Meanwhile, the basis for the war against Al-Qaeda is not religious *per se* but political. It is an effort to preserve the hegemony

of the United States in the world system and further advanced the national interest of American people.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is religious violence?

3.4 Catalysts of Religious Violence

Massive unemployment and social under-engagement

It is worth-knowing that the problem of religious diversities cannot be accepted as the main reason for chaos and violence that characterise religious landscape. The persistent situation of massive unemployment and socio-economic disengagement or under-engagement of people is one the factors responsible for youths' engagement in violent religious campaign and terrorism in contemporary world system. Most of the youths used for religious terror in the Middle East are mostly those that are social-economically marginalised.

Economic palaver

The economic crisis which has bedeviled Nigeria since early 1980s has had a negative impact on religious worship and philosophy in Nigeria. It is no exaggeration that the economic crisis has really increased poverty, ethnic rivalry, fall in the standard of education, marriage liquidations and home collapse, sickness and disease epidemics (including HIV/AIDS), violent religious conflicts among other negativities.

The economic predicament that befell most developing countries since the New World Order was ushered in has been one of the factors responsible for the growing tension among African countries and elsewhere. Capitalist economy that dominates the contemporary world system does not favour most of the old colonies and developing countries especially Africa. The situation has created a sense of marginalisation among the poor countries, and adoption of any strategy that can better their economic status is often applied. Some governments may be tempted to give covert support to the so-called religious terrorists for economic reasons.

Intercourse between religion and democratic politics

Another reason for the religious violence in Nigeria and the world at large, according to Ibrahim and Toure (2003) is “the impact of the rise of religiosity on democratic political culture.” According to them religion has become the fundamental element of state affairs. This inept institutional popularisation of religion has created ‘a specific cultural context’, which nonetheless promotes anti-democratic ethos and values with catastrophic implications.

Gladiatorial ideology among sects

It is also pertinent that we identify the emerging religious ‘norms and practices’ of large number of sects in the world especially Christianity and Islam which have created gladiatorial ideology. Creating a system that spurs in religious practice a gladiatorial ideology will definitely spawn or generate inter-cultural tensions among various religious movements in their quest to have strategic advantage over one another particularly as it concerns authoritative allocation of resources in the face of limited access.

It is argued that the Church of England has lost majority of its members due to its pacifist nature. Some scholars are of the view that people often like religious societies that articulate values of violence. The violent attitude does not always take physical form. For instance, Christianity in Nigeria and world over is now taking a violent form, different from that of the Crusades that involved the application of physical violence like killing.

Pentecostalism has become very popular among the Christian population because of its militarised ideology. The issue of prayer warfare, spiritual binding and transcendent aggression has become most popular since the emergence of Pentecostal movement. It is not surprising that introduction of the movement in northern Nigeria has led to ‘inter-cultural encroachment’, often resulting in inter-religious violence in the region.

Politicisation of religion

Politicisation of religion is also responsible for the upsurge of religious violence in Nigeria and elsewhere. Sharia has become the slogan of northern political elites who use Islamic religion to fulfill their selfish motives and regionalist agenda (Mason and Talbot, 2000). The politicisation of Sharia has produced a lot of contradictions, and since inception of the fourth republic in which tens of thousands of people have been killed in religious riots in various parts of northern Nigeria.

This situation engenders a culture of violence in religious conflict relation especially if one party feels marginalised by the other or tries to outplay the other in the accumulation of (world) state wealth and resources. The political elites have in no small measure profited from such political religionalisation project. The use of religion is evident among the political elites in Nigeria such that, religion has become a veritable tool in the struggle for political power and comparative advantage by the 'northern oligarchy' within the north and against the south. It also assists these elites in building new coalitions (Ukoha, 2003; Usman, 1987).

Hell was let loose in the city of Kaduna on February 21, 2000. The crisis was as a result of the tension generated by the government intension to introduce Sharia law in the whole state. The inter-religious bloodshed resulted in the deaths of thousands of people including women and children (Mason and Talbot, 2000).

The situation in Kaduna has shown that there has been continual eruption of religious violence between Muslims and Christians in the state. The violent situations have attracted large-scale destruction of human and material resources. Many people have blamed the problem on the politicisation of religion in the regional fight for power as well as the rise of fundamentalist Christianity and Islam.

Another example was in Bauchi where it was reported that a Christian teacher seized a Koran from a Muslim student alleged to be reading it without permission in the class. The aftermath of that incident produced a violent inter-religious conflict, in which many lives were lost (*Nigerian Tribune*, *The Guardian* and some daily news papers, Thursday, February 23, 2006 even *New York Times*, Friday, February 24, 2006).

Demographic dilemma

Youth bulges theorists see every violent behaviour as a product of high youth cohorts in relation to prevailing resource scarcity and as a basis to explaining religious violence in any given state. You may wonder how religion, population and violence interact.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, scholars have made attempts to explain the root causes of violence adopting a number of different variables including (forced) migration, ethnic and religious chauvinism, inequality, and resource scarcity. Resource scarcity model is of the view that population explosion basically resulting from high birth rate is one of the major causes of scarcity of resources, which is a veritable source that triggers armed conflict or violence of any sort.

According to social science theorists, explosion can only be experienced, if gun-powder has a contact with spark. In the absence of spark, gun-powder will look like ordinary substance. In this case, the gun-powder, according to these theorists, is the youth bulges. It is not surprising that Samuel Huntington has replaced its “Clash of Civilisation” to “Youth Bulge Theory” in the theoretical explanation of religious violence in the contemporary world system (see *The Observer*, Sunday October 21, 2001).

Youth bulges happen when adolescent youths of between the ages of 15 and 30 years constitute almost 40% of the entire population in a given

country. There is a presence of youth bulges in most countries where religious terror is experienced particularly the Middle East.

Finally, other factors responsible for the phenomena of violent religious conflicts in contemporary time may include official corruption, unequal distribution of wealth, increased rural-urban migration, socio-economic frustration of the marginalised group resulting from failure of the state to provide their basic needs, the inherent complexities of the semi-industrial capitalism of developing nations, absence of effective inter-cultural dialogue, and intolerance.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List and discuss any five catalysts of religious violence in Nigeria.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Religion is usually supposed to be regarded as a unifying force, which should promote love, social justice and peace. The identity problem that is created by religious diversity has nonetheless created enemy-image among the adherents of various religious societies or sects.

The “we and they” or “believer vs. unbeliever” syndrome that dominates religious affairs has been responsible for the atrocities that accompany religious hatred. It is, therefore, pertinent to develop a viable framework to promote inter-cultural dialogue and religious harmony among various religious societies in order to promote peace in the world. Governments should also provide opportunities for people in the areas of employment, education and social justice.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we began by treating the subject by first looking at definition of religion. We went further to describe various elements of religion. Thereafter, we discussed the relationship between religion and culture of violence on one hand, and religious violence on the other hand. The last but not the least, we explained various catalysts or factors that promote religious violence.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

How does religion constitute a value of war? Discuss drawing your case-studies from Nigeria.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Albert, I.O. (2001). *Introduction to Third Party Intervention in Community Conflicts*. Ibadan: John Archers for Peaceful Transformation Forum (PETRAF).
- Ibrahim, J. & Toure, Kazah-Toure (2003). Ethno-Religious Conflict in northern Nigeria, see www.nai.uu.se/publications/news/archives/042ibrahimkazah/index.xml?Language=en&. Retrieved on 30th July, 2007.
- Lindbeck, G.A. (1984). *Nature of Doctrine*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Mason & Talbot (2000). “Religious Conflicts in Nigeria” www.worldsocialist.com Retrieved on 21st March, 2007.
- New York Times* (2006). Friday, February 24.
- Penguin Dictionary of Religions* (1997). as quoted on www.religiousfacts.com/religion/qoutes.htm . Retrieved on 17th of March, 2007.
- Ukoha, U. (2003). “Politics, Ethno-Religious Conflicts and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria.” *The Journal of Modern African Studies*.
- Usman, Y.B. (1987). *The Manipulations of Religion in Nigeria 1977-1987*. Kaduna: Vanguard Printers.
- Wellman, J.K. (Jr.) & Tokuno, K. (2004). “Is Religious Violence Inevitable?” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43(3).
- www.baylor.edu/~Scott_Moore/texts/Marx_Opium.html. Retrieved on 1st of June, 2008.
- www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/religion. Retrieved on 10th August, 2007.

UNIT 5 IDEOLOGY AND VALUE OF WAR/VIOLENCE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Describing Ideology
 - 3.2 Characteristics of Ideology
 - 3.3 Types of Ideology
 - 3.4 Ideology as a Value of War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Ideology can be defined as any organised collection of ideas. The term ideology was coined from the French word, *idéologie* by Count Antoine Destutut de Tracy in the 18th century. According to him, it is a “science of ideas”. Ideology is regarded by Karl Marx and his followers as instrument of social reproduction. It is also described as a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of a society to all members of this society.

Ideology is essentially an organised system of beliefs, values, and ideas that form the basis of a social, economic, or political philosophy. Ideology has been presented by history as a veritable source of war and value of violence. In this unit, we shall focus on how ideology can constitute a value of war or violence as well as some other issues of discourse.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe the term ideology
- explain various characteristics of ideology
- discuss different types of ideology and
- examine the relationship between ideology and value of war/violence.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Describing Ideology

According to *Oxford Advanced Dictionary*, ideology can be described as: “A set of beliefs, especially one held by a particular group, that influence the way people behave.”

Karl Marx described ideology from the context of the relationship between the base and superstructure. He argued that the dominant ideology of any given society is determined by its sub-structure or base. You may wonder what we mean by base and superstructure. The base refers to the means of production of the society.

The superstructure is built on top of the base, and it is the dominant ideology of any given society, which covers all aspects of the society, including the established religion, economy, political system, justice system, patriotism, social welfare among others. As you will agree with me, for any structure to stand, there must be foundation.

For instance, if we want to erect a building, we must begin the building project with a foundation. This simple syllogism instructs the view of Karl Marx. He however argues that it is the base that determines the superstructure. Marx’s definition of ideology is class-based. According to him, in as much as it is the ruling or dominant class that controls the means of production of any given society, the superstructure of the society including its ideology will be determined by the interests of the ruling class.

The dominant class knowing the importance of ideology, will deceive the alienated or deprived group or class and creates a situation of ‘false consciousness’ among the members of the deprived group to make the overall essence of the ideology look as if it is for the good of all rather than the exclusive interests of the dominant class.

Ideology often guides the social interaction among people in one society or the other. In their interaction, different levels of ideological influence are brought to bear. This means that there is tendency that certain ideas will be expressed more in particular set of persons than the others. For instance, the flag of ethnicity as discussed in one of the previous chapters of this instructional material, is more flown by Africans than the people of the Western nations.

The fact is that the ideology of ethno-subjective perceptions is played-down among the Westerners due to their little or no interest in primordial sentiments. Though, this does not mean that they are not also culprits of subjective perception. They are often being accused of racism.

Considering the foregoing, we should know that the background and interest of each person determine his/her ideological preferences and behaviour. This explains why the flag of ethnicity is more flown than that of religion among the Yoruba people of south-western Nigeria. The Yoruba's don't only protect and advance their socio-cultural values but also accord great priority to those values.

This does not mean that Yoruba people are more ethnically biased than any other ethnic group in Nigeria. The socio-cultural ideology of Yoruba is so exceptional to the extent that the group is hardly beclouded with ethnic sentiments in their collective opinion and response to public issues. But, sometimes ethnic considerations influence their perception and decisions, particularly as regards national politics.

By and large, the force that drives the perception and views of the people viz-a-vis the similarity and diversity in their thoughts and actions, is easily found in ideology. This view is also shared by social scientists. Ideology involves a set of ideal values (either creative or destructive) that are internalised by members of any society.

As we must have come across earlier in some of the previous chapters of this instructional material, creative values are peace-promoting while destructive ones are violence-generating. The popularity of any ideology depends largely on how much it is communicated to the people. Ideological values are accepted and upheld by people only when such values have attracted their interest.

The impact of communication on the transmission of ideology from person to person, generation to generation and state to state is great. This explains the activities of political parties and social organisations like religious movements in the use of various channels of communication and means to influence people's attitude within their ideological constructions.

For instance, during the anti-colonial struggle in Africa, many African nationalists were attracted to communist/socialist ideology to fight against Western imperialists and colonisers. Many of these nationalist leaders received not only ideological tutelage but also (covert) military assistance from the old communist states especially the defunct Soviet Union (USSR).

It was therefore, not surprising that many of the African nationalists, upon achieving political independence of their nations, adopted communist/socialist approach in the administration of their countries when they inherited political power from the colonial masters. Subsequently, the ideological neutrality or non-alignment policy of most developing countries including Africa during the Cold War era led to what was termed as "African socialism".

3.2 Characteristics of Ideology

There are several characteristics of ideology. In this segment, we will discuss some of the basic characteristics or features of ideology while Minar (1961) and Mullins (1972) will be our guide.

According to David W. Minar (1961), the characteristics of ideology may include:

- A set of certain ideas usually with particular kinds of prescriptive contents
- This set of ideas normally has internal logical structure
- The ideas play a role, which provides for human-social interaction
- The ideas have expected function(s) of putting in place platforms in the structure of an organisation
- There must be spirit of persuasion in the ideas and
- The ideas are the bases for social interaction.

Willard A. Mullins (1972) argued that there are four basic characteristics of ideology, and these include:

- Ideology must have influence over one's cognitions
- Ideology must be force driving one's evaluations
- Ideology must create a system that controls one's action and
- Ideology must have logical coherence.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List any four characteristics of ideology.

3.3 Types of Ideologies

Political ideologies

Political ideologies are collection of (subjective) ideas and principles, which define how political power should be allocated and the goals such ideas and principles hope to achieve in the administration of state. For instance, communist ideology is primarily focused on the ways to reduce or eliminate individual ownership of property with the aim of preventing unequal distribution of wealth and situation where few individuals will own the means of production in a given state.

Political ideologies are bodies of ideals, doctrines, ethical values, symbols, and principles, which simply explain how a given society should function, creating an institutional platform or direction to accomplish a particular socio-political order. In every world democracy,

various political parties articulate their ideologies through their manifestoes or party programmes. These parties transmit their ideologies through various means of communication to achieve wide popularity among the people.

Political ideologies usually have two basic dimensions, which include **goals** and **methods**. **Goals** involve how society should be arranged or organised. **Methods** involve the means or best ways through which such ideal social order or organisation can be accomplished.

To fulfill these two dimensions, political ideologies cover various aspects of the society like economy, education, justice system, labour law, religion, patriotism, social welfare, among others. Also, there are various forms of political ideology. These include feudalism, capitalism, socialism, communism among others.

Economic ideologies

There are some ideologies that are economically based. These ideologies are the practical interpretations of abstract economic ingenuity. Capitalism is one of the available economic ideologies we have. In this case, the economy of a nation is controlled exclusively by few private individuals whose ultimate goal is to make profits and increase their revenue profile.

The issue of public good is secondary to these private individual owners of the countries' businesses as they dwell mainly on how to make profits through available means (either good or evil). Example of countries with capitalism is United State of America. Several African countries are also said to fall under this economic ideological system.

But many of these countries are yet to be regarded as capitalist economies because of their mixed economic system. Mixed economic system is an economic ideology borne out of efforts of several developing nations like Nigeria to distance themselves from East-West ideological entanglement that dominated the cold-war era. Cold War era was the period that followed the end of World War II and came to a close after the collapse of the USSR.

However, if we are to talk about the historiography of the cold war, we may agree that the period was between 1945 and 1990 (or end of 1989). During that period, there was not only a political struggle but also an economic rivalry between the east bloc led by the defunct USSR and the west bloc under the leadership of the US. The ideological struggle between the east and west blocs permeated all the world societies and political systems but not without some catastrophic implications.

In an attempt to avoid or prevent dragging the world into another World War, that leaders of some developing countries such as Tito of Yugoslavia, Nyerere of Tanzania, among others, decided to establish a Non-Alignment Movement (NAM). The economic ideology of this movement was, rather than exclusively adopting any of the warring economic ideologies (capitalism and socialism/communism) but to marry the two (both capitalism and socialism). This gave birth to the mixed economic system that we experienced in most of the third world nations, even in the New World Order.

Another popular economic ideology is communism. The basis for this economic ideology is to create opportunities among the people in a given country to enjoy equal access to the nation's economy. In this case, the state controls the means of production through the government, and on behalf of the people. This ideology demands that no individual has exclusive ownership of property. Thus, all property are owned by the state (government). Example of countries where communism exists is China.

There are several other economic ideologies, which include mercantilism, feudalism, globalism, Malthusianism, Darwinism among others.

Feminist ideology

There is no doubt that women are given inadequate coverage in human history. Little is known about the activities of women in war history, narratives. Their relevance is also undermined in the physical and textual interpretation of religion. It has become pertinent for women to make themselves socially relevant. The efforts by women and girl-children to enjoy equal rights like their male counterparts gave birth to feminism. Then what is feminism?

Feminism is a form of social ideology, which articulates for a situation where women will enjoy equal rights as their male counterparts. The ideology is a reaction against patriachism. Patriachism is a socio-cultural ideology that dominates human society where women are forced by some cultural impediments to play second fiddle to men. For instance, in virtually all the African societies, we experience superiority of men, and women are seen as subordinate (inferior) partners. Feminism is the belief in women's rights. This ideology involves belief and philosophical conviction in the need to secure, or efforts to ensure, rights and opportunities for women equal to those of men.

Religious ideology

Religion also constitutes one of the social ideologies. Religion involves people's beliefs and opinions regarding the existence, nature, and

worship of God, a god, or gods, and supernatural participation in the universe and human life. Religion is an ideological thought and practice.

It is a set of strongly held beliefs, values, and attitudes that somebody lives by. It is also an object, practice, cause, or activity that somebody is totally committed to observe and respect. Religious ideology comprises of ritual and belief, which is the hallmark of religious ideology.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Discuss any three types of ideology.

3.4 Ideology as a Value of War/Violence

Now, the break is over. Let us talk about the relationship between ideology and violence as the climax of our discourse on the value of war in this course. Ideology is a very fertile means through which culture of war and violence is imbibed. Ideology is a cultural value capable of promoting attitude of war and violence in any given society.

Ideology covers several aspects of any society such as education, economy, established religion, among others. Ideological orientation is given to every member of the society. The small children are taught by the adults about the ideological belief and values of the society. The new dimension that terrorism has taken in contemporary world system has really exposes the inherent danger in ideology. Many of these suicide bombers have been given an ideological orientation, through which enemy-image and identity is created in the minds of these people against the target parties.

Ideology has become a cultural value of war and violence in several societies of the world. The ethnocentric ideology and civilisational conflict have been responsible for the hatred several Arab leaders and people feel towards the West. They often see the West as morally decadent and non-religious people who want to lord themselves over other races in the world. This view is also shared by several Afrocentric scholars who believe that African culture is presented by the Europeans in a negative way basically for imperialistic purposes.

Religious ideology has been one of the sources of violence in the world. The doctrines and values of several religious societies vary from one sect to another. This diversity has really put some of the sects against each other. The Christian/Islam conflict relation has been a subject of the age-long ideological contestation between the Muslims and Christians.

The ideological contestation between the religions is basically over the argument on a number of issues particularly that one relating to the Trinity (God, the Son and Holy Spirit) as against monotheism. Most Christian worshippers are of the belief, in the doctrine of Trinity, that there is union of three persons in a single Godhead. The three persons are the Father (God Himself), the Son (Jesus Christ) and Holy Ghost.

On the other hand, Muslims uphold monotheism as the basis of their religious ideology. They strongly criticise the Trinity thesis of the Christians. They see Jesus as a mere prophet of God who was neither God's son nor His cousin. The bottom line is not that the Christians disprove the existence of only one God but their belief in the doctrine, which affirms that God expresses Himself through three personalities (as earlier mentioned), is the subject of contestation between the Christians and Muslims.

This singular diversity in the religious ideologies between the Christians and Muslims has created a hostile relation between the adherents of the two religions. The issue of religious violence has been a subject of debate. People keep wondering why religion that preaches peace as well as sanctity of human blood has actually become a veritable instrument of human decimation and destruction.

When looking at the whole religions, two things are common among them. One is the supremacy of a divine being, God. The second point is that, every religion advocates humanity and the values of respecting other people's needs (Do to others, what you want others do to you). The respect of mutual needs among the people is the foundation of social justice.

The real values of religion can also promote violence. For instance, in the northern Nigeria, one of the major sources of inter-religious violence that adorn the region is value orientation. The kind of orientation that people receive makes them to see other religions inferior to their own.

Thus, in the quest by each of the sects to defend its ideological values, members of various religious associations become more concerned about the ways to outwit other sects for strategic reasons than instill values of love, peace and the fear of God in themselves and young worshippers. It is important to know that most of these reasons are politico-economic rather than transcendent.

Apart from religious ideology, political ideological differences are a good source of civil war in Africa and elsewhere. The ideological rivalry created by the Cold War has really been one of the major causes of civil wars on the continent of Africa. A good example is Angola, where the

Government led MPLA and the UNITA rebels under the leadership of J. Savimbi engaged each other in a long bloody conflict with attendant huge loss in human and material terms.

The Angola crisis was a proxy war prosecuted by the United States and the defunct Soviet Union. The US gave both military and financial support to the UNITA rebels while the MPLA received its strategic support from the USSR. MPLA was a left wing political organisation in Angola, which was at the helms of affairs in that country, but the Savimbi led UNITA rebels was pro-West, supporting capitalism and other Western values by waging a war against the government.

The aim of the UNITA rebels was to liquidate or destroy the then existing socialist structures in the country to promote free economy and other Western values. But the war took a new dimension (resource-based) after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, leaving capitalism as the only alternative political and economic ideological system to the entire state actors, particularly in the Eastern Europe. There are some other sources of civil war, which may include religious intolerance, mass unemployment, endemic poverty, enemy-image philosophy, propaganda, lack of effective justice system, among others.

The problem of political ideology became manifest during the Cold War era. Thus, Cold War can be described as managed military tension between two or more parties. In this case, each of these parties tries not to allow the tension get out of their control, knowing the implication that open violent conflict is likely to pose to their security (balance of terror). It is also a limited confrontation between two or more parties in conflict.

The symmetric military relation between the parties makes them to be cautious of the way they carry out their military rivalry such that their security will not be jeopardised because the weapons that **party A** has is also possessed by **party B**, which is likely to lead to mutual destruction. The parties can also engage each other in proxy wars through their support to other warring parties in the pursuit of their military supremacy agenda.

The Cold War was a period of East-West rivalry, tension, and low-scale war, characterised by mutual perceptions of hostile intention between military-political alliances or blocs. Cold War involves several phases of confrontation and relaxation of hostility to avoid the situation where the tension will generate full scale violence or war.

The basis for the rivalry between the East and West blocs was basically an attempt by each of the ideological blocks to gain strategic advantage over the other. This singular factor is capable of generating a destructive

conflict situation where the parties will resort to the use of violence. Efforts by every ideological group to enjoy more prominence or relevance than the others are sufficient to build enemy-image among various ideologies.

Ideology has been a source of violence. If we go through the history of human civilisation, we should still remember how Adolph Hitler and his Nazi party used ethnocentric and geo-political ideologies in bringing Germany to another controversy of war mongering. He called on the Germans to respond favourably to the clarion call, to making German race the most superior one in the entire world.

The violent activities of his Nazi party were horrendous. Many Germans who failed to subscribe to the ideological ‘madness’ of the Nazis were brutalised, and some of them were murdered. The ideology permeated all classes and generations in Germany at that time. So, anybody that questioned any of the government’s policy actions was to be seen as an enemy of the state and the people.

The impact of ideology in developing violent behaviour among people shows that it is a veritable value of violence. In religious settings, we are aware of how, the subjective values of any sect can make the members to become recklessly violent. The activities of the Crusades in the medieval age to violently persecute non-Christians actually created an ideological maxim of divine dignity and blessing in killing for Christ. These activities of the Crusade became the grand norms of a number of Christian sects since then, and even up to this moment.

Violent behaviour is also exhibited by some other sects like Islam. The activities of some Islamic sects particularly the Sunni and Shiite beg for more questions than answers. One will likely wonder the degree of violence in the conflict relation between the two groups of Muslims. If the people of the same religion can kill themselves because of very few differences in their doctrines, then why should it amaze anyone if the same set of people decides to kill non-Muslims? We will discuss more about this subject in the later part of this lecture/instructional material (module 3, units 1 and 2).

However, there is no doubt that ideology can also be a source of peace in any society. The ideal values of every religion hold good neighbourliness as paramount. Unfortunately, this grand norm is often undermined largely due to inter-cultural differences among various sects. A lot of sects have abandoned the primary duties of Godliness, peace, charity, justice and love.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

How does ideology constitute a value of war?

4.0 CONCLUSION

The destructive tendencies that ideology creates can be addressed through various means. Intercultural dialogue and understanding is so important to foster peace among various ideological groups (either religious, political, etc.). There should also be need for people to address their conflict issues by giving priority to ways through which respect for mutual needs can be advanced.

5.0 SUMMARY

We began our intellectual discourse in this unit by describing the term ideology. After that, we explained various characteristics of ideology. Our search-light was also drawn on various types of ideology. Finally, we discussed on the subject of ideology as a value of war/violence.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

How does ideology promote violent behaviour?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Minar, D.M. (1961). "Ideology and Political Behaviour." *Midwest Journal of Political Science*. Midwest Political Science Association.

Mullins, W.A. (1972). "On the Concept of Ideology in Political Science". *The American Political Science Review*. American Political Science Association.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2000). (6th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MODULE 3

- | | |
|--------|------------------------------|
| Unit 1 | Morality of War and Just War |
| Unit 2 | Philosophy of Pacifism |
| Unit 3 | The Dimensions of War |
| Unit 4 | Laws of War and War Crime |
| Unit 5 | Culture of Peace |

UNIT 1 MORALITY OF WAR AND JUST WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Morality of War
 - 3.2 Just War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this module, we shall be basically focusing on some of the issues that have generated conflict and debate among scholars and some other subjects. One of such areas of intellectual discourse in social sciences and peace and conflict resolution is morality and justification of war or rather just war. In this unit, we shall look at the subject of just war.

From time immemorial, war has been a source of worry to man, as it has become an object of moral question in the history of human civilisation. From period to period, war has been a regular feature, which defies any ethically conceptual interpretation. From the pre-historic to modern era, war has remained a vehicle of nobility among state actors.

War has also been the worst and deadliest disease in human civilisation where no less than two billion people must have been killed in the last five thousand years. If we are to engage in statistical interpretation of this figure, we will realise that it is an average of 400,000 deaths recorded per year in the last five thousand year.

The experience of war in the last 400 years will account for no less than 30% of the total deaths. What this means is that since the last 400 years, the number of deaths resulting from war and war-related diseases will be

on the average of one million five hundred thousand deaths per year. The mortality rate of war-mongering is high, which often tempts one to engage in intellectual inquiry on morality of war.

The questions are: Is there any morality in war-making?; Has war brought more success than failure to aggressors or combatants on one hand, and the entire human race on the other hand?; How has war impacted (negatively or positively) on human development?; How has war affected relationship among state and non-state actors?; Are there ways to limit the effect of war on man and environment?; Can war be drastically reduced, if not completely eliminated in the nearest future?; and Are there any wars that are good (just) or bad (unjust)?.. The last question forms the basis of this unit - **just war**.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the morality of war
- describe Just War and its sources.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Morality of War

There has been a great debate on the question of morality in war. The pro-war and anti-war scholars and supporters have continued to argue to support their respective views about war. The pacifists oppose war, believing that there can never be any justification for engaging in either offensive or defensive war. They also argued that war has recorded more failures than successes in human history, and man can only reach the peak of success in human history in the absence of war. Violence will only lead to violence in cyclical order as articulated by the pacifists.

Most of the ancient states perceived war as a fundamental ingredient of state nobility and a vehicle of acquiring international influence and respect. The realists see war as a desirable object to foster international peace and security. Pacifists dispute the claims by the militarists and supporters of force, arguing that war does not help man in any way in solving his relational problems. Thus, it is through peaceful methods that peace can be guaranteed.

The militarists react against the position of the pacifists, saying that it is unpatriotic, irresponsible and erratic for pacifists to castigate the use of force. The point is that the pacifists believe in forging peace among state and non state actors by putting in moral standards or laws to guide the

human conduct. The argument of the militarists is that if law is not supported by sanction or force, it is most unlikely that the law will be respected.

Thus, fervent disobedience of the law can lead to an anarchic situation, and it is through war that man can achieve the highest good, peace, security and development. It is not easy to maintain conformity among the state and non-state actors without the use of force, such that any offender or breaker of law will have to face the penalty of violence or sanction. The ultimate pragmatic argument that pacifists may offer is that violent resistance to violence always fails to bring about peace, that war can only be expected to establish a realignment of forces under principles of violence.

Besides, pacifists may argue that war frequently fails to accomplish the political or economic ends to which it is not supposedly directed, nor do the benefits usually outweigh the cost. More so, since rarely is war actually motivated by the high ideals that its supporters use to justify it. It is not all forms of radical pacifism that make pragmatic assumptions, and rather simply oppose violence.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is morality of war?

3.2 Just War

War has become one of the fundamental elements of the Christian faith, writings and teachings as it relates to Christian participation in war against the principled pacifist doctrine of early Christianity. Several political philosophers and thinkers such as St. Augustine, St. Aquinas, Hegel, Treitschke, Mann see war as a mechanism for human development and civilisation. Heinrich von Treitschke described war as the greatest activity of mankind, consequent on the noble quest by man to achieve courage, honour and ability, which are more important than any other human endeavour.

At the eruption of World War I, Thomas Mann argued that war is a source of purification of the civil corruption caused by peace, through which man can achieve liberation and great hope. This hypothesis dominated the war policy of a number of states and societies in the world. Notable among them the ancient Greece (Sparta in particular), ancient Rome, Italy, Germany (prior to World War II), among others.

Christian tradition of just war insists that war is just, if it is for the purpose of defending Christian faith and spreading the gospel of Christ

but it is forbidden for war to be waged in holy places and the day of worship. Some Christians believe that the Sabbath day is Saturday while others believe that it is Sunday. The Muslim tradition of just war forbids any harm against women and children in the prosecution of any armed conflict, and the adherents are admonished to only engage in defensive war (just war) not offensive war (unjust) as the basic philosophy of *Jihad*. The moral code of *jihad* tradition was later exemplified in international law particularly the laws of war in the 20th Century.

Just war can be regarded as that war action undertaken by a party or a group of parties to contain the activities of an aggressor or a group of aggressors. It is a war that is waged with justification. Here, we are talking about justice in war-making based on the goodness in the motive behind the violent attitude and action, which is in reaction to offensive behaviour of the other party. There are several issues that determine the nature of justice in war, and these include:

a) War as a basis for preservation of state or whole

Just war, since the time of Constantine, became an element of a larger Christian theological doctrine, which propelled the idea of marriage between religion and politics where Christians began to perceive a suitable relation between Christian faith and political power (Niebuhr, 1940). Hegel affirms that divine or spiritual interpretations of war inform us that morality and individuality are enclosed within a larger spiritual whole.

Morality and individuality do not fade away by adopting this larger perspective. Hegel further affirms that it is the whole that man reaches the highest of all goods. Thus, the state is the higher good that should be preserved even at the expense of sacrifices of individuality and moral purity. Hegel goes on to claim that peace causes nations to become “stuck in their ways,” “rigid and ossified.” Indeed, Hegel claims that even if there were peace, a nation would need to “create an enemy” because wars strengthen nations and because nations “gain internal peace as a result of wars with their external enemies” (Hegel, 1991).

Indeed, any war waged in the preservation of the state is a just war because it is through state that man can reach his highest good (greatest achievement in his chosen field). What we are saying here is that it is through collectivity that man can be best fulfilled in life. No man is an Island, you know! If anybody wants to distort the free flow of collectivity in the affairs of man and human relation, any war waged against such person can be said to be just.

The justification for waging the war will be an attempt to maintain and sustain the collective welfare of the people. A good example is Biafran War where the armed conflict was first between the Northern (Hausa) and South-eastern (Igbo) regions of Nigeria, resulting from the events that followed the 1966 military coup, which terminated the first republic under the premiership of Alhaji Tafawa Balewa (Hausa man) while the president was Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe (Igbo man). The coup was led by Major Nzeogwu Kaduna, an Army officer of Igbo origin where the Prime Minister, Tafawa Balewa, the premier of the Northern region, Sultan Ahmadu Bello, among other non-Igbo political leaders were brutally murdered.

The coup failed and General Aguyi Ironsi, the most senior military officer took advantage of the situation to become the first military head of state in Nigeria. The Ironsi regime failed to adequately address the ethno-religious problem in the military created by the Nzeogwu Kaduna coup. The majority of failed coup plotters were officers of Igbo extraction. Again, Ironsi was accused of favouring the Igbo officers above the Yoruba and Hausa officers, which a structural suspicion among various ethnic groups within the military against the Igbo officers. This situation resulted in another coup that led to the murder of Aguyi Ironsi. This time, the coup was staged by some military officers from the North in retaliation of the 1966 killings of some of the most notable political leaders in the North. The selective killings and some other issues that later cropped up, led to the outbreak of Civil War in Nigeria in 1967.

The south-eastern region of the country majorly controlled by the Igbo extractions under the leadership of Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu declared secession. The secessionist attempt precipitated the war, which lasted for three years. The point we are trying to make here is that other parts of the country joined the Nigerian troops in liquidating the secessionist project of the *Biafrans* for the survival of the whole Nigeria.

However, people who did not support the secession would likely see the decision of the Nigerian government to stop the breaking away of the eastern region from the rest of the country as just war. Nevertheless, the outcome of war often determines the justiciability in war because it is the victor that writes the story of war not the vanquished.

b) War as a basis for reconciliation

War can just be waged for the purpose of reconciliation. Hegel argues that the effect of tragedy, if taken into account, is basically

to reconcile us to ethical conflicts. According to Hegel (1920:323), “Reconciliation in tragedy is related to the resolution of specific ethical and substantive facts from their contradiction into their true harmony.”

It is war that provides the basis for the reconciliation that man desires in realising the highest good and fulfill his destiny in the collectivity. Hegel believes that human life is dominated by alienation and evident contradictions. The apparent entertainment of evil ideas by man depicts his finitude or human limitations, and this evil idea can be engaged in armed conflict for renaissance and salvation, which justifies policy of war.

Therefore, reconciliation takes place when we accomplish the philosophical space in which evil and war are understood as part of the whole. The Christian just war tradition allows Christians to make use of lesser evils in order to obtain greater goods, which is not in conformity with the absolute pacifist philosophy that characterised the early Christianity.

Constantine changed the pacifist tradition of Christianity as laid down by Jesus Christ, to the one which operates uniquely under just war theory. The “heresy” of Constantine sacrifices spiritual and ethical purity of the Christian tradition for allegiance to political life (Yoder, 2003).

Through the “heresy” of Constantine, many soldiers became Christians, as many Christians partook in military operations in the preservation of political entity. Since then, politicisation of religion and religiousisation of politics became institutionalised in Europe, which was also imported to Africa through imperial conquest, not without bitter tales.

St. Augustine also gave a support to the tradition of just war in Christianity, such that man can kill fellow man for the purpose of spreading the gospel of Christ. The Muslim tradition asserts that it is just war for adopting violence against the “infidels”, and if one dies in the process of waging war against the unbelievers (or even non-believers), the person will be regarded as martyr and he will be greatly rewarded by God with eternal paradise. The killing of a fellow Muslim is forbidden by Muslim law except there are justifications in doing so, but killing an “infidel” is a just cause.

c) War as a basis for patriotism

Prosecution of war is important to the wellbeing of modern states because it assists in promoting patriotism and prevents states from

falling into contradictions self-satisfaction and stagnation of peace. Hegel argues that a war is just if the motive is to bring the state out of the doldrums of complacency brought by peace stagnation.

Long-term peace affects states negatively because it causes states to become “stuck in their ways,” “rigid and ossified.” Hegel goes further to advise states that if there were peace, they should try and “create an enemy” because wars strengthen nations and because nations “gain internal peace as a result of wars with their external enemies” (Hegel, 1991:325).

If the basis of war is to promote patriotism, such war can be considered to be just. Long decorum created by peace can affect the patriotism among the citizens of a particular state because the best time to put the people’s patriotism to test is during war, and if war is not fought on regular intervals, the people’s patriotism may dwindle to the detriment of the state.

d) War as a basis for love of honour

The love of honour can also attract incident of war between two or more state and non state actors. Kant argues that despite the fact that war is horrible, it remains an “indispensable means” of spiritual progress (Kant, 1991:323). Kant, in “Perpetual Peace”, presents a theory of justice in war (also developed in the Metaphysics of Morals).

In addition, Kant points out that nature employs war as a way of creating human progress (Kant, 1991: 108-114). This includes stimulating the love of honor, which is essential element of human dignity. Indeed, it is just to wage war for the sake of winning honour. Nigeria has involved in several humanitarian interventions in West Africa and elsewhere, particularly in the area of military peacekeeping operations. The country has committed a lot of human and material resources in keeping peace in Africa. The main reason for the various humanitarian efforts by Nigeria is basically for the love of honour rather than economic benefits.

e) War as a basis for history

War can be regarded as just if the thrust of its cause is to contribute to the development of history. Cassirer (1943) maintains that war remains a means that can be applied in realising the goal of history and that war is a good and desirable thing for the life of a nation. The importance of history in shaping the destiny of a man (nation) cannot be over-emphasised (Popper, 1971:8).

A country that is less popular can adopt war as strategy to secure relevance in history. The war of terror declared by Al-Qaeda network against the Western world has been justified, not basically as a religious war but as war against capitalism and western values, which has a great influence on modern history.

Since, the collapse of the Soviet Union towards the end of 1980s, many political commentators and scholars thought that the event of the collapse of the USSR would bring change to the global system from bi-polarism to uni-polarism where the US would be the Police of the world, and no state would contest its (the US) supremacy. But now the reverse is the case, as the US is not only tormented by state actors but also by non-state actors like Al-Qaeda Network. The current global political situation has created a history of powerful nations becoming preys in the hands of asymmetric non-state actors.

The experience in Iraq is also an example of justification of war where the *Sunni* insurgents have been a thorn in the flesh of the US led coalition forces. The guerilla warfare adopted by these insurgents is to violently protest against the change in the *status quo* as facilitated by the US dethronement of Saddam administration in Iraq, which favoured more the *Sunnis* than the *Shiites*.

Meanwhile, to the *Shiites*, the US invasion was a just war, against their greatest enemy-Saddam Hussein, but the *Sunni* Iraqis would regard it as an attempt to undermine their historical relevance in the country. Indeed, the battle for supremacy between the *Shiite* and *Sunni* Muslims in Iraq has remained a major source of the historical destiny of Iraqi people.

f) War as a basis for the respect of law

Just war is essential in creating a network for individual state and non-state actors to conform to the accepted norms and values. Without war parties will flagrantly disobey the law. The approach of just war in the maintenance of law and order form the basis of “Augustinian” compromise, which subscribes that it is just to employ war or violence with the aim of maintaining *tranquillitas ordinis*. This order is described by George Weigel as “the order created by just political community and mediated through law” (Weigel, 2003).

Bearing in mind the foregoing, one will accept that just war is waged as an essential mechanism to ensure the defense or protection of the tranquility of a well-ordered political community.

This is a compromise that allows the use of violence or immoral methods in pursuit of the higher good of defending the well-ordered political community. Christian just war theories might invoke the ideas of sin and grace in order to reconcile us to this compromise.

Today, a number of people see just war as legitimate, only if it is backed by international organisations like the United Nations. International Law however, recognises two forms of war as just, and these include a war waged against an aggressor in the defense of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity; and the war sanctioned by the United Nations Security Council. There are at least five reasons for justification of war in international law. These may include:

- Collective intervention in the pursuit of the objectives of the United Nations especially as it relates to advancing peace and security
- Protection of the rights and interests as well as safety of a nation's citizens by the government. A country can justify any articulation of violence against another country if the intention is to advance the interest and safety of its citizen(s), e.g. Israel's invasion of Entebbe, Uganda to rescue its citizens held hostage in Uganda by terrorists who were supported by Idi Amin.
- Self defense is another reason to justify articulation of violence by any party
- Aggression against external interference in the internal affairs by another country is justifiable and
- Aggression to contain any violence against a state under a nation's protection. For instance, any attempt by any nation to attack a nation having a defence pact with the US can be justifiably resisted violently by the US.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain the bases of just war.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Just war denotes that war can be fought, if there are genuine justifications in doing so. A party can decide to wage war against another party if there is justification in taking such aggressive decision or action. It is important to know that it is not every violent action can be justified. This is because every aggressor will definitely have his/her reason(s) for the violent behaviour he/she has decided to exhibit. Sometimes, there may be good reasons by a party to carry-out a violent action against another party but such aggressive engagement can be

found not to have moral validation. What moral justifications will a nation to kill innocent people in another state just because it is pursuing its (national) political interest or any other reason(s)?

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the question of morality in war-making. Our searchlight was also beamed on the tradition of just war and it has created moral responsibility during war. We highlighted a number of factors that determine the justification in waging war. We also discussed how just war theory has affected the religious tradition of Christianity and Islam, which undermines the absolute pacifist nature of these religions.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Explain any three sources of just war, drawing case studies from the African's theatre of armed conflict.
- ii. Describe the term just war.
- iii. Since the Constantine "heresy", the Christian tradition of absolute pacifism has taken a new shape where Christians can, as a just cause, adopt the use of small evil to achieve greater good. Discuss.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Cassirer, E. (1943). "The Science of History." In: Strayer, J. (Ed.). *The Interpretation of History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (1920). *Philosophy of Fine Art*. London: G. Bell (Vol. 4).
- Hegel, G.W.F (1991). *Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (1991). "Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History." In: H. Reiss, Kant's *Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niebuhr, R. (1940). *Christianity and Power Politics*. New York: Scribners.
- Popper, K. (1971). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weigel, G. (2003). "Moral Clarity in a Time of War." *First Things*. 139 (February).
- Yoder, J.H. (2003). *The Original Revolution*. Herald Press.

UNIT 2 PHILOSOPHY OF PACIFISM

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Definition of Pacifism
 - 3.2 Origin of Pacifism
 - 3.3 Types of Pacifism
 - 3.4 Critique of Pacifism
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Several social movements have sprung up to castigate and campaign against the culture of violence and war. The civil and social movements started from ancient Greece, China, India and medieval Europe to the modern civil rights and abolitionist movements in the United States. Anti-violence campaign has become anti war principle and pacifist ideology.

The pacifist campaign has nonetheless formed the basis for the strong moral philosophy that discourages every act or action that may involve the application of violence and force. In this unit, we are going to beam our searchlight on pacifism and its relevance in promoting peace and security through its anti-violence agenda.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, you should be able to:

- define the term pacifism
- explain the origin of pacifism
- describe types of pacifism
- discuss the critique of pacifism.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Definition of Pacifism

Pacifism can be described as any peaceable act, which prohibits the use of violence and force in the resolution of conflict that may arise in the

social interaction that forms the basis of human relations. Pacifism is a moral philosophy that discourages military ideals and aggression. Pacifists believe that every conflict between state and non-state actors should always be resolved through peaceful approaches rather than the use of force and violence, knowing full well that violence can only bring about more violence.

If violence is going to bring peace at all, such peace will always be negative form, which is likely to generate another bloody conflict of different dimension, scale and intensity. Pacifists also hold that international war should always be resolved by diplomatic and judicial means to forestall (continued) butchery of innocent souls and destruction of property. Pacifism is not limited to just war, but can also include opposing the application of any form of violence in the resolution of conflict. The use of dove symbol is associated with pacifism. Dove symbolises the hope of salvation and peace.

The pacifists have persistently maintained that war or violence is negative as it has failed to address human problems, and there is need to do everything to prevent violent situation. But it is important to note here that it is not every aspect of pacifism that rejects violence in its totality, which brings us to the question of which violent action is just or unjust. Some pacifists oppose war but not the use of force against individuals. They only oppose military institutions of the modern state. This set of pacifists is known as **anti-militarists**. In the next segment, we shall focus on the origin of pacifism.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define the term pacifism.

3.2 Origin of Pacifism

Pacifism can be said, to have begun since the pre-historic era where the early people took cognisance of the need to prevent total war and reduce the terrible impact of war on man and his environment. Utmost passion and respect for human life and general ecosystem formed the centerpiece of Jainism, a pacifist movement founded by Mahavira (599-527 BC). This pacifist ideology accords a great premium on the inestimable value of human life as well as the sanctity of human blood. No matter the crime committed by a man, it is extremely irrational to harm or kill him.

The ancient Greece also opposed any form of violence among individuals but its pacifist philosophy did not include any opposition to inter-state aggression. Jesus Christ of Nazareth also promoted advocacy

of pacifism. He called on all men to be peaceful and to always conduct themselves in a way devoid of violence. He also opposed violence in its entirety, saying that no excuse could be given for violence. He, therefore, maintained that if a man slaps you on a cheek, you should turn the other.

Prior to the reign of Constantine, the early church upheld the principle of pacifism as preached by Jesus (Weidhorn, 2004: 13-18). During the reign of the Roman Emperor, Constantine I, the church began to venture into politics as many Christian leaders and faithful got entangled with the mundane political power and authority.

Consequently, the principle of pacifism became less fashionable among the Christians, leading to the eventual prominence of just war in the Christendom. The use of violence to fight against evil and injustice was a just war. Waging a war against the enemies or perceived enemies of Christendom could be regarded as a just war. Apart from Constantine, St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas also threw their weight behind the repudiation of Christ version of pacifism where they argued that there is justification if one takes to violence (as a last resort) to protect his rights and seek for justice.

In the modern history, Peace Churches, the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Amish, Mennonites and Church of the Brethren have played prominent roles in their pacifist struggle and anti-war campaign. The Quakers were very popular in the US, in its campaign against violence and militarism. There was strong anti-war sentiment in the West during the 19th century.

Many socialist groups and movements in that century were anti-militarists who condemned war by its nature. War was a kind of institutional coercion facilitated by political leadership, imposed on the working class, who were mandated to fight and die in wars. And the war provided no benefit to the working class. Those who benefitted from the war(s) were the bourgeoisie never experienced the agonies and pains of the battlefields.

The assassination of a French socialist leader, Jean Jaure on 31 July 1914 further propelled international campaign against militarism and jingoistic attitude of political leaders. Peace societies like Peace Pledge Union, the War Register's League, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom sprang up during this period. The writings of Dutch philosophers and jurists, Desiderius Erasmus and Hugo Grotius in the 15th and 16th centuries also promoted pacifist ideology and the need to resolve conflict through peaceful methods.

Their works gave prominence to the importance of international law in the peaceful resolution of conflict.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) popularly known as Mahatma Gandhi, a Hindu nationalist leader through his exemplary political and spiritual leadership also contributed immensely to pacifism. His (peaceable) activities were instrumental to the eventual political independence of India. He was the initiator of *Satyagraha*, a form of mass civil disobedience and agitation against colonial tyranny. The ideology was built around *Ahimsa*, a philosophy of non violence and pacifism.

The aftermath of World War I experienced an increase in the pacifist literature and movements. Many of these literature or writings were banned in several European states, notable among them were fascist Italy under the draconian leadership of Benito Mussolini, the Nazi Germany among others. Pacifism was then mistaken for cowardice by several militarist elements in Europe at that time.

The eruption of World War II gave a new meaning to pacifism as many of the committed pacifists supported the counter-aggression of the Allied forces and Germany and its Axis forces. Bertrand Russell also supported the arms struggle against the Nazi Germany, claiming that the war policy of the allied forces was a welcome idea, which helped Europe and entire world to check the excesses of Hitler Germany and its fascist allies. This position was what Russell referred to as *relative pacifism*

During the same period, Dorothy Day and Ammon Hennacy of the Catholic Worker Movement called on the young Americans not to consider being enlisted in the military service. In the wake of the Cold War and the attendant nuclear proliferation and armament, more pacifist movements sprang up and some of these groups include Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in the United Kingdom among others. Another notable pacifist was Martin Luther King Jr. (1929-1968), the leader of the American Civil Rights Movement. He really provided exemplary leadership in his campaign against militarism and violence.

3.3 Types of Pacifism

Principled or radical pacifism

Principled or radical pacifism is a form of pacifism, which condemns the use of violence without reservations. It is argued that it is unethical, immoral, sinful and irresponsible for any party to apply force or violence for any reason, even defense. Radical pacifists would believe

that it is better to be killed while sticking firmly to their principles of nonviolence than to fight back and survive (principle over practicality). Rather than engage in violence, radical pacifists would consider submitting to violence against them as the only morally acceptable option, and consider their death noble martyrdom.

Radical pacifism is so controversial, such that it is only a few religions like Jainism, a number of Buddhist tradition and the peace churches that advocate it. If a man is being pursued by another fellow with a knife, such a man, according to radical pacifism, should never consider adopting a counter-violence as a measure for self-defense. Rather than defend himself with the use of violence, it is considered better that he allows himself to be harmed or killed by his enemy.

Radical pacifists usually argue that there is no way violence as negative action, will produce positive circumstances. There can never be good evil, war is evil and it remains evil, which every man must strive to do away with. Principled or radical pacifism advocates that there can never be any genuine reason for the use of violence, and there is always a justification for absolute repudiation of violence and war because they are enemies of humanity. Radical pacifists also believe that, though, there may always be conflict among state and non-state actors but such conflict must always be resolved through peaceful methods.

Several radical pacifists have also advocated that, in the time of war, people are conscientiously free to tell the government that they would not be part of any aggression against any other state or in defense of their state from external aggression. Even those serving in the military, through their pacifist convictions are also conscientiously free to take part in war not as combatants but may offer some non-violent civilian assistance. Such assistance may include taking care of the injured, driving the ambulance, and providing humanitarian assistance to war victims and civil population.

During World Wars I & II, many radical pacifists were crucified, jailed or killed by the home governments while many of them were seen as cowards, others were regarded as enemies of state and traitors. A good example of such radical pacifists was the American pacifist advocate, David Dellinger.

Pragmatic pacifism

Pragmatic pacifism is another version of pacifism which is slightly different from those mentioned earlier. As radical pacifism absolutely condemns the use of violence, pragmatic pacifism also opposes the application of violence but with reservation. The reservation is that if there is a genuine reason like the case of self defense, it is not immoral

to use violence (but as a last resort) to defend oneself against any aggressor. This view falls in line with the ideals of pacifism but it is somehow pragmatic in its approach to non-violence. It is pragmatic for a pacifist to adopt the use of violence in defending his country against any external attack.

Many religious organisations are found in this school of thought. For instance, Catholic Movement as a pacifist organisation does not totally oppose the use of violence but it must be considered as a last resort after all alternative peaceful methods have been explored, and yielding no fruitful result. The Church believes in pragmatic sense, if peace cannot give one peace, then it is not absolutely immoral to take to violence as the only option left.

It is confusing if one argues that the Catholic Movement believes in violence. No! The stand of the Church is ethical, believing that it is not irresponsible for any party to use violence to defend himself against any aggressor. Here, emphasis is centered on self-defense, not self-aggression or any other form of aggression. The position of the Church is similar to that of the political realists in international relations.

Thus, if the activities or excesses of aggressors remain unchecked the entire world would be no less a true demonstration of Hobessian state of nature where the life of man will remain brutish, nasty and short. This view is shared by Edmund Burke who argues that “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.” The view is also given a biblical support, “if you rebuke Satan, Satan flees”. The use of ‘rebuke’ in biblical context means that defending oneself against the spears of the enemy is a just cause, and Satan is the enemy of man and must be attacked, for man to enjoy eternal glory, happiness and above all peace. Pragmatic pacifism is also popular among the Muslims, who view the necessity of *Jihad*, as a defensive war of salvation and peace. By and large, both Islam and Christianity and several other religious sects, including those claiming to be radical pacifists have been found to be members of this school of thought.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the various types of pacifism?

3.4 Criticisms of Pacifism

The paradox of non-violence

The position of pacifism on non-violence and peaceful approaches to resolving any conflict situation is criticised. The need to adopt violence may be productive or counter-productive. The position of the pragmatic

pacifists on good and bad evils of violence remains a subject of debate. It is the end product of any violent act or aggression that determines its justification especially as it relates to the promotion of peace.

Thus, it is the end that justifies the means. If we consider the absolute justification of radical pacifism in the repudiation of violence, one may contest its ethical significance in the world where the aggressor tramples on the rights of people without being checked. A good instance was the World War II. If the use of violence was not adopted against Nazi Germany under the tutelage of Adolf Hitler, Germany may likely remain a deviant nation, which will torment the entire human race.

What is greater than using violence to liquidate a blood-sucking and draconian regime where rights of people are abused with impunity and mass murder has become a veritable tool of government policy? Another is apartheid South Africa where the Blacks were subjected to unimaginable animalism and brutality as the Black Africans have been able to get respite after a long arms struggle between the African insurgents and the apartheid government.

Self contradictory doctrine

Several scholars including Jan Narveson maintain that pacifism is self-contradictory doctrine. According to Narveson everyone has rights and responsibilities not to violate other people's rights. In as much as pacifists agree to not defend themselves, aggressors may take advantage of the situation, by infringing the rights of these pacifists. The attitude of the pacifists often obliterates the responsibility flow in the relation among men, such that an aggressor will continue to thrive in his dastardly act as he pays no penalty for offensive behaviour. Therefore, the unchecked excesses of the aggressor may likely lead to further aggression, which will result in the abuse of rights.

Narveson (1965:259-271), affirms that: "The prevention of infractions of that right is precisely what one has a right to when one has a right at all."

Narveson then concludes that it is not immoral to use violence or any other means to protect one's rights, and engaging an aggressor in violence is not irresponsible. It does not also paint one as unpacifist person in as much that violence adopted by one is for self-defense (*ibid*).

Ethical contradictions of pacifism

Many scholars and commentators have crucified pacifists for pretending to be in total opposition to the use of violence while many of them have at one time or the other resorted to violence. No one can work against his nature. God has created man to have human instinct-fight for

survival. Some men by their nature will always try to outsmart the other, and in trying to do so, violence may be employed as the most viable vehicle to meet the inordinate needs. It will be quite unnatural for the other man or men not to react swiftly against such irrational and aggressive behaviour to forestall being used as preys. It is funny that many of these pacifists preaching absolute justification to oppose violence and war, often resort to violence when they are pushed to the wall.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Pacifism can be both passive and active. It is **passive** in the sense that a person can refuse to fight while **active** when a person is working for peace. Several pacifists are recognised as conscientious objectors basically, by their refusal to take part in any official violence. These people oppose aggression and their profession may mandate them to be part of military operation but they may refuse to take part and opt for non-violent operations.

Some governments recognise these people (for their non-violent philosophy), while other governments may regard them as traitors or unpatriotic elements or cowards. Pacifism has continued to play a major role in the campaign against arms proliferation, armament and militarism. The activities of the pacifist movements cover every continent, seeking for global peace and security as development of culture of non-violence.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to cover the definition of pacifism as a philosophy and practice of non-violence and peaceful resolution of conflict as well as total repudiation of offensive violence. We also discussed the origin of pacifism vis-a-vis pacifist movements in human history.

We went further to explain the two major types of pacifism as radical/principled pacifism and pragmatic pacifism. We finally examined the challenges/critique of pacifism.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. “Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that. Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence, and toughness multiplies toughness in a

descending spiral of destruction.... The chain reaction of evil — hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars — must be broken, or we shall be plunged into the dark abyss of annihilation" (Martin Luther King Jr.).

- ii. Consider the above statement to analyse any conflict situation in Nigeria and why violence is not a good option in the resolution of conflict.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Narveson, J. (1965). "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis." *Ethics*, LXXV: 4.

Weidhorn, M. (2004). "Pacifism Lost." *International Journal of Humanities and Peace*, 20 (1).

UNIT 3 THE DIMENSIONS OF WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Bitter-End or Joint Survival
 - 3.2 Fundamental or Accidental
 - 3.3 Manageable or Unmanageable
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In any armed conflict between two or more parties, there are three major dimensions of war based on the character and implications of each war situation. In this unit we shall be focusing on the three aspects of war.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss both the bitter-end and joint survival dimensions of war
- describe the fundamental and accidental aspects or dimensions of war
- distinguish between the manageable and unmanageable dimensions of war.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Bitter-End or Joint Survival

Bitter end armed conflict involves a situation whereby one of the warring parties is likely to survive in the conduct of the armed hostility between these warring parties. In this case, one of the contending parties will be subjected to the confines of complete surrender where the winner will determine the post-conflict destiny of the defeated party.

In Bitter End wars, one (of the) or both parties in armed conflict will indeed be eager to use strategies of annihilation with the utmost desire to decimate the ranks of enemy forces. The party will work towards distorting its enemy's independence and undermining its political sovereignty.

In so doing, the political and military or the entire security command of the defeated party will fall under the clutches of external domination of the (victorious) party. Here, politics of survival of the fittest comes into play while the warring parties are likely to use any kind of military hardware or weapons to enjoy comparative advantage over each other.

The parties are often tempted to use weapons of mass destruction in their determination to defeat the other party. A good example of this is World War II. The allied forces led by the US and the defunct Soviet Union on one hand and the Axis forces, which included the Germany, Italy and Japan on the other engaged each other in ‘bitter end’ war.

It is important to know the background behind the coming together of Germany, Italy and Japan to forge a formidable pact. Several decades before the eruption of World War II, Japan’s aim to dominate China and to achieve its imperial interest in the trading area of south-eastern Asia and the neighbouring pacific was being challenged by the US.

The US felt concerned over Japan’s breach of the “Open Door” policy in China. In order to prevail on Japan, the US withdrew its thirty year old commercial treaty with her (Japan) in July 1939. Subsequently, the US imposed an embargo on Japan on certain strategic goods.

Due to the severance of diplomatic tie between the US and Japan, Germany took the advantage of consolidating its bilateral relation with Japan for strategic reasons. The aim of Germany was to turn away the US attention from the Atlantic to the Pacific. By September 1940, Germany, Italy, and Japan had concluded plan to form a Three-Power Pact, which included mutual assistance of its members whenever any of these members is engaged in war by any other power.

Later in the middle of 1941, Japan became further frustrated as a result of the US embargo, particularly in aviation gasoline and aircraft engines. After the diplomatic initiatives of the Japanese failed to yield positive result, she then opted for military solution against the US, and by December, 1941, the government of Japan concluded to embark on military aggression against the US.

On the 7th December, 1941, the Japanese launched an air raid on the Pearl Harbour where several American casualties and huge material losses were recorded. The aggression by the Japanese and the subsequent declaration of war against the US by Germany and Italy on December 11 same year, forced the US to fully participate in World War II.

The US was eventually integrated into the Allied forces, which later destroyed the Nazi Germany and other Axis satellites. By 1944, there had been tremendous successes recorded by the Allied forces in Europe against the Germany and its axis ally, Italy. The military campaign remained an enormous task due to a number of strategic factors including the large troops numbering over five million being controlled by Japan.

The US saw the need to adopt more effective strategy to facilitate the defeat of the Japanese, knowing that an ‘... invasion of Japan, it was estimated, would cost more than a million Allied casualties and at least again that many Japanese’ (Strayer, *et al.* 1961: 577). The use of atomic bomb was later considered and used by the US.

The Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were plagued with atomic bombs, which resulted in the death of 78,000 people in Hiroshima and 50,000 people in Nagasaki. The US bombardment of the two cities (Hiroshima and Nagasaki) led to the eventual surrender of Japan on August 14, 1945. The surrender of Japan marked the end of World War II.

Joint survival aspect of war demands that armed conflict relation between two warring parties is such that both parties are likely to survive. The warring parties don’t usually lose their sovereignty and political powers on the termination of war. This aspect of war is more dominant in war between two symmetric powers with very little or no comparative advantage in military terms (balance of terror).

The parties are somehow conscious of their policy as regards the military confrontation between themselves, considering the likely consequences of any reckless military campaign because of the symmetric military power relation. Some other factors can also be considered in the conduct of war including cultural relationship (homogeneity), as caution is taken to prevent huge human and material losses by both parties in the conduct of war due to their blood ties. Thus, it does not make sense to engage one’s brother in total war.

In Joint Survival, the parties at war often try as much as possible to avoid high casualty rate as they both attempt not to permanently get rid of each other knowing that they can still engage each other in peace or in another war in the nearest future, which makes them to conduct their military aggression against each other moderately.

In addition, the parties always create a platform for themselves through which they can address their differences. This the parties can achieve if total war tactic is mutually avoided because it will be quite difficult for

genuine reconciliation to take place between the (former) warring parties if one of the parties suffers too much human and material losses compared to the other.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Distinguish between bitter-end and joint survival dimensions of war.

3.2 Fundamental or Accidental

As a professional or student in the field of peace and conflict resolution, before one adopts any technique or area of intervention, it is imperative that he/she investigates the character of the war. This is to know if the war is fundamental or accidental. The latter is easier to resolve than the former. A **fundamental war** is very difficult to settle because the source(s) of the armed conflict is rooted in some permanent basic structure of one or both of the parties. Fundamental factors may include religion, identity, nationalism, racial question, language, (sometimes) land, among others.

The Cold War was a good example of fundamental war. The tension was between the East bloc led by the defunct USSR and the West bloc was under tutelage of the US. The period attracted excessive proliferation of weapons by the activities of the then two major powers (the USSR and US) in the world. Each of these blocs, though not in open confrontation in the real sense of it, engaged each other in proxy war.

The period deepened the vulnerability of African states to war as several countries on the continent became victims of civil strife within the framework of ideological commotion, which divided most African countries in their internal politics along the two major ideological divides: socialism and capitalism. The experience of Africa since the Cold War era is not good at all, as violence and civil war and its consequences still plague the entire continent.

Similarly, the armed conflict between the Palestine and Israel is also fundamental, particularly on the question of who should permanently control Jerusalem. Even if Israel agrees that Jerusalem should be under Palestine's control, large number of world Christian population will kick against it. If Palestinians are bent on re-annexing the city of Jerusalem and with continued presence of fundamental obstacles, resolving the crisis in the Middle East will remain a utopian (difficult) task.

Now let us discuss the **accidental war** aspect. An accidental war is transitory and its reoccurrence is somehow unlikely. This is based on the unexpected and passing circumstances. This aspect of war partially

corroborates the position of the historical theorists of war who argue that wars are traffic accidents.

But here, we are discussing the accidental aspect of war not that we support the view of the historical theorists generalising all war as traffic accidents in the history of mankind. Accidental war is less difficult to settle because it does not have any crucial permanent structure in both parties.

The tension between Nigeria and Cameroon over the ownership of Bakassi, which almost broke into full scale war can be said to be an accidental war, which is not likely to occur again. The military aggression by the Cameroon, which led to the killing of some Nigerian soldiers on the peninsula and the subsequent counter-attack by the Nigerian troops was transitory not fundamental. It is unlikely that such a situation will recur in the nearest future particularly as the conflict has been resolved by the two neighbouring countries.

The militarists have suggested that the fundamental or accidental nature of any war does not determine its level of fatality and escalation. Accidental war can be more fatal than a fundamental war based on the character of the war.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Describe fundamental and accidental dimensions of war.

3.3 Manageable or Unmanageable

Manageable war is an aspect of war in which the warring parties enjoy optimal joint control of the war event to prevent to a large extent uncontrolled or uncontrollable destruction. In this case, the enemies consciously watch the war event in such a way that they will not lose the control of the military campaign against each other. A good example is the attitude of the US, China, and defunct Soviet Union in the conduct of their covert military support in the Korean War where the three great powers mindfully guided their actions and military assistance to the warring parties: the South and North Koreas, according to two ideological pole, capitalism and communism respectively.

Again, these great powers were able to manage their involvement in the war without formally joining one of the warring parties against the other. Knowing the strategic implication of such an action, they rather continued providing covert military assistance (or providing such under guise of the United Nations). These powers became prisoners of the prevailing chain of events that surrounded the war (Hoppe, 1975).

On the other hand, **unmanageable war** is the opposite of the above-mentioned aspect of war. In unmanageable war, the parties lose the control of the event(s) of war as each of them will indeed centre its focus on the way(s) to enjoy superior advantage over the other party. Here, there seems to be growing military build-up, increased armament will become manifest in their conflict relation and loss of capacity to control or prevent massive or monumental destruction by the warring parties becomes more visible.

When an armed conflict reaches this stage of crisis, it may be difficult to resolve such war unless the parties have begun to experience the law of diminishing returns or if one of the parties has been able to gain much military advantage over the other party, which is likely to lead to the surrender of the weak party.

Sometimes, peace interveners or practitioners deliberately allow war to degenerate into unmanageable stage so that the parties will be eager to accept diplomatic solution when the offer is given to them by neutral mediator(s) or peace practitioner(s), after they (parties) must have become victims of war fatigue.

But this position needs to be supported by careful study of the war situation before it is adopted. This view was evident in the civil war in Rwanda in the 1990s, which later took a genocidal dimension and a huge refugee flow on the continent. Had it been, there was early intervention by the respective international-governmental institutions, the fatality rate of the crisis would have been minimised.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What do you understand by manageable and unmanageable dimensions of war?

4.0 CONCLUSION

Knowing the dimensions of any war or armed conflict often assist the peace practitioner or conflict intervener. It affords us a great opportunity to know the best way we to intervene in an armed conflict. If the parties applied total war tactic in the conduct of their armed hostilities, it may be pretty difficult to bring the parties to conflict transformation, particularly when one party suffers far more destruction and fatality than the other party.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss a wide-range of issues as regards the various dimensions of war basically drawing our case studies from Africa in particular as well as the world at large. We explained the bitter-end and joint survival aspects or dimensions of war. We went further to describe fundamental and accidental dimensions of war.

We also distinguished between the manageable and unmanageable aspects or dimensions of war. It is hoped you have been able to learn one thing or the other in this unit as regards the dimensions of war?

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Can Nigerian civil war be described as unmanageable war?
- ii. Discuss any two wars you consider to be of fundamental dimension.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Hopkes, T. (1975). *The Limits of Intervention*. (2nd ed.) New York: McKay.

Strayer, J.R., Hans W.G., & Harbison, H.E. (1961). *The Course of Civilisation*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. (Volume 2).

UNIT 4 LAWS OF WAR AND WAR CRIME

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Sources of the Laws of War
 - 3.2 Principles of the Laws of War
 - 3.3 War Crime
 - 3.4 Issue of Responsibility in War Crime
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

There are two parts to the laws of war (or Law of Armed Conflict), and these include *jus in bello*, which means the law concerning acceptable practices in the conduct of armed conflict or war; and *jus ad bellum*, which involves law regarding acceptable justifications for the violence. These laws of armed conflict are not only applicable to states but are also binding on individuals or non-state actors. The violation(s) of the rules guiding the conduct of war as enshrined in various international legal documents and institutions constitute war crime offence(s). In this unit, we shall be discussing several issues regarding the laws of war and war crime.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- highlight various sources of the laws of war
- explain the principles of the laws of war
- describe war crime
- discuss issues of responsibility in war crime.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Sources of the Laws of War

In addressing unbearable humanitarian disaster and reckless prosecution of war by the parties in armed conflicts, a number of international instruments have been developed to guide the conduct of war. These international instruments include the United Nations Charter, the

Geneva Conventions and the Hague Conventions, which are very prominent to guide the way wars are to be waged.

There are also customary laws of war, many of which were adopted at the Nuremberg War Trials. These laws describe both the *permissive* rights of states as well as *prohibitions* on their conduct when dealing with irregular forces and non-signatories. These international legal instruments provide guiding principles for every phase of war or armed conflict ranging from the declaration of war to the conduct of armed hostility to the end of war. Miller (2005: 80) observes that: “The initiation of war customarily requires some form of official or unofficial declaration, and conclusions to war are usually facilitated by formal agreements among the belligerents. Such declarations enable war to be ‘officially’ under way even when no military maneuvers have been undertaken. In an effort to afford some minimum principles of humanity in relation to war, the Geneva Conventions, adopted in 1949 and augmented by the Geneva Protocol in 1977, outline conditions on the treatment of combatants, prisoners of war, and civilians; protection of medical and religious facilities and practitioners; and restrictions of certain types of weapons.”

It is quite important to highlight the international legal documents, multilateral resolutions, court judgments and other relevant documents, which are the sources of the laws of war. These may include:

- 1864 First Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field
- 1868 St. Petersburg Declaration Renouncing the Use, in Time of War, of Explosive projectiles Under 400 Grammes Weight
- 1874 Project of an International Declaration concerning the Laws and Customs of War (Brussels Declaration). Signed in Brussels 27 August. This agreement never entered into force, but formed part of the basis for the codification of the laws of war at the 1899 Hague Peace Conference
- 1880 Manual of the Laws and Customs of War at Oxford, which formed the basis for the codification of the laws of war in the 1899 Hague Peace Conference
- 1925 Geneva protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare
- 1927-1930 Greco-German Arbitration Tribunal
- 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact, which is also regarded as the **Pact of Paris**
- 1938 League of Nations Declaration for the Protection of Civilian Populations Against Bombing From the Air in Case of War

- 1938 Amsterdam Draft Convention for the Protection of Civilian Populations Against New Engines of War
- 1929 Geneva Convention, Relative to the treatment of prisoners of war
- 1930 Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament (London Naval Treaty 22 April)
- 1936 Second London Naval Treaty (25 March)
- 1945 United Nations Charter (entered into force on October 24, 1945)
- 1946 Judgment of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg
- 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
- 1949 Geneva Convention I for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field
- 1949 Geneva Convention II for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea
- 1949 Geneva Convention III Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War
- 1949 Geneva Convention IV Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War
- 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict
- 1971 Zagreb Resolution of the Institute of International Law on Conditions of Application of Humanitarian Rules of Armed Conflict to Hostilities in which the United Nations Forces May be Engaged
- 1977 United Nations Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques
- 1977 Geneva Protocol I Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts
- 1977 Geneva Protocol II Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts
- 1978 Red Cross Fundamental Rules of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts
- 1980 United Nations Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW)
- 1980 Protocol I on Non-Detectable Fragments
- 1980 Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices

- 1980 Protocol III on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons
- 1995 Protocol IV on Blinding Laser Weapons
- 1996 Amended Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices
- Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War (Protocol V to the 1980 Convention), 28 November 2003, entered into force on 12 November, 2006
- 1994 San Remo Manual on International Law Applicable to Armed Conflicts at Sea
- 1994 ICRC/UNGA Guidelines for Military Manuals and Instructions on the Protection of the Environment in Time of Armed Conflict
- 1994 UN Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel
- 1996 The International Court of Justice advisory opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons
- 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (Ottawa Treaty) and
- 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Highlight any ten sources of the Laws of War.

3.2 Principles of the Laws of War

International criminal law has made it an offence for any party to carry out any military act that contravenes the existing instruments of international humanitarian law that regulate the conduct of armed hostilities. One may find the codification of rules to guide the conduct of armed conflict or war laughable due to the destructive character that war presents in the first place.

Then how can the state of lawlessness and anarchy that a situation portends be regulated when the basic objective of every of the warring parties is to use any available means to gain military and strategic advantage over the other party? In such a situation it is very likely that total war and wanton destruction in human and material terms may be employed to get rid of the enemy-state.

For instance, in fulfilling its desire to bring Japan to its knees during World War II, the United States resorted to the use of atomic bomb against the Japanese. The virulent effects of the atomic bombs on the

Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki still torment the general ecosystem in those cities after several decades. States have realised the need to develop a number of legal frameworks to regulate how war is fought. Through these international legal documents or instruments, a number of principles have emerged. These principles include:

- The conduct of war should be restricted to achieving the political objectives, which formed the basis for the emergence of the war in the first place. Thus, reckless destruction must be avoided by warring parties.
- War should not be prolonged unnecessarily and efforts should be made to bring the war to a close to reduce the scar, the attendant violence that dominates war policy is likely to produce.
- The warring parties are mandated not to harm non-combatants and also no hardship should be imposed on them (non-combatant parties) by the parties in armed conflict. Therefore, no aggression should be directed against the parties not involved in the armed conflict and their property be excluded from destruction by the warring parties.
- Total war tactic should be avoided by the warring parties, and both combatants and noncombatants should not be subjected to extreme animalism or unnecessary pain.
- The warring parties should respect the fundamental human rights of non-combatant persons or unarmed civilians, the prisoners of war, the wounded and sick, and humanitarian workers, among others.
- The warring parties should not conscript under-aged children in the conduct of their war. International law has also made conscription of children under eighteen as criminal through the convention on the rights of the child and its Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, while the Statute of the International Criminal Court established on 1st July 2002, has considered recruitment of children under the age of fifteen years as soldiers, as war crime.
- A surrendered combatant should not be harmed and no belligerent should disguise as civilian in his conduct of armed hostility.
- Sexual abuse and rape and other crimes against humanity should be avoided by the warring parties.

- The warring parties are prevented from the use of certain weapons particularly those considered as weapons of mass destruction (WMD) like atomic bombs, hydrogen gas among others (see Philips, 2006).

Application of international law on internal armed conflict has also received greater attention as reaffirmed in an article of an international convention, which reads:

- In the case of armed conflicts not of an international character occurring in the territory of one of the high contracting parties, each party to the conflict shall be bound to apply as a minimum the following provisions:

Persons taking no active part in the hostilities, including members of the armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed horsed-combat by sickness, wounds, detention or any other cause, shall in all circumstances be treated humanely without any adverse distinction founded on race, colour, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.

To this end, the following acts are and shall remain prohibited at the time and in any place whatsoever with respect to the above mentioned persons:

- Violence of life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture
- Taking of hostages
- Outrages upon personal dignity, in particularly humiliating and degrading treatment and
- The passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognised as indispensable by civilised peoples.

The wounded, sick and shipwrecked shall be collected and cared for. An impartial humanitarian body, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, may offer its services to the parties to the conflicts.

The parties to the conflict should further endeavour to bring into force, by means of special agreements, all or part of the other provisions of the present convention. The application of the preceding provisions shall not affect the legal status of the parties to the conflict (Article 3 of the 1949 Convention).

In general terms, the laws of war are most strictly applied to the losers of war, with only the victorious faction having the power to prosecute themselves for their own violations, which tends to be less harsh than the prosecution of the losers. This is evident in the position of the United States that none of its troops can be tried in any (international) court other than its municipal court. The laws of war are much more applied to weak states than the powerful states or great powers.

3.3 War Crime

War crime involves any serious violation of law applicable to both intra state and international armed conflicts. It covers a wide range of offences, which are considered prohibited in customary international and conventional law. According to Miller (2005), war crime includes: “Violations of the laws of war or recognised customs and conventions for the engagement or conclusion of them. Most war crimes are perpetrated against noncombatant and civilian populations and include murder, torture, deportation, rape, the taking of hostages, and forced labour. Such acts are also considered war crimes when perpetrated upon prisoners of war and refugees. In addition, war crimes include plundering, unjustified destruction of public or private property, the use of certain weapons, and improper usage of symbols of truce.”

International law through a number of treaties has criminalised some military and belligerent actions considered prohibited. International law has established guidelines for the conduct of armed conflict. Thus, during the **Nuremberg trials**, military necessity was used as a defence mechanism to justify a violation of international norms.

It is worth knowing that the three basic principles of international humanitarian law include principles of military necessity, humanity and chivalry. Military necessity denotes the right to apply force of the type and amount necessary to compel submission of the enemy, with at least possible expenditure of time, life and money (Omoregbe, 2003:48). In the 20th century, the second principle of humanity became prominent aimed at limiting the excesses of means and methods of warfare.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is war crime?

3.4 Issue of Responsibility in War Crime

Through various international legal instruments, international criminal law acts in conformity with the philosophy of *nolle creminen sine lege* (No crime without law). Several customs, convention, agreements,

judicial decision, legal writings and ideas have guided the conduct international criminal law, by holding individuals responsible for any grievous crime committed against humanity either by individual convictions or pursuant to the policy of state, with the ultimate aim of promoting peace and security in the global system.

International criminal law deals with criminal responsibility by making the concepts of responsibility and culpability as the foundation for its conceptual and doctrinal approaches. Through this it provides legal machineries in its adoption of a viable framework to treat wide range of issues relating to international justice, which include criminality, culpability, responsibility and punish ability.

In as much as international criminal law is not codified, it must rely on the domestic general part of criminal law, which can be fulfilled by applying the general part of criminal law of the state where the crime took place. But, attempting to develop general part of the criminal law from “general principles” of the world’s major criminal justice systems has proved more difficult in the codification of international criminal law. These various legal systems differ in the application of appropriate legal standards and tests in affirming a legal responsibility or exculpation.

Unlike domestic general part of criminal law, international criminal law does not hold “ordinary reasonable person” argument valid, while in domestic general part of criminal law, it is valid. Here, international criminal law does not consider any subjective or mental element in the determination of criminal responsibility or exoneration. In international criminal law, subjecting a crime offender to any form of psychiatric examination to evaluate the offender’s criminal intent and responsibility or judicable action is not tenable.

In international criminal law, the principle of individual criminal responsibility is upheld without according any consideration to (or attach) any relevance (in the administration of justice) to any mandate under national law or doctrine of Act of State or other immunities or even the defense of “obedience to superior orders” (Bassiouni, 1992:343) as contained in military laws. On the question of criminal responsibility, in the opening statement before the IMT, Justice Jackson holds that:

Of course, it was under the law of all civilised peoples a crime for one man with his bare knuckles to assault another. How did it come that multiplying this crime by a million, adding firearms to bare knuckles, made a legally innocent act? The doctrine was that one could not be

regarded as criminal for committing the usual violent acts in the conduct of legitimate warfare. An international law which operates only on states can be enforced only by war because the most practicable method of coercing to recalcitrance was impotence of war - of course, the idea that a state, any more than a corporation, commits crime is a fiction. While it is quite proper to employ the fiction of responsibility of a state or corporation for the purpose of imposing a collective liability, it is quite intolerable to let such a legalism become the basis of personal immunity. The Charter recognises that one who has committed criminal acts may not take refuge in superior orders nor in the doctrine that his crimes were acts of states.... The Charter also recognises a vicarious liability, which responsibility is recognised by most modern systems of law, for acts committed by others in carrying out a common plan or conspiracy to which a defendant has become a party [M]en are convicted for acts that they did not personally commit but for which they were held responsible because of membership in illegal combinations or plans or conspiracies (Jackson, 1971: 82-83, 88-89).

Under international criminal law “state action or policy” does not carry much weight because by omission or commission, it is individuals that carry out such actions on behalf of the state, using their power, position and function. The question of legal responsibility and exoneration between individual and state has remained an object of great debate among international legal practitioners. International criminal law ascribes the criminal responsibility to individuals, who have been involved in the decision making process in the articulation of a state action, considered as criminal in international law.

The legal determination of individual criminal responsibility is consequent upon the ‘after the fact’ that is based on “the pre-existence of a law which provides specificity as to the prohibited conduct and whose knowledge is available to those who are expected to heed it or incur the legal consequences of its violation” (Bassiouni, 1992:346). Due to the absence of general part in international criminal law, to distinguish between lawful and unlawful conducts has been a difficult task, as it fails to incorporate general conduct rules in the operation, particularly the question of law and fact.

Criminal responsibility, not only centers on the individuals that carry out any state or regime action (which is considered criminal), under international law, focus is also paid on the chain of activities by various

levels of decision making process, treating in whole or part the contribution of each individual and collective decision-making body in the perpetuation of the crime. According to Bassiouni (1992:345): "That responsibility persists even when the accused dissented or opposed the crime or withdrew from the group but did nothing to oppose the wrongful decision or prevent the harm from occurring. Thus, the closer a person is involved in the decision-making process and the less he does to oppose or prevent the decision, or fails to dissociate himself from it, the more likely that person's criminal responsibility will be at stake."

International criminal law discourages granting amnesties to any suspected committers of violation of international norms by ensuring that such offenders are brought to justice. The Vienna Declaration and programme of Action adopted at the 1993 conference of Human Rights, requested states to abolish any legislation that provides the granting of amnesties to suspected war crime offenders. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights however stresses that: "Amnesties are generally incompatible with the duty of states to investigate such acts: to guarantee freedom from such acts within their jurisdiction; and to ensure that they do not occur in the future. States may not deprive individuals of the right to an effective remedy, including compensation and full rehabilitation as may be possible."

The statute of international criminal court does not recognise award of amnesty for war crimes, genocide and other grave violations of international humanitarian law. In bringing perpetrators of severe violations of international humanitarian law to justice, a number of international criminal's tribunals have been set up. For instance, Rwanda in 1994, the international criminal tribunal (ICTR) was set up, which convicted at least four offenders in 2001 for complicity. By 2002, the number of convicted offenders rose to more than 20 with three acquittals, and the ICTR made a landmark submission in the history of international humanitarian law, by submitting that cases of rape should be considered as crime against humanity (The Prosecutor vs. Jean-Paul Akayesu).

4.0 CONCLUSION

International criminal law has presented some guidelines for the conduct of armed conflict without actually imposing any humanitarian disaster on innocent civilian population as well as disarmed enemies. International criminal law ensures that right weapons are used for right battles. The use of some weapons (particularly weapons of mass destruction – WMD) is extremely discouraged from being applied in armed conflict.

There has been a paradigm shift in criminal responsibility in the new world order, even after World War II, rather than holding the state (what is considered as abstract entity) responsible for war crime, individuals who are the operators of such nihilist action or brutish state policy are now held responsible. Thus, adequate punishment is expected to be meted out on perpetrators of war crime.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss on a number of issues relating to the laws of war and violations of such law, constituting war crime. We highlighted various sources of the laws of war and explained the principles of the laws of war. Thereafter, we described war crime (a violation of the laws of war). The issue of responsibility in the discourse of war crime was also discussed.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Discuss the relationship between war crime and the laws of war.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Article 3 of the (1949). Convention.

Bassiouni, M.C. (1992). *Crime Against Humanity in International Criminal Law*, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Jackson, R.H. (1971). “The Nuremberg Case”, Presentation as Chief Counsel for the United States.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies* (2nd ed.). University for Peace Africa Programme.

Omoregbe, Y. (2003). “Expanding the Horizons of International Law” African Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies, Vol.1, No.1 (June).

Phillips, J.T. (2006). List of Documents and Web Links Relating to the Law of Armed Conflict in Air and Space Operations, Bibliographer, Muir S. Fairchild Research Information Center Maxwell (United States) Air Force Base, Alabama, (May). Also available on www.auaf.mil/au/au/bibs/loac/loac.htm.

The Prosecutor vs. Jean-Paul Akayesu, Case No.1 CTR-96-4-T, 2 October, 1998.

UNIT 5 CULTURE OF PEACE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Describing the Culture of Peace
 - 3.2 The UN and the Culture of Peace
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Peace has been a very desirable but costly element of international relations as well as intra-state politics. A lot of governments use substantial part of their annual budgets to advance initiatives that can promote sustainable peace like peace-education, early warning systems, free qualitative and quality education, viable justice system, inter-cultural dialogue, solidarity, economic empowerment, civil security, cooperation, gender equality among others.

The peace ideals are what basically distinguish a Western state like the US from the developing states like Nigeria. But since the inception of the fourth republic, there is no doubt that, there has been a little improvement in the government response to the culture of peace. There is need for government to further provide conducive humanitarian atmosphere through which culture of peace can be effectively engendered. This is because the use of violence still carries some favourable benefits on the part of the aggressors. The system should give zero tolerance to violence from both the ruled and rulers in order to have the culture of peace well entrenched.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe the concept and practice-culture of peace
- explain the culture of peace as an alternative institutional framework by the United Nations in transforming violence to non-violence in the conflict relations among state and non-state actors.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Describing the Culture of Peace

In most cases the issue of social, political and economic change often precipitates conflict attitude among parties. There is no doubt that a lot of positive developments in the history of mankind have a product of conflict. There is nothing bad in conflict attitude *per se* but the violent behaviour that accompanies some conflicts attracts condemnation from the large segment of world population. It is noble if parties can try as much as possible to avoid the use of violence in their conflict relations (Cairns, 1997).

The incident of violent conflict and war has really bedeviled the entire global order with attendant litany of killings, monumental destruction of the entire ecosystem, proliferation of arms and weapons including those considered to be weapons of mass destruction (WMD) among other negativities.

Many of these violent conflicts or wars have traced their roots to structural inequalities, enemy-image and identity, marginalised economy, politics of exclusion, gender discrimination and other forms of discrimination, inadequate inter-cultural dialogue, lack of mutual respect for needs among others. According to the **International Alert** the conflict relations among parties only needs some triggers to assume a violent dimension because tension is already present, which only needs a spark to burst.

The world populations as well as the world body, the United Nations has recognised the need to address the violent behaviour that dominates the conflict relations among state and non-state actors by trying to draw an alternative framework to stem the tide of violence for global peace and security. Caution should be exercised by student of peace and conflict resolution, not to see peace as opposite of war.

Thus, if war is perceived as apparent exhibition of total violence, a negative peace can easily aid the emergence of this violent conflict behaviour. Galtung (1995), negative peace is actually associated with any peace initiatives aimed at transforming the conflict between two or more parties without addressing the structural problems or root causes.

Negative peace may even be adopted by the parties in conflict, by accepting a worse state of affairs than that which precipitated a violent conflict between them in the first instance, for the sake of ending or reducing the prevailing violence. There is likelihood that violent conflict relation will emerge between the parties, even in greater form, if the

underlying causes of the conflict are not given adequate attention and sufficient solution. According to Pankhurst (2000), positive peace, “requires not only that all types of violence are minimal or nonexistent, but also that the major potential causes of future conflict are removed. In other words, major *conflicts of interest*, as well as their violent manifestation, have been resolved. Positive peace encompasses an ideal of how society *should* be, and the details of such a vision often remain implicit, and are rarely discussed. The key distinction from negative peace is that all forms of structural inequality and major social divisions are removed, or at least minimised in positive peace, and therefore major causes of potential conflict are removed.”

Promoting the culture of peace has become an alternative strategy to promote global peace and security. In providing conducive atmosphere for the germination of norms, attitude and love for peace among state and non-state actors, there has been a renewed call on the state actors and every other stakeholder including you and me. The aim is to jointly act in the support of (positive) peace-promoting ideals or principles, which include creating active and egalitarian civil society; highly and inclusive democratic political structures and processes; and open and accountable government. Some other positive peace ideals may also include promoting inter-cultural dialogue, peace education, integration, religious tolerance, gender equality among others.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Describe the culture of peace.

3.2 The United Nations and Culture of Peace

The United Nations has shown a great commitment in the promotion of peace in the entire world system. Since the end of the World War II, the world body has remained very visible in undertaking this task through its several initiatives. One of its institutional initiatives has been in the form of reducing or ending violent aggressions by separating the combatants through its peacekeeping operations.

Thus, the United Nations has shown a great commitment in its efforts to promote peace in the maintenance of global order by declaring that the years 2001-2010 should be considered as decade of (culture of) peace for the children while the year 2000 was considered as the year of culture of peace.

It is essential that we look at this comprehensive document of the culture of peace, to appreciate the UN Agenda in promoting the values, norms, attitude and behaviour that seek to transform violence to non-violence

and war to peace, knowing well that it is only in the atmosphere of peace that meaningful development can take place. The document A/53/L.79 Fifty-third session, Agenda item 31 of the Culture of Peace is presented as thus:

Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace*

A: Declaration on a Culture of Peace

The General Assembly

Recalling the Charter of the United Nations, including the purposes and principles contained therein,

Recalling also the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, which states that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed",

Recalling, further the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant international instruments of the United Nations system,

Recognising that peace is not only the absence of conflict, but requires a positive, dynamic participatory process where dialogue is encouraged and conflicts are solved in a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation,

Recognising also that the end of the Cold War has widened possibilities for strengthening a culture of peace,

Expressing deep concern about the persistence and proliferation of violence and conflict in various parts of the world,

Recognising the need to eliminate all forms of discrimination and intolerance, including those based on race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status,

Recalling its resolution 52/15 of 20 November 1997 proclaiming the year 2000. the "International Year for the Culture of Peace" and its resolution 53/25 of 10 November 1998 proclaiming the period 2001-2010 as the "International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World",

Recognising the important role that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation continues to play in the promotion of a culture of peace,

Solemnly proclaims the present Declaration on a Culture of Peace to the end that governments, international organisations and civil society may be guided in their activity by its provisions to promote and strengthen a culture of peace in the new millennium.

Article 1: A culture of peace is a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behaviour and ways of life based on:

- (a) Respect for life, ending of violence and promotion and practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation
- (b) Full respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States and non-intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international law
- (c) Full respect for and promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms
- (d) Commitment to peaceful settlement of conflicts
- (e) Efforts to meet the developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations
- (f) Respect for and promotion of the right to development
- (g) Respect for and promotion of equal rights of and opportunities for women and men
- (h) Respect for and promotion of the rights of everyone to freedom of expression, opinion and information
- (i) Adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue and understanding at all levels of society and among nations, and fostered by an enabling national and international environment conducive to peace.

Article 2: Progress in the fuller development of a culture of peace comes about through values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life conducive to the promotion of peace among individuals, groups and nations.

Article 3: The fuller development of a culture of peace is integrally linked to:

- (a) Promoting peaceful settlement of conflicts, mutual respect, understanding and international cooperation
- (b) Compliance with international obligations under the Charter and international law
- (c) Promoting democracy, development and universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms
- (d) Enabling people at all levels to develop skills of dialogue, negotiation, consensus-building and peaceful resolution of differences
- (e) Strengthening democratic institutions and ensuring full participation in the development process
- (f) Eradicating poverty and illiteracy and reducing inequalities within and among nations
- (g) Promoting sustainable economic and social development

- (h) Eliminating all forms of discrimination against women through their empowerment and equal representation at all levels of decision-making
- (i) Ensuring respect for and promotion and protection of the rights of children
- (j) Ensuring free flow of information at all levels and enhancing access thereto
- (k) Increasing transparency and accountability in governance
- (l) Eliminating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
- (m) Advancing understanding, tolerance and solidarity among all civilisations, peoples and cultures, including towards ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities
- (n) Full realisation of the rights of all peoples, including those living under colonial or other forms of alien domination or foreign occupation, to self-determination enshrined in the Charter and embodied in the international covenants on human rights, as well as in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

Article 4: Education at all levels is one of the principal means to build a culture of peace. In this context, human rights education is of particular importance.

Article 5: Governments have an essential role in promoting and strengthening a culture of peace.

Article 6: Civil society need to be fully engaged in fuller development of a culture of peace.

Article 7: The educative and informative role of the media contributes to the promotion of a culture of peace.

Article 8: A key role in the promotion of a culture of peace belongs to parents, teachers, politicians, journalists, religious bodies and groups, intellectuals, those engaged in scientific, philosophical, creative and artistic activities, health and humanitarian workers, social workers, managers at various levels as well as to non-governmental organisations.

Article 9: The United Nations should continue to play a critical role in the promotion and strengthening of a culture of peace worldwide.

- B:** Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace
The General Assembly,
Bearing in mind the Declaration on a Culture of Peace adopted on 13 September 1999;
Recalling its resolution 52/1 5 of 20 November 1997, by which it proclaimed the year 2000 the International Year for the Culture of Peace, as well as its resolution 53125 of 10 November 1998, by which it proclaimed the period 2001-2010 as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World;
Adopts the following Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace.

- A.** Aims, strategies and main actors
1. The Programme of Action should serve as the basis for the International Year for the Culture of Peace and the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World.
 2. Member States are encouraged to take actions for promoting a culture of peace at the national level as well as at the regional and international levels.
 3. Civil society should be involved at the local, regional and national levels to widen the scope of activities 'on a culture of peace'.
 4. The United Nations system should strengthen its ongoing efforts in promoting a culture of peace.
 5. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation should continue to play its important role in and make major contributions to the promotion of a culture of peace.
 6. Partnerships between and among the various actors as set out in the Declaration should be encouraged and strengthened for a global movement for a culture of peace.
 7. A culture of peace could be promoted through sharing of information among actors on their initiatives in this regard.
 8. Effective implementation of the Programme of Action requires mobilisation of resources, including financial resources, by interested Governments, organisations and individuals.
- B.** Strengthening actions at the national, regional and international levels by all relevant actors.
9. Actions fostering a culture of peace through education:
 - (a) Reinvigorate national efforts and international cooperation to promote the goals of education for all

- with a view to achieving human, social and economic development and for promoting a culture of peace
- (b) Ensure that children, from an early age, benefit from education on the values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life to enable them to resolve any dispute peacefully in a spirit of respect for human dignity, tolerance and non-discrimination
 - (c) Involve children in activities for instilling in them the values and goals of a culture of peace
 - (d) Ensure equality of access for women, especially girls, to education
 - (e) Encourage revision of educational curricula, including textbooks bearing in mind the 1995 Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy for which technical cooperation should be provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation upon request
 - (f) Encourage and strengthen efforts by actors as identified in the Declaration, in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, aimed at developing values and skills conducive to a culture of peace, including education and training in promoting dialogue and consensus-building
 - (g) Strengthen the ongoing efforts of the relevant entities of the United Nations system aimed at training and education, where appropriate. In the areas of conflict prevention/crisis management, peaceful settlement of disputes as well as in post-conflict peace-building
 - (h) Expand initiatives promoting a culture of peace undertaken by institutions of higher education in various Parts of the world including the United Nations University, the University for Peace and the project for twinning universities/United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation Chairs Programme.
10. Actions to promote sustainable economic and social development:
- (a) Undertake comprehensive actions on the basis of appropriate strategies and agreed targets to eradicate poverty through national and international efforts, and through international cooperation
 - (b) Strengthening the national capacity for implementation of policies and programmes designed to reduce

- economic and social inequalities within nations through, *inter alia*, international cooperation
- (c) Promoting effective and equitable development oriented and durable solutions to the external debt and debt-servicing problems of developing countries, *inter alia*, through debt relief
 - (d) Reinforcement of actions at all levels to implement national strategies for sustainable food security, including the development of actions to mobilise and optimise the allocation and utilisation of resources from all sources, including through international cooperation such as resources coming from debt relief
 - (e) Further efforts to ensure that development process is participatory and that development projects involve the full participation of all
 - (f) Integrating a gender perspective and empowering women and girls should be an integral part of the development process
 - (g) Development strategies should include specific measures focusing on needs of women and children as well as groups with special needs
 - (h) Development assistance in post-conflict situations should strengthen rehabilitation, reintegration and reconciliation processes involving all engaged in the conflict
 - (i) Capacity-building in development strategies and projects to ensure environmental sustainability, including preservation and regeneration of the natural resource base;
 - (j) Removing obstacles to the realisation of the right of peoples to self-determination, in particular of peoples living under colonial or other forms of alien domination or foreign occupation adversely affecting their social and economic development.

12. Actions to promote respect for all human rights:

- (a) Full implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action
- (b) Encouraging development of national plans of action for the promotion and protection of all human rights
- (c) Strengthening of national institutions and capacities in the field of human rights, including through national human rights institutions
- (d) Realisation and implementation of the right to development, as established in the Declaration on the

Right to Development and the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

- (e) Achievement of the goals of the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004)
- (f) Dissemination and promotion of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at all levels
- (g) Further support for the activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in the fulfillment of her/his mandate as established in General Assembly resolution 48/141 of 20 December 1993, as well as the responsibilities set by subsequent resolutions and decisions.

13. Actions to ensure equality between women and men:

- (a) Integration of a gender perspective into the implementation of all relevant international instruments
- (b) Further implementation of international instruments promoting equality between women and men
- (c) Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action adopted at the Fourth World Conference on Women, with adequate resources and political will, and through, *inter alia*, the elaboration, implementation and follow-up of the national plans of action
- (d) Promote equality between women and men in economic, social and political decision-making
- (e) Further strengthening of efforts by the relevant entities of the United Nations system for the elimination of all forms of discrimination and violence against women
- (f) Provision of support and assistance to women who have become victims of any forms of violence, including in the home, workplace and during armed conflicts.

14. Actions to foster democratic participation:

- (a) Reinforcement of the full range of actions to promote democratic principles and practices
- (b) Special emphasis on democratic principles and practices at all levels of formal, informal and non-formal education;
- (c) Establishment and strengthening of national institutions and processes that promote and sustain democracy through, *inter alia*, training and capacity-building of public officials
- (d) Strengthening democratic participation through, *inter alia*, the provision of electoral assistance upon the

- request of States concerned and based on relevant United Nations guidelines
- (e) Combat terrorism, organised crime, corruption as well as production, trafficking and consumption of illicit drugs and money laundering as they undermine democracies and impede the fuller development of a culture of peace.

15. Actions to advance understanding, tolerance and solidarity:

- (a) Implementation of the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance and the Follow-up Plan of Action for the United Nations Year for Tolerance (1995)
- (b) Support activities in the context of the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilisations in the year 2001
- (c) Study further the local or indigenous practices and traditions of dispute settlement and promotion of tolerance with the objective of learning from them
- (d) Support actions that foster understanding, tolerance and solidarity throughout society, in particular with vulnerable groups
- (e) Further supporting the attainment of the goals of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People
- (f) Support actions that foster tolerance and solidarity with refugees and displaced persons, bearing in mind the objective of facilitating their voluntary return and social integration
- (g) Support actions that foster tolerance and solidarity with migrants
- (h) Promotion of increased understanding, tolerance and cooperation among all peoples, *inter alia*, through appropriate use of new technologies and dissemination of information
- (i) Support actions that foster understanding, tolerance, solidarity and cooperation among peoples and within and among nations.

15. Actions to support participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge:

- (a) Support the important role of the media in the promotion of a culture of peace
- (b) Ensure freedom of the press and freedom of information and communication
- (c) Making effective use of the media for advocacy and dissemination of information on a culture of peace

- involving, as appropriate, the United Nations and relevant regional, national and local mechanisms
- (d) Promoting mass communication that enables communities to express their needs and participate in decision-making;
- (e) Take measures to address the issue of violence in the media, including new communication technologies, *inter alia*, the Internet
- (f) Increased efforts to promote the sharing of information on new information technologies, including the Internet.

16. Actions to promote international peace and security:

- (a) Promote general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, taking into account the priorities established by the United Nations in the field of disarmament
- (b) Draw on, where appropriate, lessons conducive to a culture of peace learned from "military conversion" efforts as evidenced in some countries of the world
- (c) Emphasise the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in all parts of the world
- (d) Encourage confidence-building measures and efforts for negotiating peaceful settlements
- (e) Take measures to eliminate illicit production and traffic of small arms and light weapons
- (f) Support for initiatives, at the national, regional and international levels, to address concrete problems arising from post-conflict situations, such as demobilisation, reintegration of former combatants into society, as well as refugees and displaced persons, weapon collection programmes, exchange of information and confidence-building
- (g) Discourage the adoption of and refrain from any unilateral measure, not in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations, that impedes the full achievement of economic and social development by the population of the affected countries, in particular women and children, hinders their well-being, that creates obstacles to the full enjoyment of their human rights, including the right of everyone to a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being and their right to food, medical care and the necessary social services, while reaffirming food and

- medicine must not be used as a tool for political pressure
- (h) Refrain from military, political, economic or any other form of coercion, not in accordance with international law and the Charter, aimed against political independence or territorial integrity of any State
- (i) Recommends proper consideration for the issue of humanitarian impact of sanctions, in particular on women and children, with a view of minimising humanitarian effects of sanctions
- (j) Promoting greater involvement of women in prevention and resolution of conflicts and, in particular, in activities promoting a culture of peace in post-conflict situations;
- (k) Promote initiatives in conflict situations such as days of tranquility to carry out immunisation and medicine distribution campaigns; corridors of peace to ensure delivery of humanitarian supplies and sanctuaries of peace to respect the central role of health and medical institutions such as hospitals and clinics
- (l) Encourage training in techniques for the understanding, prevention and resolution of conflict for the concerned staff of the United Nations, relevant regional organisations and Member States, upon request, where appropriate.

*Adapted from <http://www.unesco.org/bpi/paix2000/res.htm>

4.0 CONCLUSION

The culture of peace encourages new forms of citizenship and democracy as the basic political structure, equality, politics of inclusion, respect of fundamental human rights, tolerance, pacific settlement of conflict, among others. The culture of peace seems to place prominence on the need to resolve conflict by addressing the underlying and structural or root causes of war through which a genuine reconciliation can take place.

It is only when these root causes have been addressed that conflict transformation can effectively take place. We should not forget that sometimes peace is imposed on the parties without necessarily considering the root causes of the conflict. This effort will only amount to negative peace, which cannot sustain the removal of tension between the parties.

Thus, it is likely that violence will crop-up again in no distant future, which may even be deadlier than the previous one(s). That is the reason why, it is advisable for conflict intervener or peace practitioner to move beyond negative peace by trying to address the root causes rather than limiting the intervention on the triggers. It is through creativity that long-term reconciliation and genuine resolution of conflict between the parties can be achieved.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to describe the culture of peace by first conceptualising the term peace. We went further to distinguish between negative peace and positive peace. We also agreed that it is quite imperative to focus more on root causes of war rather than the triggers (the variable or factors) responsible for the sparking-up of a violent behaviour in the conflict relation between any given parties.

In furtherance of our quest for knowledge and appreciation of the subject, we discussed the culture of peace from the angle of the United Nations. It is hoped that you have found this unit very interesting and thought-provoking. So, are you aware now that the war against violence and war is to be fought by everybody? It is only through sustainable peace that we can achieve meaningful development. The peace campaign should be extended to every nook and cranny of the world, so that the world can be a better place for you and I.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Has the United Nations campaign for the culture of peace impacted positively on the (violent) ethno-religious conflict behaviour in Nigeria?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Cairns, E. (1997). *A Safer Future: Reducing the Human Cost of War*.

Oxfam Publications.

Galtung, J. (1995). "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Responses." *Journal of Peace Research*, 22.

Pankhurst, D. (2000). "Women, Gender and Peace Building." Centre for Conflict Resolution Working Paper 5, University of Bradford (August).

<http://www.unesco.org/bpi/paix2000/res.htm>

MODULE 4

Unit 1	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict I
Unit 2	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict II
Unit 3	Peacekeeping
Unit 4	Peace Building
Unit 5	Gender Perspective in Peace Building

UNIT 1 PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT I

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
3.1	Peaceful Resolution of Conflict
3.2	Theories of Conflict Resolution
3.3	Peaceful Approaches of Conflict Resolution
3.3.1	Negotiation
3.3.2	Good Offices and Mediation
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor-Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In international law and international relations, states have continued to adopt different approaches of their choice in the resolution of their conflicts. These approaches range from peaceful; less violent, to absolutely violent ones. In the global arena, before the emergence of the United Nations, states usually explored the principle of diplomatic protection. That principle became more firmly established under the dominance of the modern concept of absolute state. Such became the apex of the international order of Peace of Westphalia (1648).

In this unit, we are going to focus on the theories of peaceful resolution of (armed) conflict. Thereafter, a number of the peaceful approaches to conflict resolution will be discussed.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe various theoretical postulations in the explanation of peaceful resolution of (armed) conflict to stimulate our better appreciation of the subject matter
- discuss some of the approaches of peaceful resolution of (armed) conflict.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Peaceful Resolution of Conflict

The parties in conflict are required to settle their disputes by peaceful means and in such a way that the world peace and security are not endangered (see Article 2(3) of the UN Charter). States or non state actors in conflict are however, required to address their conflict relation, which may occur in the course of their relations by peaceful means such as “negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies of arrangement or other peaceful means of their choice” (Article 33 of the United Nations charter). To stimulate our better understanding of the subject matter, we shall first examine some of the theories of conflict resolution.

3.2 Theories of Conflict Resolution

The building of peaceful global system remains an activity, which requires all parties, both state and non-state actors to develop connections and relationships in terms of spatial conceptual and institutional configurations. The proper understanding of cooperation and optimal communication utility among state and non-state actors will facilitate a peaceful world system.

In this segment of the unit, we shall examine various theoretical postulations, which nonetheless provide us an insight into ways through which, we can create optimal conditions for the promotion of non-zero sum relationship among state and non-state actors as regards their conflict relation, aimed at achieving peaceful atmosphere at all levels of human interactions.

On the subject of conflict resolution, it is quite important to note that conflict can be resolved through violent means (negative peace) and peaceful methods (positive peace). Meanwhile, there are several other conflict resolution techniques that are neither violent nor peaceful. Our

major task in this segment is to discuss some of the various theories of conflict resolution.

Realist/neo-realistic thesis

The members of this school of thought are of the view that it is only through coercive power, military force and violence that armed conflict between two or more parties can be adequately resolved. They believe that judicious use of power and force will indeed facilitate and generate rapid conflict resolution and (inter)national security. The followers of this school argue that sustainable peace can basically be achieved through the application of force, power, military capability and mobility and carefully articulated violence.

This theory holds that human nature does not operate according to the ideal, no pattern of reform or law or (international) organisation can change this human essence. Thus, the proper thing is to assume your own safety and assure continued existence of the system. This is by building a viable framework to check the power or recklessness of every party. This idea informed the establishment of the United Nations where military virtues and the reward of conquest have become prominent.

With recent development in the world, asymmetric relation amongst states has remained the platform to define which state is deviant and which is not. The problem of proliferation of arms and weapons has continued to militate against the world peace and security. At the same time, the situation of cataclysm and disorder dominate the entire global political system.

It is important to note that use of force does not always bring about positive or creative transformation and conflict resolution among parties. For instance, the adoption of coercion or military force by the US and its allies against Iraq has failed to yield any fruits. Therefore, state actors have begun to use influence through their social and economic powers to address their areas of conflict rather than engaging one another in violence.

Idealist thesis

The members of this school hold a contrary view, arguing that settlement of any (armed) conflict can never be achieved through the use of force or violence. They stress that those who preach for the use of force or violence would only create a strategic threat to the entire world system. The Idealists also maintain that offensive-defensive capability can only engender the development of a thriving weapons culture for state and non state actors. Such culture (of violence) is not healthy for the peace of the world.

This situation tends to generate insecurity by igniting violent conflicts rather than preventing or resolving them. This theory maintains that attainment of peace at every level of human interaction or relationship, conflict resolution and relatively safe environment can basically be explained by non-coercive, non-violent processes rather than coercive and violent ones. The idealist scholars also stress that it is non-violent or peaceful exchanges that constitute the norms for conflict resolution and world peace. Therefore, violent and coercive processes are only exceptions.

The idealist school prefers to operate from the best rather than the worst case assumptions. Conflict resolution is a very difficult task and relatively subjective. There has been no absolute case of conflict-resolution, as no absolute peace has ever been achieved. This theory holds that absolute peace can still be achieved at all levels of state and non state relations.

At the international level, the theory maintains that if there are world government negotiations, common security based on development of civic culture or international agreements and treaties, stress on depolarisation, demilitarisation (that they the idealist scholars see as functional alternative to world peace), there will be world security and viable dispute settlement. Many scholars have criticised this theory for failing to accept the importance of the use of force in fostering peace among parties. The question is that how can conflict in the interests of parties be resolved if there are no coercive power and military force to enforce diplomatic decisions. Therefore, the use of force is also essential in conflict resolution.

Transformative framework

This theoretical postulation was designed by Bush and Folger. These scholars proposed a framework aimed not at conflict-resolution but at the transformation of combatants' relationship through 'empowerment and recognition' (Folger and Bush, 2001:192). This theory is based on the premise that conflicts are not primarily problems to be solved but our main focus should center on interaction crisis. Our interventionist plan should consider utmost the need to support the parties, and make them see reason(s) on the need to be constructive rather than destructive in their conflict relations (*ibid*).

This theoretical position also assumes that parties do not need a highly structured and staged mediation process engineered by the mediator. Rather, the mediator has a 'micro focus' on identifying and taking up moment by moment opportunities for party empowerment and recognition.

The members of this school argue that the parties in conflict should demonstrate high degree of trust in creating opportunities for reconciliation by ordering their conversations and have the desired capability to move from self-absorption to mutual recognition, and never to urge outcomes or particular directions. This approach acknowledges the strong connections between process and outcomes. Thus, many theorists have criticised this approach for its theoretical grounding.

Track two diplomacy theory

This theory involves unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversary groups or nations aimed at developing strategies, influence, world opinion, and to organise human and material resources in ways that might help to resolve their (parties') dispute. Track two diplomacy is in no way a substitute for official, formal, and "track one" government to government or leader to leader relationship (Burton, 1991:162).

Track two diplomacy theory informs us that state and non-state actors need to work assiduously in the resolution of conflict without resorting to the use of coercive and confrontational approaches capable of jeopardising world peace and security. According to Montville, the proponent of this theory, the theory is not designed to replace the track one or official diplomacy but to create conducive atmosphere for official negotiations and x-raying the minds of the world public. This theory however holds that several processes are needed in conflict resolution.

The first stage is a series of conflict resolution workshops and these workshops are designed to bring-in influential and powerful national or international actors to advise the combatants or disputing parties on the need to explore alternative means of peacefully resolving the conflict.

Hence, the goal is to transform their perceptions regarding the conflict from zero-sum to win-win, which would be facilitated through such workshops. The peace facilitators should be aware that their views cannot be imposed on the parties in conflict but only to enjoin the parties to see the need to transform their conflict relation from destructive to creative one and mutually recognise the needs of each other.

Another process of 'track two diplomacy' is to influence world opinion and to change the attitude and perceptions of the parties. The combatant parties are encouraged to participate in these workshops to articulate changes particularly in relation to their conflict behaviour. The cooperation of the parties at war or conflict will be greatly required.

According to Herbert Kelman attesting to the efficacy of this theory in resolution of conflict, in the workshops he has so far participated as a facilitator, he was encouraged by the extent in which ... common

ground was achieved as it was discovered by the parties, the importance to change their conflict behaviour positively.

Kelman further claims that desired changes were achieved through optimism that is required for movement towards conflict resolution (Kelman, 1991:162). These changes are very essential in the creation of more positive and ideal world in which negotiations can take place, where a system that is devoid of the use of force and military settlement is created through which sustainable peace, security and development can be achieved.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the theories of conflict resolution?

3.3 Peaceful Approaches of Conflict Resolution

3.3.1 Negotiation

What is negotiation? According to Pruitt (1981: xi-xii), “Negotiation is a form of decision making in which two or more parties talk with one another in an effort to resolve their opposing interests … a process by which a joint decision is made by two or more parties.”

Negotiation can also be described as, “Talks between conflicting parties who ideas, information and options in order to reach a mutually acceptable agreement (International Alert, 1996: 53).”

One of the underlying properties of negotiation is that process, which involves two or more parties who are interested in preserving or improving a relationship, which conflict has seemed to distort. Negotiation is a verbal, interactive process, which is aimed at rebuilding a relationship through which participants jointly try to reach agreement on issues of individual and mutual importance.

Negotiation is a voluntary bargaining process in which the disputing parties try to assist each other on the need to shift away from the positions which have hitherto made the resolution of conflict a difficult venture through informal conversations (Moore, 1996:8). On the forms of negotiation, there are three forms of negotiations, which include:

- **Hard negotiation:** Hard negotiation is also known as principled negotiation. This form of negotiation involves a negotiator seeing every conflict as an opportunity to test his strength. It also involves one of the parties or both taking hard positions in conflict, as a desperate bid to get all he wants from other party. Hard negotiation

often results to wastage of resources and damage of relationships between the parties (Fisher and Ury, 1981: xviii).

- **Soft negotiation.** This is the second form of negotiation. It is an integrative or interest-based negotiation in which the negotiator is always willing to make concessions in order to hasten a mutual agreement with the other party. But the party's desperate bid to make quick agreement may act against him eventually.
- **Positional negotiation:** This is the third form of negotiation. It is a kind of negotiation that is both soft and hard. Positional negotiation concentrates majorly on positions of the parties. Here, negotiator considers basically his own position; the other party also follows the same behavioural pattern of negotiation. This makes it difficult for the parties to make a concrete agreement. Thus, agreement made under such an atmosphere might only end up addressing just the positions of the parties rather than their interest. According to Fisher and Ury (1981:4-5):

When negotiators bargain over positions, they tend to lock themselves into those positions. The more you clarify your positions and defend it against attack, the more committed you become to it. The more you try to convince the other side of the impossibility of changing your opening position, the more difficult it becomes to do so. Your ego becomes identified with your position. You now have a new interest in "saving face" - in reconciling future action with past positions-making it less likely that any agreement will wisely reconcile the parties' original interest As more attention is paid to positions, less attention is devoted [to] meeting the underlying concerns of the parties. Agreement becomes less likely. Any agreement reached may reflect a mechanical splitting of the difference between final positions rather than a solution carefully crafted to meet the legitimate interests of the parties. The result is frequently an agreement less satisfactory to each side than it could have been.

Undoubtedly, positional negotiation often prevents the parties to reach an effective agreement. It consumes a lot of resources, wasting too much time on trivial issues, which may not be in line with effective resolution of the conflict. It produces anger and resentment, as each party tries to gain the concession of the other party which invariably exacerbates the conflict.

Conditions for successful negotiation

There are some necessary conditions for making a successful negotiation. One of the conditions is **adequate provision of information**. Negotiating process will likely be distorted when parties don't provide themselves adequate information to address the issues of

conflict. This information will definitely help to expose the personality of each party, his position, interests and needs.

Another condition is **effective communication ability**. This helps to create an atmosphere, through which the parties will have a better understanding of their positions, interest and needs for the possible resolution of the conflict. The parties should have good listening ability and the filtration mechanism must be empowered. It is through communication ability that the parties articulate their positions and interests for peaceful resolution of conflict.

Good negotiation skills are very essential because they make the parties to think fast and evaluate options. Negotiator should possess well articulated and vibrant bargaining strategy in order not to negotiate away his interests. He should be sound in the evaluation of negotiation options and processes. Negotiator should also evaluate the implications of such options and processes. He should endeavour not to lose too much in the bargaining proceedings as a way of gaining strategically.

Emotional control is very important. Negotiator should be able to balance the tempo of bargaining. He should control his emotions not to lose too much, he must not always concede due to pressures or emotions.

The last but not the least condition for successful negotiation is **timing**. Timing is very important. Thus, there must be time-frame for negotiation processes. The negotiator should develop a time-frame for the conclusion of negotiation.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Describe the term negotiation.

3.3.2 Good Offices and Mediation

The term ‘good offices’ according to Umozurike (1993:185) is, “... used when a state that maintains diplomatic relations agrees to protect in the host state, the interests of a third state, that has several relations with the host state.”

Starke (1989:485) maintains that both good offices and mediation should be regarded as diplomatic initiatives, which are basically rendered by a third party which may in certain cases be an individual or an international organisation. He further explains that such third party renders its services with the ultimate goal of bringing together the contending parties, and to suggest the modalities for pacific settlement.

Starke also draws our attention to the distinction between good offices and mediation, which he argues, is a ‘matter of degree’, pointing out that the main difference between the two is that mediation enjoys more active role than good offices, and it involves participation of the mediating party in the negotiations (who) directing the disputing parties ‘in such a way that a peaceful solution may be reached’ while such (privileges) are lacking in good offices (Starke, 1989: 513).

One must note that such suggestions made by the mediating party are of no substance or not legally binding on the disputants. Starke commenting on the limitation in the scope of both good offices and mediation says that they lack great procedure in conducting investigation ‘into the facts or law’. And in future, there are great possibilities ‘for both methods ‘to be used as ‘preliminary or ancillary’ steps ‘to more specialised techniques of conciliation, of inquiry, and or settlement through the United Nations’ (Starke, 1989: 514).

The approach of good office involves a third party, attempting to influence the contending parties to enter into negotiations while mediation on the other hand ‘implies the active participation in the negotiating process of the third party itself (Shaw, 1997). One good example of the good offices approach is the role played by the Old USSR (through its assistance) in the peaceful settlement of the Indian-Pakistan dispute in 1965.

No success can be recorded through mediation, if the mediator is not accorded sufficient confidence by the contending parties but it is very rare ‘to find a mediator who fulfills this requirement’ (Malanczuk, 1997:276). Both Argentina and Chile, in their dispute over the implementation of the **Beagle Channel Award** accepted Cardinal Antonio Samore as a mediator upon the Pope’s proposal.

Good offices and mediation can be used at the same time (*ibid*) as evident in the role played by Algeria in 1980 in the diplomatic hostages between Iran and the US, with the disputants not speaking directly with each other. But the assistance rendered by Algeria led to the establishment of **Iran-United States Claims Tribunal** in The Hague in 1981 through Algiers Accord.

Finally, the adoption of mediation in the resolution of any international conflict is a very difficult task because ‘truly neutral stance is often not possible without favouring one side or the other, especially in armed conflict’ (*ibid*). In international arena, Great Powers have appeared having greater opportunities than the smaller or weak nations in the area

of mediation ‘due to their resources and weight’ (*ibid*, 174) and these Great Powers are basically interested in what favours them.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain good offices and mediation.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Peaceful resolution of conflict is so essential for the maintenance of world peace and security. It is so disappointing that state and non-state actors can still be engaging in the articulation of violence when there are several peaceful means through which conflict can be adequately resolved. Any conflict resolution made through the use of force can only amount to negative peace. This is because the underlying and root causes, which led to emergence of the (armed) conflict in the first place, are likely not addressed.

A party through its military and strategic superiority may defeat the other party forcing a settlement on the defeated party but the reemergence of conflict between these parties is very much possible in no distant time. The reason is because transformation of conflict cannot take place if the root sources of conflict are not addressed. It is also difficult for any meaningful transformation process to take place in the presence of violence or in the use of force.

Iraq is a good example where the US led coalition forces deposed Saddam regime (wishfully) thinking that such a military solution will lay to rest the perceived threat of (Saddam) Iraq in the Middle East. But the recent experience has shown that the contrary has been the case in the war-torn country - Iraq. The country is perpetually enveloped in systemic violence as peace has absolutely remained elusive.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss a number of subjects on peaceful resolution of conflict. We describe various theories of peaceful resolution of conflict. Thereafter, we explained two of the peaceful means of conflict resolution, i.e. negotiation and, good offices and mediation.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the main conditions for successful negotiation?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Article 2(3) of the UN Charter.

Article 33 of the United Nations Charter.

Burton, J. (1991). "Conflict Resolution as a Political System." In: Volkman, V. *et al.* (Eds.). Lexington Books.

Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving-In*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Folger, J.P. & Robert, A., Bush, B. (2001). New York: The Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation.

International Alert (1996). *Resources Pack for Conflict Transformation*. Parts I-V, London: I.A.

Kelman, H. (1991). "Interactive Problem Solving, the Uses and Limit of a Therapeutic Model for the Resolution of International Conflicts." In: Volkman, *et al.* (Eds.) *The Lexington*. M.A: Lexington Books.

Malanczuk, P. (1997). *Akehurst's Modern Introduction to International Law* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Moore, C. (1996). *The Mediation Process: Strategies for Resolving Conflict*. (2nd ed.). San Franscisco: Jossey Bass.

Pruitt, D.G. (1981). *Negotiation Behaviour*. New York: Academic Press.

Shaw, M. (1997). *International Law*. 4th (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Starke, J. G. (1989). *Introduction to International Law*. Buttersworths.

Umozurike, U. O. (1993). *Introduction to International Law*. Ibadan: Spectrum Law Publishing.

UNIT 2 PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT II

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Inquiry and Fact Finding
 - 3.2 Conciliation
 - 3.3 Arbitration
 - 3.4 Judicial Approach
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, we shall continue from where we stopped in the last unit in our subject of inquiry - the peaceful resolution of conflict. As we pointed out in the last unit, various international organisations as well as the world body (the United Nations) have articulated the need, by parties either state or non-state actors, to adopt peaceful method in the resolution of their conflict. It is only through this, world peace and security can be guaranteed. We shall discuss several other approaches of peaceful resolution of conflict.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the unit, you should be able to:

- identify various peaceful means of conflict resolution different from the ones we discussed in the last unit
- explain some peaceful mechanisms of conflict resolution.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Inquiry and Fact Finding

Inquiry is basically an object designed to ‘produce an impartial finding of disputed facts, and thus to prepare the way for a negotiated settlement’ (Akehurst, 1970:241). Partsch (1995:343-345), believes that ‘fact finding’ and ‘inquiry’ are methods for the establishment of facts in international law, which can be used for various purposes. These purposes may include the practice of decision making of international organisations.

These two approaches ‘are more or less interchangeable’. Conflict at all levels is a product of disagreement of fact, and an impartial inquiry as a means of tension reduction and conflict resolution cannot be overlooked. As such, the contending parties may see it necessary to appoint an impartial body (mostly ad hoc), after some initial negotiations, with the aim of carrying out an inquiry in order to bring into fore an ‘impartial findings of disputed facts’, which will prepare the way for a diplomatic settlement (Malanczuk, 1997:277).

In cases of boundary disputes like the one between Nigeria and Cameroon over the ownership of Bakassi, a commission may be set up to facilitate inquiry into the ‘historical and geographical facts which are the subject of controversy’, and to make clarifications on the issues for the purpose of achieving a boundary agreement (Starke, 1989: 515). Starke also adds that it is of great importance to sometimes appoint an expert fact finding committee to inquire ‘into certain special facts for the purposes of preliminary elucidation’.

Commission of inquiry is a veritable tool in producing facts about the objects of conflict between parties particularly when such commission consists of reputable individuals and experts. Dogger Bank incident is a good example of a successful inquiry. In 1904, the Russian Baltic fleet, on its way to the pacific with the aim of engaging Japan in war, fired on British fishing boats operating around the Dogger Bank in the North Sea, arguing that she was provoked by Japanese submarines (Scott, 1916: 403).

The Hague provisions were put into play. A commission of inquiry was set-up consisting four naval officers of the UK, Russia, French and American fleets, and a fifth member was chosen by the four. Eventually, an Austro-Hungarian was appointed. The commission was required to examine all circumstances, particularly with regard to responsibility and blame. The report of the commission shown that, Russia was guilty.

Due to the report of the commission, Britain withdrew its insistence on the punishment of the Russian Admiral and Russia agreed to restitute Britain with a sum of 65,000 pound sterling and this contributed to the peaceful resolution of the conflict (Shaw, 1997 725). Therefore, whenever there are disagreements on factual matters, which may ignite a conflict, inquiry can provide a ‘logical solution’ (*ibid*, 724). The great ‘value of inquiry within specified institutional framework’ is evident in its increased use within the ambit of the United Nations generally (*ibid*, 726).

The role of bilateral fact finding in conflict prevention or conflict resolution ‘has finally actually been rather modest’ (*ibid*). There is no

doubt that fact finding and inquiry play important roles in the peaceful resolution of conflict through facilitation of an impartial and conscientious investigation to create an avenue for a peaceful solution.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Explain inquiry and fact-finding.

3.2 Conciliation

Judge Manly Hudson (1994: 232) defines conciliation as, "... a process of formulating proposals of settlement after an investigation of facts and an effort to reconcile opposing contentions, the parties to the dispute being left free to accept or reject the proposals formulated."

The Institut De Droit International in 1961, in the same vein defines Conciliation as, "A method for the settlement of international disputes of any nature according to which a commission set up by the parties, either on a permanent basis or on *ad hoc* basis to deal with a dispute, proceeds to the impartial examination of the dispute and attempts to define the terms of a settlement, such and as they have requested."

Akehurst (1970: 241), sees conciliation as "a combination of inquiry and mediation." He further explains that conciliation is more formal but less flexible than mediation. If a mediator's proposals are rejected, he can go on to formulate a new set of proposals. In conciliation, on the other hand, only a single report can normally be presented.

The evolution of conciliation as a separate method of dispute settlement in international law can be traced to the *Bryan Treaties* of 1913/1914. After the German-Swiss Arbitration Treaty of 1921 as well as the model of a 1925 Treaty between France and Switzerland, the world has recorded hundreds of bilateral general arbitration and conciliation treaties which have often provided for voluntary and compulsory conciliation which should precede the arbitration of all legal disputes.

However, since World War II, the role of conciliation in bilateral treaties has reduced tremendously but it has not disappeared, "because the inclusion of conciliation, next to other forms of dispute settlement, has almost become a routine matter (Malanczuk, 1997: 278)."

Conciliation commission usually examines the disputes and makes non-binding recommendations for a possible settlement. There are considerable differences of approach in important matters, including the degree of the formality of the proceedings. The practical significance of conciliation in international law and relations lies on the area of study.

Conciliation commissions were provided for in the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 for the pacific settlement of international disputes under part III of the conventions.

Conciliation commissions could be established by ‘special agreement between the parties’ who should investigate and make reports on the ‘situations of facts with the proviso’ while the reports of these commissions lack binding status on the parties in conflict (Seidi-Hohenveldren, 1992: 726-728).

Conciliation commissions may also be established outside treaties as evident in the UN. Instances would also include the Conciliation Commission for Palestine under the General Assembly Resolution 194 (iii), 1948 and the Conciliation Commission for the Congo under the Resolution 1474 (ES-IV) of the 1960.

Conciliation is not sufficient in the peaceful resolution of conflict with reference to ‘the context of tragedy in the Yugoslavia’ where conciliation out rightly failed. In spite of this shortcoming, conciliation is very vital in the peaceful resolution of conflict. Many attempts have been made to revitalise the conciliation mechanism, but no meaningful success has been made so far.

Treaties of conciliation have less fulfilled the hopes entrusted in them. In spite of the existing hundreds of conciliation commissions, they have been rarely used. The number of cases that must have been treated through conciliation cannot be more than 10 (Henkens, *et al.* 1982: 834), and the old OAU is a case study. But in recent years, there have been some successful cases on the use of conciliation, which have hitherto attracted the clamour for the renewal of interest in this peaceful approach of conflict resolution.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is conciliation?

3.3 Arbitration

Arbitration involves appointment of certain people (arbitrators) without compulsion by the parties (not in all cases), who are charged with responsibility of making necessary arbitrating award, which has no binding status or effect on the parties. International Law Commission sees arbitration from different perspective. It defines arbitration as, “Procedure for the settlement of dispute between states by a binding award on the basis of law as a result of an undertaking voluntarily accepted (see IIYBILC, 1953: 202).”

According to Miller (2005: 17), arbitration can be described as: “A mechanism for resolving conflicts whereby the disputants identify their grievances and demands, fix a procedural process, and willingly submit to 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.”

Starke (1989: 514) argues that there is no significant difference between arbitration in international law and arbitration in municipal law because the two involve the ‘same procedure’, in which the arbitrators are appointed by choice of the disputing parties ‘who make an award without being bound to pay strict regard to legal considerations’. Umozurike (1993) argues that it is a falsehood to say that arbitral awards are not binding. According to him, such arbitral awards (*res judicata*) are very much binding on the parties but such awards may only be nullified based on some factors that may include:

- *Excesdu Pouvoir* (excess of jurisdiction). It is over the jurisdiction of the arbitrators to make decisions on issues not originally submitted to the tribunal. It is also illegal as such to adopt an unauthorised law
- Essential error is a variable that can castrate or nullify an arbitral decision most especially when the error is manifest
- It is a great fact that lack of jurisdiction can also invalidate an arbitral decision
- Absence of sufficient statements of reasons on which an award is based can also invalidate arbitral award or decision
- Fraudulent and corrupt character exhibited by any of the arbitration panel or tribunal members as well as clandestine presentation of evidences may render the award nullified.

People often think that arbitration is similar to judicial approach. Meanwhile, there are differences between the two concepts. According to Akehurst (1970: 244), the differences between the two concepts include:

- Jurisdiction in municipal law is by agreement on the arbitrator, and on a judge by general law (although the jurisdiction of a court may also be extended by agreement). But international law gives no jurisdiction to any arbitrator or judge, unless the parties in conflict agree to accord to him (arbitrator or judge)

- In municipal law, it is the disputants that usually appoint the arbitrators or by someone nominated by the parties, while the judges are not. The difference is more or less valid in the international law
- In municipal law, the parties can agree with the arbitrators to apply rules other than those of the ordinary law, as such agreement cannot be found within the operation of the court in the determination of the dispute case. In international law, the parties have the utmost power and authority to request a court to apply rules other than those of ordinary laws, and such requests or authorisations are given to arbitrators more frequently than to courts.

Arbitration involves the parties in conflict to have a right to appoint the arbitrators by themselves. The two sides in conflict appoint one arbitrator each. The two arbitrators may then proceed to agree on the choice of third arbitrator (umpire). Through this, the arbitration panel will then consist of three wise men who should not consider themselves as representatives of the parties both as ‘impartial dispensers of justice’ as was the case in the 19th century.

Arbitration panel or commission should always consist of an odd number, and must be specifically set up to deal with a particular conflict or class of conflicts. Arbitration nonetheless exhibits ‘more flexibility’ in the area of compulsory jurisdiction than a standing court.

3.4 Judicial Approach

This approach of peaceful resolution of conflict includes the activities of courts at community, state and inter-state levels, making decisions in the resolution of conflict according to the rules and principles of law. It involves the resolution of conflict through court processes. In this case, the parties are guided by their counsels or lawyers in the presentation of their facts regarding the conflict with a view to resolving it through a third party adjudication. The parties are bound by the decision of the third party adjudicator or court.

Here, the adjudicator applies prevailing body of law in the determination of the conflict case. The parties may be given a right to appeal wholly or partly against a judgment depending on the prevailing circumstances. What we mean here is that there are different types of legal system. In Nigeria, there are different courts with varying degree of power. The highest court of the land is the Supreme Court, and any judgment delivered in this court can never be a subject of appeal.

In Nigeria, there are various courts with varying degree of power and these include Customary, Magistrate, Sharia (basically in the northern Nigeria), and High Courts, which can be found at both the federal and states. The Industrial Courts, Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court are exclusively under the jurisdiction of the federal government in Nigeria.

Mind you, the decisions of any of those state courts are binding on parties irrespective of territory of jurisdiction except decided otherwise by superior court(s). The most superior courts in the land are Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court, which are under the control of the federal government.

The highest court is the Supreme Court. In a situation that a decision is made at the Court of Appeal concerning a case previously treated at a lower court, a party can go ahead to appeal against any part or whole of the judgment where he/she feels that his or her rights are not protected by the Court (of Appeal) at the Supreme Court.

The supreme can either uphold the earlier judgment or present a contrary view or order for a retrial as the situation demands. The decision of the Supreme Court is final (without any right of appeal). The people in legal profession often jokingly say that decision of the Supreme Court can only be appealed against in heaven. So the litigant will wait for the transcendent day of judgment.

Governor Peter Obi of Anambra State demanded for the court interpretation of Nigerian constitution as regards the length of his tenure in office as Governor of Anambra State after being pronounced by the court as the authentic winner of the 2003 governorship election. Before he could get his mandate he was in limbo for more than two years fighting to claim his electoral victory stolen by the People's Democratic Party (PDP). During that time, the PDP had already been in disarray. One of causes of the intra-party conflict was the disagreement between the PDP Governor, Dr. Chris Ngige and a party chieftain and erstwhile godfather, Chris Uba. This intra-party conflict almost brought the state to comatose.

After losing the bid to extend his stay in office (to officially prescribed tenure of four years) at the High Court and Court of Appeal, Mr. Obi took his case to the Supreme Court, which ruled in his favour. The legal radicalism and professional virtuosity displayed by the Supreme Court in this case made Nigerians at home and abroad to have unlimited hope in the country's judiciary.

The decision of the Supreme Court was very surprising and unprecedented in the history of judiciary in Nigeria since independence in 1960, showing the beauty of independent judiciary. Before the judgment, another governor had already been sworn-in consequent on the handover event of May 29, 2007 in the whole country but had to pack his personal belongings from the government quarters due to the judgment. The landmark judgment has served right the pathological breakers of law and protagonists of illegality. We hope that every political office holders and all stakeholders have been able to learn a lesson on the need to uphold due process and constitutionality.

By and large, this peaceful method of conflict resolution is vested on the neutral third party adjudicator to determine the objects of conflict between the parties. The adjudicator does this by looking at the facts brought before him/her by the parties as the existing body of rules or law provides direction for the case. The parties do not have the power to control the outcome of the process in this case, and the decision of the court is binding on the parties. There is even compulsion on the parties to appear before the court if their conflict is brought for adjudication by one of the parties.

In international legal system, states are not compelled to appear before any international court except such is a signatory to compulsory jurisdiction. Here, the state has agreed formally to appear in court if a party with whom it is in conflict of any sort brings their conflict before the court for third party adjudication.

However, in this case, a signatory of compulsory jurisdiction is compelled to appear in court to respond to any conflict case brought before the court involving it. States usually accept the court's jurisdiction under the optional clause. The optional clause is also regarded as the principle of reciprocity (Thirlway, 1984: 97-138).

The states can only enjoy the dividends of the optional clause if it prepares to accept the obligations of the optional clause. States often accept the optional clause basically if they can enjoy the protection of the court when it brings a conflict case before the court. This does not mean that the outcome of the legal proceedings will be favourable to the party in question.

What the party aims to gain is to bring the other party to court scrutiny on their areas (or issues) of conflict because it will not be incumbent on the court to subpoena the respondent if the petitioner does not accept the optional clause while the respondent has accepted. Thus, you cannot eat your cake and have it. If a country does not accept the compulsory

jurisdiction of the court, such a country is excluded to benefit from such right(s).

Another area of difference between the international law and municipal (local) law is enforceability of decision. The decision of the court in the municipal law is strictly enforced by the executive arm of government through its various agencies. In international law, due to absence of absolute state government machineries, it is difficult to enforce the decisions of the court. States voluntarily accept the decision of the court and may reject it if such decision is considered to be against the national interest of the party. There is no world police to enforce the judgment but such is often played by the UN Security Council.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Distinguish between arbitration and judicial settlement

4.0 CONCLUSION

The peaceful approaches to conflict resolution are very vital to the maintenance of global peace and security. There is no way any meaningful development can take in the face of violence and armed conflict or war. It is however instructive for state and non-state actors to appreciate various available methods of conflict resolution in addressing any conflict that may spring up between any of them in the course of their relation and in the quest for actualising their political objectives.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed a number of peaceful approaches of conflict resolution among state and non-state actors in the promotion of global peace and security. It is through these peaceful means that positive peace can be achieved among parties.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Peaceful methods are better than violent method(s) in the effective resolution of conflict. Discuss, drawing your case studies from any conflict events in Nigeria.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Akehurst, M. (1970). *A Modern Introduction to International Law*. Harper Collins Academy.

- Henkins, L. et al. (1982). *International Law: Cases and Materials*. American Case Book Series. West Publishing Company (June).
- Hudson, M. (1994). *International Tribunals*. IIYBILC (1953).
- Malanczuk, P. (1997). *Akehurst's Modern Introduction to International Law*. (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Miller, C. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies* (2nd ed.). University for Peace.
- Partsch, K.J. (1995). "Fact Finding and Inquiry." *EPIL*, 11.
- Scott, J.B. (Ed.) (1916). *The Hague Courts Reports*, New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace & Oxford University Press.
- Seidi-Hohenveldren, I. (1992). "Conciliation Commission Established Pursuant to Article 83 of the Peace Treaty with Italy of 1947." *EPIL*, 1.
- Shaw, M. (1997). *International Law*. (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Starke, J.G. (1989). *Introduction to International Law*. Buttersworth.
- The Salzburg Session of the Institute de Droit International (1961). Later Published in the *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (Jul., 1962).
- Thirlway, H.W.A. (1984). "Reciprocity in the Jurisdiction of the International Court." *NYIL*, 15.
- Umozurike, U.O. (1993). *Introduction to International Law*. Ibadan: Spectrum Law Publishing.

UNIT 3 PEACEKEEPING

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Meaning of Peacekeeping
 - 3.2 Functions of Peacekeeping
 - 3.3 Contextual Conditions of Peacekeeping
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Peacekeeping is only a positive response to imposing some order and enforcement actions in the separation of the parties in armed conflict. The concept and practice of peacekeeping became fully entrenched in the global peace processes and institutions when it was developed in the 1940s by the United Nations but the concept had long been in existence prior to the establishment of the UN. Peacekeeping involves a third-party intervention aimed at assisting the parties to change their violent attitude in the prosecution of the conflict to a less violent or peaceful one by separating them and keeping them apart.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss the term peacekeeping
- describe the functions of peacekeeping
- explain the contextual conditions of peacekeeping.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Meaning of Peacekeeping

Peacekeeping, in classical terms evolved around basic assumptions, which according to Brian Urquhart may include:

- the consent of the parties involved in the conflict to the establishment of the operations, to its composition and to its appointed commanding officer

- The continuing and strong support of the operations by the mandatory authority, the Security Council
- A clear and practicable mandate
- The non-use of force except in the resort in self defence. Self defence, however, including resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent the peace-keepers from discharging their duties
- (less often noted) the willingness of the member states, and especially the permanent members of the Security Council, to make available the necessary financial and logistical support. (Urquhart, 1990: 9).

According to Alan James, peacekeeping involves:

- traditional-looking military force, composed of a number of battalions and the authority of a commander. The battalions will have been detached from or supplied by various national armies, and the commander is appointed by, and be responsible to, the international authority which has arranged the operation. (James, 1990: 1).

According to Miller (2005: 62), peacekeeping can be described as:

- the maintenance of public security, civil services, and cease-fire agreements in war and conflict zones by UN or regional military, police, and civilian forces with the consent of the nation-state on whose territory these forces are deployed. Peacekeeping involves co-ordinated efforts to ensure stability and relative normalcy in the aftermath of otherwise extremely volatile and chaotic situations. Chapter VI of the UN Charter outlines the objectives of peacekeeping and serves as the international mandate. The extended goal is to create conditions conducive to establishing lasting political settlements.

Traditional Peacekeeping activities have been undergoing a series of review in recent time. For instance, the conduct of peacekeeping operations is (was) exclusively the responsibility of the UN but now a number of regional bodies have been engaging in peacekeeping initiatives, and ECOMOG is a good example. Peacekeeping is very essential for conflict de-escalation. It is worth knowing that not all peacekeeping operations are carried out by military forces because some are civilian in nature. Peacekeeping operations do not only provide security, but also involve some other non-military initiatives (see SAIS on <http://cmtoolkit.sais-jhu.edu/>).

People often mistake peacekeeping for peace enforcement and full military operation. According to the laws of United Nations, traditional peacekeeping is contained in Chapter VI, while peace-enforcement can be found in Chapter VII and full military operation is in Chapter VIII. Peacekeeping deals with the separation of combatants while peace-enforcement involves imposing peace on the parties forcefully, particularly in a situation where high humanitarian disaster becomes unbearable due to extreme violence. Peace can also be enforced if one of the parties (or both) attacks the peacekeepers violently resulting in the death of some of the peacekeepers. Miller (2005: 60) maintains that peace-enforcement involves:

- operations 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 guarantee for such conditions. Peace enforcement is typically associated with the employment of military forces in order minimally to generate 'negative peace', or the absence of violent conflict engagement.

Full military operation can be carried out when a state actor in its activities, is posing a great threat to world peace and security. The world body through the Security Council may pass a resolution to carry out full scale military aggression against any deviant state. The first Gulf War is a good example, where Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein wanted to annex Kuwait to its territory, and such an action contravenes the United Nations Charter. The world body therefore decided that a full scale military operation should be carried out against the Saddam Iraq.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is peacekeeping?

3.2 Functions of Peacekeeping

There are three basic functions performed by peacekeeping and these functions are not mutually exclusive. Thus, a peacekeeping operation can perform more than one of these functions. Simply put, the functions performed by any peacekeeping operation, depends largely on its character It may perform only one of the three functions, or two, or all the three function. In this segment of the unit, we shall focus on various functions of peacekeeping. Thus, these functions include:

Defusion

This function is that which calls for the inauguration or setting up of a peacekeeping operation in the first instance. Here, a function is performed by initiating the establishment of impartial or neutral peacekeeping operation forces with the aim of reducing the crisis that has dominated the conflict relation between the affected parties.

Part of this function is to bring the parties together to appreciate the need to reduce or stop hostilities and violence by accepting a ceasefire agreement. The peacekeeping forces will then be at the middle of the parties to separate them. Sometimes, this function is performed when peacekeeping forces are brought-in, when a conflict is gradually moving towards a crisis situation or full blown war.

Here, the intervention of peacekeepers in the conflict may serve the purpose of freezing the conflict or mitigating any possible crisis situation. This intervention may warrant the parties to desist from their planned articulation of violence. Above all, the operation may provide parties a new platform to address their conflict issues, through which a settlement can be reached.

Stabilisation

This is the second function of peacekeeping. This function is performed when peacekeepers remain in the conflict zone after the combatants or parties have already been defused. The peacekeeping forces will need to check the inherent tension by maintaining the separation of the combatants, so that they will not have an opportunity to engage each other in further armed hostilities. In this situation, buffer-zone may be created to keep peace in the warring state. Peacekeeping operation may assist to reduce anxiety for aggression or counter-aggression between the warring parties either for retaliation or any other purposes. This is aimed at reducing the negative impact that such violence may have on the entire peace process.

Peacekeepers are then mandated to stay long, even longer than expected basically with the aim of maintaining stability, knowing that it is only in the atmosphere of peace that meaningful conflict transformation and settlement can take place. Thus, the peacekeeping body will continue to stay in the war zone not only to separate the parties from continued fighting but also to monitor peace initiatives such as signing of ceasefire agreement by the parties, and ensures that none of these parties breaks the rule of peace, and oversee the negotiation processes.

To achieve transformation of conflict and diplomatic settlement, the peacekeeping body may perform stabilisation function, by further maintaining the situation of relative peace between the parties and draw

viable intervention strategies to prevent further violence that can jeopardise the whole process.

Settlement

Peacekeeping body may offer assistance to the disputing parties in the resolution of their conflict. Any progress recorded at a peace process depends largely on the amount of assistance rendered by the peacekeepers in the realisation of any (peace) objectives. If the peacekeeping body is not committed to the peace process in a warring state, it is not unlikely that the whole peace process will be efforts in futility.

A classical example was the United States peacekeeping intervention in Somalia where the peacekeepers rather than improving the conflict relation between the warring parties, ended up compounding the violent situation in that country, which later resulted in the military fiasco on the part of the US peacekeepers. The dastardly attitude of the US peacekeepers attracted worldwide criticism particularly among the African public.

In furtherance of the peacekeepers' commitment to the peace process, the forces may engage in peacebuilding exercises like demilitarisation of the war zone, disarming the former belligerents, reintegrating both the combatants and the refugees into civilian life; assisting in the post conflict reconstruction of the destroyed social facilities resulting from the war i.e. bridges, street lights, schools, government offices, among others.

The task of peacekeeping is enormous particularly as it relates to settlement, by putting necessary mechanisms in place to assist the parties towards transforming conflict relation of the parties from violence to non-violence or war to peace.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What are the functions of peacekeeping?

3.3 Contextual Conditions of Peacekeeping

When we discuss the context within which a particular peacekeeping operation takes place, we are likely to encounter four basic conditions through which such operation draws its action agendum. All these conditions are necessary to define the context of any peacekeeping operation but the last two can be argued to be less necessary depending on the (distinctive) nature of the operation(s).

Competent authority

The decision of a competent authority is required before a peacekeeping body can be set up. In most cases, the decision usually comes from the world body, the United Nations, which can allow some international (regional) institutions to establish peacekeeping operation forces through its (the UN's) 'subcontracting principle'.

Individual states can also (individually) establish peacekeeping forces to reduce or end hostilities between the warring parties outside its territorial jurisdiction. The United States has done this in a number of times including its interventions in Somalia and Liberia.

The recent experience has had it that regional bodies like the ECOWAS can also establish peacekeeping operations to contain continued humanitarian crisis in any of the member states. This informed the resolve of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to establish peacekeeping operation and intervention forces, Economic Community of West African Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to keep peace in the war-torn Liberia in 1990.

The decision for the establishment of ECOMOG was reached by the African when their efforts to bring-in the United Nations peacekeepers proved less effective or even futile. ECOMOG was a response of the political leadership of the ECOWAS "to facilitate the encampment and disarmament of the warring parties" (Richards, 1995: 144).

Provision of necessary resources

Some necessary resources in human and material terms need to be provided before a peacekeeping operation can take place. International organisations lack necessary personnel and money, which are required for any peacekeeping operation. This is evident in the activity of the United Nations and other international bodies to seek for personnel and financial contribution from states.

Thus, these international organisations as well as the world body (the UN) do not have direct control of troops. They also lack the financial resources to unilaterally sponsor any peacekeeping operation(s), as they call on member states to contribute towards peacekeeping initiative.

The financial purse of the United Nations and other multilateral bodies is very lean because many of the member states usually fail to meet their financial obligation to the organisation, and it is quite difficult for the organisation to unilaterally sponsor any peacekeeping operation(s) without the assistance of various state actors, considering the expensive nature of such peace intervention.

The inability of the world body or international organisation(s) to settle (financially) the states that have contributed troops often leads to the withdrawal of some of these troops by their home government(s). This situation is capable of jeopardising the whole peacekeeping exercise.

Attitude of the parties/host state(s)

The traditional ethic of peacekeeping demands that before any operation can be carried out, the consent of the parties or the host state must be sought. The peacekeepers are not expected to launch a military aggression against any of the parties or both parties in order to control of the conflict situation or conflict area.

The United Nations frowns at such behaviour on the part of the peacekeepers apart from the case of self defense. The Charter of the UN also frowns at (illegitimate) territorial incursion, which can threaten the sovereignty of such state. Thus, caution is made by carefully seeking the consent of the parties and host state before the peacekeepers launch their presence in the state.

In a situation where the government of the host state demands immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the peacekeeping troops, the peacekeeping body should act accordingly, by leaving the state. Meanwhile, this view is not shared by all scholars considering the recent development of international peacekeeping operation(s) in which peacekeeping body maintains its continued stay in such state despite the call for its withdrawal by the host state e.g. Sudan. Even, in some cases, the consent of the parties or the host state is not sought for peacekeeping intervention to take place in such state.

The world has become a global village such that what happens in a country is transmitted to the whole world. One factor responsible for this development is the sophistication of modern communication technology. Apart from that, there are growing human rights advocacy among the world population as well as sporadic springing up of peace and anti-war movements. These and some other factors are responsible for the emerging tradition of peacekeeping. It was the increasing call on the Western governments of the US by large segments of their citizens that made most of them especially the US to support the peace operations in Darfur, Sudan.

The atrocities perpetuated against the Black population in the violent zone, Darfur as several groups sprang up to influence world government to take decisive measures to stop the carnage propelled by the violence in the region. The government of Sudan accused of giving covert support to the Arab *janjaweeds* initially refused the UN peacekeeping operations but had to force himself to cope with the reality. This is

because the international community and the world body insisted in carrying out peace operations in Darfur to reduce the ethnic cleansing that was going on in the region at that time. Finally, it was agreed that joint peacekeeping force should be inaugurated consisting of African troops backed by the African Union and other troops brought from outside the African continent anointed by the United Nations.

Political cooperation on the part of the parties in armed conflict

Peacekeeping operation does not involve the task of conducting violence by the peacekeepers against the parties to force a peace process on them. The political cooperation of the parties is greatly required for the peacekeepers to do their job without impediment or obstacle from the parties. The parties are to demonstrate a genuine commitment and cooperation in providing the peacekeepers the opportunity to carry out their functions.

Additionally, the value of impartiality is also required on the part of the peacekeeping body, through its neutral activities. This is to build trust between her and the parties. The parties will need to jointly see the peacekeeping body as unbiased before they can be willing to give substantial cooperation in supporting the task of the (peacekeeping) operation.

Thus, if one of the parties withdraws its cooperation to the peacekeepers, it is likely that the entire peace process will be truncated. It is mandatory on the peacekeepers to always consider necessary ways of maintaining adequate political cooperation by all parties.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Peacekeeping involves creating barrier between the parties in a given armed conflict, basically to reduce the level of violence that dominates the conflict relation between the parties. By separating the combatants from fighting and creating stumbling blocks in the exhibition of further violence between the parties, peacekeeping helps in transforming the conflict and reducing the scars of armed conflicts.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the concept and practice of peacekeeping. We described the various functions of peacekeeping and explained various contextual conditions of peacekeeping operation(s). We also distinguished among peacekeeping, peace-enforcement and full military operation.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the functions of peacekeeping?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

James, A. (1990). *Peacekeeping in International Politics*. International Institute for Strategic Studies, London: Macmillan.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. (2nd ed.). University for Peace (Africa Programme).

Richards, P. (1995). "Rebellion in Liberia and Sierra Leone: Crisis of Youth." In: Furlley, O. (Ed.). *Conflict in Africa*. London and New York: Taurus Academic Studies.

SAIS, "The Conflict Management Toolkit: Approaches." The Conflict Management Program, Johns Hopkins University.

Urquhart, B. (1990). "Beyond the Sheriffs Pose." *Survival*. May/June Vol. XXXII, No 3.

UNIT 4 PEACE BUILDING

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 4.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Meaning of Peacebuilding
 - 3.2 Properties of Peacebuilding
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Peacebuilding has become one of the hallmarks of the United Nations particularly as it relates to its peace efforts. Peacebuilding became an institutional platform in the United Nations' response to address the endemic nature of violent conflict that pervaded the entire global system in the early 1990s. The concept (peacebuilding) was made popular at the level of the UN by a former Secretary General of the world body, Boutros Boutros-Ghali in 1992.

Peacebuilding is a peace initiative that is not only aimed to address the triggers, which are the immediate sources of conflict responsible for the eruption of violence in the conflict behaviour of the parties, but also to deal with the root causes. Root causes are the major structural or underlying causes of conflict, which are instrumental, but not sufficient to motivate a violent attitude between the parties.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe peacebuilding and the two classes of peacebuilding
- highlight various properties of peacebuilding
- state various challenges of peacebuilding.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Meaning of Peacebuilding

According to Miller (2005: 57), peacebuilding involves, "Policies, programs, and associated efforts to restore stability and the effectiveness of social, political, and economic institutions and structures in the wake

of a war or some other debilitating or catastrophic event. Peace building generally aims to create and ensure the conditions for ‘negative peace’, the mere absence of violent conflict engagement, and for ‘positive peace’, a more comprehensive understanding related to the institutionalisation of justice and freedom.”

The British army (1997:2), describes peacebuilding as, “Actions which support political, economic, social and military measures and structures aiming to strengthen and solidify political settlement in order to redress the causes of conflict. These mechanisms to identify and support structures that tend to consolidate peace, advance a sense of confidence and well-being and support economic reconstruction.”

According to Albert (2001:130), peacebuilding is an ability of, “Repairing” relationships, institutions and social facilities and putting in place schemes that can help the disputing communities to be united once again.”

Boutros-Ghali in his *An Agenda for Peace* classified peacebuilding into two: pre-conflict peacebuilding and post-conflict peacebuilding. According to him, pre-conflict peace building includes such measures like ‘[de] militarisation, the control of small arms, institutional reform, improved police and judicial systems, the monitoring of human rights, electoral reform and social and economic development’ (Boutros, 1995; cit. in Albert, 2001:132).

The Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), describes pre-conflict peacebuilding as:

- ... a proactive process that requires identification of conflict incidences; analysis of conflict structure, actors, and trends; adoption of relevant responses and management mechanism (IDASA 2004:29-30).

Similarly, Rechler (1997:61 cit. in Albert, 2001:132) portrays pre-conflict peacebuilding as:

- Preventive measures that aim to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor; to promote and implement human rights and the rights of the minorities, and to promote durable development and the realisation of a just and fair social order in which there is no discrimination based on race or sex.

Pre-conflict peace-building is a kind of early warning mechanism to monitor conflict triggers or catalysts and address the structural or root

sources of (armed) conflict, which may be considered as latent or a conflict situation that is still in ‘sleeping phase’.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is more associated with peacekeeping while (often) focusing more on demobilisation and reintegration programs, and immediate reconstruction needs (see Doyle and Sambanis on www.worldbank.org). Boutros-Ghali (1995:15), describes post-conflict peacebuilding as an array of peace initiatives which include: “co-operative projects ... that not only contribute to economic and social development but also enhance the confidence that is so fundamental to peace.”

Peacebuilding involves building a network of opportunities in the transformation of conflict attitude between the parties through restoration of communication and genuine reconciliation. It promotes more friendly relationship among old combatants. It also creates institutions and socio-facilities aimed at assisting the former disputants to respect their mutual needs and interests for peaceful society where meaningful development can take place.

Peacebuilding plays very important roles in the promotion of peace and conflict resolution by focusing more on the ways through which the agreement can be effectively implemented. It also builds opportunity networks in the reconstruction of social, economic, and political structures to allow for creation of sustainable capacity for peace and long-term conflict transformation between the parties. Peacebuilding includes early warning and response efforts, violence prevention, conflict resolution, peace advocacy, civilian and military peacekeeping, military intervention, humanitarian assistance, ceasefire agreements, and the establishment of peace or buffer zones.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What is the meaning of peacebuilding?

Properties of peacebuilding

Peacebuilding usually attracts a lot of responsibilities on the part of peace facilitator and the parties in (armed) conflict. Generally, peacebuilding usually has some properties or elements, which include:

- Socio-economic and political equity
- Participatory and constitutional democracy
- Respect for human rights and rule of law
- Independent and responsible judiciary
- Demilitarisation and promotion of pacific settlement of disputes
- Establishment of reconciliation and restorative agencies

- Good governance and responsive leadership
- Civic education and peace advocacy
- Effective separation of power
- Public accountability
- Prompt and adequate administration of justice
- Strengthening of NGOs and community based organisations (CBO)
- Freedom of speech, association and respect of media rights (see DFID, 2002: 27-29).

Millers (2005: 58), observes that the properties include:

- assisting an end to military or violent exchanges through the decommissioning of arms, the demobilisation of combatants, and rehabilitation and reintegration programmes
- providing humanitarian relief to victims
- protecting human rights
- ensuring security and related services
- generating an environment of trust in order for social relations to function properly
- establishing non-violent modes of resolving present and future conflicts
- fostering reconciliation among the various parties to a conflict
- providing psycho-social or trauma healing services to victims of severe atrocities
- repatriating refugees and resettling internally displaced persons
- aiding in economic reconstruction
- building and maintaining the operation of institutions to provide such services and
- coordinating the roles of numerous internal and external parties involved in such interrelated efforts.

Finally, efforts in building peace should include implementation of peace agreements, and reviving the dislocated relationship and communication among former combatants or parties in conflict. Peacebuilding also demands that the collapsed state of economies, fragility of political structures, disarmament, repatriation and resettlement of the refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) should be also addressed in the transformation of conflict between the parties from violent to non-violent and war to peace. Miller (2005) argues that peacebuilding is a very difficult task and there are some obstacles, which can lead to the failure of any peacebuilding initiatives or agenda. According to him, these obstacles include:

- failures to address the underlying or root causes of the conflict

- lack of legitimacy in the eyes of recipients and target groups, particularly in relation to newly formed institutions
- lack of agreement over the acceptance of roles and implementation of responsibilities by all parties to the conflict
- limits on leadership in times of political transition or extreme crisis
- over-reliance on external parties
- aspirations to build a society that functions generally better than it did prior to the conflict.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

List any seven properties of peacebuilding.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Peacebuilding involves putting in place some conflict transformation measures that can create trust-building opportunities and improve the communication networks of the parties. In the quest of building peace necessary strategies are usually adopted for reintegration, rehabilitation and healing. Building peace also involves addressing the root causes of the conflict and creating long-term actions for sustainable peace and harmony between the parties.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed a number of issues on the subject matter: peacebuilding. We described the term peacebuilding and its two classes. We also explained various properties of peacebuilding. Thereafter, we highlighted various challenges of peacebuilding.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. What is peacebuilding ?
- ii. What are its properties?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Albert, I.O. (2001). *Introduction to Third Party Intervention in Community Conflict*. (Ibadan: PETRAF/John Archers).

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1995). *An Agenda for Peace*. (2nd ed.). New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.

DFID (2002). *Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes*.

Doyle, M. & Nicholas, S. "Building Peace: Challenges and Strategies After Civil War." The World Bank Group.
(see <http://www.worldbank.org/research/conflict/papers/building.pdf>)

IDASA (2004). *Peace Practice in Nigeria: A Toolkit*. Abuja: IDASA.

Miller, C.E. (2005). *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*. (2nd ed.). University for Peace (Africa Programme).

The British Army (1997). *Peace Support Operations*. London: Joint Warfare Publications 3-01 (January).

UNIT 5 GENDER PERSPECTIVE IN PEACE BUILDING

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Gender Mainstreaming in Peacebuilding
 - 3.2 Institutional Framework for Women Participation in Peacebuilding
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the time of war, a lot of atrocities are meted out on women and in most of cases these women are made to play marginal role(s) in the peace process designed to end the war or in post-conflict reconstruction. It is quite an injustice, if women issues are not included in the priority list in peace process(es) while justice demands that they (women) should always be included in the peace process. Women can play vital roles in peacebuilding and post conflict reconstruction.

In this unit, we shall be focusing on gender mainstreaming in peace process. Thus, women have gone beyond being relegated to the background because they can also play active role(s) like their male counterparts in building peace, if not even better because women cherish peace more than men considering their very low involvement in war. Women also appear to be most palpable victims of any armed conflict.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe gender mainstreaming in peacebuilding
- explain some of the legal instruments and multilateral resolutions, which promote participation of women in peace process.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Gender Mainstreaming in Peacebuilding

Gender is a term that is often used mistakenly to mean female sex or issues that involve women only. The term is however going beyond that

myopic conceptualisation. It involves social activities and roles as well as relation between women and men, rather than issue of biological differences. According to Pankhurst (2000:10):

- Gender relations are social relations which include the ways in which man and women relate to each other beyond that of personal interaction. They include the ways in which the social categories of male and female interact in the every sphere of social activity such as those which determine access to resources, power and participation in cultural and religious activities.

The task of peacebuilding is enormous, which forms the basis for the new direction in peace process activities. Several humanitarian interventions and peace operations have actually undermined the importance of women in peace missions.

Most approaches to peacebuilding have either ignored or marginalised issues of gender and women. Women remain a minority of participants in peacebuilding project; receive less attention than men in peacebuilding policies; and gender analysis rarely informs peacebuilding strategies (Pankhurst, 2000:1).

In as much that more than 50% of the population in almost every conflict society is female, it is therefore important to accord women their due rights. It is essential for them (the women) to be adequately represented in peace process. It is important for women to enjoy equal right with their male counterparts who are often accused as the initiators of the armed conflicts in the first place.

However, most of the injustices suffered by women in the time of war are likely to be under-reported or not reported at all, if they are not included in the peace process. For example, the joint UN/OAS international civil mission (MICIVIH) in Haiti succeeded in its mission due to high representations of women as well as effective monitoring of gender rights.

The human rights monitors of MICIVIH revealed the high degree of rape perpetrated against women by a paramilitary gang between 1993 and 1994. The activities of MICIVIH became a cornerstone in the advocacy for (increased) women participation in peace process, particularly in post conflict reconstruction. The report of the mission showed that between January and May 1994, no less 66 politically motivated rape cases took place.

Towards the end of 1990s, the impact of gender mainstreaming in peacebuilding became more prominent as evident in the activities of the

United Nations Transitional Assistance Group in Namibia (UNTAG) between 1989 and 1990. The composition of the peacebuilding mission demonstrated a new phase of gender sensitivity in peace operations.

This development has attracted non-discriminatory and more gender sensitive principle in peacekeeping recruitment process in the UN in accordance to the Article 8 of the UN Charter which states that ‘... no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity....’ This new attitude informed the high participation of women in the civilian group of UNTAG amounting to 50% of the total civilian personnel.

The UNTAG experience addressed some of the gender justice issues facing women and gender approach to decision making in peace processes. One of notable areas the mission (UNTAG), made a huge success was empowerment of women in political decision making and political participation.

Here, the female staff of UNTAG were actively involved in gender rights crusade. They undertook the task of educating the local women on the need to make themselves politically relevant, particularly by casting their votes through a secret ballot system according to their choice rather than by dogmatically accepting the choice of their husbands (Mansson, 2005:8). The new wave of adopting gender perspective in peacebuilding has also become manifest in Africa. According to the African Heads of States, it has become imperative to:

- ... ensure the full and effective participation and representation of women in peace process, including the prevention , resolution, management of conflicts and post conflict reconstruction in Africa as stipulated in UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) and to also appoint women as special envoys and special representatives of the African Union. (Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality adopted by African Heads of State and Government on July 6, 2004).

By the year 2000, the global campaign for gender mainstreaming in peace process(es) became further engendered leading to adoption of four major policy documents. These four documents demonstrated the relationship among peace, human rights and gender equality. These documents include the following:

- The Windhoek Declaration and Namibian Plan of Action on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations issued by the Lesson Learned Unit of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).

- A Gender Mainstreaming Policy Statement by the High Commission on Human Rights (UNHCHR). By 2002, gender justice has become central to the operations of the commission. Gender sensitivity became central in the strategic priority of the organisation in the conceptualisation, implementation and evaluation of its policy objectives and actions. Gender equality therefore a guiding principle for promotion and protection of human rights through a memorandum of understanding conducted between the office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR) and DPKO.
- Statement 6816 of the UN Security Council emphasised the need to always adopt a gender justice approach in peace operations by stressing that ‘peace is inextricably linked with equality between men and women’.
- The phenomenal 1325 resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations. The recommendations of the UN Security Council presented the relevance of gender related issues in every area of conflict prevention, peacekeeping and post conflict reconstruction.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Write a short note on gender perspective in peacebuilding.

3.2 Institutional Framework for Women Participation in Peacebuilding

In this segment of the unit, we are going to discuss some of the declarations and multilateral resolutions or statements, which have given providence and support to women participation in peace process. Every segment of the world population has now seen the need to encourage increased and adequate participation of women in peacebuilding and thus:

For many years, women’s role in war and other types of violent conflict, were quite invisible throughout the world. Accounts of war through news reporting, government propaganda, novels, the cinema, etc. tend to cast men as the ‘doers’ and women as passive, innocent, victims. In poor countries wars were not portrayed in quite the same way, but stories of courage and bravery of men as fighters have also tended to eclipse the active roles which women have played ... in many wars, some women have used their different roles to try to minimise the effect of violence, if not actively to try to end the wars themselves (Pankhurst, 2000:5).

In 1981, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) was adopted. This international legal instrument encourages all states of the world,

particularly the signatories to the Convention to advance activities that promote world peace and development through gender sensitive approach(es). It seeks to engender improved and increased women participation on equal terms, not only in peace process but in all fields.

On the uncivilised and barbaric atrocities perpetuated against women in conflict societies, the International Criminal Court (ICC) has declared that perpetrators of rape and other sexual abuse on women in conflict societies should be regarded as offenders of crimes against humanity which attract long-term imprisonment.

On humanitarian crisis in Rwanda, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was created in Arusha, Tanzania to bring the perpetrators of genocide and crimes against humanity to justice. Several people accused of war crimes were put on trial, among them were some so-called religious leaders. It is so pathetic having two female leaders who were supposed to be peace makers and friends to fellow women were found to be among war crime suspects. .

The first was the trial at the ICTR of Pauline Nyiramasuhuko, a former Minister for Women and Family Affairs who was thrown in prison along with her son. She was accused of inciting her son and his militia men to rape and kill women and children. In the similar vein, another former female cabinet member, Agnes Ntamabyaro, Minister of Justice, was also accused of participating in the genocide debacle. She was also thrown into prison in Rwanda. Several other women were also accused of crimes against humanity including nuns.

Nonetheless, women have currently played several critical roles in peacebuilding.

The efforts of women in realising their gender justice ambition through increased participation in peace processes were evident in their strategic and result-oriented campaign and activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) peace dialogue.

They strived for their inclusion in the process of peace negotiations. Through their commitment and the tremendous support from the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the African Women's Peace Committee, Femmes Africa Solidarite (FAS) among others, there was a renewed call to increase women participation in peace process.

The participation of women in the Inter-Congolese Dialogue (ICD), which took place in Sun City Resort, South Africa between February 25 and April 18, 2002 cannot be underestimated. Initially, the peace

conference ended without reaching any accord but it was later agreed that another peace meeting should be convened later in the same year in Pretoria, South Africa. Through the material and technical support of the UNIFEM, a number of Congolese women met in Nairobi, Kenya in between February 17 and 19, 2002.

The major objective of the meeting was to draft a declaration to develop a framework aimed at increasing women participation in the peace negotiation process in their country. Another major intention of the Nairobi meeting was to inaugurate a group of women to represent the interest of the Congolese women. The group would consist of eleven representatives, and each of these women would represent each of the eleven provinces of the country.

Their (Congolese women's) deliberations resulted in the Nairobi Declaration. The declaration accorded relevance to the needs and aspirations of women, particularly as Congolese women contributed 52% of the total population in the DRC. The population strength of women should be considered by negotiators as 'an inescapable force in the restoration and maintenance of peace and development' of the warring country.' The Declaration went further to highlight various atrocities women suffer in conflict societies ranging from rape, mutilation to HIV infections.

In the Nairobi Declaration, women explained the need for all and sundry to acknowledge their active roles in peacebuilding, reconstruction and development because they are no less 'mothers of the nation', as their active roles in the family and society at large cannot be overemphasised, particularly in the area of mediation. Therefore, the active participation of women should be encouraged and the IDC should adopt gender equality approach in order for the peace negotiation meeting to yield fruits. Through their declaration, the Congolese women resolved (in addressing the conflict in DRC) that:

- there should be cessation of all hostilities and immediate withdrawal of foreign troops must be observed
- unification of the entire country be facilitated and territorial integrity of the country be respected
- there should be immediate adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) as the platform to eradicate gender inequality and discrimination against women
- improved and adequate representation of women in decision making institutions and processes be guaranteed by affirmative action

- Inter Congolese Dialogue (ICD) should engender gender equality and gender sensitivity in the diplomatic process
- there should be proper and adequate rehabilitation and re-integration of the demobilised child soldiers
- in the agenda of the ICD, the needs of women, children and other vulnerable groups must receive a priority attention.

Hence, the increased participation of women in the peace negotiation process and peace movement strategies have really had a great impact on the (relative) peaceful atmosphere (relatively) in the DRC, which recently conducted and completed an electoral process (though almost marred with pockets of violence between the government forces and the rival parties).

Notwithstanding, a great history has been made in the conflict ridden country for successfully conducting an election after several decades in limbo and military tyranny. It should be incumbent on the new democratic government of Joseph Kabilo to take cognisance of various international declarations and resolutions by adopting a gender sensitive approach as he desires to take the new Democratic Republic of Congo to the land of promise.

It is important to highlight some human rights instruments that protect the rights of women and children who constitute the larger part of the vulnerable groups in conflict societies. These human rights instruments include the Universal Human Rights: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR); Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Convention Against Torture (CAT), Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their families.

All these human rights instruments protect the interests of women in one way or the other, as the two covenants: ICCPR and ICESCR in their Article 3 mandate gender equality as a basis for human rights protection and promotion. Therefore, there should be equality between men and women in peace operations.

Since, there is less patronage of women in most peace operations, the campaign for gender sensitivity has not ceased. This campaign has formed the basis for the Kigali Conference. The Kigali Declaration reinforces positive and active roles of women in peacemaking and peacebuilding, and their peace-enduring attitudes as well as love. The declaration: “recognise(s) women’s traditional peacemaking roles and

their right to equal involvement in all peace initiatives, including early warning mechanisms and swift responses at national, regional and international levels" (Kigali Declaration, 1997).

Another notable and important forum where gender equality was discussed was Beijing Conference where 189 governments pledged to 'revoke any remaining laws that discriminate on the basis of sex.' The modus operandi of the United Nations Fourth World Conference on women in 1995 (known as Beijing Conference) in the city of Beijing in China, was to address the structural and fundamental inequality that was characteristic in the relationship between men and women both at national, regional and international levels.

The campaign had a little impact in the abolition of discriminatory laws against women. The conference has though given more life to the women advocacy and struggle as a lot of gender oriented NGOs started springing up and gender mainstreaming in peace operations became a regular vocabulary in international peace and gender discourse.

Now, in the constitution of Uganda, gender equality is engendered, as men and women have equal rights and opportunities to political, economic and social resources. This new direction has been reflected in the appointment of a woman, Ms Betty Bigombe as the principal negotiator representing the government's team in the peace negotiation process between the government and the Lord Resistance Army (LRA), a rebel group that has been launching an armed insurgency against the government.

Moreover, her participation in the peace process was very productive and fruitful as ceasefire was facilitated. She was later dropped as the Minister for the Pacification of the North, but before she was removed from office, the fragile peace in Uganda was provoked when the ceasefire agreement broke down. There is no gainsaying that it was the effective negotiation skills and diplomatic artistry of Miss Betty Bigombe that necessitated her reappointment by the government to engage the rebels in further diplomatic repertoire [negotiation or peace talk(s)].

In Rwanda, there is more pleasant news. The new constitution of the country guarantees women at least a 30% quota in political institutions. In the parliament, women are now occupying no less than 48.8% of the parliamentary seats. The constitution further guarantees women, 50% of the Supreme Court Judges, and women are happy to have the 50% constitutional share in the judicial appointment at the nation's Supreme Court.

Another good story was that of the appointment of a woman as the court president. In addition, a woman was also appointed as the Minister of Justice and the head of the National Service for *Gacaca* Jurisdiction. *Gacaca* Justice was a baby of circumstance. *Gacaca* courts were created by the government to address the pains and agonies of the genocidal war that befell the nation where various accused persons made confessions about their activities in the war.

The courts operated on the hill tops and people were expected to attend to collectively condemn genocide in strong terms. The courts were operated under the tutelage of locally elected judges known as *inyangamugaya* meaning people of integrity. *Gacaca* bemoans acts of hostility as several of those considered to be guilty of various crimes against humanity got their hostile attitudes condemned by their communities with repudiation, which have succeeded to reduce the burden of guilt and shame.

The *Gacaca* jurisdiction was established on 26 January 2001 to prosecute the offenders of crimes against humanity and genocide that visited Rwanda between 1st of October 1990 and 31st December 1994. One of the landmark gender sensitive efforts made by the *Gacaca* jurisdiction was prioritising sexual abuse and rape issues as category one criminal offences, which propelled courage among women-victims to bring several perpetrators of rape and sexual abuse to justice in the country.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Women play important roles in peacebuilding. As activists and advocates for peace, women have continued to respond to need to stem down the culture of violence, which has thrown the entire global system in war and confusion. Women have increased their campaign for the promotion of culture of peace among the world population through promotion of principles of democracy and human rights.

Women are now getting more involved in (international) peacekeeping initiatives and humanitarian activities. They also serve as mediators, trauma healing counselors, and policymakers for meaningful conflict transformation. It is not surprising that women have been able to achieve this fit within short time of their gender advocacy in peace process. They remain committed not only to building peace but also active in socialisation processes, creating unique values and civic attitude among the people.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have been able to discuss some of the declarations and institutional resolutions that have given credence and support to the improved women participation in peace process. We also explained several gender advocacy activities carried out by several women organisations and NGOs in their quest for mainstreaming gender in peacebuilding.

3.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Has there been any improvement in the women participation in peace process in Nigeria?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Kigali Declaration (Final Document of the Pan African Conference on Peace, Gender and Development). Kigali, Rwanda 1-3 March, 1997.

Mansson, K. (2005). "Integrating Human Rights in United Nations Peace Building Activities: Developing Gender Justice Best Practices." In: *Gender Justice in Post Conflict Countries in East, Central and Southern Africa*. Advocacy Magazine, Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria/UNIFEM, September.

Pankhurst, D. (2000). *Women, Gender and Peacebuilding*. Working Paper 5, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Dept. of Peace Studies, University of Bradford (August).

Solemn Declaration on Gender adopted by African Heads of State and Government, the Third Ordinary Session of the AU Assembly Meeting, Ethiopia, 6-8 July, 2004.