Role models in peace-building in Africa: An assessment of selected characters
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African scholars and experts have developed several methods and strategies of conflict management and peace-building, they have not been widely popularized as role models. Thus, researchers and practitioners have to fall back on theoretical frameworks and methodologies propounded in Europe and Asia in building peace in Africa. This has created problem of intellectual poverty for the continent. This paper, therefore, aims at promoting four Africans, who have distinguished themselves in peace-building to serve as role models. The characters are Anwar Sadat, Nelson Mandela, Harold Dappa-Biriye, and Yakubu Gowon. The paper adopts post-behavioural theoretical framework and applied purposive sampling technique, and finds that the efficacy of the methods of the characters have built confidential relationship among the people and parties. In the process, they have narrowed-down the gulf between theory and practice in peace-building in Africa. It concludes that the methodologies and strategies they applied become standard in peace-building for the benefit of humanity. The paper then recommends making the characters role models in peace-building and security studies as is done in other disciplines.
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INTRODUCTION

Several Africans have over the years propounded theories and developed methods and strategies of conflict management, resolution, and peace-building, but they are not been popularized. Thus, scholars and experts (Ikelegbe, 2001; Imobighe, 2003; Isaac, 2005) have to go back to theoretical frameworks and methodologies developed in Europe and Asia (Bryce, 1908; Easton, 1951; Bertallanfy, 1956; Marx, 1951/1978; Gandhi, 2008) in resolving conflicts in Africa. This has created problem of intellectual poverty or inferiority for Africans the same way the British claimed of bringing civilization to Africa (Fage, 1965:50). Jomo Kenyatta has to debunk the British propaganda; but our position is that the present problem requires going beyond debunking to that of promoting African scholars and experts who have contributed immensely to peace-building. The position is consistent with that of Mbeki (2004), former President of South Africa. He said, “… we should always refuse to rationalize the upside-down way of looking at Africa. Our poverty and underdevelopment should never serve as reason for us to abandon our dignity as human beings, turning ourselves into... subservient recipients."It is on record that men and women who have demonstrated exceptional skills for positive social change in philosophy, science, medicine, engineering, music, and other disciplines are honoured as idols or role models in that particular field. Such persons become reference point and celebrated when discussing that particular subject within and outside the community. As a role model, he or she serves as standard of excellence and is worthy of emulation (Schlesinger, 1978; Carter, 1982; Dappa-Biriye, 1995). For Engels (1978), the role model is to ensure that the “useless memories and futile strife by oppressors that spur violent conflicts were dead and buried. This serves as the starting point of a new development..., and one great product they leave is that of modern nationalities, the refashioning and re-grouping... to make history.”

Four Africans, representing the major regional blocs, have already distinguished themselves and made history in peace-building, and fit into the description of role models. They are Muhamad Anwar El Sadat, Egypt;
Nelson Mandela, South Africa; Harold Dappa-Biriye and Yakubu Gowon, Nigeria whose theories, methods, and strategies of peace-building have generated so much positive social changes that they have become reference points or standards in the African society.

Anwar Sadat, for example, adopted the “doctrine of personal responsibility”, and applied the instruments of corrective revolution (1971) and infitah policy (1973) to constructively engage Israel to peace-building in 1977. The World applauded Sadat’s peace formula which was concritized in Camp David in 1979. He was awarded along with M. Begin of Israel the Noble Peace Prize in 1979. Nelson Mandela based his peace formula on “constructive engagement” where conflicting parties, that is the Whites, Blacks and Coloured people, were encouraged to collaborate, negotiate and reconcile with each other as equal partners. Thus, after his release from prison in 1990, he was actively engaged in the reconciliation and transformation processes of South Africa into multi-racial democracy; and was awarded along with F. Deklerk the Noble Peace Prize in 1993.

Harold Dappa-Biriye on the other hand propounded the “interactive theory” on conflict and pursued its realization through constructive engagement by bringing together all major tracks or stakeholders in conflict to dialogue under conducive atmosphere; and it has the following four forms, components, or phases, namely, peace-making, peace-keeping, peace-enforcement, and peace-building. He applied it to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1976 at the instance of the Secretary-General of UN, Bolo-Bodo (1967) and Andoni Ogoni (1973) inter-ethnic conflicts in the old Rivers State, Nigeria. The formula brought about an uninterrupted peace in Andoni-Ogoni ethnic nationalities for 20 consecutive years. Going forward, while Gowan’s theory is “peace at all cost”, the method is based on an “independent mediation” where conflicting parties are motivated to collaborate and negotiate on what they considered to be the solution to their problem. Gowan applied the method to resolve the protracted Ogoni debacle (1997-2002), global antagonism against Nigeria, following the death of Ogoni 9 (2003), and Jos crises in 2004, 2008 and 2010. The formula or model has built confidential relationship among the Ogoni people, Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Ltd (SPDC), and Rivers State and federal governments.

In discussing the efficacy of the methods and strategies of the four characters in relation to their peace-building efforts, one common feature stands out among them, that is, their ability to ensure that the terms and conditions of the conflict resolution (settlement) consolidates confidential relationship for the aggrieved party to be properly re-integrated into the mainstream of Egyptian, South African and Nigerian society. The other characteristics are the restoration of peace and existing relationship among the people, institutions and government, and the increasing application of the methods these days at(Table 1-1). The Table 1 explains the characteristics of the four characters and how their efforts have impacted positively in their respective societies that they are recognized by the world. The characters reacted to their immediate situations localized in time, space and surrounding. It is this characteristic reaction to a particular situation in a particular way that makes them different from mere nationalist (Carson, 1980; Udoji, 1996). A nationalist is a citizen of a particular nation, which in this case, is Egypt, South Africa, or Nigeria, who is devoted to the interest of that state. He or she is concerned with the political independence of the state, guiding the modern state, and defending and advancing the interest of its citizens in the international political and economic system. The underpinning principle of a nationalist is patriotism, instead of restoration of relationship for peaceful co-existence as the case of role models. That is why a nationalist often times become a trouble shooter and there are numerous examples of such persons in Africa, ranging from Kwame Nkrumah (Ghana); Milton Obote, Idi Amin and Yoweri Museveni (Uganda), Ahmed Ahidjo and Paul Biya (Cameroun) to Robert Mugabe (Zimbabwe). These nationalists turned around to become enemies of the same people and state they fought hard to liberate. This explains why there are persistent internal conflicts in the continent (Ogwu, 2006).

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the foregoing analysis does not mean that a nationalist cannot become a role model where he/she distinguishes him/herself beyond the level of a mere nationalist. In America and Britain, for example, several nationalists have become role models in peace-building. According to Tocqueville (1956), “long before the Age of Jackson, Thomas Jefferson had been honoured as role model for setting forth the proposition that, “all men are created equal”. In recent times, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, John F. Kennedy, Bill Clinton, and now Barrack Obama in America, and Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, and Tony Blair in Britain have become reference points in politics, good governance, and making “democracy safe for the world.”

Role models are particularly important in conflict resolution and peace-building. Peace-building, as demonstrated by the characters is the application of well-articulated methods and strategies to ensure an absence of war, and respect and tolerance of other people’s opinions. This, as applied by Harold Dappa-Biriye, takes four forms, components or phrases, that is, peace-keeping, peace-enforcement, peace-building and peace-making (Table 1). For Ibeanu (2006:12-13), “each of the forms expresses a specific articulation of conflict and development in Africa”.

Figure 1 shows a typical conflict situation in African where if conflict processes are low and the conditions for sustainable development are limited, the peace process takes the form of peace-keeping. This involves the use of peace keepers to keep the conflicting parties apart and
Table 1. Characteristics and character of African peace-builders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sadat</th>
<th>Mandela</th>
<th>Dappa-Biriye</th>
<th>Gowon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theory/Doctrine</td>
<td>Doctrine of Personal Responsibility</td>
<td>Doctrine of War for Freedom</td>
<td>Interactive Theory</td>
<td>Peace at all Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Method/Strategy</td>
<td>Corrective revolution, and infitah policy</td>
<td>- Constructive engagement anchored on perseverance and endurance after justice - Has components of collaboration, negotiation and reconciliation as equal partners</td>
<td>Multilateral diplomacy anchored on peace-building, peace-keeping, peace-enforcement, and peace-building</td>
<td>Independent Mediation anchored on constructive dialogue; reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation (RRR) programs; multitrack peace process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficacy/Impact</td>
<td>- Peace with Israel, paving way for Arab-Israeli direct negotiation - Spurred UN to pass Resolutions No. 248 and 338 for ceasefire and comprehensive peace-building in the Middle-East - Called for an end to wars, and the peace formula has stood the test of time</td>
<td>- Reconciliation and transformation of South Africa into multi-racial democracy - Charted new path to free society - Triumph over forces of apartheid</td>
<td>- Resolved Arab-Israeli war in 1967, leading to UN Resolutions 248 and 338 - UN interrupted 2020 years of peace in Andoni, Ogoni and Bolo-Bodo (Ogoni) ethnic nationalities</td>
<td>- Resolved Ogoni crisis, and global antagonism against Nigeria following death of Ogoni 9 - Embarked on Jos peace processes - Incorporated Yakubu Gowon Centre to pursue peace advocacy, peace network, etc. in Nigeria and Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

keep conflict at low levels. But where conflict is high and conditions for peace remain limited, peace enforcement is required to create the opportunity for enhancing sustainable development and reducing conflict. Going forward, peace-making arises in situation where conflict is high but there are viable opportunities for pursuing development. Peace-building applies to situations of low conflict and high prospects for sustainable development.

What we have done is to link peace to existing socio-economic and political conditions in African
society. Peace itself is a complex concept and has to be understood from five perspectives, namely, instrumentalists, functionalists, sociologists, political and philosophical (Etekpe, 2009). The Instrumentalists interpret peace as a means to an end. This means, peace is a catalyst for social progress and development. The functionalists also see peace as playing a social function in African. The sociologists capitalized on the instrumentalists and functionalists perspectives to define peace as a condition of social harmony. These will however, take place where there are no violent conflict and individual and group needs are adequately met. This may account for the reasons why Political scientists see peace as a political condition that makes justice possible (Brecht A, 1959). What this means is that peace gives political structures such as the executive, legislature, judiciary arms of government, etc values and stability to operate effectively.

The foregoing concepts of peace point at one thing, that is, an understanding of the complex nexus between development and conflict, both in Egypt, South Africa, Nigeria, and the larger global environment in which the characters operated.

The issue at stake is that while these role models are reference points in addressing contemporary challenges in their respective disciplines, careers and professions, it is not the case in conflict management, security and peace studies. Scholars and experts in conflictology hardly refer their publics to role models as if they are non-existent in the discipline. Instead, the publics are exposed to abstract methods, styles and/or strategies that do not really resolve conflicts and build peace in Africa. It is probably for this reason, Isaac, (2005) raised the question as to whether “conflict is not resolvable?”, and Tavchy (2011) thesis of “political scientists in search of a discipline.”

There are several factors that seem to account for the non-popularisation of role models in conflictology, and the most prominent one is that each of the character was literally regarded as rebel against the existing order of values and attitudes that dominated the time. As if Verma (1975) had Nelson Mandela, a classical case of rebellion in mind when he wrote, “a rebellion involves action, and unless somebody has himself gone through action of rebellious character, he will not be in a position to understand…..” Nnamdi Azikiwe (1974) made this point clearer when he wrote:

...the experience gained by such human beings in their political history in different parts of the world, especially since the age of enlightenment, liberalism and radicalism, following the English revolution (1688), American revolution (1776), French revolution (1789), Haitian revolution (1800), Russian revolution (1917), Chinese revolution (1949), Egyptian revolution (1952), Cuban revolution (1963) and the Nigerian revolution (1966) is cherished by the people.

This paper, therefore, aims at bringing together the works of four carefully selected African characters (earlier stated) to be referenced as role models in peace-building in the continent. This is necessary because there has been a great deal of writings on conflict, peace and security studies (that is, conflictology), as well as discussions on the nature, sources and causes of conflicts, including methods, styles and strategies of managing conflicts without adequate attention given to the role of tested and proven idols in the discipline.

The paper is divided into four broad areas, beginning with an introduction, this is followed by theoretical framework and methodology, and an exposition of the four selected role models within the context of their background information, the theory and practice each of them propagated, and the lessons for the future in peace-building. The last part makes critical remarks and far-reaching recommendations that would make role models an integral part of peace-building in Nigeria, in particular, and Africa, in general.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

The framework to address these and similar “issues and events” are based on David Easton’s works on “post-behavioural revolution” (Easton, 1953). The work establishes new trends emerging in the discipline aimed at the revival of faith for political science, including peace and security studies, to move away from too much dependence on other social sciences and start growing as an autonomous discipline. This shall bridge the gulf between the various branches of political science for better appreciation, not only the compatibility but the inter-connectedness between philosophy, science, and peace studies so that the study of role models is no longer neglected as important. We applied purposive sampling methodology to select the four characters (Bailey, 1982). In purposive or judgmental sampling, we applied prior knowledge about which character meet the purpose of the study. This is important to guide against including nationalists or political philosophers in the sample population. The method is also used in election prediction, and deviant case studies (Gabriel, 1965).

CASE STUDY OF ROLE MODELS IN AFRICA

Muhamad Anwar El Sadat, 1918-1981, Egypt

Background Information: Anwar El Sadat was born on 25 December 1918 in Mit Abu al-Kum, al-Minufiyah in Egypt. While his father was an Egyptian, his mother was Sudanese. His parents had 13 children, but he grew up under the care of his grandmother. The grandmother had native intelligence and used to tell Anwar El Sadat stories of early resistance movements against the British occupation of the country, and how war settles external conflicts (Engels, 1978).

These stories made him admire four persons that became his role model. They were: (1) Zahran, a nationalist who resisted British rule and allegedly killed a
British soldier. He was then hanged in retribution for it; (2) Kemal Ataturk, a Turkish activist for challenging the imperialist and introducing several reforms; (3) Mahatma Gandhi, an Indian, for his tenacious application of non-violence against injustice; (4) Hitler, a German, for his ability to wage war against Britain, the then Number One imperial power of the world.

He married two wives, Mrs. Ehsan Madi and Jehan Raouf that gave him a total of six girls and one son (Gamal). He enrolled and graduated from the Royal Military Academy in Cairo in 1938 and was deployed to the Signal Corps. There, he met Gamal Abdel Nasser and along with others formed the Free Officers Movement (FOM). The FOM was committed to liberating Egypt from British imperialism, and he participated in the Egyptian Revolution of 23 July 1952 to overthrow King Farouk I. Based on his gallant role, he was assigned to announce the overthrow in Egyptian national radio networks. Gamal Abdel Nasser, who succeeded King Farouk, appointed Sadat as Minister of State (1954), Secretary to the National Union (1959), President of the National Assembly (1960-1968) and Vice President (1969). He became President after Nasser’s death in 1970.

The theory, method and practice in peace-building:

Anwar El Sadat’s theory of peace-building was based on the “doctrine of personal responsibility”. Thus, upon assumption of office as president of Egypt, he introduced two policies that eventually prepared grounds for peace-building. The first was the corrective revolution in 1971. It involved purging Nasserist members from strategic positions in the government and security services, which have lost the original vision of Egyptian revolution, become pro-Soviet, and popularised the tenets of the Egyptian Revolution of 1952. He also strengthened the foreign policy and dealt with extreme Islamists. The second was the Infitah policy in 1973. This policy brought about several positive economic and political reforms in Egyptian private and public sectors that eventually ushered in peace and stability in the region. Sadat’s infitah policy was greatly influenced by the philosophy of free-market.

Having consolidated the domestic front, Sadat launched his foreign policy by attacking the Israeli forces occupying the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula and the Syrian Golan Heights on 6 October 1973 in an attempt to recapture the territory earlier captured by Israel in the Six-Day War of 1967. He was motivated by two factors. First, his perception that Israel did not “desire to negotiate” the handing over of those territories to Egypt and Syria, especially as Israel was suspicious of the heavy presence of Soviet forces in Egypt. Secondly, the conviction that the desire for peace requires preparation for war. He remembered Hitler’s philosophy that war was an instrument of peace. The October War of 1973 astonished both Israel and Arab world, and consequently spurred both Israel and Egypt to a re-think of peace-building.

The United Nations was also re-awakened, and eventually passed Resolution 338 on 22 October 1973. The resolution called for an immediate ceasefire and set the tone for a comprehensive peace-building in the Middle East region. The ceasefire did not last but the October war gave Egypt an edge in the search for peace in the region. Having been dissatisfied by the role of third parties in the Israeli-Arab peace process, Sadat took a unilateral decision to officially visit Israel and met with Menachem Begin, the then Prime Minister, on 19 November 1977. Both leaders discussed the implementation of the UN Resolutions 242 and 338, and how they should be meeting regularly at Geneva. Jimmy Carter, former president of America, capitalised on it and arranged for a comprehensive peace process in 1978. It cumulated in to the Camp David Accord and both parties signed it in Washington DC on 26 March 1979 (Carter, 1982). The world hailed this giant stride and Sadat and Begin were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. In his acceptance speech, Sadat (1977) said:

Let us put an end to wars, let us reshape life on the solid basis of equity and truth. And it is this call, which reflected the will of the Egyptian people, of the great majority of the Arab and Israeli peoples, and indeed of millions of men, and children around the world that you are today honouring. And these hundreds of millions will judge to what extent every responsible leader in the Middle East has responded to the hopes of mankind.

The main features of the agreement were the mutual recognition of each other’s country, cessation of hostility that has existed since the first Arab-Israeli war in 1948, complete withdrawal by Israeli forces in the Sinai Peninsula, free passage of Israeli ships through the Suez canal, and the recognition of the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aquaba as international waterways. The treaty has stood the test of time.

Lessons for the future: Sadat seemingly adopted the United Nation for Education and Scientific Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO’s) principle that “since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defence of peace must be considered” (Etekpe, 2009) by making a “risky journey” to Israel in 1977, and for many years, he was known as the “hero of the crossing”. In the process, he achieved peace in several fronts, including cessation of war, recovery of the Sinai Peninsula, and uninterrupted access to the Suez Canal. Today, Sadat’s peace process has become reference point in resolving international conflicts. Whereas the peace treaty gained wide support among Egyptians, it was extremely unpopular in the Arab and Muslim world. They accused him of sidelining Arab’s interest, and betraying his predecessor’s Pan-Arabism. In 1979, the
Arab League (Imobighe, 2003) expelled Egypt and moved its headquarters from Cairo to Tunis. He was equally assassinated during the annual victory parade in commemoration of Egypt’s crossing of the Suez Canal by Lieutenant Khalid Islambouli on 6 October 1981. Eleven other persons were killed along with him, including a Cuban Ambassador, an Omani general, an Irish Defence Minister and US Military Liaison Officer. In commenting on Sadat’s death, Etelke (1983) wrote:

...in this world as it is, no man can be free unless he lives within the protection of a free society. In the free society, there are men and women, fighters of freedom, who strain at the bonds of their society, having a vision of life and peace as they ought to be. They live gloriously, and many of them die gloriously. And in life and death, they magnify freedom....

The Sadat’s theory and practice of peace won him the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1984 by President Ronald Reagan, and has become a reference point in resolving international conflicts. The Arab world that initially resisted it returned the headquarters of the Arab League to Cairo in 1989 and is gradually embracing the peace accord. His second wife, Mrs. Jehan Sadat, an Associate Resident Scholar at the University of Maryland in America has instituted The Anwar Sadat Chair for Development and Peace in hour of her husband’s legacy in 1997. His successor, President Hosni Mubarak kept the momentum of Sadat’s theory and practice in peace-building for 34 years before he was removed from office in April, 2011.

Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela, 1918 – , South Africa

Background Information: Nelson Mandela was born on 18 June 1918 in Thembu at Ounu in Transkei in South Africa. His native name, Rolihlahla, meaning “trouble maker” seems to reflect his character in later years. He was born into a royal family as his father was the the then Principal Councillor to the Acting Paramount Chief of Thembuland. Unfortunately, his father died when he was still young, and he was compelled by custom to take over the position even though he was not prepared for it. As a chief, he was reminded of how his ancestors gallantly resisted the European exploitation and the need for his “age grade” to continue the “war for freedom”. He then thought of becoming a lawyer at that early age in order to, first, defend his people, and later apply the profession to dismantle apartheid system in South Africa.

He then started the process by attending a Methodist Church primary school at the age of seven in 1934 as the first in the family to do so. The local Methodist Church introduced him to the Christian doctrines and dogmas, including giving him a Christian name, Mandela. He later moved to Wesleyan Secondary School, and enrolled at the University College of Fort-Hare for a Bachelor of Arts (Law) degree programme. During this period, he was elected as member of the Students’ Representative Council. The Council became radical and protested against apartheid system in 1940 and Nelson Mandela was suspended for spear-heading the protest. He then went to Johannesburg to complete the BA degree programme. At Johannesburg, he increasingly experienced the evils of apartheid system of separate areas for Africans and White settlers, Pass Law, Stock Limitation, Suppression of Communism\ and Group Area Acts, the Bantu Authorities Act, and the Voters Act between 1941 and 1951 (Etelke, 2009).

He had no other option than joining the African National Congress (ANC) in 1944 as a platform to fight the apartheid (discriminatory) system. He changed the direction of ANC from the pursuit of Gandhi’s non-violence to Kwame Nkrumah’s radical “positive action”, and the White government saw Nelson Mandela as a true “trouble-maker”. Accordingly, he was quarantined for over 30 years in prison in Robben Island. Nelson was brought out every day between 0600 and 1300 hours to break rock, thinking he would die of such a torture. At the end of the exercise, his jailers would ask, “Are you ready to denounce violence and be freed?” Nelson would look at the jailer(s) – right into their faces, and kept silent. The various types of torture made him become one of the world’s most famous political prisoners. The former President F. W. De Klerk could no longer sustain apartheid system amidst growing international demand for the release of Nelson Mandela and entered into secret negotiation. Nelson Mandela insisted that prisoners have not right to negotiate, and so the talks broke down (Mandela, 1965). He was eventually released from prison in 1990, and the negotiations commenced. Both of them worked closely and negotiated for a “free society” until apartheid was dismantled and Nelson Mandela became the President of a “new” South Africa in 1994.

The theory, method, and practice in peace-building: Nelson Mandela’s theory on peace-building seems to fit into Machiavelli’s postulation that the “end justifies the means”. That seems to suggest that the application of violence would prepare the ground for peaceful negotiation (that is, doctrine of war for freedom). Nevertheless, he re-fashioned the Machiavelli’s theory to embrace constructive engagement anchored on perseverance and endurance after justice. He took advantage of his legal profession to campaign against apartheid at the grassroots, and urged the people to support the ANC Youth League and ANC policies. After his release, he played active role in reshaping politics of reconciliation for the ideals he stood for to strive. In this regards, he worked closely with Frederick W. De Klerk to transform the country into a multi-racial democracy where the Africans (17.70 million), Whites (4.20 million), Coloured (2.30 million) and Asians (0.7 million) charted a
new path to “free society”.

Nelson Mandela has been the driving force in the joint meetings of the three major ethnic nationalities and impressed on the majority black Africans not to carry out retributory actions instead be engaged in continual dialogue. Thus, he and De Klerk were jointly awarded the 1993 Noble Peace Prize for “suffering and sacrificing so much for the freedom of South Africa”. Having stabilised the politics, he voluntarily quitted active politics and governance after the first tenure as President. This is hardly practised by African leaders (Gideon-Cyrus M, Rohio, 2007).

Lessons for the future: Nelson Mandela epitomises the lessons of uncompromising attitude towards evil and the determination to achieve a “free society”. Thus, in writing on, No Easy Walk to Freedom (1965), he reminded oppressors that, “no power on earth can stop an oppressed people determined to win freedom.” This has impressed people in economic and political positions to resort to constructive dialogue, instead of military superiority. There is no doubt; Nelson Mandela has taught people how to be radical in action, but peaceful in building bridges within and outside the ANC and South Africa, Africa and the World.

In writing on, “Nelson Mandela: The Legend Lives on”, Kolawole (2010) seems to have summarised the efficacy of his method and lessons this way:

As many are aware, his influence went a long way in South Africa’s choice by FIFA to host the 2010 World Cup tournament – the first on African soil. It was a poetic coincidence that his 92nd birthday fell a few days after the highly successful tournament. When Mandela published his autobiography,...many reviewers and commentators described the subject as an enigma, a man with an uncommon generosity of spirit..., a rare statesman and nationalist. These accolades remain true of Mandela today as they were then. It is no surprise that the UN has deemed it necessary to honour this great humanist and intellectual icon with a day set apart to celebrate the great qualities.... The epic story of Mandela is a source of inspiration to millions of people around the world. His perseverance and endurance in the face of persecution, his large-heartedness, selflessness, his sense of nationalism, his uncommon faith in the equality of people of all races, his dogged insistence on what is right, and triumph over the forces of apartheid are qualities that have set Mandela as role model in peace-building (and other disciplines).

Harold Jenewari Dappa-Biriye, 1920-2005, Nigeria

Background Information: Harold J. Dappa-Biriye was born on 26 September 1920 at Peterside, Bonny in Rivers State, Nigeria to the family of Chief Wilcox. He grew up under his grandmother. As fairly educated, she groomed and exposed him to the ecology of the Niger Delta. He attended Bonny Government School between 1929 and 1936, and completed his high school certificate in King’s College, Lagos between 1937 and 1941. He changed his name from Harold Wilcox to Harold Dappa-Biriye to have a native identity. Harold Dappa-Biriye worked briefly with the defunct Post and Telecommunications (P&T) and Public Works Department (PWD) before veering into international trade to export rattan canes, piassava and black pepper to London and New York.

He was the Secretary of several socio-cultural organisations, including Ijaw Union, Port Harcourt (1952), Rivers State Congress (1953), Rivers Chiefs and Peoples Conference (1956), and founder/President of the Niger Delta Congress (NDC) – a political party (1959). The NDC contested in the 1959 general elections as a minority party in Nigeria (Dappa-Biriye, 1995). Going forward, he represented the minorities in the pre-Constitutional Conferences in London in 1957/1958 where he argued for the minority rights, as well as the need to create separate states for them – Oil Rivers, Calabar-Ogoja, and Middle Belt states. The argument culminated into the setting up of Henry Willink’s Commission of Enquire in 1958.

The theory, method, and practice in peace-building: He propounded the interactive theory of conflict resolution and peace-building in 1941. The theory emphasizes on galvanising parties in conflict to re-examine their positions. The re-examination is expected to generate positive change and innovation that would at the end prevent apathy in any given society or nation (Etekpe, 2007). The theory is anchored on “multilateral diplomacy”, with four forms, components or phases, namely, peace-making, peace-keeping, peace-enforcement, and peace-building. The forms or phases emphasize dialogue as the best option for peace-building (Figure 1).

He applied the method in the resolution of Arab-Israeli conflicts in June – July 1967 when, he, along with 5 other experts in peace-building were assembled by the UN Secretary - General in New York for the mediation of the Arab-Israeli war. During the mediation process, he introduced his peace formula earlier stated (that is, peace-making, peace-building, peace-keeping and peace-enforcement). This formula was eventually adopted by the other members of the team in implementing the UN Resolutions 242 and 338. Due to his brilliant contributions, he received from the Mayor of the City of New York a Golden key.

He equally applied the peace formula in the resolution of Andoni, Bonny and Ogoni inter ethnic crises in old Rivers State in 1973. This brought about a 20-year period of uninterrupted peace in these clans until Governor Ada George’s administration in the state tinkered with it in
1993 and spurred another round of conflict. He is fondly referred to as the pacifier to divisions 2 and 3 of the Nigerian Army during the 30-month Nigerian civil war. Going forward, the then Governor of the State, Chief Melford Okilo used Chief Harold Dappa-Biriye to pacify another inter-ethnic crisis between Bolo and Dere (that is, Okrika and Ogoni) in Rivers State in 1983.

His greatest instrument to peace-building in Nigeria is stateism. He was the champion of state creation as a political platform for the development of minority ethnic groups in the country.

It was a long and sustained agitation that started in full force immediately he graduated from King’s College, Lagos in 1941, and was realised after 26 years on 27 May 1967 when General Dr. Yakubu Gowon created the first twelve states, and gave his Rivers ethnic group a separate state. From the beginning, the number of states has risen to 36, and by 31 December 2010, 33 ethnic groups were clamouring for their own states. It should be emphasized that state creation has contributed immensely to the unity, peace and stability of Nigeria.

He was also known as the Treaty Mandatory of the Rivers Kings, Chiefs and People from 1957 to his death on 17 March 2005 (Etekpe, 2004) The mandate conferred on him the power and authority to negotiate on their behalf treaty rights of the City States in London in 1957 and 1958. In recognition of his peace efforts, he was made the “patriarch of the Niger Delta”.

**Lessons for the future:** As champion of minority rights, he applied institutional framework to fight internal colonialism and ensured that ethnic minorities have equal access to central (state) power and resources. He promoted minority rights to the point that it formed an integral part of the fundamental human rights enshrined into the 1959, 1960 and 1979 Constitutions of Nigeria. Interwoven with it is his consistent advocacy for state creation which has enhanced the unity and injected peaceful co-existence in the country.

The other lesson is that of perseverance, resilience, courage and candour in liberating oppressed people from the tyranny of the majority ethnic nationalities. In the Obsequies of Harold Dappa-Biriye on 18-19 March 2005, General Dr Yakubu Gowon, former Head of State and Government between 1966 and 1975 wrote:

> he was a staunch nationalist, and at the same time a peace-builder, who believed fiercely in one Nigeria. He believed that the people of the Niger Delta should not be marginalised. He was a proponent of state creation (and multilateral diplomacy) to protect the minority groups.... (Etekpe, 2009).

Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, another former Head of State and Government between 1975 and 1979, and President, 1999-2007, describe him as “steadfastly committed to the cause of justice and self-determination of his people over several decades. He was an extraordinary leader who pioneered the struggle for emancipation and empowerment of the Niger Delta communities. With his death, the nation has become poorer”.

**Yakubu Jack Dan-Yumma Gowon, 1934 –, Nigeria**

**Background Information:** He was born on 19 October 1934 to Mr. and Mrs. Nole Yohanna and Matwok Kurnyang Gowon in Kanke village in Pankshin Local Government Area (LGA) of Plateau State, Nigeria. Mr. Yohanna Gowon left for Wusasa in Zaria in Kaduna State as missionary of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) when Yakubu DanYumma was still an infant. Thus, Yakubu grew up in Wusasa, Zaria and had his home, primary and secondary education there. After graduation from Government College, Zaria in 1952, he enlisted in
the Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA), Kaduna in 1954. He was commissioned as Second Lieutenant on 19 October 1954. Thereafter, he attended several officers training courses in Ghana, England, and India, and became the first Nigerian Adjutant of the 4th Battalion in 1960. He served in the UN peace-keeping force in Congo (Zaire) between 1961 and 1963, and became the first Nigerian to be bestowed as Adjutant-General in the Nigerian army. As Adjutant-General of the Nigerian Army, Yakubu Gowon remained a career soldier and had nothing to do with politics until he was appointed as the Head of State and Government at the age of 32 years on 1 August 1966. He was a onetime Chairman of Organization for African unity (OAU) (1973) and founding father of Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975.

The theory, method, and practice in peace-building: In spite of his military background, Yakubu Gowon applied “independent mediation” method of peace-building. The instruments of the method and practice include the instrument of constructive dialogue to resolve conflicts and initiated several peace talks, including that of Aburi in Ghana to end the Nigerian civil war in 1976. This was followed by the instrument of state creation on 27 May 1967. The instrument of state creation is one of Yakubu Gowon’s greatest legacies on peace-building as it weakened the “tyranny of the majority”. It is interwoven with the famous declaration on 10 January 1970 at the end of the 30-month civil war that there was “no victor, no vanquished”. He then took the bold step to embark on massive reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation (3R) programmes to “heal wounds” and make the country stronger and more united. As if these were not enough, he established the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) scheme in 1973 to build bridges of peace and friendship across the country.

Earlier, he repealed the infamous Decree 34 of 1966 that created a unitary form of government in the country, and released several political prisoners, including Chiefs Obafemi Awolowo, Anthony Enahoro, Ninetry Ezenbodor and Major Isaac Boro. Their release made Gowon so popular that the people coined out an acronym for him – go on with one Nigeria (GOWON).

When the Ogoni ethnic nationality plunged itself into crisis, resulting from the death of, first, four prominent pro-government second generation elites (Ogoni 4), and later, nine pro- Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP) chieftains (Ogoni 9) between 1993 and 1995, there were no local or international organisations, including World Council of Churches (WCC) to resolve the crisis. Yakubu Gowon volunteered to intervene as an independent mediator and brought about relative peace through a 6-year tedious peace process, known as the “Ogoni Peace Process” (Etekpe, 2007; Fiofori, 2009). The effort prompted the Commonwealth to re-admit Nigeria after the country has been a pariah state for several years following the hanging of “Ogoni 9” in 1995. The peace process has moved to different dimensions, such as guinea worm eradication and rollback malaria programmes since 1998 and 2004, respectively.

Lessons for the future: Yakubu Gowon, the most respected Nigerian Head of State and Government was not tired of forging peace and unity in Nigeria even when he left governance in a military coup in 1975. Thus, he incorporated a non-governmental organisation (NGO), known as the Yakubu Gowon Centre (YGC) in 1980. The centre pursues peace and national unity, integration and international co-operation, and has executed several peace and humanitarian programmes that have unified the country more than when he was in active governance. The programmes, as earlier stated, includes Ogoni Peace Process (1997-2003), guinea worm eradication programme and rollback malaria (1998), Nigeria Prays (1998) and election monitoring in Nigeria and other parts of Africa and the world since 1999. The Nigeria Prays is an inter-religious rally that has brought Nigerians closer to God, and healed the people physically and spiritually. It has become a national programme. Gowon has become an epitome of peace in Nigeria and Africa, and should be immortalized.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper argues that those who have distinguished themselves in philosophy, medicine, science, music and other disciplines/professions have been referenced and celebrated as idols or role models, this is not the norm in peace-building, especially in Africa. The absence of role models has created a vacuum in peace, conflict resolution, and security studies. The paper pointed out the importance of role models in peace-building, and assessed how the theories, methods and practices of four Africans, namely, Sadat (Egypt), Mandela (South Africa), and Dappa-Biriye and Gowon (Nigeria) fits into the description of role models and be celebrated. Their methods and strategies have consolidated confidential relationship between the people, institutions and governments, not only in their respective countries, but in Africa (Table 1). In the process, they have re-integrated parties in conflict into the mainstream of the polity and economy in Egypt, South Africa, and Nigeria. The paper adopts the post-behavioural theoretical framework and applied purposive sampling technique. It finds that the efficacy of the methods of the characters qualify them as role models in peace-building and recommends immortalizing them (characters) and categorizing role models along the nature and types of conflicts.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis, it is recommended:
Role models be incorporated into peace and security studies as is done in other disciplines. This will inspire and commit scholars, practitioners and conflictual parties to quicker resolution of perennial conflicts.

That there should be additional commissioned studies to categorise role models according to the nature and types of conflicts so that such knowledge can easily be applied to specific areas for meaningful results in Africa.
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