

# Human Rights Abuses, Justice and Peace within Developing Democracies: An Introspective Reflection

Elias Nankap Lamle (Phd: Leuven-Brussels)<sup>1</sup>, Felix Ogbewe Aigbovbioisa (M.A: Ibadan)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centre for Conflict Management and Peace Studies, University of Jos, Jos, Nigeria*

<sup>2</sup>*Peace and Development Studies Programme, Salem University, Lokoja, Nigeria*

**Abstract:** This paper examines Human Rights, Justice and Peace. Human Rights are fundamental, inherent and intrinsic to all human beings in as much as they are human, irrespective of nationality, gender, ethnicity, origin, colour or any other ascribed status. These rights can be protected in a functional democratic setting that anchors its foundation in the rule of law. Sadly, in most developing democracies, the reverse seems to be the case as human rights are not often respected as they ought to be. Extra-judicial killings, unlawful detentions, and other series of human rights abuses are still prevalent in developing democracies. This paper therefore, undertakes the following: conceptual understanding of human rights, justice and peace; human rights and social justice issues in Cameroon, Egypt and Nigeria; as well as highlighting the nexus among human rights, justice and peace as potential guarantors of social stability in human society. To this end, the paper ends with a conclusion with profound recommendations made. Secondary sources were mainly used for the purpose of this paper.

**Keywords:** Human Rights, Justice, Peace, Developing Democracy, Rule of Law, Instability

## I. INTRODUCTION

Human rights constitute a set of norms governing the treatment of individuals and groups by states and non-state actors on the basis of ethical principles regarding what society considers fundamental to a decent life. These norms are incorporated into national and international legal systems, which specify mechanisms and procedures to hold the duty-bearers accountable and provide redress for alleged victims of human rights violations. It was precisely on 10<sup>th</sup> of December, 1948 that the United Nations General Assembly adopted and made a proclamation on Universal Declaration on Human Rights. The declaration centered on the ontological and inherent dignity of man, equality of human person, and inviolable and inalienable rights of all human species. Since human beings moved from the state of nature to organized and orderly civil society, observance of human rights still remain largely a fiction as they cannot be said to be respected and guaranteed where rule or law is neglected. In fact, rule of law means that everybody, no matter their position is subject to the law; that is, the law is supreme and no respecter of anyone. Not only that the law is supreme, it is also its duty through justice system and other governmental agencies to protect the rights and dignity of the human person.

In Nigeria, for instance, citizens enjoy many rights and the inalienability of these fundamental rights of citizens is statute-protected by the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Precisely, Chapter IV of the amended 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria lists out the basic Fundamental Human Rights enjoyed by citizens of the country.

Despite this increasing recognition of the links between respects for human rights as having potential for the prevention of conflict in human society, there has been little debate on how human rights mechanisms and tools can be better employed to sustain peace. Various Member States of the United Nations have reservations regarding the applicability of human rights mechanisms for sustaining peace, and discussions on human rights issues in intergovernmental organs outside of the Human Rights Council, especially the Security Council.

## II. CONCEPTUALISATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, JUSTICE AND PEACE

### *Human Rights*

The ontological essence of man demonstrates he is a being with value. The cognition of this intrinsic dignity and value shows imperativeness of the inalienability of the rights of human beings. Those inalienable and inviolable rights are foundation for social justice and peace in the world. If the rights are neglected and disregarded, it will result to barbarous acts which are antithetical to the human conscience. The world in which the human person shall express himself, enjoy freedom of speech, religion, freedom from fear, lack and want are the superlative dreams of the human family. Human rights therefore, are inalienable and inviolable basic rights which a human person possesses inherently simply because he or she is a human being. Human rights are perceived as universal; that is, it is for every person. These rights in national and international law could exist as natural or legal rights. Human rights are basic rights and freedom that all people are entitled to, regardless of nationality, gender, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, language, or other ascribed status. It includes civil and political rights, such as the right to life, liberty and freedom of expression and social, cultural and economic rights, freedom from slavery and torture, including the right to

participate in election, to work and receive education, etc. No wonder Oraegbunam, Ikenga K. E. (2007) argues that fundamental human rights are attached to every human being by virtue of that very fact of 'being'. Everyone is entitled to these rights, without discrimination. (UN, 2019)

Human rights are norms that aspire to protect all people everywhere, from severe political, legal, and social abuses. A society is deemed to be just when it has laid down mechanisms for specifying and protecting people's rights (Ekanola, 2011, p.46). The philosophy of human rights addresses questions about the existence, content, nature, universality, justification, and legal status of human rights (Lamle, 2018). The strong claims often made on behalf of human rights (for example, that they are universal, inalienable, or exist independently of legal enactment as justified moral norms) have frequently provoked skeptical doubts and countering philosophical defenses (Lacrois and Pranchere 2016, Mutua 2008).

### Justice

One of the first written definitions of justice is that of the philosopher Aristotle, who lived approximately 2300 years ago (384–322 BC). Aristotle described justice as "the bond of men in states" (Ekanola, 2011, p.52). He stated that justice consists of righteousness, or complete virtue in relation to one's neighbour. Furthermore, he espoused the idea of justice as a state of character, a cultivated set of dispositions, attitudes and good habits. Aristotle expands on justice by stating that it consists of treating equals equally and unequal's unequally, in proportion to their inequality. This is also known as distributive justice (Aristotle 1962).

The core of the concept of justice, according to Ekanola, (2011, p.45), "...lies in how people are treated within the context of a social arrangement. A society might be said to be just when its basic structures and institutions are ordered in such a way that people are treated fairly; or put differently, are given their dues."

According to most contemporary theories of justice, justice is considered overwhelmingly important. And it is thought of as being distinct from benevolence, charity, prudence, mercy, generosity, or compassion; although these dimensions are regularly interlinked (Lamle, 2018).

Justice is a concept of moral rightness based ethics, rationality, law – be it natural or manmade, religion, equity and fairness, as well as the administration of the law, taking into account the inalienable and inborn rights of all human beings and citizens; the right of all people and individuals to equal protection before the law of their civil rights, without discrimination on the basis of race, gender, national origin, color, ethnicity, religion, disability, age, wealth, or other characteristics; and is further regarded as being inclusive of social justice (Lamle, 2017).

### Peace

Peace has always been among humanity's highest values; for some, supreme. Consider: "Peace at any price" (Lamle, 2018). The most disadvantageous peace is better than the most just war. Peace is more important than all justice. The most popular (Western) view of peace is construed as an absence of dissension, violence, or war; a meaning found in the *New Testament* and possibly an original meaning of the Greek word for 'peace', *Irene*. Pacifists have adopted this interpretation, for to them all violence is bad. This meaning is widely accepted among ideologists and students of international relations. It is the primary dictionary definition of the concept of 'peace'.

Peace, however, is also seen as concord, or harmony and tranquility. Although "tranquility may be a tranquility of slavery, or a tranquility imposed by violence and maintained by force" (Justice Chukwudifo Oputa (rtd); cited in (Cukwura and Sylvester, 2008, p.2). 'Peace' is equally viewed as peace of the mind or serenity. It is defined as a state of law or civil government, a state of justice or goodness, a balance or equilibrium of Powers. Such meanings of peace function at different levels. Peace may be opposed to or an opposite of antagonistic conflict, violence, or war. It may refer to an internal state (of mind or of nations) or to external relations. Or it may be narrow in conception, referring to specific relations in a particular situation (like a peace treaty), or overarching, covering a whole society (as in a world peace). Peace may be a dichotomy (it exists or it does not) or continuous, passive or active, empirical or abstract, descriptive or normative, or positive or negative (Lamle, 2018).

There are a variety of approaches to conceptualising 'peace,' but space does not allow a full discussion here. However, we do wish to distinguish two types of peace: negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is simply the absence of violence, or more specifically, the absence of war. During a violent conflict, negative peace—stopping the violence—is likely the immediate goal. However, as Galtung (1964, 1969) argues, violence includes more than direct, physical violence, and consequently a society might achieve peace in the negative sense without necessarily being peaceful because of structural, psychological and cultural violence. In his words, for instance, Justice Chukwudifo Oputa (rtd) as cited in (Cukwura and Sylvester, 2008, p.3), and acknowledged in Aigbovbioisa, (2018, p.3), argues that "'true peace' results from 'true order.' An order imposed by force, oppression, fear, threats, blackmail, etc is a 'false order.' It's slavery!" At best, the above can only bring about 'negative peace'; that is, peace of the graveyard! One common feature of 'negative peace' is that people do not have freedom to exercise their rights; they are gagged and coerced to remain calm despite the oppression of the state. Therefore, the people simply obey the state for fear of threat, force, oppression and other negative tendencies by the state (Aigbovbioisa, 2018, p.3). However, notwithstanding these negative tendencies by the state to

coerce the citizens to a state of total submission and docility, citizens often and usually ventilate their grievances either through occasional riots, violent protests and/or revolutions (Aigbovbioisa, (2018, p.3). This, of course, may be why Albert Einstein, the Theoretical Physicist, submits that “peace cannot be kept by force, it can only be achieved and maintained by understanding” (Cukwura and Sylvester, 2008, p.3).

Thus, the axiomatic submission of the renowned scientist, Albert Einstein, is in direct consonance with the idea of ‘positive peace’ as coined by Galtung (1969) and espoused by the Peace Studies Perspective. ‘Positive peace’ ensures the absence of physical, psychological and structural violence with the presence of social justice. ‘Positive peace’ guarantees and promotes freedom, happiness and social inclusiveness of citizens of the state in the scheme of things hence, everyone is always willing to obey the state without being forced to do so (Aigbovbioisa, (2018, p.3). Therefore, since the presence of both psychological and structural violence with the absence of social justice that can inhibit man from reaching his full potential can precipitate armed conflict, scholars and policymakers should pay attention to both forms of violence (Galtung, 1969). Thus, here, we would understand peace to be defined both as the absence of physical violence or war, and more broadly as “positive peace” (Lamle, 2018).

#### *African Union Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights*

The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (also known as the Banjul Charter) is an international human rights instrument that is intended to promote and protect human rights and basic freedoms on the African continent. It emerged under the aegis of the Organisation of African Unity (since replaced by the African Union) which, at its 1979 Assembly of Heads of State and Government, adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a committee of experts to draft a continent-wide human rights instrument, similar to those that already existed in Europe (European Convention on Human Rights) and the Americas (American Convention on Human Rights) (Lamle, 2016). This committee was duly set up, and it produced a draft that was unanimously approved at the OAU’s 18th Assembly held in June 1981, in Nairobi, Kenya (Lamle, 2018).

The AU has a human rights focus that is more explicit than the OAU. The importance of human rights was not strongly recognised under the OAU Charter, which only made reference to the UN Charter and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In contrast, the AU Act confirms the importance of human rights by the adoption of guiding principles such as gender equality, participation of the African peoples in the activities of the Union, social justice, peaceful co-existence of the member states and respect for democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law, and good governance. Thus, apart from the individual obligation of member states to ensure the guarantee of human rights within their jurisdiction, the AU has undertaken an institutional

obligation to ensure the effective guarantee of human rights in Africa in general (Icelandic Human Rights Centre, 2019).

### III. HUMAN RIGHTS IN NIGERIA

Human Rights, has been defined as the “inalienable rights of people”. They are the legal entitlements which every citizen should enjoy without fear of the government or other fellow citizens (Lamle, 2016). They are said to be the rights which cannot be said to have been given to man by man but are earned by man for being human because they are necessary for his continuous happy existence with himself, his fellow man and for participation in a complex society (David Kaluge, *Human Rights Abuse 2013* as cited in Adenrele and Olugbenga, 2014).

In the Nigerian Constitutions, beginning from the Post-independence Constitution, due attention has always been given to the issue of human rights. In the 1960 Independence Constitution, 1963 Republican Constitution and the 1979 Constitution, provisions were made for human rights protection. Further, in the 1999 Constitution (as amended) two Chapters, spanning 26 (twenty six) sections are devoted to human rights subject. The need for constitutional provisions for human rights cannot be over-emphasised because, it is the state, with its various institutions which is primarily responsible for guaranteeing the implementation and enforcement of these rights in respect of its citizens and all those coming under its jurisdiction (Dada, 2012).

For the sake of emphasis, the Fundamental Rights of Nigerians under Chapter IV of the 1999 Constitution (as amended) are as follow, as cited in Lamle (2018).

1. The Right to Life
2. The Right to Dignity of Human Person
3. Right to Personal Liberty
4. Right to Fair Hearing
5. Right to Private and Family Life
6. Right to Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion
7. Right to Freedom of Expression and the Press
8. Right to Peaceful Assembly and Association
9. Right to Freedom of Movement
10. Right to Freedom from Discrimination
11. Right to Acquire and Own Immovable Property anywhere in Nigeria

### IV. HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES IN CAMEROON, EGYPT AND NIGERIA

#### *Human Rights and Social Justice Issues in Cameroon*

Cameroon, a country in Central/West Africa previously known for its stability, has lately faced with violence and serious human rights abuses in 2018. The country endured abusive military operations against a secessionist insurgency in two Anglophone regions, attacks by the Islamic militant group, Boko Haram, in the Far North, and a worsening humanitarian crisis.

In the South West and North West, government security forces have committed extrajudicial executions, burned property, carried out arbitrary arrests, and tortured detainees. A Human Rights Watch report documented a range of abuses by both sides in the Anglophone regions, including arson attacks on homes and schools. According to the International Crisis Group, government forces and armed separatists killed over 420 civilians in the regions since the crisis escalated in 2017.

The humanitarian consequences of the Boko Haram attacks and separatist insurgency are of serious concern, too. As of November 2018, the United Nations estimated that more than 244,000 civilians were displaced in the Far North and 437,500 in the Anglophone North West and South West regions. About 32,600 Cameroonians found refuge in Nigeria. Also, Cameroon has continued to forcibly return Nigerian asylum seekers, fleeing Boko Haram attacks in northeastern Nigeria. While the Cameroonian government maintained it did not tolerate serious crimes committed by security forces, it failed to demonstrate progress in investigating and punishing them (Human Rights Watch, 2018).

In the Anglophone North West and South West regions, the absence of a genuine political process to address decades-old grievances against the Biya government contributed to the radicalization of the discourse and tactics of Anglophone activists. Since mid-2017, Anglophone separatists have attacked government institutions and threatened, kidnapped, and killed civilians perceived to side with the government.

In 2016 and 2017, government security forces used excessive force against largely peaceful demonstrations organized by members of the country's Anglophone minority who were calling for increased autonomy for their region. During demonstrations in late 2017, according to Human Rights Watch, (2018), and Amnesty International (2018, p.5), government forces used live ammunition, including from helicopters, against demonstrators and bystanders, killing at least a dozen people and injuring scores. Some individuals detained in the context of the demonstrations were subjected to torture and ill-treatment.

#### *Human Rights and Social Justice Issues in Egypt*

According to its constitution, Egypt is a republic governed by an elected president and unicameral legislature. The Presidential elections held in March 2018 were largely perceived as unfree and unfair presidential election, according to Human Rights Watch (2018). Prior to the presidential elections, challengers to the incumbent president Abdel Fattah al-Sisi pulled out, citing personal decisions, political pressure, legal troubles, unfair competition, and in some cases they were arrested for alleged violations of candidacy prohibitions for military personnel. Domestic and international organisations expressed concern that government limitations on association, assembly, and expression severely constrained broad participation in the political process. Domestic and international observers, according to Human Rights Report

(2018), expressed concern about restrictions on freedom of peaceful assembly, association, and expression and their negative effect on the political climate surrounding the elections.

According to Amnesty International (2019), the scope of Egypt's human rights crisis expanded, as the authorities arrested opponents, critics, satirists, current and former human rights and labour rights activists, journalists, presidential candidates and sexual harassment of some women. The authorities used prolonged pre-trial detention to imprison opponents, and restricted and harassed civil society organisations and staff. The authorities used solitary confinement that amounted to torture and other ill-treatment and enforced disappearance against hundreds of people with impunity, and failed to investigate cases of extrajudicial executions (Amnesty International 2019). Civilian and military courts issued mass verdicts after unfair trials and sentenced hundreds of people to death. The authorities prosecuted two women who spoke out against sexual harassment, while discriminating against women in law and practice. People were arrested on the basis of their real or perceived sexual orientation. The authorities prevented Christians from freely practising their beliefs and failed to hold to account those responsible for sectarian violence. The armed forces used US-imported banned cluster bombs in an ongoing military operation in Sinai (Amnesty International 2019).

Thus, human rights issues in Egypt in 2018 included unlawful or arbitrary killings by the government or its agents and terrorist groups; forced disappearances; torture; arbitrary detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions; arbitrary arrest and detention; political prisoners; arbitrary or unlawful interference with privacy; undue restrictions on free expression, the press, and the internet, including censorship, site blocking, and criminal libel; substantial interference with the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, including government control over registration and financing of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs); restrictions on political participation (Human Rights Report, 2018).

Although the government inconsistently punished or prosecuted officials who committed abuses; whether in the security services or elsewhere in government; in most cases, the government did not comprehensively investigate allegations of human rights abuses, including most incidents of violence by security forces, contributing to an environment of impunity (Human Rights Report, 2018).

#### *Human Rights and Social Justice Issues in Nigeria*

Nigeria is a federal republic composed of 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). In 2015, citizens elected President Muhammadu Buhari of the All Progressives Congress (APC) party to a four-year term in the first successfully democratic transfer of power from a sitting president in the country's history.

On assumption of office in 2015, President Muhamadu Buhari vowed to bring to an early end, the menace of the Boko Haram insurgency prominent in the northeast of the country. However, the menace of the militant terrorist groups Boko Haram and the Islamic State in West Africa (ISIS-WA) has remained largely uncontained. The groups conducted numerous attacks on government and civilian targets that resulted in thousands of deaths and injuries, widespread destruction, the internal displacement of approximately 1.8 million persons, and external displacement of an estimated 225,000 Nigerian refugees to neighboring countries, principally Cameroon, Chad, and Niger (Human Rights Report, 2018).

Besides the unholy and dastard acts of human rights violations by the militant terrorists above, there is also another dimension to human rights abuses in Nigeria. For instance, after being held incommunicado in detention for more than two years by the State Security Service (SSS) without trial, access to counsel, or family visitation, the publisher of the Bayelsa State-based tabloid 'The Weekly Source', Mr. Jones Abiri, was released on bail in August. The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) reported Abiri was accused of being a member of a Niger Delta militant group but was not formally charged, and said Abiri's detention was in response to critical coverage from the July 2016 edition of the Weekly Source. Following an open letter from the CPJ and significant public outcry, Abiri was arraigned and eventually released on bail. Abiri told reporters that he was blindfolded, held in an underground cell for most of the two years, and did not have access to medication in detention (Human Rights Report, 2018). And of course, added to the above is the Police and Military brutality on civilians and the likes, as noted by Ogoloma, et al (2014, p.30; cited in Ozoigbo, 2017, p.30).

#### V. ANALYSING THE NEXUS BETWEEN HUMAN RIGHTS, JUSTICE AND PEACE AS GUARANTORS OF SOCIAL STABILITY

On the surface, it seems clear that human right, justice and peace are interrelated concepts. At the most basic level, war can lead to violations of human rights and gross violations of human rights can lead to war (Isakovic 2001). The foundations of the international human rights system are rooted in the experiences of World War II; the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights was created on the belief that human rights violations threatened world peace (McGuinness 2011). Even as the two terms are inherently connected, human rights and peace are often framed as contradictory objectives in the study of transitional justice and peacemaking, although scholars and practitioners have challenged this assumption.

It is important to understand how human rights and peace are defined. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, includes a variety of rights, including political and civil rights, as well as social, economic, and cultural rights. However, international

actors differ in their conceptual approaches to human rights, including which "rights" are universal. In this regard, three separate generations of human rights have been identified by (Wellman 2000).

First-generation human rights are political and civil rights, the most basic of which would be life, liberty, and security; but also embodies freedom of religion, opinion, expression, assembly, and association. Such rights are often considered "negative rights," as they express rights that governments should not infringe upon (i.e., they restrict government behaviour) (Lamle, 2018).

Second-generation human rights include socio-economic rights, such as the right to education, the right to work, and the right to housing. These are often called "positive rights" because they suggest actions governments should be required to do. The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights entered into force in 1976 and has been ratified by 164 States (Lamle, 2017). However, these rights remain controversial, as their Cold War context and association with communism has prevented their full acceptance by some countries. Because a focus on these rights provides "strong incentive to reduce the glaring economic inequalities of our world" (Johnston 2014, 912), we expect to see a greater commitment to second-generation rights by non-Western groups.

Third-generation human rights are commonly referred to as "solidarity rights." These rights are the most controversial of the three generations of rights and include rights that are claimed by groups of people, rather than individual rights. Examples of third-generation rights include the right to development, the right to a healthy environment, and the right to peace (Lamle, 2017). Due to their more controversial nature, third-generation rights have not been as fully incorporated into international law. Initially, these rights gained their greatest purchase among developing countries. For example, the "right to development" first appeared in 1981 in Article 22 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR 2005).

Root causes of conflicts are multiple and include conflicts over ethnic rivalries, long legacies of mistrust, failures of earlier peace agreements, unfinished business of decolonization, high levels of human development deprivation, and fights for territory and resources. The effects of these root causes of conflicts are manifest at multiple levels, including political, cultural, economic, social, psychological, and human well-being. In order to realise positive peace, those root causes of abuses that lead to injustices need to be tackled. This expansive view of what is needed to realize peace is helpful because Galtung's emphasis is on finding the structures that can remove the causes of war and offer alternatives to violence (Lamle, 2018).

Many scholars have discussed the intrinsic relationship between human rights and peace, with one author noting that "there is no short cut to peace without human rights" (Hoole

2009, 136), and another stating that “there cannot be a real peace in a society in which human rights and the fundamental freedoms are mass-violated” (Lopatka 1980, 364). Physical integrity rights should be associated with negative peace since these rights are directly related to physical violence. Some political and civil rights, such as electoral self-determination, might also be associated with negative peace, but others begin to move into the realm of positive peace. Economic and social rights and “empowerment” rights, for instance, fall under a broader understanding of positive peace that looks toward greater equality (Lamle, 2017).

The one area that seems to provide the greatest gulf between those focusing on “peace” and those focusing on “human rights” is the settlement phase of conflict. Scholars point to a disconnect or even tension between peace negotiators and human rights advocates (Hannum 2006). On one side of the debate are those who prioritise human rights and equate protecting human rights with war crimes prosecutions. They argue that the prosecution of abusers of human rights is important and creates a deterrent to future violators of rights; as such, justice mechanisms should be incorporated into any type of post-conflict peace agreement. These groups are specifically concerned with physical integrity rights and move to hold human rights violators accountable through tribunals or human rights commissions (Anonymous 1996; Gaer 1997; O’Flaherty 2004). This is a fairly narrow, and negative, view of human rights, which also may reflect a narrow, and negative, view of peace. On the other side are those who argue that efforts to prosecute human rights violators will make it more difficult to reach a peace agreement, that conflict parties will not come to the negotiation table if there is the threat of criminal prosecutions, and thus a focus on justice can impede peace settlements and ultimately lead to greater conflict and human rights violations (Akhavan 2009; Williams 2014, p.135). Armstrong (2014, p.590) notes that the International Criminal Court’s decision to investigate the government of Uganda and the Lord’s Resistance Army “was considered a direct threat to local peace efforts.” This view is also largely focused on negative peace—as the peace agreement in itself is primarily meant to end armed conflict.

Today, the International Criminal Courts operate in complex environments characterized by on-going armed conflicts where suspects of international crimes may also be the same persons who might be involved in peace negotiations. The ICC intervention in Uganda brought to light some dilemmas of pursuing justice during on-going conflict (Lamle, 2017). In some instances, conflict resolution practitioners have often strongly argued against issuing international arrest warrants against members of certain groups involved in negotiations on grounds that it might deter willingness to commit to a peaceful settlement and complicates the negotiation process. In such situations, the parties involved might even demand immunity from prosecutions as a precondition for concluding peace agreements. This was the case during the Lome Peace negotiations aimed at ending the conflict in Sierra Leone

where the rebel group – Revolutionary United Front (RUF) demanded for an amnesty as well as during the Juba negotiations between the Lords Resistance Army and the Government of Uganda (GoU) aimed at ending the conflict in northern Uganda. However it is equally important to note that at times suspects of international crimes have used arrest warrants issued against them to scale up violence and this complicates efforts in executing warrants of arrest for such people (Lamle, 2017).

## VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The gap between what a people expect as being just and fair and what they actually have can heighten a sense of unfair treatment and so develop a sense of deprivation, feelings of deprivation, provide fertile grounds for mobilising opposition and the affected group with the real potential for collective violence and social instability. Economic, social and political institutions that are perceived to have failed to address the conditions producing deprivation become victims of vicious campaigns that can lead to violence. The fear of unemployment and the strain of reduced economic security in people's private lives can create tremendous anxiety and agitation. Conceivably, the fear of social instability may increase the potential for violence. The tensions between justice vs peace are real and debates have matured overtime in that it is generally agreed that both concepts can actually work hand in hand for durable solutions. Efforts to view human rights, justice and peace, more broadly and in more positive ways may help bridge some of the gaps that have formed between different types of human rights organisations.

Furthermore, as policymakers become increasingly concerned with matters of religious extremism, conflict defined partially in religious terms, or human rights violations and the perseverance for justice, with how groups conceptualise the relationship between human rights and peace could provide fruitful insight. Strengthening of government institutions and agencies responsible for safeguarding and promotion of human rights should be considered inevitable. Within developing democracies, leaders should be knowledgeable, sensitive and pro-active to the issue of human rights. Knowledge ability can relatively guarantee citizen-oriented policy. Respect for human dignity. There should be emphasis for the leaders and citizens to see themselves as “Imago Dei” image of God, a transcendental subject, an end in his/her self. Every obstacle to educational, economic and cultural development must be removed. All levels of government must encourage universal Basic Education. Military coup/rule should not be allowed or tolerated. Military has been known to be the worst in abusing human rights of citizens. Efforts must be put in place to checkmate their incursion into politics. Their duty is to protect the integrity and sovereignty of the nation and not to rule.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Adenrele, A. R., and Olugbenga, O. M. (2014). Challenges of Human Rights Abuses in Nigeria Democratic Governance –

- Which way forward? *Journal of Social Economic Research*. Vol 1. Federal College of Education, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.
- [2]. African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR). 2005. "Article 22 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights." Accessed October 15, 2015. <http://www.achpr.org/instruments/achpr/#a22>.
  - [3]. Aigbovbioisa, F. O. (2018). *A Handbook of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution*. Abuja: Omenic and Company Ltd.
  - [4]. Akhavan, P. (2009). "Are International Criminal Tribunals, a Disincentive to Peace? Reconciling Judicial Romanticism with Political Realism." *Human Rights Quarterly* 31: 624–54.
  - [5]. Anonymous (1996). "Human Rights in Peace Negotiations." *Human Rights Quarterly* 18: 249–58.
  - [6]. Aristotle (1962). *The Politics*; translated with an introduction by Sinclair, T. A.; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
  - [7]. Amnesty International (2018). *A Turn for the Worse: Violence, Human Rights Violations in Anglophone Cameroon*. P.5. Retrieved from: [amnesty.org/download/Document/AFR178481201ENGLISH.PDF](https://www.amnesty.org/download/Document/AFR178481201ENGLISH.PDF). Accessed 05/01/2020.
  - [8]. Amnesty International (2019). *Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa: Review of 2018*. Retrieved from: [amnesty.org/download/Document/MDE1299162019/ENGLISH.pdf](https://www.amnesty.org/download/Document/MDE1299162019/ENGLISH.pdf). Accessed 06/01/2020.
  - [9]. Armstrong, K. (2014). "Justice without Peace? International Justice and Conflict Resolution in Northern Uganda." *Development and Change* 45: 589–607.
  - [10]. Cukwura, A. O. and Sylvester, V. M. (2008). "Basic Concepts of Peace and Conflict Studies". In Sylvester, V.M. and Wali, R.C. (eds.) *Readings in Peace and Conflict Resolution (Revised ed.)*; Abuja: Prince Taiwo Royal Ventures.
  - [11]. Dada, J. A. (2012). *Human Rights under the Nigerian Constitution: Issues and Problem*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. University of Calabar: Nigeria.
  - [12]. Egypt Human Rights Report: Executive Summary (2018). Retrieved from: [state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/EGYPT-2018.pdf](https://state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/EGYPT-2018.pdf). Accessed 06/01/2020.
  - [13]. Ekanola, A. B. (2011). *The Imperative of Justice in the Quest for Peace in Contemporary African Society*. In Albert, I. O. (ed.). *Perspectives on Peace and Conflict in Africa*. Ibadan: Peace and Conflict Studies Programme, Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
  - [14]. Gaer, F. (1997). "UN-Anonymous: Reflections on Human Rights in Peace Negotiations." *Human Rights Quarterly* 19: 1–8.
  - [15]. Galtung, J. (1964). "An Editorial." *Journal of Peace Research* 1: 1–4.
  - [16]. \_\_\_\_\_ (1969). "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6: 167–91.
  - [17]. \_\_\_\_\_ (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means*. London: SAGE.
  - [18]. Hannum, H. (2006). "Human Rights in Conflict Resolution: The Role of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in UN Peacemaking and Peacebuilding." *Human Rights Quarterly* 28: 1–85.
  - [19]. Hoole, R. (2009). "Sri Lanka: Ethnic Strife, Fratricide, and the Peace vs. Human Rights Dilemma." *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 1: 120–39.
  - [20]. Human Rights Watch (2019). *World Report: Egypt Events of 2018*. Retrieved from: [hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/Egypt](https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/Egypt). Accessed 05/01/2020.
  - [21]. Human Rights Watch (2018). *Cameroon Events of 2018*. Retrieved from: [hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/cameroon](https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/cameroon). Accessed 05/01/2020.
  - [22]. Icelandic Human Rights Centre (2019). <https://www.humanrights.is/en/human-rights-education-project/human-rights-concepts-ideas-and-fora/human-rights-fora/the-african-union>: Accessed 10/15/2019.
  - [23]. Isakovic, Z. (2001). "Choosing Between Peace and Human Rights?" *Peace Research* 33: 37–46.
  - [24]. Johnston, D. L. (2014). "A Muslim and Christian Orientation to Human Rights: Human Dignity and Solidarity." *Indiana International and Comparative Law Review* 24: 899–920.
  - [25]. Longtau, S. (2010). *Tarok hypercultural in context*. Nggapak vol.1, no 4. The role of Oral Literature in Conflict Mediation: A Case Study of the Tarok of Plateau. A paper presented at the 23rd conference/AGM of the Linguistho Association of Nigeria (Clan) held at the university of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt.
  - [26]. Lamle, E. N. (2011). *Laughter and conflict: joking relationships and conflict mediation in the Nigeria*. A Case Study of Funyellang in Tarokland. A Ph.D Dissertation submitted to Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium (2010).
  - [27]. Lamle, E. N. (2018) "Developing Trends Within Democracy, Human Rights and Conflict" Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
  - [28]. Lamle, E. N. (2018a) "African Approaches to Conflict and Peace Studies" Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
  - [29]. Lamle, E. N. (2017) "Religions and Cultures in Conflict: Marketing the Catechism of Hate". Jos: Jos University Press.
  - [30]. Lamle, E. N. (2017) "Introduction to Conflict and Peace Studies in Africa" Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
  - [31]. Lamle, E. N. (2017) "Gender Participation, Radicalization and Peace Building in Nigeria: Arms Trade Treaty, Land Disputes, the Autochthonous and Settlers within the Benue Trough in Nigeria" Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
  - [32]. Lamle, E. N. (2017) *Skin Colour Complex and African Conflict Genealogy and Social Construction*. Germany: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
  - [33]. Lamle, E. N. (2016) "Conflict and Continuity: Traditional Education, Conflict and Peace Building in Africa, Tarokland in Context". Jos: Jos University Press.
  - [34]. Lamle, E. N. (2015) "Identity Politics, Ethno-Religious Nationalism and Conflict: An Ethno-Biographical Exposition". Abuja: Visart Publishing Ltd.
  - [35]. Lamle, E. N. (2011) "Laughter and Conflicts in Africa: Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution In Africa: A Case Study of the Middle Belt of Nigeria". Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
  - [36]. Lacrois, J. and Pranchere, J., (2016). "Human Rights on Trial: A Genealogy of the Critique of Human Rights," Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  - [37]. Lopatka, A. (1980). "The Right to Live in Peace as a Human Right." *Security Dialogue* 11: 361–67.
  - [38]. McGuinness, M. (2011). "Peace v. Justice: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Modern Origins of the Debate." *Diplomatic History* 35: 749–68.
  - [39]. Mutua, M., (2008). "Human Rights: A Political and Cultural Critique" Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
  - [40]. Nigeria 2018 Human Rights Report: Executive Summary. Retrieved from: [state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Nigeria-2018.pdf](https://state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Nigeria-2018.pdf). Accessed 06/01/2020.
  - [41]. O'Flaherty, M. (2004). "Sierra Leone's Peace Process: The Role of the Human Rights Community." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26: 29–62.
  - [42]. Ogoloma, F. & Nyege, B.S. (2014), " Democracy, Good Governance and Human Rights in Nigeria: an Appraisal." *In Knowledge Review*, Vol. 31, No. 3.
  - [43]. Onwuazombe, I.I. (2017). *Human Rights Abuse and Violations in Nigeria: A Case Study of the Oil-producing Communities in the Niger Delta Region; Annual Survey of International and Comparative Law*. Vol. 22, Issue 1: Article 8.
  - [44]. Ozoigbo, B. I. (2017). *Democracy and Human Rights in Nigeria: A Critical Inquiry*. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 5, No. 5
  - [45]. Porter E. (2015). *Connecting Peace, Justice and Reconciliation*. USA, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
  - [46]. UN (2019). *United Nations*. Retrieved from [www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/human-rights/](https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/human-rights/): <https://www.un.org/en/sections/issuesdepth/human-rights/> pp. 8&9
  - [47]. Waldron, J., (2018), "Human Rights: A Critique of the Raz/Rawls Approach," in Etinson, A. (ed.), *Human Rights: Moral or Political?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [48]. Wellman, C. (2000). "Solidarity, the Individual and Human Rights." *Human Rights Quarterly* 22:639–57.
- [49]. Williams, K. (2014). "Justice or Peace? A Proposal for Resolving the Dilemma." *Pace International Law Review* 26: 131–81.

#### AUTHOR

Elias Nankap Lamle (PhD: Leuven-Brussels) is a Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Conflict Management and Peace Studies, University of Jos, Nigeria. Dr. Lamle is also a member of the International Advisory Board of the Peace Fellows, Center for African Peace and Conflict Resolution, California State University, Sacramento, USA.

Felix Ogbewe Aigbvbioisa (M.A.: Ibadan) is an Assistant Lecturer on the Peace and Development Studies Programme at the Salem University, Lokoja, Nigeria.