Community Participation in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Multi-Ethnic and Multi-Religious Settings[1]

Isaac Olawale Albert*
Olubayo O. Adekola**

Abstract

This paper is on Nigeria. The countryis bedeviled by different forms of violent conflicts. Most of the problems take place in multi-ethnic and multi-religious settings and the main factors responsible for them include competition for resources, contradicting value systems, psychological needs of individuals and groups, and unhealthy communication systems. The situation is compounded by policy makers who often fail to treat groups equally and respond proactively to the problems associated with diversity. This paper argues that this kind of problem can be reduced through better community participation in development. The paper draws some concrete case studies from Niger State, one of the least developed states in Nigeria.

Introduction

Part of the process of modernization involves the learning of new skills and the acceptance of new ideas about the nature of the world and of human relations. Another part of the process entails the acceptance of new values and the changing of preferences. A still deeper dimension of the process calls for a fundamental change in motivations and in the direction in which it is felt that human energies can properly be directed (Pye, 1963:149).

The political public, unattached to any standards of judgement other than those provided by ethnicity, locality, party or passion... will be useless to the political culture of a modern society (Shils, 1963:64).

What is community participation? The question cannot be answered until a more primary one is asked: What Is a community? It refers to "a group of people who share an interest, a neighbourhood, or a common set circumstances. They may or may not,

* *Director, Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.*
*¨~ *Institute of African Studies, University oflbadan, Ibadan.*

acknowledge membership of a particular community" (Smithies and Webster 1998:1). However, "community" means more than we have provided here; it connotes different things to different people. To politicians, it might not mean more than political constituencies; to an urban planner, it takes its meanings from geographical boundaries; social movements see it in terms of those who believe or do not believe in their ideologies. Within this frame-work, the concept could be said to have multidimensional meanings and involves "a complexity of horizontal and vertical relation-ships between people and organisations" (Breuer 2002: 9). Tc this extent, BoutiHer et al consider the concept to be problematic (BoutiHer et al 2000) most especially for "community participation" practice.

The concept of "community participation" is equally problematic. It has been defined as "a process by which people are enabled to become actively and genuinely involved in defining the issues of concern to them, in making decisions about factors that affect their lives, in formulating and implementing policies, in planning, developing and delivering services and in taking actions to achieve change" (Breuer 2002: 10). It is needed in a development intervention "because it expresses not only the will of the majority of the people, but also it is the only way for them to ensure that the important moral, humanitarian, social, cultural and economic objectives of a more humane and effective development can be peacefully attained" (Rahnema 2001:121)

How does the concept of community participation link up with the discourses on conflict prevention and peacebuilding? Michael Lund defined it as "any structural or intercessory means to keep intrastate or interstate tension and disputes from escalating into significant violence and use of armed forces, to strengthen the capabilities of potential parties to violent conflict for resolving such disputes peacefully, and to progressively reduce the underlying problems that produce these issues and disputes" (Lund 2002:117). On the other hand, peacebuilding refers to a comprehensive and long-term approach to peace and security including: early warning, conflict prevention, civilian and military peacekeeping, military interven-tion, humanitarian assistance, ceasefire agreements, the establishment of peace zones, reconciliation, reconstruction, institution building, and political as well as socio-economic transformation (Maiese 2003). Both conflict prevention and peacebuilding aim to achieve same thing: to ensure that conflicts are dealt early enough. Both concepts assume that conflicts qccur because their root causes are not dealt with early enough. Such factors contributing to increased risk of violent conflict and insecurity include rapid economic decline, human rights abuses and undemocratic government, inequalities in the distribution of wealth, scarcity and degrada-tion of natural resources, unemployment, lack of education, ethnic and religious tensions, border and regional disputes, disintegration of the State or lack of peaceful means of settling disputes.

Conflict prevention and peacebuilding programmes produce the best results when presented as an integral part of poverty reduction andsustainable development policies. This involves making conscious

efforts towards tackling the root causes of tlie conflict and ensuring that whatever projects that are done do not have unintended negative impact on the conflict dynamic. Conflict prevention in this context could take two forms: indirect and direct. Indirect conflict prevention and peacebuilding initiatives include a set of actions addressing the problems in a given sector as a result of which the society is stressful (agriculture, education, rural development, democratic governance, amnesty, post conflict reconstruction etc). The assumption here is that these projects would get the people more engaged and leave them with less option of violent conflict. A lot of initiatives of this nature are now being executed all over Nigeria.

On the other hand, direct conflict prevention and peacebuilding initiatives include conflict-sensitive and targeted human rights and democratisation initiatives such as community dialogues, participatory processes and strengthening democratic norms; support to peace processes/initiatives and high level mediation activities; support to state/non-state mechanisms for resolving conflict (eg Ombudsman, arbitration panels, Truth & Reconciliation Commission); peace building/ grass root initiatives (civil society, including women's groups, youth organisations, indigenous peoples, peace media); judicial and security sector reforms; small arms and light weapons control; disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants.

Both indirect and direct intervention projects are most needed in multi-ethnic and multi-religious society which is usually characterised by intergroup suspicions and bickering over allocation of resources, values, psychological needs and communication channels and methods. In such a society, people compete rather than cooperate and political leaders must continuously work towards making the people to collaborate through different forms of community participation strategies. However, the interventions here are not expected to be a one-solution-fits all. They must be based on sound analysis of the stakeholders, causes of conflict, risk factors, and options for action.

Rather than speaking in abstract terms as done by some past works, this paper is made development-relevant by analysing the circumstances of the *Jama'a* Forum and the ongoing Ward Development Projects (WDP) in Niger State in Nigeria that resulted from the kind of community dialogue process discussed above. The two development interventions *(fama'a* forum and WDP) have several indicators of how community participation could build peace and forge a community in which the basic interests of people in multi-ethnic and multi-religious society are met. The Jama'a forum is an example of a direct conflict prevention initiative while the WDP illustrates how indirect prevention could be done. While the *Jama'a* Forum enables the people to sit down with the Governor of the State to map their needs, the Ward Development Programme provides them with the resources with which these communities would participate in meeting those needs identified at the Forum. This is an innovative idea in conflict prevention and peacebuilding,

In *A* country where it is unbecoming to find academic analysts saying anything positive about Nigerian leaders, the contents of this

paper would appear patronising on the surface. However, the work is basically a product of a scientific research. The data for writing the paper was collected in 2009 and 2010 and it is part of a larger project trying to understudy what works in Nigeria as different from what does not work which past studies focused upon.

The Jama'a Forum in Niger State

The Jama'a Forum, an interesting policy intervention in deliberative democracy, was developed by the Governor of Niger State, Dr. Babangida Aliyu, in 2008 as a "communal round-table" through which community leaders and their elected representatives formally interact and share their collective and individual views on socio-political matters as these relate to governance in Niger State. It enables the electorate in wards and local government areas to express their hopes, aspirations and expectations, and as well providing an avenue for the government to respond to the people and take stock of matters arising from on-going projects and social issues. Sometimes when analysts and commentators say that the people have to interject themselves back into the political process, they seem to ignore the fact that in the first place it was notthe people who threw themselves out of governance. It is this realisation that makes other analysts speak of empowerment, which can be done only by a person who has acquired the requisite power, but who realises that such power is best used to make the people even more capable of being the ones to deliberate and decide on issues that are of vital interest to the improvement of the polity. What Governor Aliyu has done in Niger State is to empower the people by making them enter

the arena of political discourse through the Jama'a Forum.

On his assumption of office, Governor Aliyu openly acknowledged that there was a great divide between the political leadership and the people of the State. At Kontagora, for instance, Governor Aliyu spoke thus:

My personal observation is that our people feel disengaged and disempowered. You have been neglected and ignored by government and its officials, who often assume that they know your problems and have the solutions to them. I believe that nobody can claim to have the monopoly of wisdom to know your problems more than yourselves. That is why you probably no longer want or expect Government to "solve" all your problems; you want the means in your hands to lead your own lives, make your own choices and develop your potentials (Aliyu 2008: 35).

But this is not the usual rhetoric without action. One of the first things that Governor Aliyu did in office was to announce that the way to create avenues of active interaction between government and the people is through the use of channels of communica-tion which are people-owned and people-oriented. He tried to achieve this goal through the Jama'a Forum which is the age-old African 'palaver house' adapted and streamlined into the structures of present-day democratic governance.

Commencing from January 2008, the Jama'a Forum has been convened in different parts of the State. The Governor together with members of his cabinet and other state officials makes the round of the different local government areas, meeting people in town halls and squares, and discussing with them in relation to the political exigencies in their communities in order to arrive at consensual

approaches to move forward the respective communities and the state as a whole.

The Jama'a Forum is not a talk shop; its input into government policy decisions has been demonstrated again and again. What is more, it is not a place where community leaders make demands and all that the Governor and his entourage have to do is accede to these demands. It is a deliberative council where discussion and debate are the order of the day, with a view to reaching decisions that are in the end consensually approved. This procedure may seem cumbersome to those who want an executive to act with the speed of light. In fact, the charge may be raised that a good executive does not need to do research of this son in order to know what the people want. But then, the presumptuousness of politicians is legendary, and there is no gainsaying the fact that what people want is not static but is rather dynamic ' and subject to change, not to mention the fact that it is always better to debate one's political programme with the very people that such programmes will impact on.

The Jama'a Forum also serves as a platform for democratic accountability where the electorate can speak directly to government officials and both sides can compare notes on the basis of set goals and objectives in order to determine the extent to which there has been fulfilment or a shortfall. 'To be accountable is "to have answers for one's action or inaction"' (Roberts 2002: 658). In point of fact, Roberts hinges her idea of accountability on the process of dialogue between the different parties - in our case government officials and the people. She sees dialogue as a unique form of communication,

'a special kind of talk' (Robert 2002: 660, citing Dixon 1996), in which there is a submission to the mechanism of questioning and concerted efforts are made to arrive at answers. Roberts argues that dialogue is 'at the heart of what has been called "citizen empowerment," "civic engagement," "citizen/community governance," and "public deliberation"' (Roberts 2002:660).

A community dialogue is an iterative process with multiple exchanges as the dialogue proceeds through agenda setting, strategy development, and decision making. The agenda setting round asks the community tc define the scope and terms of the dialogue. The strategy development round asks citizens to identify promising options and the decision making round asks citizens to select the preferred course. (Weeks 2000:362). This kind of encounter, according to Claibourn and Martin (2007: 194) "offers the potential for stronger arguments and evidence to trump weaker ones. Group discussions also offer the opportunity to pool informational resources and refine ideas that may allow each discussion member to take away more than they contributed".

The Jama'a Forum is an experiment that tries to achieve the goal of sharpening argument with argument as 'iron sharpeneth iron'. Policy decision making must be an arena for argument and discussion otherwise what will emerge runs the risk of tunnel vision. It is true that this means some relin-quishment of power on the pan of the elected officials and their coterie of advisers. But if the aim of democracy is to make the people rule as is made explicit in the very phrasing of the concept, then empowering the people by

6   Isaac   Olawale   Albert   and   Bayo   Adekola

bringing them into the process of debate and discussion in relation to policy and social issues is to practise democracy the way it should be practised. Deliberation and accountability are non-negotiable conditions for democratic rule otherwise what is being practised is a political ruse that leaves power in the hands of autocrats and oligarchs. The sort of political accounta-bility that is achievable through dialogue entails the entrenching of society-wide structures of democratic governance. Roberts reasons thus on the issue:

During this kind of dialogue, all participants must treat one another as equals, even though there may be status differences among them outside the dialogue. They refrain from exening coercive influences over one another - direct or indirect - in order to maintain their equality and build some mutual respect and trust. They listen and respond empa-thically to one another, trying to understand what others think and feel, particularly those with whom they disagree (Roberts 2002:660).

This kind of dialogue, sharing, and equality may sound too strange and remote to our notions of how power is used once elected officials assume office. But the true nature of democracy is that it is a practice in deliberation (see Zinnes 2004); and it has been observed that the deliberation practised in democracies has to be pluralised beyond cabinet and legislative sessions to include structures that bring in interest groups and the broad mass of the people.

The Forum in Niger state is organised in such a way that its deliberations originate at the ward level. Interest and pressure groups as well as opinion leaders and the general mass of the people participate in its meetings. It is important to note that the palaver sessions do not operate by exclusionary principles. Gender, for instance, is not a criterion for forum attendance. And the Forum incorporates systems of community governance that are customary and well-respected by the people. That is to say, it brings in the traditional political system, which is an important site of group mobilisation in most parts of the country. For instance, Forum sessions are sometimes held between the people and their elected representatives in the emir's palace. This is a very conscious attempt to make it known that the Forum is a platform where power and the people become one through the process of deliberation. Written into the code of this framework is that both the governmental and the traditional system of power are accountable to the people through the mechanism of the argument and discussion that dialogue enables.

The Ward Development Projects

Under the ward development projects of the Niger State government, a community is defined politically as a ward but members of the community are broadly defined to include all people, irrespective of their ethnicity, religion and politically affiliation, living with a ward.The Ward Development scheme focuses on how all of these people (at the ward level rather than their representatives in government) are provided a monthly grant of ₦500,000 (about US$3,3000) per ward. The grant was increased to N1million a year after. The money is provided by the State Government for identifying, designing, and implementing health, education, agricultural and water projects as prioritised by the people irrespective of any external interference. The

Community Participation in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Multi-Religious Settings 7

role of the State in the system is limited to project monitoring, evaluation and commissioning.

To an international observer, the grant might look too small for a community of about 200 people but to Nigeria - a state in which the people hardly feel the presence of the government - this is an unprecedented policy intervention. In addition to providing infrastructure, the projects create jobs for local artisans and skilled technicians. The scheme, which transfers the responsibility for community development to the people (and minimises the negative influence of corrupt state officials), has led to a rapid transformation of Niger Stateto one of the fastest developing States in Nigeria. New wells, dam projects, boreholes and water irrigation schemes, schools, health care centres, roads and even mosques bearing the logos of the ward development programme are conspicuous in different parts of the State. As if formally underscoring the neglect of the past, these projects are distinct in the affected communities.

The Ward Development Projects are a logical outcome of the impetus driving the Jama'a Forum. In deliberative governance, it is not enough to just let people debate and talk. They would have to arrive at conclusions and these would have to be implemented. As they discuss issues relating to their economic and community development, they will feel empowered in the true sense when they are able to see structures that make it possible for their decisions to be carried out. As the saying goes, development is about people. This is a corrective to the modernisation principle which sees development as occurring along a

unilinear trajectory that must manifest in the same way in all societies. The Aliyu administration in Niger State believes participatory democracy should have a component that infuses into the system 'project identification and execution at the grassroots', to quote the photo magazine *Our Grassroots*, a quarterly that is published by the Ministry of Local Governments, Community Develop-ment and Chieftaincy Affairs in the State.

History, Legal Framework and Management Strategy

WDP started as a pilot project in February 2008. The need for the project was felt in the course of the Jama Forums held with the people by Governor Aliyu and it is based on the understanding that the people are in the best position to determine what is good for them. The main role of a political leader is to provide assistance for this process of self-actualisation by the people.

The test-running of the project lasted for three months during which it was clearly established that the project has deep grassroots reach, is effective, acceptable to the people and have the capacity to rapidly transform the rural communities in the state. Following the pilot stage, the full implementation of the project started. A 7-man committee was established in each of the 274 wards in the state headed by "men and women of integrity devoid of political affiliations, religious groups, ethnic barriers and other critical sentiments".

A Directorate headed by a Director General had to be established to manage the project. The duty of the DG include implementing state decisions as it concerns the Ward Development Projects, screening bills of

8   Isaac Olawale Albert and Bayo Adekola

quantities, conducting meetings with coordinators, enforcing rules and regulations of ward development, initiating policy-direction and guidelines for the ward projects, supervising, monitoring and developing action plans, consideration of petitions and complaints, investigation of same, preparation of documents for the invocation of provisions of the law incase of violation, disbursements of project funds to local government councils and wards as well as any other directives from the overseeing Ministry and the State.

It was initially without any formal legal framework. Due to the criticism of the "opposition" in the state, the Governor has to establish a legal framework for implementing the policy. This involves the amendment of the State's Local Government Law to capture the whole essence of the policy.

Although we cannot but emphasise the infrastructural aspects of the WDP, embedded in its operational system is a mechanism that makes the WDP committee at every ward accountable to the people and to the State Government. This is the obverse of the accountability of the Jama'a Forum where office-holders are made to answer the people and defend their stewardship. With the WDP, people at the grassroots are made answerable for the way they expend the disbursements made out to them. The Bill establishing the project places heavily emphasis on financial accountability by the ward committees. No ward gets the next allocation when the last disbursement has not been well accounted for. This policy seems to take the idea of deliberative democracy and democratic accountability to a new level. Hitherto, it was not acknowledged that the need for accountability

runs through the length and breadth of the democratic polity, imposing a responsibility of disclosure on both leaders and followers. In the context where people at the grassroots assume decision-making powers, they must also assume account-rendering responsibilities. This is the philosophy of the WDP.

Each community is solely responsible for constituting the members of its WDP committee. As noted on the WDP website (http://wdpniger.org), these committees have female representation, youth representation, village representation as well as boasting the presence of experienced retired civil servants. Political affiliation is not a criterion for the selection of WDP committee members. The community decides, not the ruling party. Under the aegis of the Ministry for Local Government, Community Development and Chieftaincy Affairs, a monitoring system operates. The WDP bank account is different from the Local Government account in order to ensure that 'disbursements reach the various, ward committees directly'.[2]

The transparency of the WDP is clearly visible as the projects undertaken under its auspices are to be found all over Niger State. Its reports and disbursements are public knowledge, and, what is more, it has a website which can be visited by anybody with an interest in knowing more about what the different ward committees are doing with the allocations periodically made out to them. The website itself is an eye-opener because it shows that the people of the State have largely similar views about what development projects require urgent attention in their various communities, as evidenced in the pictures that come with this paper. Indeed, one can safely

Community Participation in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Multi-Religious Settings   **9**

say thai the development landscape in the State will not end up being uneven or lopsided as some people may have feared on account of the fact that different communities may have widely varying development perspectives. What we see all around Niger State are WDP projects that tackle the common problems of poor and rural agrarian communities everywhere in the world: water projects (whether hand pumps or electrical pumps), small community clinics most times targeting maternal and child health, renovation of classrooms and provision of teaching materials to improve the learning environment for schoolchildren, agricultural projects aiming at improving soil fertility, construction of drains and culverts, etc., etc. Even where some communities decide to expend their disbursement on social goods like securing burial grounds and renovating mosques and sharia courts, the unique thing here is that they are the ones responsible for the selection and execution of these projects, and they have to give account of how the money was spent to the monitoring team set up by the relevant Ministry. They have become part and parcel of the process by which government policy is made and government money is spent.

Certain criticisms can be levelled at the idea of the Ward Development Projects. In the first place, the scheme may be charged with providing an avenue for the abdication of executive responsibility in relation to the success or failure of development plans. What this means is that the State executive, in a sense, cannot be held responsible for the failures of the WDP, as its projects originate from the people and are carried out by them. It may also be said that the WDP could result in an

uneven development landscape as different communities may pursue development projects that would make them look very much different at the end of the day. Whereas some communities are sinking boreholes and constructing drainage channels, some communities may decide to renovate their central mosques and the town hall. At the end of the day, these communities will reflect very much localised ideas as to what is of importance to them, making it difficult for the observer to see how they cohere as units in a larger framework of organisation. But once again, we must remember that the thing to avoid in our thinking is the unilinear paradigm that sees development as constituting but only one trajectory and only one package. We need to eschew that arrogance which Offiong characterises thus:

Foundering on the ethnocentric assumption that the "backward" or "underdeveloped" peoples of the world would enthusiastically embrace a modernisation package as evidence of progress, Western theorists grossly underestimated the ability of peoples to resist "modernity" and stick to what they know best and what has worked for them, at least from their perspective (Offiong 1997:439),

Nevertheless, the charges raised against the WDP above would have carried a lot of impact if the WDP were the only development agenda on the ground in the State. Far from it being the State's government only develo-pment strategy, it must be said that the WDP is an autonomous supple-mentary means of making the development that people see around them look familiar. The simple idea is that from time to time, all the 274 wards that are in the State are given a disbursement which they will have

to expend on community development projects in tandem with their understanding of what development issues can be addressed with that amount of money. The WDP does not replace the development agenda of the Local Government Councils and the State Government. It is the lowest rung in the hierarchy of development planning in Niger State. It makes it possible for people to do things for themselves. In the photo magazine *Our Grassroots,* verso pages carry pictures of development projects executed by different local government councils in the State, while recto pages showcase the projects undertaken at the ward level through the support of the WDP.

Conclusion

The general assumption of the study is that it might be difficult for the whole of Nigeria to be positively transformed at the same time. By documenting the few "success stories", it might be possible for the country to work through many of the development problems that confront it. In this respect the Jama'a Forum and WDP in Niger State are instructive. The projects encourage community members to participate as equal partners in community-driven, consensus-based projects. In the process of this effective communication participation, future conflicts are prevented.

The Ward Development Project is a model in terms of setting northern Nigerian communities on a path of development that was hitherto exclusive to southern Nigerian communities. The idea of communities championing the development of their communities is not too popular in northern

Nigeria is not too popular in northern Nigeria given the paternalistic community development traditions in the region. On the other hand, the people of southern Nigeria have always been working together to establish schools; build clinics and roads for themselves since the colonial period through town development associations. The only difference is that the money for such projects does not come from the state as we have seen in the case of WDP, members of the town associations whether within the community or in the Diaspora have to levy themselves. WDP has established the model for the working of this in any northern Nigerian community. Above all other things, it seems to have introduced the people to how to conceive, implement and monitor community projects. This is a major contribu-tion to governance in Nigeria. Having done the projects themselves, it is most likely that the communities would give quality attention to their maintenance.

What makes the two programmes discussed in this paper to be unique is that they are objectively verifiable. Anybody driving past Niger State is bound to see the Ward Development Projects in every community he/she passes through. The projects include clinics, schools, drainages, roads, culverts, places of worship, palace renovations, electrifications, bore holes (both motorised , solar and hand-dug) court renovations, police station renovations etc. The fresh paint on the buildings, newness of the roads and culverts, fresh mud from dug potholes and the like stand the projects out in the communities. The rustic nature of the communities in which the projects are located readily call attention to

Community Participation **in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuildlng in Multi-Religious Settings   1l**

the neglect of the past. One can therefore clearly understand and appreciate the readiness of the people to talk to any external interviewer on what they proudly refer to as "Chief Servant's Projects". In many of the communities, the people show appreciation to the State Government by writing the name of Governor Mu'azu Babangida Aliyu on the projects - even when not commissioned by him.

        This Niger State case study is instructive. Based on the desire for broad community engagement and recognising the multitude of potential beneficiaries with differing ethnic and religious backgrounds, the government designed a group structure that is somewhat elaborate. This case study graphically illustrates the importance of designing a group structure and decision-making process that meets the needs of its participants. What our discussions have shown so far is that community participation goes beyond the case of consultation in the process of a development intervention. It basically draws on the energy and enthusiasm that exists within communities to define what community wants and how It wants to operate. In the process, tension is lessened in the society.

Endnotes

1. The first draft of this paper was delivered at the Third National Conference on Community Development, Grand Hotel, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria. November 20-24 2011.We appreciate all the comments taken into consideration in revising it.
2. Hon. Emmanuel Musa, http://wdpniger.org/ index.php?=comjxxTten^view=an1cle&Jd= 14:wdp-so-far

References

Achebe, Chinua (1984). *The Trouble with Nigeria.* Ibadan: Heinemann.

Aliyu, Muazu Babangida (2008). *Selected Speeches of the ChiefServant of Niger State.* Minna: Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the Governor (Speech writing).

Breuer, D. (ed.) (2002). *Community participation in local health and sustainable development,* New York: World Health Organisation, http://www.euro.who.int/data/assets/ pdfJUe/0013/ 101065/E78652.pdf

Claibourn, Michele P. and Paul S. Martin (2007). The Third Face of Social Capital: How Membership in Voluntary Associations Improves Policy Accountability. *Political Research Qaurterly.* Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 192-201.

Deveau, Monique (2003). A Deliberative Approach to Conflicts of Culture. *Political Theory.* Vol. 31, No. 6, pp. 780-807.

Dlxon, Nancy M. (1996). *Perspectives on Dialogue: Making Talk Developmental for Individuals and Organizations.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Dryzek, John S. (2005). Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia. *Political Theory.* Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 218-242.

Dudley, BJ. (1975). *Scepticism and Political Virtue.* Inaugural Lecture 1975-76. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Fleming, James E. (1995). Securing Deliberative Autonomy. *Stanford Law Review.* Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 1-71.

Fung, Archon (2005). Deliberation before the Revolution: Toward an Ethics of Deliberative Democracy in an Unjust World. *Political Theory.* Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 397-419.

Hanberger, Anders (2006). Democratic Accountability in Decentralized Governance. Paper to be presented at the Conference on the Interpretive Practitioner: From Critique to Practice in Public Policy Analysis, 8-10 June 2006.

12   Isaac Olawale Albert and Bayo Adekola

Keohane, Robert O. (2002). Global Governance and Democratic Accountability. Chapter prepared for a volume to be edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi from the Miliband Lectures, London School of Economics, Spring 2002.

Lund, M. (2002). "Preventing Violent Intrastate Conflicts: Learning lessons from experience", in *Searching for Peace in Europe and Eurasia: An Over-view of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities*, eds. Paul van Tongeren, Hans van de Veen & Juliette Verhoeven Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Maiese, M. (2003). What it Means to Build Lasting Peace. Electronic document, hup://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/ peacebuilding/

Maier, Karl (2000). *This House Has Fallen: Nigeria in Crisis.* London: Penguin Books.

Markoff, John (1999). Where and When Was Democracy Invented? *Comparative Studies in Society and History.* Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 660-690.

Offiong, Daniel A. (1997). Conflict Resolution among the Ibibio of Nigeria. *Journal of Anthropological Research.* Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 423-441.

Our Grassroots. May-September (2008). A quarterly publication of the Ministry for Local Governments, Community Development and Chieftaincy Affairs, Minna, Niger State.

Pye, L.W. (1963). "Communications and motivations for modernization", in L.W. Pye (ed.), *Communications and political development*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rahnema, M. (2001). "Participation", in Wolfgang Sachs (ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide*