

Making Peace in Kaduna State in the Light of Gen 13:8-9

Joel Haruna Usman

Abstract

The absence of peace has ravaged the human society with incessant conflicts and strife. Gross human rights violations have been identified as a part of the root causes of such dissensions. Human rights violations do occur when there are no fair human dealings in the society because the dignity and integrity of everybody in interpersonal and social relationships are not respected. When this is lacking, what becomes is conflict of any magnitude caused by the lack of integrity and the will power by political leaders to take up political decisions that uphold and perpetuate the dignity and dues of everyone. The desire to initiate and implement the political decisions that encourage peace arising from the exercise of justice and equity has led to about 40 Commissions of Inquiries to investigate the causes of strife and deal with them for the good of posterity. Painfully, only a few countries have fully or considerably implemented the recommendations of these Commissions. It is the argument of this article that should concerned individuals be inspired by integrity and will power, human society will be rid of violent conflict by the prompt implementation of the recommendations of Commissions. Using a conflict situation that was amicably resolved in Gen 13 by Abraham, we shall equally propose a model which ensures peaceful resolution of disagreements. We shall achieve this through a literary analysis of Gen 13:8-9.

Keywords: *Tāmīm*, Making Peace, Conflicts, TRCs, Words, Attitude, Action.

Introduction

The making of peace in the world, especially in Africa, has become illusive. An illusion exacerbated by the incessant gross human rights violation ravaging especially Nigerian societies and communities like the recurring conflict in Kaduna State between farmers and herdsmen. Other conflict situations highlight issues relating to religion, land disputes, settlers/indigenes, ethnic, political manipulation, marginalization, and domination. These conflicts have caused deaths, maimed or incapacitated individuals and communities for life; and property worth billions of naira have been destroyed. Both on the short and long terms, these disputes have produced shortages of food, caused suspicion,

entrenched hunger, raised unemployment, encouraged armed banditry activities and kidnapping. Thus, there is a geometric increase in crimes, violence, political instability due to thuggery and ballot snatching, corruption, and all forms of social ills. The consequence of these tussles are poverty, illiteracy, underdevelopment, violence and injustice. Hence, political analysts could describe a nation like Nigeria that is under such social malaise as possessing the indicators of a “failed State”.

In the midst of strife and the violence they generate, efforts have been made to make peace. Nigeria is not an exception. The Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission such as “Oputa Commission” (Matthew Hassan Kukah, 2011, p. xv) and the National Sovereign Conferences are good examples. There is also: Ife and Modakeke of Oyo State; Zangon Kataf and their Hausa Fulani neighbours of Kaduna State; Tivs and Jukun; Jukun and Kuteb of Benue and Taraba States; Sayawas and Hausa Fulani of Bauchi State; Ogoni and Shelf in Rivers State (2011, p. xvii) commissions of Inquiry. There are by extension others found around the world. The primary concern of Truth Commission in any country is to reconcile the victims and perpetrators of violence. But despite these efforts, there continued to exist disputes in Nigeria and in Kaduna state in particular. This is partly because these Commissions have not been successful in enabling peace because of inadequacies in their recommendations or the implementation of their findings. This article takes the event narrated in Gen 13:8-9 to suggest a pattern which could, alongside Commissions' recommendations, contribute to resolving conflicts in Kaduna State. It shall through literary analysis evaluate the biblical passage in question.

Literary background of Gen 13:8-9

The wider literary background of Gen 13:8-9 is the Abrahamic Cycle (Gen 11:27-25:11). This Cycle narrates the story of Terah and his family who were living in Ur of the Chaldeans. It informs that Terah had three sons: Abram, Haran and Nahor. Each had a wife, but it was only Haran who is said to have a child called Lot. Painfully, Haran died. After his death, Terah emigrated with his family, which included his grandchild Lot, to Canaan. This meant Terah had full responsibility for the care and wellbeing of Lot. Sadly, Terah himself later died in Canaan (Gen 11:27-32). With Terah's passing, the headship of the family became the responsibility of Abraham. He was charged with the task of caring and protecting the members of the entire family, and by implication, Lot, his nephew. When God called Abraham (Gen 12:1) whether Lot opted to freely go with him or was taken along unsolicited for the journey to an unknown destination is immaterial. What matters is the narrator tells his readers that when Abraham departed in response to the call of YHWH, he took his wife Sarai and all that they had acquired and embarked on their journey for Canaan (Gen 12:4-5).

By Gen 13, it was already clear that Lot had been constituted part of the family of Abraham's journey entourage. No wonder, Nwaoru describes Gen 13-14 as the Abraham-Lot narrative (2015, p. 480). This narrative thus serves as the immediate literary context that ensconces Gen 13:8-9. And it simply tells the story of the disagreement between Abraham's servants and Lot's regarding herding of livestock. To avoid escalating the conflict which could ominously evolve, Abraham proposed a solution to the problem which was acceptable to Lot. And so, a would have been major conflict was resolved without a problem.

The Reason for the choice of Gen 13:8-9

Gen 13:8-9 falls within the unit of Gen 13:5-13. Scholars identify the passage as a 'quarrel narrative' (Nwaoru, 2015, p. 483; Claus Westermann, 1985, p. 172; Mary Jerome Obiorah, 2015, p. 37). The pericope is subdivided and entitled as: itinerary vv. 1-4; reason for the conflict vv. 5-7; separation and settlement as solution vv.8-12; Abraham's dialogue with YHWH and itinerary vv. 13-18 (cf. G. W. Coats, *Genesis*, page 116; J. Skinner, *A critical and exegetical commentary on Genesis*, 1930, pages 262-266). From the foregoing, our text of study is in vv. 8-12 entitled as "separation and settlement as solution".

Gen 13:8-9 is chosen within vv. 8-12 on the following grounds. The narrator in Gen 13:5-7 details the quarrels between Abraham's and Lot's herdsmen over inadequate grazing land for their livestock. But he states from v. 8 that Abraham begins a speech with a verbal clause אָמַר אַבְרָם (Abraham said) to resolve the conflict arising from the quarrels. The speech flows-on uninterrupted up to v. 9. From v. 10, the narrator describes the decisions and actions taken by Lot in reaction to Abraham's speech. Thus, vv. 10-12 begin an independent sub-pericope which explains Lot's separation from Abraham as the solution reached in settlement of the conflict of vv. 5-7. The separation importantly entrenched peace between Abraham and Lot.

Focus shall be placed on the literary features of Abraham's speech and on his attitudes in Gen 13:8-9 for the resolution of the impending disaster of vv. 5-7.

The structure and exegesis of Gen 13:8-9

Abraham's speech to Lot in Gen 13:8-9 is broken into two parts: his appeal to kinship bond for peace (v. 8) and his proposal that settled the conflict (v. 9).

Abram's appeal to kinship bond for peace (v. 8)

Abraham's speech opens with an appeal to Lot: "let there be no strife between you and me, and between your herders and my herders; for we are kindred". This appeal firstly is empowered by Abraham's employment of the article אֵלֶּךָ ('al-nā'). 'al-nā' with the imperfect or jussive as in our text (יְהִי אֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ) can be

rendered, “for goodness' sake”. In this simple request, Abraham was profoundly appealing to Lot as would a subordinate to a superior. Powerfully, the reverse is the case here. Abraham being the superior humbly applies a mild command to his nephew in words that direct to his heart massaging it to seeking the aversion of dispute between them (Cowley, 1910, p. 324). Secondly, Abraham's approach and attitudinal disposition drives at convincing Lot on the appropriate action for enduring peace between his herders and Lot's (Von Rad, 1972, p. 171) before the situation escalates into full blow violence.

Abraham's words and approach for the attainment of peace are essential for a few reasons. The term רִיב (*rib*) mentioned in v. 7 means 'dispute, strife' and in the Septuagint (LXX is μ χη) it further implies physical combat. Thankfully, v. 7 did not state if there was any. Nevertheless, the utilization of *rib* suggest that the paths of the two herding parties had criss-crossed and their might have been some mild violent exchanges of words and physical contacts. The unimaginable crisis that could arise from this development is underscored by *rib* and it might have propelled Abraham's speech of v. 8.

In his speech, Abraham made a statement of respect to Lot by recognizing his person as a man and describing him as a brother: בְּיָמֵינוּ אָנָּחִים וְאָנָּחִים (we are men and brothers). The nouns אָנָּחִים ('*anāshîm*) meaning “men” and אָחִים ('*achîm*) meaning “brothers” in the Hebrew language statement בְּיָמֵינוּ אָנָּחִים וְאָחִים are syntactically in apposition with each other. Nevertheless, they possess the same reference and syntactic formation (Van der Merwe *et al*, 2018, p. 521) and could explain a dynamism. The dynamism of Abraham's בְּיָמֵינוּ אָנָּחִים וְאָחִים portrays equality and respect for Lot. He made Lot to see that they were of equal standing. As a result, as Nwaoru would argue, by Abraham declaring “we are men”, he was emphasizing and giving Lot his due social status as a mature adult male who is reasonably wise and capable of independent and constructive decisions (2015, p. 485). As men, there was need for them to resolve the conflict between their herders. Otherwise, it might negatively impact on their filial relationship to which Abraham reminded him by stating “we are brothers” (Wenham, 1987, p. 297; Nwaoru, 2015, p. 485). Abraham's employment of the term אָח ('*ach*) in his speech of respect to Lot (בְּיָמֵינוּ אָנָּחִים וְאָחִים, 'we are men and brothers') is important, because '*ach* underlines different connotations in the Old Testament such as “biological brother” (Gen 4:2), “a member of one's kindred” (Gen 13:8), “a fellow country man” (Gen 31:32; Deut 15:3), “even to an unrelated persons” (Gen 19:7) and “by affinity” (Ps 133:1). In v. 8, Abraham uses '*ach* to describe Lot as family, being his nephew (Rickett, 2014, p. 618; Rickett, 2011, p. 48; Obiorah, 2015, p. 38). Accordingly, fighting should not be an option in the settlement of their herders' disputes. Abraham's goal here is summed up in Ps 133:1: “How good and pleasant it is when brothers dwell [ישבו] in unity [יחד]” (Wenham, 1987, p. 297).

Abraham's proposal and the conflict of Gen 13:8-9 (v. 9).

As Abraham's speech unfolded, in v. 9, he proposes a solution to the problem at hand. He suggests to Lot: "Is not the whole land before you? Separate yourself from me. If you took the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if you took the right hand, then I will go to the left." The question posed by Abraham to Lot is underpinned by the interrogative particle הֲלֹ (hālō') which means "Is not". The power of Abraham's gentleman's appeal to Lot which he started with the phrase אֶל-נָ (al-nā') in v. 8 interpreted as "for goodness sakes" is continued in the question clause הֲלֹ (hālō'), by the modal particle נָ (nā'). Standing independently from הֲלֹ (hālō'), נָ (nā') which although has a difficult translation here means "please". By Abraham's use of nā', he pleas for Lot to positively adopt and apply the suggestion to the problem he has raised. In essence, Abraham as an uncle entreats his nephew to accept his workable proposal. Furthermore, the narrator's choice of the *niphal* imperative of פָּרַד (pārad) which means "divide" points to the precedence Abraham gave to Lot to amicably resolve the crisis at hand. The *niphal* form of pārad implies Lot will choose for himself first and then what is left Abraham will take. This is instructive because the order of first choice given to Lot was supposed to be the prerequisite of Abraham, the uncle; but he relinquishes that right to his nephew by telling him to choose either to the שְׂמֹאל (sh m'ōl) 'left' or יְמִין (yāmîn) 'right' hand side first, actually referring to north or south (Obiorah, 2015, pp. 46, 47; Snyder, 2015, p. 157; Nwaoru, 2015, p. 487; Rickett, 2014, p. 620; Rickett, 2011, p. 41). Eventually, Lot made his choice and the conflict was resolved.

That Abraham transits from calling for peace in v. 8 and finally suggests separation in v. 9 does not just sustain their kinship bond, but he also identifies Lot as a mature man capable of his independent existence. Abraham's suggestion is worthwhile not only on the grounds of his appealing to the person of Lot, but he followed the conventions of their time in resolving the problem at hand. For according to Roland de Vaux, peaceful separation was the ancient way of settling disputes amongst the nomadic people because it even fostered growth and more wealth and it discourages animosity between the kinsmen at the point of their separation. As a result, when Lot was captured as a prisoner, Abraham immediately came to his rescue (Gen 14:12-16) (De Vaux, 1961, p. 7). This development finds close parallel in the event between David and Jonathan (2 Sam 1:23) and that between Ruth and Naomi (Ruth 1:17) (Nwaoru, 2015, p. 486).

The big question is, can the speech and attitude of Abraham in his resolution of the impending conflict with Lot serve as a model for peaceful resolution of crisis in Kaduna state?

Abraham, Gen 13:8-9 and conflict resolution

Within the Abraham – Lot narrative, there is no account of any conflict between kinsmen save the land dispute of Gen 13:5-9. By inference, this is the first conflict between Abraham and his nephew. They had been living peacefully until they hired herders to pasture their flock. Evidently, it was imperative to address the first ever recorded conflict of the Abraham – Lot narrative with the speed of light to prevent it from escalating (Gen 13:8-9). Our exegetical study underscores land and space as the immediate cause of the conflict. The available land was not sufficient for both herding teams to graze effectively; and this might have been worsened by possibly the agricultural activities of the Canaanites and Perizzites (Gen 12:6; 13:7). These kinsmen had amassed great wealth in flock that the land could not support them grazing together in the same space (Gen 13:6-7). The possible size of their flocks caused a crisscross between the herders of Abraham and Lot, and of course, their flocks. The crossed paths engendered a dispute, but there is nothing in the text which suggests any form of violence. The ensuing dispute might have involved some physical contact arising from the crisscrossing by flocks and the altercations between Abraham's and Lot's herders over space.

To prevent the conflict from becoming vicious, Abraham swiftly swung into action as a precautionary measure to steer the family he heads away from any further escalation of the struggle. To achieve a peaceful resolve, he appealed to the maturity of Lot as an adult and as his brother. The act of appealing to the maturity of Lot which placed them on equal standing gave room for an honest and sincere discussion on the matter at hand. By treating his nephew as a responsible person and an adult empowers him to make any choice that suits him. One important element that Abraham put on the table of dialogue was his readiness to relinquish his right over making the first choice as the elder person. He was ready to abide by any choice which Lot was going to make.

In the final analysis, his decision to humble himself paid off. The conflict was resolved because Lot knew that his uncle was a peaceful and generous man. It was because of his uncle's generosity that he owned everything he had acquired. They had also shared so much in common even from when he was only a lad. The supposition of Lot's wealth is deduced from the text itself. Prior to Gen 13:5, there was no information as to how Lot acquired his wealth of flocks, cattle, and tents. We are only left to make intelligent guesses that Lot shared in the blessings YHWH made to Abraham (Gen 12:3, 16-18). Having been favoured by Abraham's blessing, it became imperative for Lot, for the first time, to do what would promote the existing peace which he had enjoyed with his uncle. Notably so, the kindness of Abraham to Lot which placed him on the same social status urged him to respect his uncle's wish by separation, which was the common practice among nomads of the epoch (De Vaux, 1997, p. 7). Lot

saw no reason why he should contest the land under discussion no matter the circumstances by opting to the left against north or south, as Abraham pleaded. Going to the east was Lot's humble resignation to the entire land of Canaan to Abraham.

The fair dealings Abraham had with Lot and his unquestionable integrity made peace possible. Abraham's marks of honesty are manifested in his choice of words, his attitudes, his actions during his speech and his past just dealings in his relationship with his nephew earned Lot's respect for his uncle. All these qualities are embodied in the person of Abraham which assisted in resolving the conflict. As a result, there was no animosity between them after separation. And when Lot was in difficulty later on, Abraham even went and rescued his nephew from the hands of his captors (Gen 14).

Conflicts and government's attempts to make peace in Kaduna State

Causes of Conflict in Kaduna State

There are a number of causes of conflicts in Kaduna State, particularly in the Southern part. Every conflict, no matter the dimension it takes, is hinged on the Hausa-Fulani hegemony. Nevertheless, what has become the dominant conflict in recent times is the struggle over land between Muslim Fulani herdsmen and the Christian native farmers. Others include ethnic intolerance, political party dominance, land ownership, resource control, insecurity and marginalization (Kukah, 2016, p. 1; Akin Akinteye, 2004, p. 226; Ibrahim James, 1997, p. 202; Ayuba Gimba Mavalla, 2015, p. 27; Bagobiri, 2017, p. 11; Stephen Kirimi, 2018, p. 38; Jeremy Sarkin, 1999, p. 806; Abdulkarkindo *et al*, 2018, p. 18). Apart from the aforementioned, Abdulkarkindo *et al* corroborate this article's position on the causes of the conflict in Southern Kaduna thus: "many perspectives lay emphasis on environment, ethnicity, political contestation, population and/or economic competition as being the basis for the violent conflict" (2018, p. 18).

The natives of Southern Kaduna have been suppressed for a long time from the feudal system of the Hausa-Fulani to the British indirect rule that put them in their hands. Having been repressed and suppressed by the northern power brokers who have the organs of government at their disposal, they Southern Kaduna indigenes have grown to resist what they see as an agenda to eliminate them from their ancestral heritage. On the part of the Hausa-Fulani, who have enjoyed power and influence over the minority tribes of this State, they want to maintain the existing but enslaving status quo by whatever means possible. To achieve their objective, they scheme out their rivals out of any political office. This perceived rivals and enemy to their domination happen to be the Southern Kaduna. They achieve this through the power they control which harnesses State structures for their selfish goals (Pierre Hazan, 2006, p. 6), in order that they adjure themselves as the winner of all (Jonathan Cohen, 2006, p. 427).

From the foregoing, the people of Southern Kaduna interpret their present woes as a gross neglect of government to carry out its primary function of providing quality leadership to its citizens. There is no justice in the distribution of its resources and appointments either in the State or at federal levels. Instead, what these neglected people have been visited with is anarchy, brutality and lawlessness which violate human rights. They have been denied every right due to a citizen. This political subjugation has attracted the concern of many writers and Human Rights Activists, not only in Kaduna State and Nigeria but even around the globe (Joanna R. Quinn, 2004, pp. 402, 403; Hazan, 2006, p. 5; David Webster, 2007/2008, p. 591; Suren Pillay and Helen Scanlon, 2008, p. 20; David Dyzenhaus, 1999, p. 311; Sarkin, 1999, p. 767; Catherine M. Cole, 2007, p. 168; Annelies Verdoolaege, 2005, p. 184; Anne K. Krüger, 2012, p. 342; James L. Gibson, 2005, p. 344; Gerhard Werle, 1996, p. 65; James Cotton, 2004, p. 187; Tim Murithi, 2015, p. 76; African Union Panel of the Wise, 2013, p. 48). All because the Hausa-Fulani have forgotten that good governance is key to any meaningful development in the world. The lack of it is tacitly manifested in their hate speeches that incite violence that encourage ethnic and religious bigotry.

Another cause of these brouhaha in Kaduna State is structural injustice where all the relevant government agencies are lopsidedly located in the northern part with little concern of how others would see and interpret it. This total neglect by the State government has made the ground fertile for strife. Joseph Danlami Bagobiri (of blessed memory) and Matthew Hasan Kukah did not mince words when they laid bare their minds on these burning issues of great concern. In their contention, the trick to subdue the minority groups of Southern Kaduna is by denying the people of this region of both Federal and State infrastructural developments (Bagobiri, 2017, web.14/2/2019; Kukah, 1999, p. 11).

Consequently, historical distortions are used to justify these unfortunate trends. Notable among them is the position of M. D. Suleiman of the History Department of Bayero University Kano. He claims that the distribution of the population of the people of Kaduna State is 70% for the Muslim and less than 30% for Christians. He also alleges that the settlers have been in this part of the State even before the native whose culture dates back to 500 BC. How Suleiman came by these figures and what aspect of history he used in generating this error is a mystery. As unfortunate as this narrative is, it has been endorsed and promoted by Mallam Nasir El Rufai. This questionable history has the capacity to inflame issues and hinder the attainment of peace and development in the State (Suleiman, 2011, p. 2; George, 2016, p. 15). Forcing the Muslim/Muslim ticket in 2019 by El-Rufai is a claimed example now used to force on the outrageous Muslim majority. As a result, with the winner takes all, El-Rufai led government has denied the people of Southern Kaduna their rights and privileges as citizens of the State; thus, sustaining the endless marginalization

of the people of Southern Kaduna (Mavalla, 2015, p. 27). Kukah recently evaluated the situation arising from such perspective in saying:

The persecution of Christians in northern Nigeria is as old as the modern Nigerian state. Their experiences and fears of northern, Islamic domination are documented in the Willinks (sic) Commission Report way back in 1956. It was also the reason why they formed a political platform called, the Non-Muslim League. All of us must confess in all honesty that in the years that have passed, the northern Muslim elite has not developed all moral basis for adequate power sharing with their Christian co-regionalist. We deny at our own expense. By denying Christians lands for places of worship across most of the northern states, ignoring the systematic destruction of churches all these years, denying Christians adequate recruitment, representation and promotion in the State civil services, denying their indigenous children scholarships, marrying Christian women or converting Christians while threatening Muslim women and prospective converts with death, they make building a harmonious community impossible. Nation building cannot happen without adequate representation and a deliberate effort at creating for all members a sense, a feeling, of belonging, and freedom to make their contributions. This is the window that the killers of Boko Haram have exploited and turned into a door of death. It is why killing Christians and destroying Christianity is seen as one of their key missions (Kukah, 2020, No. 18).

These rights and equality of citizens are enshrined in the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic on Nigeria [as amended] (Nigeria Const. 1999 amend. IV, sec. 34-45). Painfully, despite the Covid-19 lockdown and the imposition of 24-hour curfew, the Hausa-Fulani backed Fulani invasion still stealthily go on killing spree in Southern Kaduna and other States which produce headlines like: "Kaduna: Bandits kill over 50 in fresh attack" (Vanguard, March 2nd, 2020); "15 feared slain in fresh attack on Kaduna community" (The Guardian, May 13th, 2020) and "Gunmen kill over 20 in Katsina, Kaduna, Benue communities" (Daily Trust, May 14th, 2020). These killings go on because perpetrators have been emboldened by governments' body language.

The million-naira questions are, what has been the effort of government in dealing with problems arising from conflicts, and what has it done to avert conflicts?

The role of government in making peace in Kaduna State

Many attempts have been made by the State government to make peace in

Kaduna State right from the Kafanchan riots of 6th March 1987 and the Zangon Kataf riots of February/May 1992, but there is no significant improvement in achieving the desired peace especially in Southern Kaduna. Government has instituted many Commissions of Inquiry to either decipher the remote and immediate causes of those conflicts or to negotiate for peace. They include the Justice Rahila Cudjoe Commission of Inquiry (1992), AVM Usman Mu'azu's Reconciliation Committee (1995), and the General Martin Agwai Committee on stamping out attacks on Southern Kaduna Communities (2016). Their findings were expected to inform government on what to do to avoid future occurrence of any conflict (Abdulbarkindo *et al*, 2018, p. 32). Painfully, after these Commissions submitted their findings and recommendations, government did not have the will power and refused to demonstrate the political clout to act swiftly on the recommendations with policy guidance for peace via white papers. It can be assumed that the State Government established these Commissions in the spirit of those of other parts of Nigeria and the world at large that total 40 of Human Rights Violations Inquiries (Krüger, 2012, p. 340). Of these figures, South Africa has had 17 Commissions (Cole, 2007, p. 172) modelled after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Argentina (1984) and Chile (1991) (Lansana Dumbuya, 2003, p. 18; Krüger, 2012, p. 348; Sarkin, 1999, p. 819). These exemplary Commissions succeeded in restoring relative peace in their concerned countries by their governments' implementation of the content of the reports and recommendation of their Commissions of Inquiries. Kaduna State government has not seemingly followed the footsteps of those governments at ensuring durable peace.

Consequently, conflicts persist in Kaduna State because government's inability to draw out a white paper on the report from the Commissions has entrenched distrust from the people on government. It is worsened by the deceptive body language of those in power since it does not commensurate with their spoken words. Nevertheless, Governor Mallam Nasir El Rufai on the 29th June 2020 set up a "White Paper Committee" on the 1992 Zangon Kataf riots. This is in reaction to the skirmish of Zangon Kataf of 11th June 2020 in which scores were killed in the Southern parts of the State. The initiative was ominously intended because the constituted Committee had an imbalance in representation of the aggrieved parts of the State. There is a loud dominance of the Hausa-Fulani in the committee. This has raised doubts on the credibility of the Commission and the intention of El Rufai for peace. The conclusion is he is on a sort of vendetta considering the divisive claims and utterances he emitted against the Southern Kaduna people since coming into power in 2015. And therefore, the Southern people believe there is nothing tangible which might come out from the White Paper Committee. Government must work harder to convince the people that she means well for them, by toeing the part of justice and equitable distribution of State resources, like what Abraham did to Lot.

Abraham's approach as model for making peace in Kaduna State

The text of Gen 13:8-9 contains the speech of Abraham that doused the conflict which would have erupted in 13:7. However, the way it was managed has shown that peace making is possible. In his speech, Abraham brought out the necessary elements that could avert and importantly quench any tension and usher in peace. These necessities are the words, attitudes and actions that are carefully chosen and used in the dialogue with conflicting parties. In the speech, Abraham, being the *pater familias*, was very careful and articulate over what to say to Lot. Interestingly, these ways of dealings with other human beings in any given relationship is interpreted in Hebrew as a display of the virtue of *tāmîm*. All the different literary contexts of the term *tāmîm* have given its root *tmm* meanings. One of such meanings is integrity. In the Old Testament, different verbal and adjectival forms imply *tāmîm* as dealing with someone who relates and deals with people in the virtue of integrity. It is mostly concerned with the type and manner of human activity, the completeness of the action, and the attitude of any human agent. The word *tāmîm* is not found in Gen 13:8-9, but the way and manner Abraham dealt with the conflict before him through his attitudes and actions reflect the qualities of *tāmîm*. Abraham knew that he had to be careful to ensure peace as the head of the family. To do so, he paid attention to how to approach his nephew, Lot.

Consequently, Lot accepted the terms for the truce because of the way Abraham, his uncle, handled the issue. He respected his uncle by giving him a listening ear. As a result of that, when Abraham shifted ground, he did the same. There was no show of power or wielding influence by one to the other, and there was no use of foul language. Abraham showed a strong will to make peace in his language. He was not only a man of a well-articulated speech but had the will power for peace without minding what it might cost him. In this context, when integrity and strong will are put together, cease-fire can be possible.

Lot considered the manner with which his uncle addressed the issue and the truce was achieved. As such, he did not only consider but accepted the armistice of his uncle by going outside the land of Canaan as far as the plains near Sodom and Gomorrah and settled there (Gen 13:12). Lot knew that his uncle was a man of his own word having lived under Abraham's tutelage and came to know the life and dealing of his uncle as imbued with integrity. Hence, he trusted his words. This is what the political leadership of Kaduna state must possess and demonstrate. The ability to evoke trust from the people.

It is this life of Abraham's honesty, transparency and selflessness with others that endeared Lot to believe in his uncle. And this is part of what this article calls the Kaduna State government to, if she is ready to deal with every conflict in the

spirit of reconciliation. She should deal justly, honestly, and sincerely with others so that the trust built over time could be put to use when discord surfaces. Government should stop this arrogance of the Hausa-Fulani, for history and power change over time. She and the Hausa-Fulani must be mindful of the language they speak. It should not be a language that break hearts away from suing for peace. Such disposition wins trust from government's citizens who will believe them as unbiased umpire in conflict resolution in Kaduna State.

Recommendations

From the foregoing, this study puts forward the following recommendations as guide to government on how to engender policies for peace in Kaduna State.

Traditional institutions should be valued

The integrity and selflessness of Abraham as a traditional head of the family is the paradigm for respect of the office of traditional rulers. The minority tribes in Kaduna State lived together in peace at a period when there were no legal systems, law enforcement agencies, prisons, yet with minimal crimes. There was order, discipline, harmony, and balance in the society; and that which made it to happen was the kinship leadership quality of heads of family considered to be men of integrity. Kinship does not necessarily mean everybody must come from the same root with a common ancestor. It can be by adoption too. The herdsmen and farmers may not have blood affinity or be connected by adoption, but if they all see themselves as sharing a common humanity and use that as their point of convergence, there will be tolerance and peace. Abraham and Lot solved their conflict because they were kinsmen, most importantly that there was no pre-existent conflict in the text. All that Government needs to do at all levels is to by principle of subsidiarity grant certain roles to heads of family or clan and especially traditional rulers. In assuming that traditional role, these traditional rulers will see every member within its territory with the interpretation of kinship and dispense justice to all. With such leadership as the primary resolver of conflicts in the spirit of our human kinship a lot of peace will be entrenched within communities in Kaduna State.

Distribute resources evenly in Kaduna State

There is no substantial government presence in the southern part of Kaduna to make the natives feel belonged in the State. Every worthwhile government institution or parastatal is in the northern part. Coincidentally, the north is predominantly Muslim, and the south is Christian. Even in the construction of roads and expansions currently going on in Kaduna metropolis, it is all centred in the northern part of the metropolis where the Muslim are in a shouting majority. Christians in the southern part feel neglected. To build lasting peace, elements that give birth to suspicion must not be part of government's activities.

They create distrust. It is this feeling of mistrust and suspicion that have made peaceful resolution in Kaduna State impossible.

Grossly reduce the security details of government officials and individuals

The advent of Covid-19 has placed all citizen of Kaduna State on equal status. Nobody is immune from its ravaging effects. The steps government of every level have taken to curb this menace equals its horrendous effect across all levels. The same should be applied to security matters in the State. If banditry, kidnapping, highway robberies and other social vices affect every citizen, there should be collective efforts to curb it. This demand of government the urgent need to reduce the security details of government officials and “respected” individuals. The extra hands should be deployed into all the security agencies to fight insecurity and all forms of banditry.

Equal treatment of citizens

Government has the responsibility of treating its citizens on equal standing regardless of any religious or ethnic affiliation. One amongst the many reasons why there is conflict in Kaduna State is government as understood by its body language to be biased in discharging its primary functions of protecting lives and property. Government has the responsibility of treating all citizens equal before the law. So also, it will be important for government to be neutral over religious and ethnic matters. It should not be found to be sympathetic towards one religion or ethnic group against the others.

Harmonization of diversity

Government of Kaduna State has not been able to manage its diversity to bring about meaningful development for its people. This state is made of many difference cultures, customs, traditions and religious beliefs and practices. If these diversities were properly harmonized and integrated, it would have become a beehive of activities that could promote tourism because of its rich cultural heritage.

Rule of law

Laws that are unjust and cannot give security to the citizens need to be repealed. Every human law is supposed to be for the good of the people and as such, any law that appears to be unjust and a threat to the security of the very people it is supposed to serve should be abrogated. The purpose for which the laws are created in the society is to serve the general good of every citizen. If law is enacted to suppress and demean a group of persons and their ethnicity, it becomes destructive and so should be rescinded or re-evaluated. Some examples are: Grazing Reserve Law enacted by the Northern Regional Government in 1965; Decree 6 of the Land Tenure Act of 1978; ECOWAS

Protocol A/P.1/5/79 Relating to Free Movement of Person, Residence and Establishment of 1979. These need to be reviewed because *ab initio* they were set up to confiscate indigenous lands belonging to the natives and be given to settlers under the guise of law.

Conclusion

This article affirms the fact that making peace is possible, no matter how difficult and challenging the task may be. What is needed for peace to be achieved is men and women of integrity to steer the organs of governance. With justice and equitable distribution of state resources and equal treatment of citizens, peace would be attained. However, if there is a breakdown of law and order, conflicts can easily be resolved when the citizens know that those at the helm of governance are honest, sincere and trustworthy. In the atmosphere of gross Human Rights Violation, marginalization, sectionalism, deceits, arrogance, and impunity peace will be elusive.

No number of Commissions of Inquiries, Peace Accords and security presence can bring about peace in the face of injustice and outright disregard for the rule of law. What is happening in Kaduna State especially in the southern part is the product of long years of neglect and suppression of the natives. They have been denied of their necessities of life, their lands confiscated without compensation and allotted to foreigners who have no linguistic nor cultural affiliation with the local people. Such infiltration can only heighten tension leading to conflict and not peace. The government of Kaduna State can broker peace between the natives and the foreigners only when there is transparency in its dealings with the owners of the land.

Abraham was able to curb the first conflict that arose between his herders and those of Lot because of his integrity and love of his nephew. He empowered Lot and made him rich in flocks and tents. With such peaceful state of mind, he resolved their impasse easily. That is what government needs to do to the people of Southern Kaduna to restore affection and trust among the people. Anything short of that would be a mere charade. The composition of arbiters, their body language, choice of words, attitudes and actions would go a long way to making peace. Government officials must avoid utterances that demonstrate hatred, bitterness, and anger. These are far from the prerequisite for making peace under any circumstances.

REFERENCES

- Abdulbarkindo, A., *et al* (2017). Nigeria: Southern Kaduna and the atrocities of Hausa-Fulani Muslim Herdsmen. *World Watch Research, Vol. 1*.
- (2013). Peace, Justice and Reconciliation in Africa. *The International Criminal Court and Africa*. African Union Panel of the Wise: International Peace Institute.
- Akhaine, S., *et al* (2020). 15 Feared Slain in Fresh Attack on Kaduna Community: Villages of Gonan Togo in Kajuru Local Government Area. *The Guardian Newspaper, 13th May*.
- Akinteye, A., *et al* (2004). Zangon Kataf Crisis: A Case Study. *Community Conflicts in Nigeria: Management, Resolution and Transformation*. Onigu Otite and Isaac Olawale Albert (eds). Ibadan: Academic Associates Peaceworks.
- Aminu, H. U. and Yaba, M. I., (2020). Gunmen Kill over 20 in Katsina, Kaduna, Benue Communities. *Daily Trust, 14th May*.
- Bagobiri, J. D., (2017). *Christians: Seed of another Humanity*. Ikeja: Nilesorphem.
- . (2017). Religion, Government and Southern Kaduna Killings. Retrieved from: www.theeagleonline.com.ng/ on 25th May, 2020.
- Brown, F., (ed), (1907). *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cohen, J. R., (2006). A Genesis of Conflict: The Zero-Sum Mindset. *University of Florida Law Scholarship Repository*. Florida: UF Law Faculty.
- Cole, C. M., (2007). Performance, Transitional Justice, and the Law: South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Theatre Journal, Vol. 59. No. 2*.
- Cotton, J., (2004). East Timor in 2004: It I All about Oil. *Asian Survey, Vol. 45. No. 1*.
- Cowley, A. E., (1910) (Ed.). *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press
- De Vaux, R., (1961). *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans.
- Dumbuya, L., (2003). *The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Post Conflict Sierra Leone*. Cairo: Department of Political Science, School of Humanities, the American University in Cairo.
- Dyzenhaus, D., (1999). Debating South African's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, Vol. 49. No. 3*.
- Federal Republic of Nigerian. (2010). *1999 Constitution (As Amended) of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Abuja: National Assembly.

- Gibson, J. L., (2005). The Truth about Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa. *International Political Science Review/Revue Internationale de Science Politique*, Vol. 26. No. 4.
- Hassan, I., (2020). Kaduna Bandits Kill over 50 in Fresh attack: Kerewa Village in Igabi Local Government Area. *Vanguard Newspaper*, 2nd March.
- Hazan, P., (2006). Morocco Betting on a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *US Institute of Peace*.
- James, Ibrahim., (1997). *Studies in the History, Politics and Cultures of Southern Kaduna People Groups*. Jos: Ladsomas.
- Kirimi, S., (2018). The Role of Local Networks for Peace in Kenya. *Local Network for Peace: Lessons from Community-Led Peacebuilding*. Lesley Connolly and Laura Powers (eds). International Peace Institute.
- Koch, K., (2004). תּוֹמִים. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Vol. 3. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann (eds). Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Krüger, A. K., (2012). From Truth to Reconciliation: The Global Diffusion of Truth Commissions. *Reconciliation, Civil Society, and the Politics of Memory: Transitional Initiatives in the 20th and 21st Century*. Birgit Schwelling (ed).
- Kukah, M. H. (1999). *Democracy and Civil Society in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum.
- . (2016). The Emergence of Hausa-Fulani Hegemony (1950-1965). *Religion, Politics and Power in Northern Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum.
- . (2011). *Witness to Justice: An Insider's Account of Nigeria's Truth Commission*. Ibadan: Bookcraft.
- . (2020). *Solemn Witness: A Homily at the Funeral Mass of Seminarian Michael Nnadi on 11th February 2020 at Good Shepherd Seminary, Kaduna*. Sokoto: Department of Social Communication, Catholic Diocese of Sokoto – Nigeria.
- Mavalla, A. (2015). Causes and Evolution of Violent Conflict in Northern Nigeria. *Issues in Conflict, Peace & Governance*. David Oladimeji Alao, Ed. Ibadan: Fodnab.
- Murithi, T., (2015). Ensuring Peace and Reconciliation while Holding Leaders Accountable: The Politics of ICC. *African Development*, Vol. 40. No. 2
- Nwaoru, E. O., (2015). Separated but not Estranged: Reading Abraham-Lot Narrative in African Family Context. *Theology and Family in the African Context*. Ferdinand Nwaigbo (eds). Port Harcourt: Catholic Institute of West Africa.
- . (2015). Conflict and Reconciliation in Joseph Narrative (Gen 37-50): Hermeneutical Issues for Africa. *Conflicts and Reconciliation in the Bible: Proceedings of the Fourteenth Congress of the Panafrikan Association of African Exegetes*. Paul Béré et al (eds). Abidjan: Panafrican Association of African Exegetes.

- Obiorah, M. J., (2015). 'Let there be no Strife' (Genesis 13:8): A Study of Genesis 13 in the African Context. *A Proceeding of the Fourteenth Congress of the Panafrican Association of Catholic Exegetes on Conflicts and Reconciliation in the Bible*. Paul Béré, Mary Sylva Nwachukwu, Anthony I. Umoren (eds). Abidjan: Panafrican Association of African Exegetes.
- Odafe, G., (2016). Boko Haram, Fulani Herdsmen and Possible Humanitarian Crises: Evaluation and Recommendations. *Nigerian Journal of Religion and Society*, Vol. 6. Kaduna: Good Shepherd Major Seminary.
- Pillay, Suren and Helen Scanlon (2008). Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in Africa: South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana and Sierra Leone. *Peace Versus Justice? Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and War Crimes Tribunals in Africa*. Centre for Conflict Resolution.
- Quinn, J. R., (2004). Constraints: The Un-Doing of the Ugandan Truth Commission. *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 26. No. 2
- Rickett, D., (2011). Rethinking the Place and Purpose of Genesis 13. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, vol. 36. No. 1.
- , (2014). Creating an Unrighteous Outsider: The Separation of Abram and Lot in Early Scriptural Retellings. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 76.
- Sarkin, J., (1999). The Necessity and Challenges of Establishing a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Rwanda. *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 21. No. 3.
- Sheehan, S., (1999). *The Ancient World: Great African Kingdoms*. Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn.
- Skinner, J., (1930). Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. *The International Critical Commentary*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Snyder, J., (2015). Reading an Outsider: Lot in Jubilees. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 24. No. 3.
- Suleiman, M. D., (2011). Southern Kaduna: Democracy and the Struggle for Identity and Independence by Non-Muslim Communities in Northern Nigeria 1999-2011. *A Paper Presented at the 23rd AFSAAP Conference Flinders University*.
- Turaki, Y., (2010). *Tainted Legacy: Islam, Colonialism and Slavery in Northern Nigeria*. Virginia: Isaac.
- Uroko, F. C., (2018). Readdressing the Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Southern Kaduna, Nigeria in the Light of Abraham-Lot Narrative (Genesis 13:1-18). *UJAH*, Vol. 19. No. 2.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. et al (2018). *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 2nd Ed. New York: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark.

- Verdoolaege, A., (2005). Media Representations of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Their Commitment to Reconciliation. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, Vol. 17. No. 2.
- Von Rad, G., (1972). *Genesis: A Commentary*. John H. Marks. (transl.). Philadelphia: The Westminster.
- Webster, D., (2007/2008). History, Nation and Narrative in East Timor's Truth Commission Report. *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 80. No. 4.
- Wenham, G. J. (1987). Genesis 1-15. *Word Bible Commentary, Vol 1*. Bruce M. Metzger et al (eds). Dallas: Word Books.
- Werle, G., (1996). Without Truth, No Reconciliation. The South African "Rechtsstaat" and the Apartheid Past. *Law and Politic in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, Vol. 29. No. 1.
- Westermann, C., (1985). *Genesis 12-36: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Williams, I. F. et al (2004). Conflicts between Pastoralists and Agriculturists in North-Eastern Nigeria. *Community Conflicts in Nigeria: Management, Resolution and Transformation*. Onigu Otite and Isaac Olawale Albert (eds.). Ibadan: Academic Associates Peaceworks.