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Abstract
Gandhi's concept of nonviolence has a humanistic approach. He tried to change the very character of every Indian in the society where he lived. He said that man is basically a violent being, but gradually he can become non-violent if he desires. He recognizes that man is a conditional being and as such subject to the determination of the physical world. The ultimate end in man's life for Gandhi is realizing the Absolute. Pertinent to note that, Gandhi had spent quite some time in his tutelage in Southern Africa where his experiences impelled him to adopt non-violence as the only paradigm to overcome oppression and domination in his country India. British oppression and inhumanity were so severe and intensive that Gandhi was cautious about the use of violence, alternatively, he adopted non-violence to be the only imperative paradigm to dislodge the domination and inhumane treatment of the British against the Indians in South Africa. In this respect, I recommend Gandhi's non-violence principles as a fundamental paradigm towards peace in Africa. Peace in Africa is imperative for human and societal development especially as one sees Africa grappling with instabilities, insurrections, terrorism, xenophobia, political upheavals, nepotism, and gender agitations. In this article, I recognize Gandhi’s postulations on non-violence as an initiative which if adopted and its dictates are adhered to, could enhance peace in Africa.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The concept of non-violence is basically an axiological and ethical one. In modern times, it is more a counter-thesis than a thesis per se. It is not a fact, but it counters the fact of violence and the world- view grown upon this fact. In countering the fact of violence, the idea of non-violence is translated into action plans giving rise to many more allied concepts like 'Truth', 'God', 'Swaraj' or 'Self-rule', 'well-being' etc. Since the equation of means and end, it speaks of a societal transformation and a transformation of human subjectivity from the state of violence to non-violence. In the context of the critique of modern civilization which is beset with different forms of violence, it is M.K. Gandhi who is the pioneer in spelling out the meaning of non-violence in terms of this equation (Juregensmeyer, 2000). The end of human action is the cumulative consequence of the means used. This idea of non-violence as an end flowing from a non-violent agency is again based upon a moral struggle that in Gandhian phraseology may be called a struggle between the 'soul force' and 'brute force' in the human subject and finally upon a victory of the 'soul force' (Krishnamurti, 1994). In this sense, non-violence as a moral state of-affairs countering violence as a fact is indicative of an inner transformation within the human subject. Human freedom lies in this transformation. Gandhi would call it 'Swaraj' or 'self-rule' in the truest sense of the term.

The quest for peace in Africa importunes that its importance ought to be the most viable and practical alternative to sustain advancement within the developmental ambiance of Africa (Yta, 2015; Yta, 2017; Udoh, 2017; Akpanika, 2017). Both natural and human resources had been stagnated due to a lack of peace in Africa. The conflict situations have worsened our hopes of advancement, thereby placing Africa in a state of despondency. Stakeholders in peace, conflict resolution and non-violence agree that the paramount need for basic actions towards man's existence and progress is the correction of basic social injustice committed and inflicted upon man as an individual and as a social being in the society (Udoh, 2017; Udoh, 2018; Duke & Okafor 2020). Upon this backdrop, violence against man as an individual and social being is nugatory to individual existence and society. In conflict and peace studies, two strands are reconcile for resolution and management; these are the use of violence and non-violence in peace attainment. In this article, however, I examine the non-violence option with specific affiliation to Mahatma Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence towards conflict resolution and peace in Africa. However, is it possible to attain peace in Africa using Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence? This article affirms that it is a possibility to adopt, maintain, and sustain peace in Africa with Gandhi's nonviolence philosophy. Obviously, Gandhi's nonviolence and his gravity of applicability, functionality and effectiveness are “borne out of his moral convictions, personal dispositions and religious beliefs and doctrines” (Onoh, 2018) further, this article argues that “ideas rule the world” and most of our problems are resolve when ideas on basic issues of life” are placed and examined in the crucible of rationality. The article also gives credence to the facts that, most conflict situations, wars, and upheavals are never resolved and managed by violence, but by non-violence which is the thrust of this article.

2 NON-VIOLENCE
The word ‘non-violence’ or ‘ahimsa’ literally means ‘non-injury’ (Miri, 1987). It is an important concept in Indian as well as Western tradition. Ahimsa has been preached and practiced in the Indian tradition as a religious and moral virtue for thousands of years. But in the hands of Gandhi, the concept found a much greater connotation and was put into practice in a much wider area and with greater success than it had been achieved in the past. Gandhi himself says that he has nothing new to teach to the world because truth and non-violence are as old as the hills. But Gandhi was a great synthesizer of ideas. It goes to the credit of Gandhi that he took up certain principles, isolated what is authentic and worthwhile and put them into practice. Though ahimsa is an ancient concept, yet it has been under constant investigation and development.
Non-violence or *ahimsa* has long been central to the religious traditions of India — especially Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism (Miri, 2003). Religions in India have consistently upheld the sanctity of life, whether human or animal (Miri, 2003). *Ahimsa* has been recognized as a virtue in the Veda. Vedic thinkers prescribe non-injury as a virtue. So, the beginning of the concept of ahimsa as non-injury can be traced back to Vedas. The roots of non-injury, non-killing and nonconsumption of meat, are found in the Vedas, Agamas, Upanishads, Dharma Shastras, Yoga Sutras and other sacred texts of Hinduism.

*Ahimsa* has been recognized as a virtue by many of the systems of Indian Philosophy. For example, in Patanjali’s *Yogasutra* *ahimsa* is always interpreted broadly as abstinence from malice towards all living creatures in every way and. Patanjali regards *ahimsa* as a yogi’s mahavrata, the great vow and foremost spiritual discipline, which those seeking Truth must follow strictly and without fail (Pareek, 1995). This was not meant merely to cover non-killing, but extended to exclude harm caused by one’s thoughts, words, and deeds of all kinds — including injury to the natural environment. Even the intent to injure, even violence committed in a dream, was regarded as a violation of the principle of ahimsa.

According to Vaisesika thinker, Prasastapada *ahimsa* is one of the universal duties, which is obligatory for all irrespective of caste and conditions of life (Roy, 1986). In the Mahabharata also *ahimsa* has been recommended as a moral duty (Roy 2003). The Mahabharata contains extensive reference to the idea of ahimsa. At various places, it has condemned ahimsa in its various forms (Pareek, 1995).

However, in Buddhism and Jainism we come across a special and exclusive emphasis on *Ahimsa* (Rupesinghe, 1994). Buddhism emphasized universal compassion and love (Selboume, 1985). When understood in this way ahimsa calls for positive action to do away with the sufferings of all beings. In Jainism, ahimsa is the standard by which all actions are to be judged. For a householder observing the small vows (*anuvrata*), the practice of ahimsa requires that he should not kill any animal. For an ascetic observing the great vows (*imahavrata*), *ahimsa* entails the greatest care to prevent him from knowingly or unknowingly being the cause of injury to any living substance. Living matter (*jiva*) includes not only human beings and animals, but also insects and plants, and the same law governs the entire cosmos. The interruption of another *jiva*’s spiritual progress increases one’s own karma and delays one’s liberation from the cycle of rebirths. Many common Jaina practices, such as not eating or drinking after dark or the wearing of cloth mouth-covers (*mukhavastrika*) by monks are based on the principle of *ahimsa* (Selboume, 1985). Ahimsa is the leading tenet and is the fundamental ethical virtue of Jainism. All actions are judged and evaluated in accordance with the standard of ahimsa. But the Jainas go to the extreme and lay excessive emphasis on ahimsa. As all activities involve violence in one form or the other, Jainas insist that their followers should engage themselves in the fewest possible activities. They refuse to take the life of even the smallest insect. It is the extreme application of the negative aspect of a vital principle and has become “a burden to humanity almost impossible to bear” (Singh, 1994).

Gandhi says that this extreme application of nonviolence by Jainas is based on a wrong assumption (Terckhe, 1998). They think that only death is a form of suffering and life in any form is preferable to death. This is due to the undue emphasis given to the sacredness of sub-human life in preference to human life. Though the Hindus and Buddhists never required so strict an observance of ahimsa as the Jainas, vegetarianism and tolerance toward all forms of life became widespread in India. The Buddhist emperor Ashoka, in his inscriptions of the 3rd century BC, stressed the sanctity of animal life. Ahimsa is one of the first disciplines learned by the student of yoga and is required to be mastered in the preparatory stage (*yama*), the first of the eight stages that lead to perfect concentration (Singh, 1994). For India’s ancient thinkers, life is seen as divine. They further hold that each life form possesses consciousness and energy (Kytile, 1982). In India, there has developed an unparalleled concern for harmony among life forms. This has led to the growth of a common ethos based on non-injury and minimal consumption of natural resources. The virtues of compassion, non-possession, and simplicity are based on the principle of *ahimsa*.

### 3 A DISCOURSE ON GANDHI AND UNDERSTANDING NON-VIOLENCE WITHIN THE AMBIENCE OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE

Gandhi was known originally as Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. The literature on non-violence reveal that nonviolence was not Gandhi’s invention, but he is called the father of non-violence because he raised non-violent action to a level never before achieved “Kirshna Kripalani added “Gandhi was the first in human history to extend the principle of nonviolent from individual to social and political planes, with Gandhi, the notion of non-violent attained a special status. He did not only theorize on it, he adopted non-violent as a philosophy and an ideal way of life. He made us understand that the philosophy of non-violent is not a weapon of the weak, it is a weapon that can be tried by all (1982:20).

To strengthen this position, Prabhu and Roo assert that “Gandhi’s philosophy bears the influence of several sources and *Ahimsa* forms the basic foundation of Gandhi’s thought. Apart from *Bhagavad-Gita*, *Upanishad and Bible*, he was highly influenced by Tolstoy’s “The Kingdom of God is within us”, Ruskin’s “Unto this last, Thoreau’s ‘On the Duty of civil disobedience’ and Plato’s *Dialogues of Socrates* (1985: 20). In the contemporary world, it is Gandhi who very strongly asserted the role and significance of *ahimsa* in the individual as well as in social life. Before Gandhi, the term ‘non-violence’ was accepted both in Indian philosophy and religion as a religious virtue. Gandhi can be unquestionably given the credit for extending, rather for widening the scope of ahimsa. In other words, Gandhi was mainly responsible for bringing it out from the boundaries of religions and getting it a place in moral and political thinking (Ogar, 2018; Udoudom, 2018). It was due to his theory and practice in the field of politics that the principle of *ahimsa* or non-violent action has won a place in the vocabulary of politics. Gandhi’s principle of *ahimsa* not only governs the relationship between human beings, but also man’s relation to the non-human world (Bassey, 2019).
I want to realise brotherhood or identity not merely with the beings called human, but I want to realise identity with all life, even with such beings as crawl on earth. I want, if I don’t give you a shock, to realise identity with even the crawling things upon earth, because we claim common descent from the same God, and that being so, all life, in whatever form it appears must be essentially one (Pareek, 1995: 79).

Gandhi was not satisfied with the literal or popular meaning of ahimsa, which is negative in character. Non-killing or non-injury seems to signify merely the absence of violence. One who merely refrains from violence can be regarded as non-violent in the negative sense. The very use of words like ahimsa and nonviolence with negative prefix creates the impression that the concept of ahimsa has no positive content. Gandhi moved away from this popular understanding and maintained that ahimsa does have a positive content which is much more important than its negative meaning. This extension of meaning of ahimsa from mere non-injury or non-killing to love and compassion makes Gandhi’s position different from Jaina concept of ahimsa, because there is a marked difference between having an active love and being satisfied with the mere absence of injury. Ahimsa, in its negative connotation, will be a set of prohibitions only. Without positive content, the principle of ahimsa is likely to promote inaction. Gandhi was not willing to accept any doctrine that would bring in any kind of inaction in man. Non-violence has absolutely nothing to do with passive acceptance or acquiescence to evil done to a person or nation. Gandhi’s non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear ones unprotected. Even violence and use of force is preferable to passive acceptance. Gandhi declares that vengeance is any day superior to passive, effeminate and helpless submission. Forgiveness is higher still. Vengeance too is weakness. The desire for vengeance comes out of fear of harm, imaginary or real.

4 Gandhi’s Philosophy of Non-violence

Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence is encapsulated in his notions of ‘AHIMSA’ and ‘SATYAGRAHA’ even though other persons deeply influenced him. Now, the major principles are examined;

4.1 Satyagraha

This is one of the greatest contributions of Gandhi to Indian history and world history in general. Gandhi formulated this concept to express the nature of his action against the “racial discrimination” in South Africa. Satyagraha was first used for the first time during the resistance of Indian workers in South Africa against the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance of 1906 (Iyer, 2000: 62). In another perspective, ‘Satyagraha’ was conceived out of two ‘Sanskrit’ words, “Satya meaning “truth” and “agraha” meaning “holding fast to,” he extended the word to mean truth force (Edet, 2002:33, Eyo, 2012: 157). However, prior to its usage, ‘Satyagraha’ was synonymous with passive resistance, but when it was fully developed, the expression gradually ceased to be considered as being synonymous because violence (passive resistance) was conceived as a universal weapon of the weak. (Eyo, 2012:157).

Gopinath submitted that according to Gandhi, discovered the science of Satyagraha by his experiments with truth. This science of Satyagraha has come to me by scientific research. It is a result of the hardest labor a human being is capable of. I have applied to this research all the skills of a scientist (Gopinath, 1946: 65-66) Gandhi to strengthen this concept defines Satyagraha as a relentless search for truth and a determination to reach the truth” (Dalton, 1998: 141).

Desai asserts, Satyagraha is dynamic, passive resistance is static and negative… Satyagraha on the other hand acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness because from “love”, the sufferings are fruitful. It is based on the principle of love and believe in “love for all and suffer for all” it excludes the use of any form of violence. It is based on this philosophy that man knows the absolute truth and cannot punish anyone. At this point, the notion of Satyagraha can be better understood through three basic truths namely “Satya” (truth), “Ahimsa” (Non-violence) and “Tapas” (self-suffering). Eyo added “Satyagraha as a matter of principle does not coerce anyone but rather to convert by persuasion to reach the reason through the heart” (Eyo, 2012: 158).

4.2 On Truth

The first ingredient of Satyagraha as espoused by Gandhi is the notion ‘truth.’ According to him, some friends have told me that ‘truth’ and non-violence have no place in politics and worldly affairs. I do not agree. I have no use for them as a means of individual salvation. Their introduction and application in everyday life have been my experiment all along” (Iyer, 2000: 66) “Truth alone is eternal, everything else is momentary” (Dalton, 1998: 82). He emphasized that one should always search for the truth and seek to find truth even though absolute truth cannot be found in man. However, the only means to reach the truth is “Ahimsa” non-violence for it is the most necessary and only means of realizing it” (Dalton, 1998: 142).

4.3 (Non-violence) Ahimsa

There are variations of non-violence. These include generic non-violence, pacifist non-violence, non-violence resistance or non-violence direct action and psychological or emotional non-violence. Gene sharp defines genetic, pacifist and non-violent resistance as follows:

Generic non-violence is defined and characterized by abstaining from physical violence (cowards and hermits)... pacifist non violence is (non-violence) (occassioned) by people who refused to kill or participate in wars based on morals, ethical or religious principles, non-violence resistance is act of commission or omission that defies an opponent but also reject violence. Act of omission for instance includes not taking part in political and social ceremonies/acts of commission is purposely breaking the law… (Sharp 1990, 44-45).
Non-violence remains a thing of great concern to many including Nagler who sees it as "that force or principle which comes increasingly to motivate a human being as he or she transforms the desire to injure others into its positive counterpart" (Nagler, 1986:72) Bond Douglas also defined and classified non-violence into "absolute pacifist, principled pacifist and pragmatic pacifist. The absolute pacifist endures suffering and sacrifice even until death. A complete pacifist absolute perspective will be unable to help reduce the suffering of others and therefore by such an act of omission, would increase the burden in others. Principled pacifists have their objective mitigating violence to the best of their ability. Problems arise because they have no way of knowing which part is least violence eventually. The pragmatic pacifist is concerned with using violence in pursuit of a specific socio-political objective wherein the non-violent ethics is thus specifically utilized as a means of other ends (Bond, 1988: 86-87).

The above excerpts stipulate that for non-violence approach to be effective and functional there must be a combination of the common good with individual sacrifice and suffering which will be carried out infidelity. By extension non-violence within the context of individual development and community, the building becomes the hallmark for peace in Africa. Individual development and community building cannot be possible amidst constant conflict situations. The fact is that only peace can enhance individual development and community building. These are the two pillars that Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence has its stronghold, upon which conflict resolution and peace could be advanced in Africa. However, Eyo and Francis quoting Grovier defined non-violence as “those methods of protest, non-cooperation and intervention in which the actors, without employing physical violence refuse to do certain things they are expected or required to do, or do certain things they are not expected or are forbidden to do”. (2017:141). In a critical exposition of Gandhi philosophy of non-violence Eyo said that,

“Gandhi in his famous trial speech in March 1922 put his theory of non-violence with great eloquence when he stated non-violence to be the first article of his creed. Indeed, non-violence was the founding principle of Gandhi's spirituality and the bedrock of his political philosophy... Gandhi rejected the tradition of violence with its revolutions because it always ends in repressive dictatorship. This is evident in the fact that once the violent gain control of the state machinery; they continue to use force to keep insurgents at bay, thus running the government like the military camp. This breeds further violence, and the reason for the revolution or resistance, which is to achieve freedom from tyranny ends up in a regime of bloody dictatorship” (Eyo, 2012: 153).

However, Gandhi opines that “A non-violent man can do nothing save by the power and grace of God. Without it, he won't have the courage to die without anger, without fear and retaliation. Such courage comes from the belief that God sits in the heart of all, and that there should be no fear in the presence of God non-violence, (Kytie, 1982).

Gandhi phrased this concept to express the nature of his action against the ‘racial discrimination’ in South Africa. The technique of Satyagraha was used for the first time during the resistance of Indian workers of South Africa against the Asiatic Law Amendment ordinance of 1906 (Iyer, 2000: 61-62) Satyagraha was discovered by his experiments with truth. For Gandhi, “The science of Satyagraha... has come to me... by scientific research. It is a result of the hardest labor a human being is capable of. I have applied to this research all the skills of a scientist” (Gopinath, 1946: 65-66). Moreover, Eyo in this respect, added that Gandhi insists that anyone or group of people who engage in non-violence must always be ready to reap the initiative consistently and throughout the duration of the struggle. The opponent must be given ample time to consider the proposal but should never be allowed to ignore the grievances of the non-violence resisters. During this period violence must be allowed to break their ranks. He further maintains that half of the struggle, and indeed the most difficult part of it is to convince the opposition or the tyrant that they are serious and not just displaying their frustration. When the tempo of the non-violent resistance is sustained, the tyrant has no choice but to deal with the resisters in the spirit of understanding and solidarity or by recourse to brute force. In another way the opponent becomes involved in a relationship with the movement and with time would step in to resolve the issue. Gandhi strongly opines that non-violence would be barren unless it is backed up by a program of action geared towards the charge. In the same vein, non-violence requires trust in the truth and the basic goodness of even the most debased human being (2012: 155). Gandhi in his book An Autobiography states how he came by the idea of Satyagrah

But I could not for the life of me, find a new name and therefore offered a nominal prize through Indian opinion to the reader who made the best suggestion on the subject. As a result, Gandhi coined the word “Sadagraha” and won the prize. But to make it clear I changed the world to Satyagraha (Eyo, 2012: 157).

The concept of Satyagraha was conceived out of two sankrit words, ‘satya’, meaning truth and ‘agraha’, meaning holding fast to. Gandhi occasionally translated the word Satyagraha to mean “truth force” (Edet, 2002: 33). Eyo opines that Satyagraha is a holistic philosophy of non-violence. Specifically, it is a technique or tool of non-violent action. As a technique, Gandhi developed Satyagraha to give the Indian population in South Africa a psychological weapon with which to resist the injustice of the British colonial government. Gandhi drew a clear-cut distinction between passive resistance as understood and practiced in the West and his own concept of Civil Disobedience. Gandhi made it known that before he developed his concept of Satyagraha to its logical spiritual extent, he had often used the term “passive resistance and Satyagraha” as synonymous terms, but as the concept of Satyagraha developed, the expression ‘passive resistance’ gradually ceased to be synonymous with his convictions because ‘passive resistance’ occasionally allowed for violence and was gradually gaining universal recognition as the weapon of the weak. (2012: 157).

Satyagraha, excludes all forms of violence since the use of coercion, on one hand, suppresses the development of the individuals and fails to show respect to the adversary and on the other hand, obscures the vision of truth. His concept of Satyagraha is based on the notion that the adversary is also a human being having a faculty of reasoning and goodness.
For Gandhi, to practice Ahimsa or non-violence one needs proper training of the strong will, patience, and moral courage and all this, in turn, leads to the transformation of the mind. For this transformation, an inner conscience is needed which gives an excess truth and non-violence to act as tools for peace and true existence. To live a life of violence Gandhi opined that man needs training to fully arouse his inner conscience and devotion which could achieve knowledge of the truth about the moral and physical world.

4.4 Tapas (Self Suffering)

To further reiterate the thrust of Satyagraha, Gandhi explained that Satyagraha further constitutes self-suffering (Tapas). For Gandhi, self-suffering is superior to the sacrifice of others, by an extension such suffering aims at a right cause towards the person who uses it. In his words ‘non-violence in its dynamic conditions bespeaks conscious suffering. It does not in any perspective mean meek submission to the will of the oppressor, rather means putting of one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant’ Gandhi, (Selboume, 1985).

In another perspective, Gandhi informed his followers that suffering is an indispensable aspect of Satyagraha. In this respect “we have to endure every hardship that we can imagine and wisdom lies inpledging ourselves on the understanding that we shall have to suffer all that and even worse pains…” (Prasad 1990). The suffering here stated must be voluntary and creative, implying that, this aspect of Satyagraha converts the tyrant or oppressor to be humane thus suitable for physical and spiritual progress. It also affects the conscience of the adversary thereby arousing in him “a sense of justice.” Self-suffering goes along with fearlessness and courage, accordingly without self-suffering it is impossible to attain freedom” (Prasad 1990; 86). Comparatively, Gandhi submits that self-suffering is applicable to both violent and non-violent actions. For in violent actions and conflicts many causalities are recorded. This position of Gandhi arose because of some occurrences in history which were exemplified in violent revolt in India's struggle for independence in 1857 and Algeria’s revolution which was non-violent. When these situations are compared with the French revolution, the number of deaths and injured were enormous. Kytle affirmation becomes evident in this excerpt “in the Indian struggle for independence, though I know of no exact statistics, hundreds of thousands of Indians went to jail, probably not more than five hundred received permanent physical injuries and probably not over eight thousand were killed immediately or died late from wounds. No British, I believe, were killed or wounded…” (1986: 100).

For emphasis, the consequences of non-violent resistance along with physical sufferings also involve economic losses. For instance, in Boston which action was non-violent, the British government closed the ports leading to lots of unemployment and starvation. In non-violent resistance in Ruhrkampf, Germany suffered economic disruption, infant mortality and unemployment (Sharp, 1960: 121). It follows that aside from the negative aspects of suffering, there are some positive aspects involved. It hampers the opponent's ability to control the situation in case of continued suffering and it also has a psychological influence on the opponents and tyrants and their supporters. This self-suffering viewed ordinarily could be construed as "no pain, no gain". At this juncture, it is instructive to put to question, the imports of Gandhi’s non-violence philosophy towards conflict resolution and peace in Africa.

5 Gandhi’s philosophy towards conflict resolution and peace in Africa

Gandhi’s ‘Ahimsa’ provides African political stakeholders a paradigm to take the right political action towards introducing non-violence approach to conflict resolution within Africa. Non-violence in this perspective becomes a sort of guide for practical prudence in search of truth for violence-free Africa. Gandhi’s ‘Ahimsa’ gives one the power to make wise decisions about relative truth in socio-political, religious, economically, and historical realms than just contemplation about the relatively good life and other theoretical perspectives. It is believed that since non-violence involves negotiations shifting grounds and making amend it is possible to resolve conflicts and accomplish peace in Africa.

There is another perspective upon which Gandhi’s nonviolence philosophy could be interpreted to facilitate and enhance conflict resolution and peace in Africa. This is evident in Fanon’s words that Europe has been successful because of her reliance on and through violence. This is all and more reason the oppressed must find something different and do something that Europe has failed to achieved (Fanon, 1964:312; Eyo & Essien, 2017: 66). By this, the oppressed African’s should rather restore their humanity by discarding the oppressive and violent devices of Europe, rather the oppressed must search within for something new that will bring them into contact with their true humanity” (Onoh, 2018:93). This new way is nonviolence which is the foundation of Mahatma Gandhi’s philosophy. Through nonviolence, Gandhi set out these paradigms for conflict resolution and advancement of peace, which include negotiation, agitation for redress, non-cooperation, civil disobedience, self-purification and issuing of ultimatum.

Notably, Africa as a continent is developing (Eyo, 2018; Eyo, 2019; Eyo, 2020), yet it is against human rationality for its reliance on non-violence to advance peace, cognizant that nonviolence method is subtle and weak. But one could agree that the world is characterized by violence and violence occurs everywhere, there are wars across the globe, terrorism, violence, conflicts, and deprivation. However, if these conflict situations continue, there will be no rest, peace, harmony, and tranquility among humans. Africa has not solved and fared well in violence and disturbing circumstances because it is a developing continent. It is time therefore for Africans to set out acceptable processes, models and paradigms which are embedded in non-violence. It is time for African to enthroned a peaceful method in conflict resolution and conflict management. This is the only paradigm towards the advancement of peace in Africa.

To advance peace in Africa, Gandhi’s words are instructive “if war cannot be abolished, there is absolutely no hope for the future of the human race, as sooner or later society is bound to annihilate itself… even vast continents will be reduced to impotency and dissolution …war must be abolished at all cost if civilization is to survive” (Shastitri & Shatri 1998, 83; Onoh, 2018, 96). On this note, for non-violence to be sustained in Africa and utilize for conflict resolution and
advancement of peace African nations must persuade world powers and oppressors to be conscious and acknowledge that all men belong to the same humanity. Gandhi had premised his non-violence philosophy on “love” which he associated with Ahimsa. The “love” Gandhi referred to was that which encourages the oppressed people to fight against social injustice. According to Gandhi “love” in his philosophy was not necessarily an affectionate and sentimental feeling rather it was “love” which shows goodwill and empathy and stimulates compassion for humanity. The instructive highlights for Africa now are the enhancement of peace and facilitation of conflict resolution in Africa. It should be a holistic display of “love” which will also break the frontiers of oppression and inhumane treatment meted out to the oppressed Africans. Non-violence as captured by Gandhi and recapitulated here reminds Africans that non-violence pays more than violence. For in adoption and adaptation of the non-violence philosophy of Gandhi there will be consistent and continuous conviction registered and stamped on the subconscious of the oppressors. At this point, there would be no option but a violent free Africa.

6 Conclusion
In this article, I have examined and exposed that Gandhi’s philosophy of non-violence can greatly institutionalize Africa’s mechanism of conflict resolution and the process of actualization of peace. Most importantly of Gandhi's philosophy was Satyagraha “truth force,” “Ahimsa” non-violence and “Tapas” self-suffering.” These constitutive elements urged Indian activists to exhibit vision, hope courage and action of enduring significance to accomplish success in India’s independence. However, I stated in this paper, that non-violence comparatively is stronger, viable and efficient than the use of violence in conflict resolution and advancement of peace. On this frame, therefore, for Africa, a developing continent with enormous natural and human resources to advance and liberate herself from foreign strangulation and manipulation I opine that non-violence, as proposed by Gandhi with some further articulations, would help Africa to fine-tune and stabilize mechanisms of conflict resolution and maintain the peace for continuous and consistent advancement and needed social liberation.
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