ABSTRACT
Conflict as an integral part of man is unarguable. Equally, peace as a pivotal need of man is without doubt. Peace is therefore imperative in any human setting. Alternative Dispute Resolution is one of the many different ways man and society has devised to find peace between parties in conflict. This discourse used historical and secondary records to argue in favour of the application of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in human relations as enunciated in first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (6:1-8) and anchored its argument on the social theory of forgiveness and the maxim: to err is human, to forgive is divine. It concludes that disputes among humans are not only socially inevitable but scripturally backed. It therefore, recommends that since the world religion favours peace and forgiveness and, more than half of the world population are Christians, court litigation should be used only when alternative means of conflict resolution have failed. This becomes necessary because court decision on a conflict does not always restore peace as alternative dispute resolution often does.
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INTRODUCTION:
Good human relations are not optional extra, yet global societies have witnessed myriad of interlocking crisis or conflicts on different fronts and at different levels. In our global modern world, where weapons of mass destruction are manufactured as wares to be purchased and indeed are being purchased in hard currencies, world peace seems to be threatened and peace, unachievable. Yet modern democracy in the words of Lawrence Carter, Dean, Martin Luther Jn. International Chapel, Morehouse College, cited in Ikeda (2008), “Flourishes only when the populace is enlightened, can dialogue and cooperate in spite of its difference, and builds a society of hope pointing towards the ultimate goal of peaceful coexistence”

These disagreements or conflicts range from intra-personal, inter-personal, intra-state, inter-state to transnational. Regardless of the level, at the root cause of these crises is the collective failure of humans to focus on peace-building than selfish and divisive tendencies along ethnic, religious and cultural divides. The endemic occurrences of conflict become worrisome due to the propensity of persons involved to hastily opt for court litigation. But the fact remains that once a matter goes to the court, the possibility of keeping a cordial relationship becomes very slim, if not permanently lost. In fact, the disposal of a matter by the court begins another, often deeply entrenched conflict between the individuals, albeit, surreptitiously, which is more dangerous. This line of thought is shared by Ivy (2003) when he quipped that:

Unless the underlying relational issues can be addressed and dealt with, any intervention is likely simply to foster instability and continuing conflict. It is also likely to store up hatreds and resentments both within the conflict situation and against the intervening parties.

The implication of the above is that if parties involved in a conflict go to court for ‘settlement’, it will produce ephemeral result but never a lasting solution. Thus the bible has called some people,
‘PEACEMAKERS’. In this sense, the peacemaker has to make a conscientious effort to gain the trust of all the major participants in a conflict and guide them through a process that will take its’ cue or bearing from basic biblical doctrines on peace, justice, fairness and good relations. This is different from court proceedings in conflict matters, where adjudications are based on prima facia evidence from the parties and their witnesses unlike the biblical peacemaker that make effort to listen to all sides of the story from the parties, showing concerns for all, maintaining moral neutrality, and interest in future relationships between the warring parties or disputants.

In other words, the court has failed to provide peace in troubled times between persons, besides its ability to adjudicate on a matter by apportioning blames or rights and awarding of damages against the presumed wrong doer. It is on this premise that other means of achieving peace began to evolve over the years. Such ways are referred to as Alternative Dispute Resolutions (ADR). The alternative dispute resolution refers to the use of methods such as arbitration, mediation on a round-table to resolve a conflict or dispute between individuals, groups, families and communities without resorting to litigations.

The Wex Legal Dictionary/Encyclopaedia defines alternative dispute resolution as any method of resolving disputes without litigation. This alternative legal means of resolving conflict is abbreviated as “ADR”. According to Legal Information Institute {LII}, ADR is any means of settling disputes outside court room. The popularisation of ADR have credence to 1958 convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, tagged, “New York Convention”. This was coined at Wrenghering domestic courts of awards granted in foreign countries. The USA joined this convention as one of the 157th counties signatories.

Alternative Dispute Resolution as a non-judicial process of settling dispute between individuals and communities is divine and amenable to human composition as we would always need each other. This may account for the rising acceptance of ADR in Nigeria. It offers opportunity for collaboration and realignment. Although courts may review the validity of ADR methods, it may not overturn the decisions made by ADR as long as the parties involved made the social contracts and are ready to abide by their agreements.

This paper, therefore, used historical and secondary sources to argue that ADR, just as the Bible tenets advocates, should be embraced as a more effective means of peace-building, reconciliation and good neighbourliness than court actions.

THE CONCEPT OF CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS

Burton {1987} and Kats {1966} see conflict as an essential element in human relations. To Herbert (1976), cited in Keghku (2008:350) conflict is a natural phenomenon. Natural in the sense that human beings as long as they live, must disagree and ultimately fight. This fight according to Burton {1980} “is born out of competition for interest and position which each party in the dispute wish to occupy”.

Udezo (2008) opines that “conflict means to strike at another, to fight with an enemy or to do battle with an opposing force”. But that it may, if conflict are handled very well, it may turn out to be positive. The positivity of conflict is seen when after resolution, it binds the parties further in their relationship. It is perhaps, one of the greatest benefits of alternative dispute resolution. Webel and Galtung (2007) summarized the above position by noting that:

“The antithesis of peace is not conflict. Conflicts appear historically inevitable and may be socially desirable if they result in personal and or political progress. Conflicts may, perhaps paradoxically, promote and increase peace and diminish violence if the conflicting parties negotiate in good faith to reach solutions to problems that are achievable and tolerable, if not ideal”.

The idea of achieving peace and progress is the under laying motive or cardinal principle behind conflict resolution that alternative dispute resolutions tends to achieve. To achieve this, however begins with a person’s ability to manage conflict within oneself. This is what is referred to as intra-conflict resolution. What this portends is that the level at which one is able to manage internal conflict impacts on his relationship with others around one. The person will be able to transfer or relate his experience to his immediate environment and associates. To resolve a conflict presupposes that all shades of opinions, grey areas and murky interests are critically considered an ideal or mutually acceptable offers are reached. To this ends, Miller (
2003) cited in Udezu (2008) explains that, conflict resolution uses a variety of approaches targeted at removing conflicts through an intervening variables of constructiveness different from conflict management or transformation.

THEORY OF FORGIVENESS

The theoretical anchor of this discourse is forgiveness theory. It is a theory that postulate that when individuals forgive one another’s wrong and offenses as nature demands, it leads to a better quality of life for all. The theory is attributed to Jean Piaget in the 30s and 40s. By 1950 a concerted movement saw forgiveness as both religiosity and pastoral as a cure to pathology. It was in 1960s that another psychologist, James G Emerson argued that there is a connection between forgiveness and healthiness. Although some contends that Robert Enright of University of Wisconsin-Madison and founder of International Forgiveness Institute should be credited for making forgiveness an important psychological concept.

This theory of forgiveness finds expression in another social maxim: “To err is human; to forgive is divine”. The maxim which holds its origin from a poem published by an English poet, Alexander Pope in 1711, opines that everyone could make a mistake and as such, should desire to forgive others as does God. It means in its simplest form, to show mercy to wrongs. The wordings of Pope in the early 18 century did not read human but humane which was the acceptable spelling then. This classical notion aligns with Jesus’ statement that we should love and forgive one another that the world may know that we are his children (john 13:35).

CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVES ON CONFLICT

Christ himself says “it is impossible for offense not come” (Luke 17:1). The church and the bible does not teach absence of conflict. The bible have records of quarrels, conflicts of various sizes between biblical personalities and families. For example, Abraham and Lots and the house of David and house of Saul; to arm conflict between nations, for instance, Israel and philistine.

Since the bible does not deny the possibility of conflict but does not subscribe to court litigation, what then does it postulate as a better way of resolving conflict? Our topic actually provides the answer: “Biblical Endorsement of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Context of 1 Corinthians 6:1-8”. However, with the progression of this paper, it will become clear what and how the bible suggest conflicts should be handled. Nevertheless, the basic tenets of the bible is that good human relations and a restoration of such whenever it is threatened is the basis on which peace and progress can be established. In doing this, the process of forgiveness and a relational process between individuals, groups, communities and society at large will be developed. Christian leaders and members are called to pursue peace and maintain such and, by implication, a growth of the gospel and the communities.

The Christian religion describes the Holy writ, The Bible, as the book of life. This description is a reference to the fact that in it contains divine instructions for human essentiality, especially the peaceful coexistence among individuals in the society. Others outside Christendom points to The Bible as containing some golden rules like, “do unto others what you want others to do to you,” which they see as a social maxim for the control of social actions and contracts among human beings.

Nevertheless, the evolution of the society did not take into cognisance to practice this divine guidance for the desired tranquillity of human life, as the world increasingly becomes Hobbesian and a matter of survival of the fittest, where the strong tends to annihilate the weaker ( Thomas hobbes,1651).With this trend ever growing, the human society tends to retrogress as conflicts, fights and trenchant quarrels among individuals, families, communities, nations and countries become more prevalent. Yet, man must congregate and communicate because man was created to be gregarious. Yes, created, because the myth of evolution of man by science can be disproved by scientific definition of science. For any theory or phenomenon to become scientific, it must be empirical, observed and logical.

The evolution science did not tell us who observed the changing of baboon into man, we did not put it into verification in a laboratory to proof it, neither does it have logical conclusion as other scientific theories tends to disproof the evolution, such as the Big bang—that the universe just erupted. Since man was created by God to live in groups and to connect to one another, the need to seek ways of minimising conflicts
Among themselves other than court litigations becomes necessary. This branch of socio-psychological innovation is what is referred to as Alternative Dispute Resolution.

It is a peace initiative geared towards resolution of conflicts outside a formal police case and ultimate court case, thereby engendering peace, friendliness, mutual respect and progress as the dictum goes; where there is peace there is progress and where there is no peace, there is no progress.

Regardless of how this approach may look novel and cheering, it is like someone going to the archive to dust a piece that has been lying dormant. The implication of my statement is that The holy Bible, thousands of years before the present proponents of alternative dispute or conflict resolution, have made it bare that though human individuals need one another, conflicts must abounds (Luke 17:1, matt.18:7). Nevertheless, instead of fighting, one or both warring parties should endure or overlook the wrong or offense (1 Corinthians 6:1; Rom 14:10) and instead of going to court, one or both parties should get down to round table.

**ADR UNDERPINNINGS (1CORINTHIANS 6:1-8)**

The bible has a wide range behavioural outlines that guarantee a just and transformed social order or system regardless of the possibility of conflict eruption. This is possible because, the scriptural tenets are to sow a seed of peace, forbearance and tolerance in the hearts of the adherents- which is key to all peoples and communities for a just and fair living in spite their religious inclinations.

To this ends, one can understand St. Paul’s amazement when he states that it is “shameful” for a Christian to take his fellow Christian to the court to be judged by an “unbelieving” judge. He wonders why one of the combatants cannot allow himself to be ‘defrauded’ provided that peace reigns. The arguments here is that our obedience to God should be able to brake barriers of selfishness, ethnicity, clannishness and all that breeds conflicts and create a common ground that inspires a sense of togetherness or oneness in our communities.

Our shared religion and faith in God should drive us towards near absence of conflicts, an opinion shared by Tutu (1994, p. 254) that “unity would be based on a common humanity and a common nationhood with space for diversity of cultures, race, faith and language”. The biblical stance aligns with our earlier position that court litigation is alien to our culture, structure and composition as a people- a notion of oneness or shared existence that welcomes strangers( Hebrew 13:2) and to strive to live in peace with all men (Hebrew 12: 14). 1 Corinthians 6:1-8, elaborates the need for human beings to live with one another by forgiving wrongs or offences against one another. Paul explains that it is a bad example for a brother to take a brother to a law court. He opines that it is a show of shame, engineered by lack of forbearance and humility of heart when people who are supposed to be living together begins to litigate against one another. He sees it as a faulty step when a brother takes a brother to the law court. Instead, he advocates for a ‘life of let go’ when offence occurs.

In Christian conflict resolution, the rule of the game is to avoid escalation by not engaging in wrong choice of words. There must be a sincere and committed heart ready to for peace. Importantly is the fact that past conflicts and errors are not revisited. We should have a sense of closure. Let what is gone be gone. As god forgave us and never revisits or recall our past sins, wrong or offences, we must not revisit that of others against if we must build a peaceful and egalitarian society. He further cautioned on the need for self-discipline, respect for one another and love for a functional societal contacts and as an antidote for conflict and disagreements. Practically the biblical tents of 1 Corinthians 6:1-8, is the proposals presented by the alternative dispute resolution.

**RISING ACCEPTANCE OF ADR**

One cardinal aspect of ADR success story is its recognition that first of all, present relationship are flawed, and that the wrong and injustice may have been committed, and that these wrong and injustices should be attended to but not by revenge or vendetta but by re-establishing the fractured relationship rather than separation or permanent enemies.

In the early Nigerian society, just as it were in other African society, dispute are never handled in the “OYIBO” man’s court. The elders, made chiefly of revered old folks, wise and well respected members of the society constitute the council that looks into disputes among individuals and families. This
arrangement could also be referred to as customary arbitration—customary in the sense as it relates to the peoples customs, beliefs and opinions.

However, with the advent of the British, the customary methods were abandoned for litigation in the courts. With the passing of time, it was observed that instead of resolving matters on the floor of the courts, it becomes worst. The backdrop was that even when cases were won and lost in the courts, the individuals were still in loggerheads because fences were still not mended. They were still in enmity, businesses and other social contracts were still broken. The reason for this seemingly discordancy was because the acrimonious and complicated process of formal court order is alien to our socio-cultural psyche. Parties in the dispute become aware that one may win the case in the court but in actuality is the loser since he has lost his friends, business associates, and interest and thus, built a wall of exclusion against himself socially, culturally, religiously and above all, business wise.

The brazen clog in litigation process has led to an increased awareness and acceptance of Alternative dispute Resolution. Most contracts in Nigeria of today include ADR clauses. To this end, most conventional courts have room for ADR. The Arbitration and Conciliation Acts are adopted by many states in Nigeria and thus, has increased the influence of ADR. In fact, ADR is now an international phenomenon. Lawyers now advises their clients to adopted Alternative Dispute resolution instead of litigation.

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS

All the processes engaged by ADR are in most cases, less tedious, less formalized and less traditional. For an effective alternate dispute resolution, the communicator must familiarize himself with terms applicable. Such terms include; arbitration, mediation, negotiation, hearing, binding and non-binding, neutral evaluator, case conferencing, collaborative law, summary jury trial and mediator.

However, the fundamental process of alternative dispute resolution begins by recognizing that a conflict or case has is at hand and as real as it could be; that someone has been wronged or is a victim and that someone is the perpetrator or wrong doer. This recognition will offer the space for confessions, forgiveness and subsequent resolution of the conflict. In allusion the above, Best (2005) opines that “conflict resolution connotes a sense of finality, where the parties involved in a conflict are mutually satisfied with outcome of a settlement and the conflict is resolved in a true sense of it”. The assertion of best is necessary because a conflict is seen to have been resolved when the parties involved accept that the needful has been done. They must be satisfied with the outcome of the dialogue and their fears allayed.

At this point the resolution naturally become transformed into what is called conflict transformation—that is, turning the weakness into strength and turning the gains into progressive friendship in the future. That is to mean that at conflict transformation, we move beyond the goals of the parties involved by creating new realities and new meanings for them to walk in.

ARBITRATION

In arbitration, a neutral person hears the matter, arguments and evidences to the case as presented by the contending parties and issues his decision after hearing the matter. It looks like the normal hearing of case by the judge. His decision may be agreed by the parties as binding or non-binding. The person engaged in this process is called an arbitrator. He is the impartial third party in a dispute, given the power to act so by the disputing parties.

HEARING

One of the communication skills that make for effective communication that is key to dispute resolution is listening. The application of alternative dispute resolution involves critical listening to uncover shades of meaning and innuendos as may be presented by the disputants. This is pivotal due to instances of provision of evidences and arguments before an arbitrator prior to his decision on the matter. This listening is called hearing in ADR.
MEDIATION
A process whereby a person called the mediator in a case works in agreement with the parties in a dispute to arrive at a solution, usually non-binding. The person who engages in this process is called a mediator.

The mediator helps the parties to communicate amicably to resolve a matter. He does not take sides and does not decide the case. Mediation is a skill by a third party employ to create an enabling environment for parties in a conflict to arrive at amicable solutions through a process of dialogue.

It is a voluntary process of peace-building by a third person. Mediation can be seen as an intervention to fast-track a conflict to normalcy.

CASE CONFERENCE
In case conferencing, the parties involved and their legal representatives meets with the judge to settle some or all the issues in the dispute before going to trial. This is seen as the last bridge to cross on the road of contestants to court. Here, the conflicting parties and their legal representatives sits to agree to an amicable solution or otherwise, move into the court session.

COLLABORATIVE LAW
This one refers to couples disagreeing or threatening a divorce. It is a way of offering them opportunity of ending their marriage without going to the court, to avoid embarrassments. However, if they fail to settle in such way, they can still go to court.

NEUTRAL EVALUATION
The evaluator is a neutral person who is an expert in the area of dispute. He offers the full implication in an event of the case going to court. This is in an attempt to dissuade the contenders against court and to settle for resolution. In event of successful persuasion, the evaluator guides the parties to a settlement.

SUMMARY JURY TRIAL {SJT}
This a situation whereby the parties are requested to present their case in a shortened written form to a lawyer before the case goes to trial. The jury makes an advisory statement or rule which is not binding. The jury gives the parties a preview of the likely verdict should the case go to court, in an effort to convince them not to go to court. These and many more are available processes one may apply to engage in alternative dispute resolutions.

CONCLUSION
It is clear that conflict will always occur among humans, even between low animals. However, all persons over the world agree and desire peace and not conflict.

Therefore this paper concludes that if we must have enduring peace, we must make a conscious efforts to move from rhetoric to good intentions and conscience and allow divine rules guide and control our actions, since as a people, we claim to be religious-Christians.

Again, having witnessed ourselves, that court actions have never given us peace, we advocate very strongly that the alternative dispute resolutions remain most veritable for peace-building and resolution of conflicts.

RECOMMENDATIONS
We believe that if humans allow divine rules to guide them, things will change for the better, peace-wise.

Therefore, we recommend that all concerned in conflicts, no matter the level, should embrace alternative resolution, other than resorting to court litigations.
We recommend as well, that individuals, groups, families, organisations and governments should allow religious doctrines that reflect peace modules permeate their daily actions to reduce frictions and fractions.
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