

The Inevitability of Crisis in Human Existence

Ogunkoya, Jolley Oladotun, University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Abstract

This paper examines the nature of crisis and attempts to argue the thesis that the total removal of crisis from the world is tantamount to the removal of the human species from the surface of the earth and ultimately the end of the existence of society. It is reasoned that human development is essentially anchored on the ability of the human person to devise methods of surmounting problems that are encountered in society. Therefore, the idea of fashioning the world in an orderly manner characterized by absolute peace without any upsurge of crisis whatsoever is an expectation of a paradise on earth, where absolute perfection would be a mark of identity of its inhabitants. Such an expectation, though it holds sway only in the religious arena, is not only a fantasy but also an unreliable hope which is doomed to fail at the onset. I argue that human existence itself is crisis, a phenomenon which dictates the spate of societal progress and development.

Introduction

Usually, when people are faced with certain predicaments or discuss the way out of crises, the human mind readily and urgently expresses an optimistic desire to design potent devices which are formidable enough to rid society off both the immediate crisis and the possibility of occurrence of future crises. But a glooming pessimism is expressed of the inevitability of crises in the world. Yet, it is sometimes acknowledged that in the midst of all these crises, there is usually a point for the enthronement of peace, even though it may be short-lived.

The renewal of human faith in the possibility of an end to crises in the world is registered within the tenets of some religious beliefs, where God is exonerated for the existence of these crises. For example, Christianity ascribes evil and crises to *Satan the Devil*, who is constantly threatening God's work and attracting human beings to his ever growing fold of followers. Saint Augustine, though disagreed with the idea of ascribing evil or crisis to God, his concept of "The Two Cities", in a way, emphasizes the dichotomy between the two categories of people in the world – those with God in contradistinction to those with the Devil. According to St. Augustine in *The City of God*, there are two groups of people in the world, namely: "those motivated by the love of God" and "those motivated by self-love". Augustine also says that there are also two corresponding cities – "The City of God" and "The City of men". Those who are motivated by the love of God and observe the moral laws are the citizens of the city of God, while those who are motivated by self-love and jettison moral laws are the citizens of the city of man. Everybody is a citizen of either of these two cities. Consequently, the motivating principles of human actions are self-love and the love of God. The choice of one is a denial of the other. Thus, he who loves himself, does not love himself, it is only the man who loves God that really loves himself. These two cities are, however mixed together, and there is a dialectical relationship between

them. The whole history of man is the consequence of the interplay between these two basic principles of human actions, which have divided human race into two camps. But St. Augustine, however, remarked that these two principles, directing the history of men are to be separated at the end of time (cf. Omoregbe, 1991). Though St. Augustine preferred to accept Plotinus' position that evil or crisis is not an entity and not from God but lack of goodness, Christian faith holds to the fervent believe in Christ Jesus as the only way of preventing and ending all crises in the believers' life. Thus, the slogan that "once you give your life to Christ Jesus, no weapon fashioned against you shall prosper", can be interpreted to mean in this context, to read, "Just have faith in Christ Jesus and you will be rid off all forms of crisis in your life". The Bible records that Christ Jesus once publicly made a pronouncement that "Come onto me those who labour and heavily laden, I will give you rest" (Matthew, 11verse 28). That rest can be interpreted to mean absolute peace which is devoid of any form of crisis.

Furthermore, Asceticism also holds the stance that abstinence is the basic principle for prevention and eradication of crises or evil or suffering in the world. Ascetics like the Hermits in Buddha's teaching recommend solitude by sojourning permanently in the wilderness where no contact is made between them and other human beings. This is taken as a step towards the attainment of inner happiness, peace and tranquility. But it is obviously true too that by living a life of solitude they have by so-doing subjected themselves to other forms of crisis.

Epicurus, a hedonist born around 342 B.C., held pleasure as the beginning and the end of living happily. He was not concerned with momentary pleasure but rather long-term pleasure which is the internal tranquility. In the process of practicing his rigorous ascetic philosophy, he fell into a prolonged illness and died of a self-imposed starvation and denial of comfort. On the day of his death he wrote these few lines to his disciples:

On this truly day of my life, as I am at the point of death I write this to you. The diseases in my bladder and stomach are pursuing their course, lacking nothing of their usual severity; but against all this is the joy in my heart at the recollection of my conversation with you. Do you, as I might expect from your devotion from boyhood to me and to philosophy... (cf. Russell, 1946: 251 and Omoregbe, 1991: 82)

All these rigorous efforts have not removed crises from the world. Against this background, therefore, this work will examine the meaning of crisis, different categories of crisis and then proceed to advance reasons and evidences to justify the position that crisis is inevitable.

Meaning of Crisis

The term "crisis" is so overused today to the extent that its real meaning is no longer clear. It can be defined as an unpleasant event beyond the control of any actor or moral agent. A.S. Hornby's Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1995), defines crisis as "a great difficulty or danger or when an important decision must be made". It is seen as a catastrophe inflicted upon a society with some attendant characteristics - it may

be sudden, by taking the affected persons unaware; the magnitude may usually be so much that it could threaten to engulf the affected areas; and it may give a very limited time within which it must be brought under control, in order to prevent it from spreading to upturn the entire society.

Crisis may be associated with acute distress, and this may take different forms. It may get to a point when you no longer have the power to control your feelings and behaviour. The person concerned may be experiencing extreme sorrow, grief, fear or danger which may culminate in depression. Thus, there are many dimensions of crises: social, psychological, spiritual, cultural, economic, religious, political, ideological, etc. But our interest in this work is basically socio-political crises or disorder, in form of strife or conflict or war, etc. These categories of crises are often generated by socio-political problems, especially activities at the seat of power. It may ensue in form of conflict. Conflict is an activity that takes place between conscious beings. It is defined in terms of the wants, needs or obligations of the parties involved. These wants may be relatively practical, such as in a conflict over landed property, non-payment of staff salaries, encroachment on ethnic boundaries, etc. Thus, conflict exists when two people wish to carry out certain acts which are mutually inconsistent. This is different from mere disputes between two people or entities which may be regarded as ordinary disagreements. According to Michael Nicholson,

Conflicts abound in all forms of social behaviour. In industry there are strikes, in international politics there are war and threats, in marriages there are quarrels ... While these forms of conflict are different from each other, they are all recognized as conflicts and hence have some common attributes (Nicholson, 1992: 13).

It is often believed that the existence of crises is a phenomenon that is beyond human control, and that it cannot be managed for the benefit of society. Such pessimism essentially stems from the complexities of both the society itself and its major inhabitants – human beings. The human society is a system the main elements of which are the people in it. Man is the subject of all historical, economic, social and political processes that take place in the society. Thus, man is both the main actor in and the main victim of all conflicts, strife, wars and all other societal crises. Incidentally, man desires peace and as a rational and finite being, he often makes attempts to seek it within his reason and exhibit it through his actions. From the inception of society, different attempts have been made by man to attain societal peace. These attempts range from individual scholars, to religious bodies, to local and international organizations. But in spite of all such theories prescribing solutions to crises in the world, the phenomenon itself seems becoming more wide-spread and in different complex dimensions rather than reduce.

Indeed, the “crisis of our age is not a temporary one. It is probable that we are living in one of the great transition periods of human history” (Palmer and Perkins, 2002: xi). Thus, the question of peace in our society has always been a recurrent one. Almost every day of our lives, we witness or hear about wars, ethnic clashes, riots, mob demonstrations against constituted authorities, religious conflicts, insurgencies, etc., taking place around the world. Usually, the use of force by constituted authorities or governments to quell revolts or to subdue opponent(s) in order to maintain peace and the status quo has become more

or less legitimate. Even if reconciliation of the warring parties would be done later, force is often used to gain control first, before adopting a more humanistic approach to resolving crises. The attempts so far made to resolve and prevent crises can be grouped into two broad categories, namely: individual efforts and collective efforts. Individual efforts made to generate peace range from religious to mystic, social, political, economic, scientific, philosophical, etc. It is to this category of efforts that the proposal offered by this work belongs. On the other hand, “collective security and peaceful settlement of international disputes have been commonly regarded as the most promising of all the approaches to peace” (Palmer and Perkins, 2002: 238). This collective security and peaceful settlement of international disputes is exemplified in the roles and principles of certain international bodies such as the United Nations (UN), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) now African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and some intellectual bodies such as National Association for Religious Tolerance (NARETO), etc. Besides, within the collective efforts category there are some multilateral alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the former Warsaw Pact, SEATO, and CENTO (Palmer and Perkins 2002: xxvii). Of all these bodies, the UN is more concerned with world peace than others. According to Article I of the Charter, the UN is: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace and to bring about by lawful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to breach of peace.

These organizations have achieved, to some extent, some of their set goals. But as some of these crises are addressed many more crises begin to surface and even the vestiges of those ones purported to have been addressed may, in fact, sprout and geminate into a higher magnitude. Such is the nature of crisis in society. Scholars have identified many factors for the persistent eruption of crisis in spite of the frantic efforts that are constantly made to address, prevent, and eliminate its occurrence. These factors include political, social, cultural, religious, reasons, etc. Kegan (1995), for example thinks that war has been persistent because of mankind’s failure to keep peace. But the question is if we successfully take care of these factors, shall we by so doing achieve absolute peace in the world?

Categories of Crises

Societal crises can be grouped into two broad categories, namely, violent crises and non-violent crises. The main actor in whichever category of crisis is man. Essentially, the distinguishing features between violent and non-violent crises are: the manner in which the moral agent or the main actor in the scene (that is, man) is involved and the kind of atmosphere that accompanies the crisis. Consequently, a violent crisis can be defined as one in which the main actor in a given situation displays a violent attitude. Thus, it is a kind of crisis which is accompanied by violence. On the other hand, non-violent crisis is conceived of as a violence-free crisis. This category of crisis depends on the meaning, nature and scope of violence.

There have been a series of intellectual misrepresentations of ideas regarding the meaning and nature of violence. To some, violence and revolution are synonymous. This is

an overgeneralization because there are instances of non-violent revolutions. Besides, some regard violence as a symbol of aggression, while to some, violence only subsists in the use of physical force to cause harm or injury to others. According to the *Oxford Dictionary*, the term violence is characterized by the exercise of physical force (on somebody) so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to the person or to his property. It consists in actions of conduct characterized by certain kinds of treatments which tend to cause bodily injury or forcibly interfere with the personal freedom of an individual. Violence in this sense means use of physical force to hurt or harm or kill somebody. This act is characterized by uncontrolled, rough, or destructive force. Thus, when any action or behaviour inflicts injury on one's self or other selves by means of an uncontrolled or destructive force, it is said to be a violent act. Thornton (1995: 1) says, "By violence, I mean literal empirical behaviour that causes damage or death".

Meanwhile, Rummel (1976) sees violence as an intense manifestation of strength, usually involving some severe physical effects as in the violence of thunderstorm, earthquake, explosion, stampede, and so on. Rummel feels that violence is a manifestation of the balancing of powers of nature. Indeed, it has been contested that the above definitions are restrictive because violence may not necessarily consist in the exertion of physical force by one person to harm another person. Galtung, a famous peace activist, identifies three types of violence, namely direct violence intended to harm and hurt and which is visible, example war; structural violence which is invisible and is embedded in the structure of society like poverty, slavery, colonialism, imperialism; and cultural violence which is also invisible and is seen in the marginalization and exclusion of certain people of different castes, colours, rationalities, sexes and communities (*cf. Maria, <http://www.ivoco.org/mpc/clalia>*).

Following Galtung's classification, it is clear that violence can either be visible or invisible. Admittedly these categories of violence exist, but they may exist side-by-side with one another or be interwoven in such a way that the existence of one may lead to the other. In our own thinking, we consider both categories as evidence of crises. We also argue that both the visible and invisible forms of violence are indications of violent crises. Surely, violent crises are crises which are associated with violence (whether visible or invisible). They are usually indicated by the use of force. The term "force" is used in this context to mean the unreasonable and illegitimate use of power to intimidate or compel a person to do something against his or her wish. Crises, which involve genocide, ethnic cleansing, killing, fighting (not in terms of sport), rampages, and war cannot be said to be manifestations of legitimate use of force. They are clear manifestations of violent crises.

Nieburg sees violence as an "act of disruption, destruction and aggression whose purpose, choice of targets, victims, surrounding circumstances, implementation and/or effects have political consequences that tend to modify the behaviour of others in bargaining situations" (*cf. Dowse and Hughes, 1972: 403*). For example, twisting somebody's arm in order to make him reveal a secret, or beating him up to confess his wrongdoings, or inflicting pain to punish him for what he has done wrong, are all demonstrations of coercion which are intentional and are manifestations of what Rummel (1976) calls "social conflict". Rummel posits that insofar as violence is a means towards coercing another, it is a manifestation of social conflict. Thus, he seems to think that the intention of the user of force is what determines its legitimacy. He observes that it is possible for a person to use

threat of force or apply actual deprivations such as torture or a beating to coerce another's will to do what we want. It is also possible for an individual to ignore the other's will and simply use physical force (such as dragging him struggling into a jail cell) on his body. Rummel believes that it is the intention of the user that determines whether any of these instances can be regarded as a case of coercion or physical force. However, no matter the variants of crisis that have been identified by scholars, it is the concern of this work that crisis is endemic in human life so much so that its eradication is impossible. Now let us consider the reasons for this conclusion.

On the Inevitability of Crisis in Human Life

Instances (directly or indirectly) abound to support the argument for the inevitability of crisis, but the evidences which are enunciated in this section are not only distilled from the works of some scholars, philosophers as well as some literatures of human beliefs, but also carefully selected to make our illustrations very brief. Suffice therefore to say, that these evidences are by no means conclusive as there are quite many other ones which have not been listed here.

The history of Western philosophy records that Heraclitus, (the Greek philosopher who lived between 535-475 B.C.) held that the world emanates and survives in the midst of flux. Heraclitus taught that there was no permanent reality except the reality of change as illustrated by his maxim "you cannot step twice in the same river" (cf. David McReynolds (2002). He therefore saw conflict as a necessary condition of life because the universe is composed of the conflict of opposites without which progress is impossible. He thus maintained that:

Nothing is permanent in this world, nothing is constant or stable, and everything is always in the process of change. Not only is there perpetual change, there is also perpetual conflict, and perpetual strife, for the universe is a universe made up of conflict and clashes of opposites. Conflict is the very condition of life; it is through conflict that things come into being and remain in existence. The system of the universe is that of conflict of opposites, good and evil, light and darkness, hot and cold, wet and dry, male and female... They complement each other and the endless conflict or strife between them is the condition of life and progress (cf. Omoregbe, 1991: 11).

Suffice it to say that the dialectics of progress and human existence necessarily involve the existence of conflict, strife and war in the world. Thus, to propose a complete end to such strife, conflict and war is to propose an ultimate end to progress, human existence and the world. Furthermore, atomists like Leucippus, Democritus and other precursors of atomism held that life, the evolution of existence, as well as the development of the universe depend solely on the behaviour of atoms. Everything that exists is due to the accidental clash of atoms. According to them "Everything that exists is due to the chance clash and agglomeration of the atoms as they float about in the void. There is nothing like purposive creation, everything that exists is a result of the chance combination of the atoms when

they clash while in motion” (cf. Omoregbe, 1991: 23). Since man is made up of atoms and he came into existence by the accidental clash of floating atoms, it means that strife, conflict and war constitute an essential part of human nature.

A Social Contract theorist, Thomas Hobbes, also emphasized the inherent traits of conflict and individualistic tendencies in human nature, though his theory may not express more than the nature of man as conceived in the West. Thomas Hobbes describes the primitive life of man (in his hypothetical State of Nature) as a state of perpetual warfare, where man’s existence was “brutish, nasty and short” (Hobbes, 1962: 100). It was a state where every man was an enemy to everyone and men lived without any other security apart from that which, their individual strengths could guarantee. Thomas Hobbes gave the highlights of some main features of the State of Nature in the following words:

In such condition, there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently, no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of commodities that may be imported by sea, no commodious building; no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death, and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short (Hobbes, 1974: 186).

The Legists, (a school in ancient China of the 3rd century B.C.) argued that human nature was ab initio evil and that “the good ways in which men often acted were due to the influence of the social environment, particularly the teaching of rituals and the restraints of penal laws” (Lloyd, 1985: 15). The early Church Fathers maintained that God created man with a pure heart, but that sin or man’s evil and unruly behaviour began with the “Fall of Man”.

Bertrand Russell maintained that turbulence in society is inevitable because life in human society is not mechanistic and static. Russell explained this in the following words:

In all social animals, including Man, co-operation and the unity of a group has some foundation in instinct. This is most complete in ants and bees, which apparently are never tempted to anti-social actions and never deviate from devotion to the nest or hive. Up to a point, we may admire this unswerving devotion to public duty, but it has its drawbacks; ants and bees do not produce great works of art, or make scientific discoveries, or found religions teaching that all ants are sisters. Their social life, in fact, is mechanical, precise and static. We are willing that human life shall have an element of turbulence if thereby we can escape such evolutionary stagnation (*Russell, 1970: 12*).

Russell further contended that social cohesion, which started with loyalty to a group reinforced by the fear of enemies, grew by processes partly natural and partly deliberate until it reached the conglomerations that we now know as nations. At a certain stage, a further development took place. This development came in form of wars. These wars were of extermination of man and they gradually became wars of conquest. The war captives became slaves and were forced to labour for their conquerors. That was the beginning of crisis in human society.

Furthermore, human biological sciences reveal that the conception of human beings in the womb exhibits a necessary struggle for survival among the released spermatozoa. This, in a way, shows the inherent discriminatory and greedy tendencies in man. It also reveals that conflict is in the original nature of man.

For Hegel (1956), the whole universe is a self-projection of the absolute spirit. Cosmic history is the process of the self-projection of the absolute. Everything in the universe is a manifestation of the absolute and part of the dialectical process of his self-manifestation and self-development of the absolute. The development of the absolute takes place in space and time. Therefore, past civilizations – Eastern civilization, the Roman civilization and the German civilization - represent different stages that the spirit has gone through in its course of development. The highest stage that the absolute spirit attained at the time of Hegel was the German civilization. Hegel also maintained that all the individual heroes in human history who changed the course of the world history – Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Hitler, etc. – were special instruments used by the absolute to achieve its self-development. One essential characteristic of the relationship between the absolute spirit and its victims is that these historical individuals could not resist the action of the spirit. So, crisis is part of human history, part of the development of society, the manifestation of the self-development of the absolute spirit and part of the development of human life.

Karl Marx and Frederich Engels (1977) also stressed the significance of the dialectical clash between the opposites. The history of the human society, says Marx, has been that of class struggle. For him, the thesis is negated by the antithesis to produce the synthesis. This development is a natural process which is necessary for the development of man and society. However, a modern theorist in international relations, Grieves (1977) identifies four different propositions concerning the inevitability of conflict in society, namely, that human conflict is a fact of social life and is likely to remain so for the indefinite future; that the abolition of war is a dream; that the theories of Armageddon are likely to be not only empty but even dangerous.

Conclusion

A reflection on the causes of crises also reveals its inevitability. Scholars have identified very many reasons for crisis, and these include economic factors (scarcity of resources, need for survival, conflict of economic interests, limited opportunities, all forms of economic deprivation, poverty, corruption etc.); political factors (political deprivations, clash of political interests, independence, etc.); religious factors (religious intolerance, religious domination or imposition, different interpretation of the sacred books, etc.); cultural factors (cultural domination, ethnicity, ethnocentrism, etc.); psychological factors (psychological disorder, psychopathological problem, depression, etc.) and so on. Even with the available solutions proffered to address these problems, crises continue to exist in

human society. That explains why Oputa submits that:

It is true to say that life in common – be it married life or family life, or in the community, or business life, or city life, or the nation's life – is a continuous succession of quarrels and conflicts. Conflict is therefore part of life albeit a sad part of it. Society is closely bound up with conflicts. Within society, we find a mass of struggles and opposition everywhere and at every level. Conflict is thus a phenomenon which we cannot afford to ignore or quietly sweep under the carpet. It has to be confronted (*Oputa, 2003: 13*).

Thus, as long as human beings continue to live on earth and interact among themselves for existence, protection and the continuity of society, crises will linger. It is the existence of crises that compels man to devise means of coping and surmounting problems which eventually culminates in societal progress. To seek peace therefore, is to seek a condition of relative tranquility with minimal crises. And to remove crises completely from society is to wipe human beings completely from the surface of the earth. At best, we can manage crisis and prevent its likely future occurrence wherever possible.

Selected Bibliography

- Aquinas, T. (1952), "The summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas II" in R.M. Hutchins et al. (eds.), *Great Books of The Western World*, Vols. 1 and 2, London: William Benton for Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
- Augustine, A. (1952), *The City of God*, London, Encyclopedia Britannica vol. XI 4:2, Inc.
- Clausewitz, C. (1996), *On War*, (edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dowse, R.E. and J.A. Hughes, (1972), *Political Sociology*, London: John Willey and Sons Ltd.
- Doyle, M.W. (1997), *Ways of War and Peace*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Galtung, J. (1969), "Violence, Peace and Research Peace", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. VIII, no. 2.
- Garver, N. (1968), "What Violence Is" in *The Nation*, 209.
- Gleditsch, N.P. (ed.), (2003, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 40, no. 1, London: Sage Publications/PRIO.
- Grievies, L. F. (1977), *Conflict and Order An Introduction to International Relations*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hegel, C.W.F. (1956), *The Philosophy of History*, (prefaced by C. Hegel and translated by J. Siberee), New York: Dover Publication, Inc.
- Hobbes, T. (1962), *Leviathan*, edited by Michael Oakeshott, New York: Collier Books.
- Hornby, A.S.(1995), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasswell, H.D. and A. Kaplan, (1976), *Power and Society*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Levy, J. S. (2002), "The Study of War" in W. Carlsnaes et al. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, London: Sage Publications.
- Lloyd, D. (1985), *The Idea of Law*, Middlesex: Penguin Book Ltd
- Marx, K. and F. Engels, (1977), *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow: Progress Publishers
- McCarthy, C.(2001), *All of One Peace: Essays on Nonviolence*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press.

- McReynolds, D. (Dec. 19, 2002), *Philosophy of Nonviolence Part Two*, (<http://www.nonviolence.org/commentary/messages/2133.htm>).
- Momoh C.S. et. al., (1988), *Nigerian Studies in Religious Tolerance*, vol. I, (Religious and their Doctrines), Lagos: CBAAC and NARETO.
- Momoh, C.S. et. al., (1988), *Nigerian Studies in Religious Tolerance*, vol. II, (Religion and Morality), Lagos: CBAAC and NARETO.
- Momoh, C.S. et. al., (1988), *Nigerian Studies in Religious Tolerance*, vol. III, (Religion and Nation Building), Lagos: CBAAC and NARETO.
- Momoh, C.S. et. al., (1988), *Nigerian Studies in Religious Tolerance*, vol. IV, (Philosophy of Religious Tolerance), Lagos: CBAAC and NARETO.
- Narveson, J.(1980) “Violence and War” in T. Regan (ed.) *Matters of Life and Death*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Nenon, J. (2000), “Viable Ways for Changing Violence at Community Level” in *The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution (OJPCR)*, (Issue 3.2), (<http://www.members.aol.com/peacejnl/2.1>).
- Nicholson, M. (1992), *Rationality and Analysis of international Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.
- Nieburg, H.L. (1962), “The Threat of Violence and Social Change”, in *American Political Science Review*, 56.
- Omogbe, J.I. (1991), *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy, Vol. One, Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, Lagos: JoJa Educational Research and Publishers Limited.
- Oputa, C. (May 15, 2003), “Peace Building and Non-violent Conflict Resolution: Approaches in Nigeria”, *The Guardian*.
- Ottan, A. (2003), *Annual Report on Violent Conflict in Nigeria 2003*, Peace and Development Projects (PEDEP) and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES).
- Palmer, N.D. and H.C. Perkins, (2002), *International Relations (The World Community in Transition) Third Revised Edition*, Delhi (India): Krishan Nagar.
- Platt, T (1992), “The Concept of Violence as Descriptive and Polemic” in *International Social Science Journal* 55, no 2.
- Rummel, R.J. (1976), “The Conflict Helix” in *Understanding Conflict and War*, vol. 2, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Rummel, R.J.(1977) “Conflict in Perspective” in *Understanding Conflict and War*, vol.3, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Rummel, R.J.(1979) “War, Power, Peace” in *Understanding Conflict and War*, vol.3, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Russell, B. (1970) *Authority and the Individual*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Russell, B. (1946) *History of Western Philosophy*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Storr, A.(1964), “Possible Substitutes for War” in J.D. Carthy and F.J. Ebling (eds.), *The History of Aggression*, London: Academic Press.
- Taylor, C (1979), *Hegel and Modern Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornton, R.(1995), “The Peculiar Temporality of Violence”, <http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papthorn.htm>
- Tolstoy, L. (1993) *War and Peace* (translated by Louise and Aylmer Maude), Hertfordshire: Wadsworth Editions Ltd.
- Watson, H. and J. Boag (2000) “Ethnicity and Religion” in *Eliminating the Causes of War, PUGWASH Meeting no 255*, (50th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, Cambridge, UK). (<http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256>).
- Wright, Q.(1935) *Causes War and Conditions of Peace*, New York: Longmans Green and Co.
- Wright, Q. (1942) *A Study of War*, 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zartman, I.W (1995) *Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*, Washinton, D.C.: Brookings.