A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO THE NONVIOLENCE PRINCIPLE AND PEACE IN THE WORLD

Uadiale J. Kennedy
Department of Philosophy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: dialekenny@yahoo.co.uk

&

Kelechi Onyeka Ezeani
Department of Philosophy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: kelechiezeani@gmail.com

&

Ogochukwu Okpokwasili
Department of Philosophy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: ao.okpokwasili@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract
The possibility of attaining world peace has been a topic in many political discourses for as long as men have sought solutions to the problem of revolution and violence and other challenges that face nations in the international politics. There has been controversy in solving the problem of violence, terrorism, revolution, religious conflict, xenophobic attack and many other forms of cruelties in the world today. In proffering solution to this problem, we shall adopt the method of philosophical analysis; it is the process of breaking down complex system of thought. This paper will help in reducing the problem of violent conflicts in the world politics.

Introduction
There are two possible conditions political states may be towards one another: peace or war. It seems self-evident that peace is the normal condition between states, and that war is an abnormal dislocation of international relations. There has been controversy on the role of religion in the world today. For many individuals and groups, religious conflicts constitute increasing share of violent conflicts today. Violent conflicts have many consequences in the world. Violence violates the universal moral order because violence is inevitably and produces violent result.[1] Thus; violence creates conflict and separation, not only physically but psychologically. It may reflect the nature of our existence. But it directly contradicts our essence: the fact that "we caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny[2], "that our individual freedom and fulfillment depends on the freedom and fulfillment of others. Only in acts of non-violence do we embody this essential nature of the universe. Only non violence conforms to the fact of our present interconnectedness and dependence on others and only non violent acts in the service of justice can move the universe towards its ultimate destination, in which our existence will fully embody our essence. Therefore, nonviolence is more than just a nice deal. It is the only way to live and act in accordance with how things really are, and are

meant to be in the world. That explains why violent efforts to improve society are self- defeating. Every act of physical violence both reflects and increases an inner violence, which is hatred of another. Hatred leads a country to depersonalize and dehumanize others. At the end, it leaves society in monologue rather than dialogue. Even when violence is used to promote a just cause, it destroys the very community it seeks to create. So violence can never unify. It can never produce a social order that matches the moral order, the true nature of reality; it can only produce an endless cycle of meaningless chaos.

Martin Luther King (Junior)'s moral argument for nonviolence was based on his highest moral imperative. He assumed that nonviolent acts are, selfless acts of love aiming for the well-being of all in the beloved community, all action would be an expression of agape love. A nonviolent act is one that makes the beloved community not only a distant goal, but a present reality.[3] The only way to follow the moral law of universe is through reconciliation of what has been separated. Responding to hate with love is the only way to reestablish broken community. According to Martin Luther, "A Just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just and any law that degrades human personality is unjust[4]. "Philosophically speaking, just laws treat persons as ends in themselves, while unjust laws treat persons as means to someone else's ends.

Causes and Motivation of Terrorism
Although people resort to terrorism for a number of reasons, experts attribute most acts of violence to three major factors: Political Terrorism was originally theorized in the context of insurgency and guerrilla warfare, a form of organized political violence by a non-state army or group. During the "troubles" in Northern Ireland, which stretched from 1968 to 1998, Catholic and Protestant groups waged an ongoing campaign of violence against one another in Northern Ireland and in England, seeking political dominance. The causes of terrorism seem almost impossible for anyone to define. Here is why: they change to scholars who explain terrorism. Their ideas change over time too, as new trends in academic thinking take hold. Many writers begin statements about "the causes of terrorism" as if terrorism were a scientific phenomenon whose characteristics are fixed for all time, like the cases' of a disease, or the causes' of rock formation. Terrorism isn't a natural phenomenon. It is the name given by people's actions in the social world.[5] Both terrorists and terrorism's explainers are influenced by dominant trends in political and scholarly thought. Terrorists are people who threaten or use violence against civilians with the hope of changing the status-quo, perceive the status quo in ways that accord with the era they live in, these trends change over time. Viewing terrorism as the extreme edge of mainstream trends helps us understand, and thus seek solutions to it. When we view terrorists as evil or beyond explanation, we are inaccurate and unhelpful. We cannot 'solve' such evil. We can only live fearfully in its shadow. It is proper to make an attempt in solving this problem.

In the early 20th century, terrorists justified violence in the name of anarchism, socialism, and communism. Socialism was becoming a dominant way for many people to explain the political and economic injustice they saw developing in capitalist societies, and for defining a solution. Millions of people expressed their commitment to a socialist future without violence, but a small number of people in the world thought violence was necessary.[6] In the 1950s through 1980s, terrorist and violence tended to have a nationalist component. Terrorist and violence in these

years reflected the post-world war II trend in which previously suppressed populations committed violence against states that had not recognize them in political realm. Algeria terrorism against French rule; Basque violence against the Spanish state; Kurdish actions against Turkey; the Black Panthers and Puerto Rican militants in the United States all sought a version of independence from oppressive rule. We understand here that these terrorists are motivated in such terrorist act as a result of oppression, or injustice, religious reasons, political reasons, psychological and sociological reasons etc.

The Nature of Terrorism
If terrorism was to be a living organism with flesh and blood, and it is dissected, what would be seen? Among things to be seen are anger, frustration, violence, death, destruction, great fear and agonizing pain. A terrorist by extension is an angry, frustrated and violent person, ready to use destruction, great fear and agonizing pain to pursue his/her goals. Some terrorists in these days of suicide bombing are ready to kill themselves or be killed for what they believe in and the goal they are pursuing as obtains in the middle-east. In July 1975, the Organization of African Unity (now African Union) held a conference in Kampala, Uganda, on 30 July, terrorists ordered all heads of state and government attending the summit to leave the country within 24hours or face liquidation through bomb attack.[7]

On July 7, 2005 people yet to be identified exploded bombs at several points in London leading to the sudden death of 57 people from different nations of the world, at least two Nigerians died in the bombing. On September 11, 2001, two planes were hijacked by suicide bombers and made to crash into the towers of the World Trade Centre in New York, USA, this led to the death of 6000 citizens of various nations of the world[8]. An election motorcade was ambushed in Borno State, Nigeria with at least four people reported dead. Responsibility was claimed by Jihadist insurgents. Kashim Shettima, the state governor survived. He was not hurt in the incidense. This incidence took place Wednesday 13 February, 2019. Since 2009 till date, Nigeria has been experiencing terrorist attacks. At least 30 people have been killed in a triple suicide bombing in the village of Konduga in Borno state. Authorities say the Islamist militant group Boko -Haram is to blame for the attack. This happened on Sunday 16 June 2019 in Borno state.

Libya has been locked in conflict since 2011, when an uprising saw longtime dictator Moammar Gadhafi overthrown and killed. Since then, rivals factions and militias have engaged in both long-term and sporadic fighting. While there is now ostensibly one central government in Tripoli, Lybia remains plagued by sectarian violence. Libyan people are fighting war against terrorism on behalf of the world. In September 2018, the

> Islamic state who have carried out similar suicide attacks in Libya before, claimed responsibility for another suicide bombings in a statement published on the group's Amaq news website. Loosely defined, terrorism is the use of violence with the aim of furthering a political or ideological goal at the expense of the general population. Terrorism can take many forms and has many causes, often more than one. It can have its roots in religious, social or political conflicts, often when one community is oppressed by another. Some terrorist events are singular acts linked to a particular historical moment, such as the assassination of Austria's Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914, which touched off World War 1.

> Although acts of terror and violence have been committed for centuries, terrorism's modern roots can be traced to the French Revolution's Reign of Terror in 1794 – 1795, with its gruesome public beheadings, violent street battles and bloodthirsty rhetoric.[9]

In the 20th century, acts of terrorism became more prevalent throughout the world as political, religious, and social activist agitated for change. In the 1930s, Jews living in occupied Palestine conducted a campaign of violence against the British occupiers in a quest to create the state of Israel. Religious persecution must be condemned as immoral and contrary to the natural law. Religious tolerance came late in history, though it was advocated in theory long before it could be put into practice. Any religion which considers itself as the only true religion must condemn contradictory religions as false and so cannot be dogmatically tolerant. Pragmatically, violence is seen as self-defeating, because it is embedded in a network of harmful values.. When a society feels threatened by its own inadequacies, it uses violence to prop itself up. A militant mass movement that uses violence only increases the sense of threat and therefore provokes counter-violence. This increases conflict, which in turn breeds anarchy. "Out of anarchy comes more injustice and violence. Nonviolence is the best antidote to violence and injustice, Pope Francis the 1st affirmed. But it must be employed carefully. It must be preceded by careful investigation of the facts, to be sure that there is a real injustice being done. Then there must be a serious effort to negotiate a just solution. However, there is one evil that is worse than violence and that's cowardice.

Nonviolence also demonstrates the resistor's willingness to find moderate solution and get the maximum justice for everyone. Therefore it helps both sides avoid destructive extremes. Genuine nonviolence had to be more than a pragmatic technique. It had to be a moral commitment.

The Reasons of the Persistence of Violence in Politics
Agnes Heller argued that the abolition of the monarchy led a crisis in the conception and definition of politics. By the absence of a supreme figure embodying political power, a ruling class associated with the state and its strict distinction from the ruled we have lost the criterion which enables us to define what makes political distinctive as a domain, as an activity or as a type of relationship.[10] Within this context, both Arendt and Foucault's critique point out the problematic nature of the persistence of the use of the traditional grammar politics. Sovereignty is emblematic of such persistence since a closer look at politics and the use of political notions such as law or right or power would reveal their conceptions remain within the framework of absolute power that accompanied the rise of the sovereign European state. From Arendt's perspective, a politics of sovereignty formulates politics as a relationship of domination, the effectiveness of which then is substantiated by violence.

Arendt criticizes the French Revolutionaries for replicating the political structure of ancient monarchy. The notion of sovereignty is an act of mimicking the absolute power of the king. The enormous risks inherent in the secular realm of human affairs caused them to turn to the only element of traditional religion whose political usefulness as an instrument of rule was beyond any doubt". Even Machiavelli, who in Arendt's view is the spiritual father of the Revolution with his passionate yearning to revive the spirit and the institution of the Roman antiquity, which was adopted later by the eighteenth century revolutionaries as well, was puzzled with the task of foundation and had to recourse to God. His appeal to "high heaven", Arendt argues, was

certainly not inspired by any religious feelings but exclusively dictated by the wish to escape the difficulty of finding an irrefutable authority and establishing a stable political order.

Unlike the American Revolution (in Arendt's opinion is a successful example of a revolution), which was a successor of a "limited monarchy" the French Revolution was founded on the ruins of an absolutism, which explains the obsession with an "absolute' she writes. Nothing, indeed, seems more natural than that a revolution should be predetermined by the type of government it overthrows; nothing therefore, appears more plausible than to explain the new absolute, the absolute revolution, by the absolute monarchy which preceded it, and to conclude that the more absolute the ruler, the more absolute the revolution will be which replaces him.

Paradoxically, then for Arendt, the secular rulership construed by the French Revolution assumed the same framework and political grammar of the Plato's idea of the rule of the philosopher-king that had rested at the thrones of the Christian kingships with reference to divine sources for a very long time. The new Republic was founded on the model of a king-God, both omnipotent and the legislator of the universe.

On Arendt's view on violence, she notes that there is an implicit agreement among political theorists from left to right which views violence as the most flagrant manifestation of power, quoting C. Wright Mills, "All politics is a struggle for power, the ultimate kind of power is violence", and Weber who defines the state as the "rule of men, based on the means of legitimate, that is allegedly legitimate violence. Arendt argues that the agreement is very strange since almost all theorists equate political power with "the organization of violence" which confirms Marx's estimate of the state as an instrument of suppression in the hands of the ruling class. These definitions, she points out, are derived from a misconception that goes back to the ancient Greeks, particularly to the platonic philosophy that defines government as the rule of man over man. The force of this ancient vocabulary "for Arendt has been strengthened by modern scientific and philosophical convictions that declare so-called laws with regard to the nature of man. "An inborn instinct of domination and an innate aggressiveness in the human animal" explicated in philosophical or political texts as a will-to-power (e.g. Thomas Hobbes, Friedrich Nietzsche) consolidated the equation of power with rule and implicitly and violence."[11]

The attribution of a moral aspect to violence, treating it as if through which man creates himself might be Hegelian or Marxist as part of a leftist humanist rhetoric. Yet, for Hegel man realizes himself via thought, for Marx via labour. Although one could possibly argue that the thought of self-creation implies a violent process, self-creation through both thinking and laboring significantly differ from creation through destruction, in other words implementing violence.
Another conceptual misapprehension of violence as a destructive yet emancipatory or originative force pertains to the understanding of history, as a continuous chronological process whose progress, moreover, is inevitable, Arendt argues.[12]

If we look upon history as a continuous chronological process, violence in the shape of war and revolution may appear to constitute the only possible interruptions of such process. If this were true, if only the practice of violence would make it possible to interrupt automatic processes in the realm of human affairs, the preachers of violent actions would have won an important point, although, so far as I know, they never made it. However, it is the function of all action, as

distinguished from mere behavior, to interrupt what otherwise would have proceeded automatically and therefore predictably. And the distinction between violent and non-violent action is that the former is exclusively bent upon the destruction of the old and the latter chiefly concerned with the establishment of something new. It is true, she admits, like action, violence interrupts regularities. It attacks, shatters and even destroys the established system, albeit unjust, or unequal. Yet, action has the superiority of creating something new which is absent in violence in Arendt's views.

The praise of violence, Arendt argues, is due to its employment by a discourse of brotherhood, which suggests that engagement with collective violence, fighting the enemy and facing death together is what makes a collectivity, reminding us of Schmitt's write-up on the political. For Arendt, "it is undeniably true that the strong fraternal sentiments; engendered by collective violence, have misled many good people into the hope that a new community together with a 'new man' will arise out of it. Violence seldom creates, rather it is destructive, it ends and limits progress in society."

Cases of Revolution and Violence
The term "revolution" is a very sharp change made to something. Also, it is a forceful or forcible overthrow of a government or social order, in favour of a new system while violence is the use of physical force so as to injure, abuse, damage or destroy. Globally, violent actions resulted in the deaths of an estimated 1.28 million people in 2013 up from 1.13million in 1990 from assault by Firearm. No government in the world will approve or welcome its citizens carrying out revolution or violent protest. The Latin American wars of independence were the revolutions or a revolutionary wave that took place during the late 18th and 19th centuries and resulted in the creation of a number of independent countries in Latin America. The reason for the revolution was that the Creoles wanted their independence from Spain and form their own nation. They wanted more political and economical power. They believed the colonial system was unfair, as they were excluded from the political decision-making process.

Similarly, the Argentine war of independence was fought from 1810 to 1818 by Argentine patriotic forces under Manuel Belgrano, Juan Jose Castell and Jose de San Martin against royalist forces loyal to the Spanish Crown. Africa is obviously a continent dominated by young people. Sadly, while the youths hold the large numbers, they don't control the continent and most of them lack job. The biggest casualties of unemployment, poverty, illiteracy and social vice in Africa are its youth. Despite decades of so-called government interventions; foreign aid and international development support, the continent has been unable to pull itself out of its glorified third-world status. Most people believe there is only one cause of Africa's problems: bad leadership, which is very true. In July 2017, an emotional message by a Zimbabwean Cleric on social media sent shockwaves across his country. Protest after protest, the people of Zimbabwe especially its youths took to the streets to demand for better governance and improved standards of living. Also, just a few months ago in South Africa, pupils of Pretorio Coirls High School caught the world's attention as they protested against their school's policies against wearing their natural hair and speaking their African languages at school. In a similar pattern in 2011, young Nigerians – using social media pulled off one of the most successful civil disobedience protest in the history of Nigeria. They firmly opposed the government's decision to hike the retail price of

petrol. Though the decision was not reversed, everybody was shocked by the large turnout and participation.

In 2011, General Muhammadu Buhari, the candidate of the Congress (CPC), called for a revolution in Nigeria – albeit through the ballot box. That was not the first time president called for mass action, he did the same in 2003, after losing the presidential election to incumbent Olusegun Obasanjo of the Peoples Democratic Party (PDP). Omoyele Sowore, the presidential candidate of African Action Congress (AAC), who is also the director of Sahara Reporters News, was arrested by the Department of State Services (DSS) for planning a Revolution -Now. He tag the protest "Revolution now" that was why it attracted the military. The police have described the planned civil disobedience that took place on the 5th August 2019 as treason and terrorism. In any case, the revolution was not successful. Africa must wake up to the reality that when a leader fights insecurity and corruption, unemployment etc for the citizens, it becomes a revolution in itself against revolutions. And no foreign backed force can dethrone him or bring down the government. Most leaders in Nigeria seem to fight poverty, insecurity, corruption etc whereas they are chasing shadow, leaving all institution as worse as they met them.

Criticality of Non violence
We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor, it must be demanded by the oppressed. The end of oppression may amount to a total revolution. Yet this revolution needs not destroy social order. It is crucial to recognize that social order is good only when it promotes justice; order is a means to justice, not vice versa.

Martin Luther King (Junior) argued for a strict, principled nonviolence pragmatic, moral and religious ream. For an oppressed to gain freedom from an oppressor must be done through nonviolence means 'for him violence is self-defeating, because it is embedded in a network of harmful values. Values grow to the degree that injustice prevails, the more injustice in a community, more violence or potential violence, in that community. A militant mass movement that uses violence only increases the sense of threat and therefore provokes counter-violence. This violence injures the image of god. Cowardice is worse than violence anyway. A community or an individual that has consistently refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. Luther's moral argument for non-violence was based on his belief in Agape-selfless love as the highest moral imperative. A nonviolent act is one that makes the beloved community not only a distant goal, but a present reality. On the contrary, Frantz Fanon justifies violence in two main ways. First, it is a means necessary to political action that is, his justification is instrumental. Second, it is an organic force or energy that follows its own logic. Meanwhile, Arendt attacks both of these lines of argument. In relation to the former, she agrees with an instrumentalist analysis of violence. She is quite clear that violence is essentially the enhancement of natural strength through the use of tools. However, violence is not and cannot be politically instrumental for two reasons.

Firstly, because it identifies politics mistakenly with the achievement of pre-defined ends. Secondly, those who confuse violence with power misunderstood the inherent unpredictable consequences of violence. Particularly in the long term, the means of violence and revolution have tendency to overwhelm the ends for which they are used. Her argument against the identification of violence as a kind of energy or force is more straight forward. The category of

violence, hovers somewhere between the categories of work and action in Arendt's account. In either case it is bound up with motives and intentions that are not in any sense predetermined by the workings of natural drives or unconscious libidinal energy. Violence is a product of distinctively human emotions and reasons. The problem with violence lies in the discrepancies between its intended and its actual outcomes or effects. It is difficult to disagree with the argument that the destructiveness of violence is always likely to overwhelm the purposes for which it is being used. However, identifying violence with an instrument or tool, as Arendt claimed, the argument would be partial because violence is not actually very much like a tool at all. Understanding violence in this way can suggest that there is no essential connection between violence and either the persons who use it or the persons it is used against. It also suggests that violence can be picked up and put down in the same manner as we might pick up or put down a screwdriver or a hammer. But, there are obvious problems with this way of thinking when we take into account that our bodies themselves are prime instruments of violence. When Arendt criticizes the conflation of violence with politics, she identifies this as a mistake on the part of political actors. She addresses the reasons why this mistake may have happened. The mistake could lie in an illegitimate generalization of a justifiable emotional reaction to injustice and hypocrisy. The repertoires of violence are at work in the meaning of manhood, womanhood and citizenship, and they are at work in the economic, social and political institutions of all known societies.

Many countries today both developing and developed face insecurity problem. The difference however between some of them and our country, Nigeria is how they manage the threat. Within the last few years, heightened social insecurity in Nigeria has arguably fueled the crime rate, leaving unpalatable consequences for the nation's economy and its growth.

The socio-political landscape in Nigeria has been blighted by the endemic evil of violence, the abysmal failure of successive administration in Nigeria to address challenges of poverty, unemployment and inequitable distribution of wealth among ethnic nationalities, ultimately resulted to anger, agitation and violent crimes against the Nigeria State by some individuals and groups. Such crimes include militancy, kidnapping, bombing, armed robbery, destruction of government properties, among others.

If social change can come out of violence and to a greater extent countries and individual achieve success, while would it not be the case in the issue of Nigeria. Fela Anicoulakpo Kuti, a musical legendary of the Federal Republic of Nigeria sang "nobody wants to die everybody has something to live for therefore we should be suffering and smiling. There could never be peace without the struggles for such peace." But could it be violence? For how long should negotiation for peace in a society like Nigeria go on? Is the social insecurity not enough to declare war on the culprit?

Conclusion
Violence is inevitable in our world today but the research concentrates more on how to attain world peace in politics through nonviolence by critically examining scholars that are advocates of violence in politics. For Frantz Fanon, he understands and justifies violence in two main ways. First, it is a means necessary to political action that is, his justification is instrumental. Second, it is an organic force or energy that follows its own logic. Hannah Arendt attacks the justification

of violence. According to Arendt, the instrumental reasoning that underlies the use of violence in politics is antithetical to politics, because it identifies politics mistakenly with the achievement of pre-defined ends. Secondly, in any case, because those who confuse violence with power misunderstand the inherently unpredictable consequences of violence. When Arendt criticizes the conflation of violence with politics, she identifies this as a mistake on the part of political actors. It is a fact that violent conflicts have plaques many countries in the world up to the present day. The consequences of violent conflicts are innumerable. A violent conflict has consequences for human persons and for the entire natural environment of the world. War is one of the most regrettable thing that has come to deface our fair world unlike natural disasters, war is a wholly man made affair, the result of man's injustice, greed, envy, hate, ambition, blindness and passion, something utterly useless and unnecessary in such a world we could have unending peace. The present Pope Francis first said for peace to reign in the world, every country must imbibe the rules of justice. Every form of corruption must be wiped out of the world, for the world to be peaceful.

References
1 Fagothey A., Right and Reason, Rock Ford: Tan Books and Publishers, 1959.
 2. *Ibid;* p. 86
3. Martin L., Strive Towards Freedom, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1958.
4. Ibid Pg 40
5. Amy Zalman. The major causes of terrorism, London: University of Suffolk, 2019, Pg 74
6. Ibid Pg 93
7. Paul Willkinson, Political Terrorism, London: Macmillian Publisher, 1974, Pg 29
8 Aimable E and Rossello ,J. The short – term impacts of 9/11 on European airlines demand. European journal of tourism Research VOL.2 Pg 145 – 161.
9. Ibid Pg 176
10.Heller Agnes., The concept of the Political revisited, New York: Sage Publisher, 1990, Pg 65
11. Hannah Arendt, On revolution, New York: Viking Press, 1963, Pg 192
12. Ibid. Pg 154
13. Appadorai A., The Substance of Politics, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.
14. Omoregbe J. I., Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Ikeja: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Limited, 2010.
15. Fanon F., The Wretched of the Earth, New York: Grove, 1965.
16. Alanamu S., Political Violence: An Introductory Note, in Issues in Political Violence in Nigeria, ed. Ayinla Saadu Alanamu, Illorin: Hanson Printing Communications, 2005.
17. Hannah A., The Human Condition, Chicago: Urwin, 1958.
18. www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hannah.Arendt