OPEN ACCESS

A Colloquy on Violence and Non-Violence: Towards A Complementary Conflict Resolution

[1]**Emmanuel Bassey Eyo,** [2]**Diana-Abasi Ibanga Francis**

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar
Cross River State, Nigeria
dremmanueleyo@yahoo.com

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar
Cross River State, Nigeria
ibanga.letters@gmail.com

Abstract

In conflict resolution discourse the two challenging and contrasting concepts, violence and non-violence, are often presented as opposites and contradictory. On the basis of this, one is affirmed against the other. In this article, we aimed to present violence and non-violence as complementary phenomena toward a complementary process of conflict resolution. The objective was to provide an analysis to show that the two concepts can contribute meaningfully to conflict management and resolution. To achieve this aim and objective, we highlighted their significance as methods of resolving and managing conflict, and discussed their problems as well. We used the method of complementary analysis to render a practical account of this discourse; the paper reviewed a number of scenarios where the strategies of violence and non-violence were employed towards conflict resolution and transformation. This enables us to see how the violent and non-violent methods can contribute to resolve the issue of conflict. From the analysis, we concluded that methods of violence and non-violence should overlap each in conflict and peace research.

Keywords: Violence, Nonviolence, Complementarity, Conflict Resolution, Peace.

INTRODUCTION

Conflict resolution engenders peace in human society. Philosophers, scholars, peace advocates, sociologist, and leaders have written momentous volumes of literature and developed differential methodologies for conflict resolution. On the one hand, philosophers such as Martin Heidegger, Mahatma Gandhi, Confucius, Martin Buber, Immanuel Kant, Martin Luther King Jr., Leo Tolstoy, David Thoreau, and Chevez have developed philosophical framework and methodologies for non-violent resolution of conflict. On the other hand, philosophers like Fantz Fanon, Malcolm X, Walter Rodney, Friedrich Nietzsche, Karl Marx, and Georg Hegel have developed philosophical frameworks and methodologies for violent resolution of conflict. These frameworks and methodologies are plausible in their own right and are deployed in practical situations in pursuit of peace. In Africa, philosophical frameworks on peace have been proposed and developed by Ephraim Essien (Debellibifism), Jim Unah (Phenomenology of Tolerance), Campbell Momoh (Conflictology), and Chigbo Ekwealo (Ndu Mmili Ndu Azu).

Despite the large volume of literature written in this area and the practical deployments of the various methodologies, peace has been elusive. Therefore, it remains relevant to continue to pursue studies in this direction with the hope of finding a formidable framework, methodology and strategy in resolving conflicts. This is the preoccupation of this article, namely: to adumbrate a complementary ontological framework towards the study and understanding of the roles of violence and non-violence in conflict resolution. This article is dovetailed on the basis of complementary principle. The method of complementarity holds the promise of providing metaphysical basis for the understanding of the roles of violence and nonviolence in conflict resolution. However, diverse principles of complementarity would be examined in this article with the aim of confluencing violence and nonviolence towards conflict resolution.

VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE: CONCEPTUAL ANALYSES AND DISCOURSE ON RELATED CONCEPTS

Definition of the concepts of violence and non-violence in its broadest sense will help us understand the thin line between the two concepts and how superficial interpretations of the concepts have led many analysts and scholars to presume fundamental difference for the two notions. Trudy Govier (2008) argues that the concepts of violence and nonviolence are not simple clear cut distinctions of which their differences can be easily pointed out. Generally, in this section, I set out to show how the concepts of violence and non-violence overlap conceptually. This will enable me to prove how the two concepts complement each other in conflict resolution.

Violence: The concept of violence is one of the many terms with disputed or disagreeable definitions. Sanko (2003) argues that there is considerable disagreement among scholars regarding the meaning of violence. One of the commonest ways of defining violence is that it is an impermissible application of physical force to another person (Reidel & Welsh 2002; Waddington, Badger & Bull 2004; Govier 2008). This sort of narrow

way of defining violence has even found its way into jurisprudence whereby violence is defined merely as impermissible infliction of physical hurt or injury on another person without his/her consent (Weiner 1989). The World Health Organization (WHO) defines violence as, "The use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation" (WHO 1996, 4). This definition is a bit broad because it encompasses armed conflict, threats, suicide, and acts undermining the well-being of individuals. Further, in the speech he delivered on 3rd April 1964 in Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "The Ballot or the Bullet", Malcolm X (2017) defined violence to include racial oppression, exploitation and degradation.

Willem de Haan posits that "violence is multifaceted because there are many different forms of violence which are exhibited in wide range of contexts; ...[and that] violence can be individual or collective, interpersonal or institutional, national or international, symbolic or structural" (2008, 28). He further avers that violence is context-specific; hence what is classified as violence is socially determined. Haan (2008) scheme two ways of defining violence, namely: restrictive definition of violence and inclusive definition of violence. Restrictive definition of violence limits concept of violence to physical attacks and threatening gestures. In this direction, violence is defined as "behaviors by individuals that intentionally threaten, attempt, or inflict physical harm on others" (Reiss & Roth 1994, 2). Inclusive

definition of violence focuses on replacing the terms 'force' with 'power'. In this direction, "violence is defined as the use of power to harm another, whatever form it takes" (Henry 2000, 3). The harm may take the forms of physical, psychological, emotional, moral, economic, political, philosophical and/or metaphysical characteristics.

Another definition of violence is that advanced by Vittorio Bufacchi. According to him, there are two basic conceptions of violence in the literature – namely: violence as force and violence as violation (Bufacchi 2005). Violence as force characterizes violence as intentional act of excessive or destructive force. John Dewey is in this category of scholars who defined violence as mere force. According to him, "energy becomes violence when it defeats or frustrates purpose instead of executing or realizing it" (Dewey 1916, 361). That is to say, violence is force gone wrong in terms of being destructive and harmful. Dewey does not argue that force and violence are synonyms but that force becomes violence when it becomes destructive and harmful. The other conception of violence, according to Bufacchi, is violence as violation. This he defines in terms of infringement, transgression, or exceeding of some limit or norm (Bufacchi 2005, 196). This may include violation of rights. This approach to conceptualizing violence also reflects the African philosophical approach. Generally, in African ontology or theory of force, violence is represented as violation in terms of disrupting the hierarchical arrangement of forces by violating either communal norm or being of the other (Unah 2002). In this direction, peace (which is viewed as opposite of violence) means coexistence, that is, live and let live.

One other conception of violence which is pertinent is that of Johan Galtung. It is a categorical departure from the traditional definition. According to him, "violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations" (Galtung 1969, 168). The usage of the potential-actual duality in the definition presupposes that violence is the cause of the difference between what could have been and what is. For example, if a person dies from tuberculosis in the 18th century it is not violence because it was unavoidable due to absence of cure; but if a person dies from tuberculosis in the 21st century when there is cure for the disease then it is violence. In this manner, violence will include absence of government's public health measures to curb the disease. He expanded the meaning of violence by making a distinction between personal and structural violence (Galtung 1969). Personal violence may include direct and indirect use of force in any forms. Structural violence includes inequality in the distribution of power, opportunities, amenities, education, and other social survival measure as well as racial and ethnic stratifications. All these characteristics go a long way to prevent the individual from realizing his/her actual somatic and mental capacities.

Galtung (1969) notes that the definition points to six dimensions of violence. The first distinction is "physical and psychological", which range from constraint in physical movement such as absence of access roads to all sorts of indoctrinations, brainwashing, lies, mental poisoning, and threatening gestures. The second distinction is "negative and positive", which range from punishing somebody for refusing to act in conformity to one's expectation to rewarding somebody for conforming to one's conception of right which prevent the human being from realizing his/her actual potentials – For example, paying a professional footballer who is hopelessly confined to the bench. The third distinction is "whether or not there is an object that is hurt", which includes arrested violence such as testing of missiles which may cause degradation in the individual. The fourth distinction is "whether or not there is a subject (person) who acts", this range from personal violence such as physical attack to structural violence such as nepotism. The fifth distinction is "intended or unintended", which can be decided by on the basis of either utilitarianism or deontology. The six distinction is "the manifest and the latent", which range from observable forms to potential forms.

The canon of philosophy of violence as enunciated by Malcolm X is that violence should be reciprocal: "if there is to be bleeding, it should be reciprocal – bleeding on both sides" (Malcolm X 2005, 144). He argues that a people or person visited with violence, and without hope of getting justice from the political system, should respond in kind. He argues that the individual should not start the violence for that would constitute in an immoral act; but if he is faced with violence, he should reciprocate in kind.

> I don't mean go out and get violent; but at the same time you should never be nonviolent unless you run into some nonviolence. I'm nonviolent with those who are nonviolent with me... Any time you know you're within the law, within your legal rights, within your

moral rights, in accord with justice, then die for what you believe in. But don't die alone. Let your dying be reciprocal. This is what is meant by equality. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. (Malcolm X 2017, 176)

Malcolm X avers that it is morally right for people living in areas that are vulnerable to violence to protect themselves from violence. That the first law of nature is self-preservation; but self-preservation by any means necessary. He argues that it should be constitutional right for people to own a gun; but then it would exceed their right if they constitute themselves into a battalion out of it and go about looking for opponents (Malcolm X 2017). He denounced nonviolence methods which mean to appeal to the moral conscience of the aggressor. He argues that by resorting to set out against another with violence, the aggressor has lost his conscience. That it is a waste of time appealing to his moral conscience; for the aggressor only eliminate the evil in his being if it threatens his existence, and not because it is illegal or immoral (Malcolm X 2017).

NONVIOLENCE: Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. seem to have provided an unambiguous and systematic definition of nonviolence. But let us begin with the definition provided by other scholars. Govier defines nonviolence 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" (2008, 63). The key

phrase in the definition is "without employing physical violence". However, nonviolence is not cowardice or helpless submission to the oppressor but active resistance and not passive resistance (Gandhi 2014; King 2005). Gandhi (2014) says that "one cannot be passively non-violent" (63); he describes passive resistance as misnomer (67). Non-violence is not a do-nothing philosophy; rather it involves active direct action such as non-cooperation, protest march, and petitioning. It is active direct action because it involves taking the initiative and meeting up with your fears (opponent) in a direct manner without ambiguity. Nonviolence is not merely a substitute for violence whereby one resorts to nonviolence because he lacks the weapons to engage in physical violence. Gandhi avers that "the strength of non-violence is in exact proportion to the ability, not the will, of the nonviolent person to inflict violence" (2014, 61). He also says, "non-violence therefore presupposes ability to strike" (Gandhi 2014, 39). The individual is considered to be nonviolent if he possesses the capacity (weapons) and the capability (ability to strike) to cause physical violence but rather refrain from it despite possessing an advantage by means of weaponry. Gandhi (2014) avers that violence degrades and undermines our personhood; and reduces humans to the level of animal. Nonviolence, for him, is the way of nature and it is the most active force in the world. He maintains that although "we may never be strong enough to be entirely non-violent in thought, word and deed;" but we must fix our focus upon it and make steady progress towards it (Gandhi 2014, 37). For it is only by nonviolence that truth can be found and possessed.

Govier's (2008) definition of nonviolence is trite, he opines that it involves processes of protest, non-cooperation and intervention, without employing physical violence, to cause an opponent to change a course of action. The key phrase in the definition is "without employing physical violence". This definition suggests that the use strategy of psychological violence in a non-physical violent resistance is appropriate. The tactics employed or recommended for nonviolent struggle is designed to cause disruptions of processes of normalcy or status quo in order to force change or encourage an opponent to come to their negotiation table. Robert Holmes (1971) defines psychological violence as a process of rendering another person vulnerable in non-physical ways such as denying him/her respect by non-physical means as in when they are insulted or humiliated by actions involving no application of physical force. Humiliation can be by means of using words or singing songs that hurt his/her dignity as person. Holmes (1971) argues that psychological violence or non-physical violence by psychological means is violence nonetheless, and it is a violation of one's personhood. He argues that doing violence means violating a person or treating a person in a way that diminish him/her.

Immanuel Kant (1949) had argued that persons are deserving of respect and worthy of dignity in themselves; and that depriving or denying persons respect or dignity violates their personhood. However, Gandhi has rejected Kant's version of the personhood argument by arguing that "the dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law" (2014, 6). The opponents in a nonviolent struggle are not deserving of dignity, or lack it thereof, if their actions are not in alignment with the

higher law – natural law. Holmes (1971) calls this psychological violence; and that it exists because people are not only vulnerable in physical ways. Interestingly, some psychological violence is more forceful and harmful than physical violence. People often say 'don't break me with words' or 'those words deeply hurt'. In other words, his/her ego has been affected. The ego is the seat of the human personhood and the source of his pride as person; it cannot be affected by physical means except by means that are psychological. The methods of nonviolence often impress psychological violence on the ego. Moreover, some methods of nonviolence (such as strike or disruption of public utility like hospital) can be negative or seriously affect other persons not targeted in the struggle and may cause them physical harm such as leading to their demise or putting them in a more vulnerable state of physical health.

King (2005) has developed six tenets for philosophy of nonviolence. The first tenet stipulates that the nonviolent resister must be courageous to resist oppression without resorting to methods of physical violence. And that he must recognize nonviolence as the only way to victory. The second tenet is that the person involved in nonviolence should not aim to humiliate the opponent but to win his friendship and understanding. That, while nonviolence is often expressed in the forms of non-cooperation and protest, those are merely means; the aim is to awaken moral shame in the opponent and ultimately seeks reconciliation and fosters a beloved community. The third tenet is that nonviolence resistance is directed against forces of evil rather than the person exhibiting the evil. The aim is to redeem the opponent from the evil forces and

reconcile him to oneself and good. Nelson Mandela avers that "the oppressor must be liberated just as surely as the oppressed [because] a man who takes away another man's freedom is a prisoner of hatred, he is locked behind the bars of prejudice and narrow-mindedness... [Therefore] the oppressed and the oppressor alike are robbed of their humanity" (1994, 544). Balwant Bhaneja notes that, for Gandhi, "man and his deed are two distinct things"; hence, his insistence that we must "hate the sin and not the sinner" (2007, 217). The fourth tenet is that persons involved in nonviolence should be willing to accept suffering from the opponent or oppressor without physical and mental retaliation. He must see the suffering as redemptive and as a route to freedom. The fifth tenet is that nonviolence movement must be anchored on love. Nonviolence resistance must not only avoid inflicting external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. "The nonviolent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him" (King 2005, 136). For this reason, nonviolence must not lead to the resister to become bitter or indulge in hate campaigns. The fifth tenet connects directly with the third tenet which aims at reconciliation and fostering of a beloved community. The sixth tenet is that nonviolence philosophy recognizes that the universe is on the side of justice and "works to bring the disconnected aspects of reality into a harmonious whole". Consequently, the nonviolent practioner must have abiding faith in the future; that while he accepts suffering without retaliation his effort are in alignment with the cosmic order of the universe.

NON-HUMAN VIOLENCE

Concept of violence has been largely discussed in anthropocentric perspectives. Both the traditional and broad definitions of violence seem to exclude non-human nature from its scope. It is apparent that not much attention is accorded by scholars to the impact of violence on non-humans and its moral scope within such consideration. Apart from the fact that physical violence which is directed at human entities do impact significantly on non-human entities, there are also deliberate efforts by individuals and communities to get rid of certain animal and plant species by violent means (Francis 2016; Ekwealo 2010). Despite the lukewarm attitude of violence studies towards animal and plant violence, there are two conceptual paradigms that suggest the importance of animal violence to the overall corpus of violence studies. These philosophical paradigms are: utilitarianism and Kantism.

The utilitarian paradigm was developed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Although the doctrine of utilitarianism can be easily traced to the ancient Greek philosopher Epicurus; but it was Bentham and Mill who definitely systematized it into a functional framework of study to understand and resolve problems. The aspect of utilitarianism, called environmental utilitarianism, where this section derives much authority, was definitely developed by Peter Singer. Utilitarianism, particularly the version developed by Mill, states that the goodness or utility of an action is determined by the amount of harm it inflicts: the less pain or harm an act foster the more good, moral or just it is (Mill 1994). This means that violence is not intrinsically bad rather its moral value is determined by the amount of pain experienced by the subject. This is

multiplied by the number of persons. What enable detection of pain is sentience; which is a bodily quality present both in human beings and animals that cause suffering and pain? It is on the basis of this that Mill condemns harm, particularly those that have least utility value for the greatest number of people. It is also on the basis of this that Singer condemns violence against animals. Singer (1994) argues that violence is bad because it causes pain and suffering to the animal. Singer's argument recommends total prohibition of animal killing, including those done for consumption purposes. Singer's view is considered to be extreme; this can be compared to Kant's position on animal rights.

Kant animal ethics centres on the necessity as the only basis for killing of animal. He argues that killing animal for food is acceptable but that killing it for game or for the joy of it, is morally depressing. He argues that humans are like caretakers over the animals; hence must not abuse their roles towards them. He recommended that animals that have serve his/her master as domestic animal for long should be allowed to live until its death rather than be killed for food or be violently disposed of (Kant 1963). He argues that there was a linkage between animal violence and violence towards humans; that those who commit violence against animals are more likely to do same to human subjects (Kant 1963).

This view that Kant advanced over 350 years ago has now been supported with empirical findings. Many empirical studies today have linked animal violence to attitude of violence against human being (Raupp, Barlow, and Oliver 1997; Fitzgerald 2009; Upadhya 2014; Phillips 2014). This therefore provides strong

theoretical basis for substantial re-conceptualization of the concepts of violence (and nonviolence) to include physical attacks on animals, particularly those that have to do with animal abuse. If concept of violence is substantially revised, then even acts of ecological abuse which have led to climate change will be calculated to be violence against animals. But then it will also be violence against human beings; because decimated non-human entities have serious bearing on the socio-economic welling of human beings directly connected to that environment (Baird 2008). If an attempt is to be made to ecologically reconceptualise violence, it will look like something like this: *Violence refers to the use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, animal, or against a group or community, or an ecosystem, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation, so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations; but which in the case of an animal or ecosystem the violence arose as unnecessary*.

THE DISCOURSE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPLEMENTARITY

Complementarity as a notion is discussed both from the perspectives of social and existential paradigms. According to the historical records, complementarity has been in existence from the cradle of civilization, especially in the Egyptian mystery school. First, from semantics point of view, the term derived from the word complementation, which means to complete. Flower says "it is that which completes" (1964, 247). Hitherto, we had mentioned that complementarity principle

is traceable to the cradle of civilization in Egypt. Innocent Onyenwuyi captures this point thus, "Maat is the Egyptian concept of the principle which underlies and governs the interrelationship of antithetical pairs or opposites and brings about harmony, balance and justice among aspects of existence which otherwise should be antagonistic and makes them complementary" (1993, 252). As an extension of the concept above, he added:

> The principles of creation, that is, male and female, hot and cold, external recurrence and external sameness in their mode of functioning illustrates a complementary relation. Taken separately, each is an individual aspect of life, distinct aspect that cannot single handly create life unless when working together in unity (Onyenwuyi 1993, 252-253).

Inyang Effiwatt explication of the concept here is pertinent. According to him, "in African social relations, the idea of complementarity is used to show how distinct individual efforts can blend to achieve overall harmony and success in the community" (Effiwatt 2000, 290). Complementarity is discernable at the global frame as it pertains to cross-cultural exchange between the various blocks and continents of the world which contemporaneously is found in the notion of globalization. Obviously, an adequate understanding of the actual complementary aspects and complementary potentials of diverse cultures would facilitate the creation of a new world order devoid of political tension, economic hostilities and other forms of violence and rancour (Effiwatt 2000). In Anaxagoras' philosophy, the principle of

complementarity abstracted from his dictum "there is portion of everything in everything". The recency of complementarity is evident in the African postulation of Ibuanyidanda philosophy.

The Ibuanyidanda theory of being as enunciated by Innocent Asouzu holds that approach to being transcends uni-dimensionality rather it is complementary and multidimensional. Asouzu introduced the concept of "missing links" to define reality as fragmentary and mutually complementary rather than oppository and antagonistic. He maintains that "all experience, modes of existence and expression of being in history are missing links, which upholds their being and existence the moment they can be conceived as aspects of being in complementary relationship, as to help make evident the character of this relationship that is service in complementarity" (Asouzu 2007, 267). He also argues that to be is to be in mutual complementary relationship and that its negation is to be alone (Asouzu 2011). If reality is complementary then to access it demands complementary approach. Asouzu (2007) argues that complementary approach to the study reality ultimately contributes to harmonious understanding of being or reality.

VIOLENCE AND NONVIOLENCE: TOWARDS COMPLEMENTARY CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Violence and nonviolence have often been discussed as mutually exclusive concepts; of which one stands in total opposition and contradiction to the other. The two are conceived as being at opposite extremes. Studies have tended to emphasize one against the other, otherwise it has de-rationalize one and rationalize the other.

But the obvious questions are: Does moral arc bends towards nonviolence rather than violence? Doesn't violence have a place in a peace process? Are there where contexts violence and nonviolence are complementary in a search for peace? These are the questions that guide this section of the discourse.

Generally, in ontological circle, conflict is often traced to Parmenides' theory of being. Parmenides had argued that being (what is) is one, fixed, eternal, infinite, unbecoming and indivisible (see Stumpf 1994, 16-17). This means that truth (or what is) is uni-dimensional, fixed, static and monolithic. Parmenides rejected the view that reality is, and can be, multidimensional. He argued that multiplicity is illusion because being is one, fixed, static and monolithic. From Parmenides's thesis it follows that there is only one way to truth. And in the context of this work, there is only one way to conflict resolution and management. If nonviolence is identified as a viable path to peace, then it must be the only path.

In the context the ibuanyidanda framework, violence and nonviolence are merely aspects to the whole reality. Both violence and nonviolence have their place in the scheme of things. Some aspects to reality require violent approach; some require nonviolent approach; and others require a combination of both approaches to achieve a holistic perspective. For example, nonviolence requires relying on protest rallies, petitions, and non-cooperation with the oppressors. But what can protest rallies, petitioning or non-cooperation do to resolve the Boko Haram conflict in the Nigeria's northeast or the Islamic State conflict in the global mid-east. In fact, oftentimes it is said *the only language Nigerian government*

understands is the language of violence. Many times this saying is proven true. Georg Hegel and Karl Marx argue that history of humankind progresses by means of violence. Many times transformation in the society is brought about by violent means. The Arab Spring movement of 2009 in North Africa was mainly a violent movement that led to toppling of despots and enthronement of democratic regimes in the affected country.

However, several times violence alone cannot bring about conflict resolution. The recent experience in The Gambia clearly indicates how strategic deployments of violent and nonviolent means can contribute towards resolving a conflict situation. The American civil rights struggle is another case in point. Although, many scholars are fun of one-sided analysis of the American civil rights conflicts; it is noteworthy that realisation of civil rights took many factors, other than nonviolent methods. The American civil rights conflict was a long struggle that combined violent and nonviolent tactics to whittle down the power of oppression of the minorities in that country. As Denton Watson rightly notes, "King's nonviolent tactics [alone] could not have destroyed the south's racial system" (2005, 169). Tiffany Gallati (2017) has also said the same thing, that Martin Luther King's non-violent movement would not have had serious effect if it was not complemented by Malcolm X's militant rhetoric as a backdrop. Sometimes, nonviolence serves to prolong conflicts rather than resolves or transform it. Yet, as Afanasyev rightly argues, avoidance of violence and "struggle for peace is essential to social progress" (1968, 107). It is important to pursue the course of peace and

nonviolence, no matter how long it may take, so that our efforts to transform our environment may not be wasted in the field of violence. Moreover, it is cheaper to pursue course of nonviolence, at least when measured in terms of human death, ecosystem disruption and material destruction. However, one must be courageous enough to accept that both violence and nonviolence have their place in conflict resolution process.

CONCLUSION

From the analysis above, we can conclude thus: The use of violence and/or non-violence methods as a means of resolving conflict is context-dependent. Conflict is historical event; it depends on what happened. To this end it is important for context to be factored in whenever any discourse is made on the subject. An arbitrary and absentminded discourse on conflict is likely to boomerang or at least become ineffective. When historical contexts are factored in, it becomes clear what direction a conflict should take and what methods should be adopted towards resolving it. Context will ultimately determine whether violent or nonviolent strategy should be adopted and when or where. Sometimes, a combination of violent and nonviolent methods is the most effective way of resolving a conflict within a given historical context. Insisting that all conflicts should be resolved by nonviolent means amount to blind idealism. Within this frame of reasoning, violence and nonviolence are paradigms for a complementary conflict resolution. The principle of complementarity makes unassailable the argument that violence and nonviolence apparently underlie the profundity of complementary conflict resolution.

REFERENCES

Afanasyev, V. 1968. *Marxist Philosophy: A Popular Outline, 3rd ed*. Tr. Leo Lempert. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Asouzu, Innocent I. 2011. *Ibuanyidanda and Philosophy of Essence*. Calabar: Univeristy of Calabar Press.

Asouzu, Innocent I. 2007. *Ibuanyidanda: A New Complementary Ontology Beyond World-Immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and Impositions*. Zürich: LIT VERLAG GmbH KG Wien.

Baird, Rachel. 2008. *The Impact of Climate Change on Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Minority Rights Group International.

Bhaneja, Balwant. 2007. Understanding Gandhi's Ahimsa (Non-Violence). *Asteriskos, 3*(4): 215-224.

Bufacchi, Vittorio. 2005. Two Concepts of Violence. *Political Studies Review, 3*: 193-204.

Dewey, John. 1916. Force and Coercion. *International Journal of Ethics, 25*(3): 359-367.

Effiwatt, Inyang. 2000. Complementarity and African Social Relations: A Case for Cultural Universalism. In *Logic, Philosophy and Introduction to Computer Science,* ed. Princewill Alozie, 289-97. Calabar: Elcrof Pub. Co.

Ekwealo, Chigbo. 2010. Do Witches Really Exist: A Mystical-Philosophical Evaluation. *Lagos Notes and Records: A Journal of the Faculty of Arts University of Lagos, 16*: 18-39.

Fitzgerald, Amy. 2009. Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime rates: An Empirical Analysis of the Spillover from "The Jungle" Into the Surrounding Community. *Organization & Environment, 20*(10): 1-27.

Flower, E. Ed. 1964. *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Francis, Diana-Abasi I. 2016. Logical and Theoretical Foundations of African Environmental Ethics. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies, 9*(9): 3-24.

Gallati, Tiffany. 2017. *Malcolm X & Martin Luther King Jr.: Non-Violent v. Violent Resistance in the Civil Rights Movement in the American South*. Retrieved at: https://tru.academia.edu/triffanygallati

Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research, 6*(3): 167-191.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2014. *My Non-Violence*. Sailesh Kumar Bandopadhyaya (Compli). Ahmadabad: Jitendra T. Desai Navajivan Publishing House.

Govier, Trudy. 2008. Violence, Nonviolence, and Definitions: A Dilemma for Peace Studies. *The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies, 40*(2): 61-83.

Haan, Willem de. 2008. Violence as an Essentially Contested Concept. In *Violence in Europe: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives,* ed. S. Body-Gendrot & P. Spierenburg, 27-40. New York: Springer.

Henry, S. 2000. What is Violence? An Integrated Definition. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 567*: 16-30.

Holmes, Robert. 1971. Violence and Nonviolence. In *Violence: Award-Winning Essays in the Council for Philosophical Studies Competition*, ed. Jerome A. Shaffer, New York: David McKay Company.

Kant, Immanuel. 1949. *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Thomas K. Abbott (Trans). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

Kant, Immanuel. 1963. *Lectures on Ethics*. Louis Infield (Trans). New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.

King, Martin. 2005. Blacks Must Employ Nonviolent Resistance. In *The Civil Rights Movement,* ed. Jill Karson, 133-9. Detroit: Thomson Gale.

Malcolm X. 2005. Nonviolent Resistance is not Enough. In *The Civil Rights Movement,* ed. Jill Karson, 140-6. Detroit: Thomson Gale.

Malcolm X. The Ballot or the Bullet. In Antihostile (Ed.), *El-Haji Malik El-Shabazz Malcolm X: Collected Speeches, Debates and Interviews (1960-1965).* Malcolmxfiles.blogspot.com

Mandela, Nelson. 1994. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Mill, John. 1994. Utilitarianism. In Donald C. Abel (Ed.), *Fifty Readings in Philosophy* (371-379). McGraw-Hill Inc.

Onyenwuyi, Innocent. 1993. *African Origin of Greek Philosophy: An Exercise in Afrocentrism*. Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press.

Phillips, Allie. 2014. *Understanding the Link between Violence to Animals and People: A Guidebook for Criminal Justice Professionals*. Alexandria, VA: National Center for Prosecution of Animal Abuse.

Raupp, Carol, Mary Barlow and Judith Oliver. 1997. Perceptions of Family Violence: Are Companion Animals in the Picture? *Society and Animals, 5*(3): 219-237.

Reiss, A. & J. Roth. 1994. *Understanding and Preventing Violence*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Riedel, M. and W. Welsh. 2002. *Criminal Violence: Patterns, Causes, and Prevention*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Sanko, E. 2003. Introduction: Conceptualizing the Meaning of Violence. In *The Meanings of Violence,* ed. E. A. Sanko, 1-13. London: Routledge.

Singer, Peter. 1994. All Animals Are Equal. In *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application,* ed. Louis P. Pojman, 33-40. London: Jones and Barlett Publishers.

Stumpf, Samuel E. 1994. *Philosophy: History and Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Unah, Jim I. 2002. *African Philosophy: Trends and Projections in Six Essays, 2ⁿᵈ ed*. Lagos: Foresight Press.

Upadhya, Vivek. 2014. The Abuse of Animals as a Method of Domestic Violence: The Need for Criminalization. *Emory Law Journal, 63*: 1163-1209.

Waddington, P. A. J., D. Badger and R. Bull. 2004. Appraising the Inclusive Definition of Workplace va: World Health Organisation.

'Violence'. *British Journal of Criminology, 45*: 141-164.

Watson, Denton. 2005. King's Protest campaigns had a Limited Impact on Civil Rights. In *The Civil Rights Movement,* ed. Jill Karson, 169-73. Detroit: Thomson Gale.

Weiner, N. 1989. Violent Criminal Careers and 'Violent Career Criminals': An Overview of the Research Literature. In *Violent Crime, Violent Criminals,* ed. N. A. Weiner & M. E. Wolfgang, 135-8. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

World Health Organisation (WHO). 1996. *Violence: a Public Health Priority*. Global Consultation on Violence and Health. WHO/EHA/SPI.POA.2. Gene