

REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY

Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu

Department of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

ezeakilebuchi@gmail.com

08033198321

Abstract

Conflict, struggle, revolution and violence are arguably fundamental in the character of human society. Dialogue is one of the modern methods basic in resolving conflicts in the human society as well. The menace of terrorism, tribal agitation, partisan irrational struggle for dominion and corruption in various places of trust in Nigeria have prodded the minds of Nigerian scholars from various disciplines towards seeking for a pragmatic solution to reduce these occurrences and if possible, bring them to the barest minimum. Some idealist philosophers and scholars of crisis resolution across the globe have argued that violence aggravates than solves any problem. In the same vein, realists have, also argued that for peace to reign, violence must beget violence. Basic to the fundamental principle of the realists is the resolve that human nature is characterized by conflict, struggle and competition and that the world is a battle field where the fittest survives. Since both arguments have merits and demerits, which could be more pragmatic in resolving Nigeria's crisis? What justification authenticates the adoption of any of these standards? Applying the methods of analysis and hermeneutics, this paper, therefore, argues that "alternative violence" could be nearest in resolving irrational crisis in Nigeria. It is revealed that Nigeria as a nation with diverse ethnic groupings has a complex structure and her crisis demands an indigenous system or a self styled democracy that will accommodate our complexes and also give room for praxis-oriented approach necessary in resolving crisis. The conclusion is that a rational violent revolution is a *sine-qua-non* for resolving and restoring the present crisis ridden Nigeria to a near stable and peaceful state.

Keywords

Idealism, Realism, Crisis, Philosophy, Dialogue, Violence, Conflict.

Introduction

It was Fanon (1967: 8) who alerts the world that "man is a yes that vibrates to cosmic harmonies. Uprooted, pursued, baffled, doomed to watch the dissolution of the truths that he has worked out for himself one after another, he has to give up projecting onto the world the antimony that co-exists with him". Even though the civil society evolved out of the necessity to dissolve self-government characteristic of the state of nature, society, unlike biochemical processes as Fanon argues, cannot escape human influence because man is what brings society into being. Little wonder, Mondin (1991: 1) insists that "*the supreme question for man is man*". Every society, in so far as it is a human society is characterized by crisis. This phenomenon however, is a permanent possibility which man alone can control, even though it may be right as some philosophers contend. For instance, Boko Haram in Nigeria is a human orchestrated terrorism which can be controlled by man. Militancy and other tribal irrational agitations in

**REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL
STUDY-----*Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu***

Nigeria are human triggered and can also be controlled by Nigerians themselves through appropriate standards. Again, corruption and mismanagement are all perpetrated by human beings and they can only be controlled by man himself. However, this is not to discard completely the influence of transcendental forces in human affairs. The facts that these phenomena appear through human institutions make them require an effective human solution. Besides, the fact that these crises generate violence, both physical and psychological, does not make them alien to Nigerians because they are historically borne.

History has proven that even though it is man that brings society into being, it is also the same man who destroys it. It is also arguable that, man is capable of restoring order and stability in society. The reason is grounded on the fact that man in history contributes substantially to the destruction of the society he built. Izunwa (2006: 135) argues along the same line of thought when he contends that “Statistics tend to show that of the general disquiet world over, which of course is not out of tune with the human condition, [Nigeria] admits of a greater percentage”. Since independence, Nigeria has been struggling with crisis in which military coup’d’état, tribal and inter-tribal conflicts and ethnic agitations, are inclusive. These factors in historical times are permanent variables. And because they are indispensable in Nigerian society also it becomes necessary to tackle the “real” with some “real measures” if one would unearth these crisis from their root causes. Given this understanding, we would not hesitate to analyze the principal claims of both realists and idealists in crisis resolution. With realism constantly rearing its head in Nigeria’s past and present national affairs, one would likely argue that dialogue would be a mere sham, especially at present. But since dialogue also has some reliability in the Nigerian existential equation, it would tantamount to making a hasty conclusion to adopt the former assertion without thorough evaluations.

Definition of Terms

In order to make this paper easy to comprehend it is thus instructive to begin with an attempt to clarify and define our principal terms of reference. There is need for analysis cum systematic interpretation and evaluation of data or information by breaking the basic concepts in this article so as to uncover their interrelations and acquaint ourselves with emergent meanings from beclouded notions. The aim also is to provide the basis for problem solving and decision making. In defining these concepts, we also gain knowledge or better understanding of a particular philosophical issue under consideration. For as Mason (1985: 105) rightly remarks that:

Principles are seriously misleading if they are not correctly rooted in a proper understanding of the concepts from which they emanate. The search for the meaning of concepts and the establishment of principles are par excellence philosophic tasks. Although the clarifications of concepts and the elucidation of principles will not have themselves solve concrete issues, nevertheless, without the conceptual clarification of the philosopher, the issues are never adequately resolved.

Most times, the clarification of concepts solves problems where the problem lies with meaning or linguistic clarification. Again, we shall examine the relationship between realism and idealism and the historical attempts of philosophers at the justification of crisis resolution in Nigeria

Realism: A Formal Definition

Ordinarily, the word 'realism' is taken from the word "real" or "concrete" or "pragmatic" or "practical". It connotes violence in its usage here. As a concept, it is widely discussed with scorn, yet attracts more result and existential involvement. In its strict, professional sense it is properly called real politick or "power politics". Existentially, it is a real life drama. Anthropologically, it is intertwined with man. And ethically, it is both '*descripto*' and '*prescripto*' praxis interplay of what obtains in real society. It is the view that man is man; that human nature is characterized by conflicting self interest. This philosophy of life and aspect of human nature is as old as man.

Generally speaking, realism covers a whole lot than the narrow definitions given it. Also, it permeates our entire life drama; from the struggle to make ends meet to that of obtaining salvation, and from birth to death. Lots of scholars understand this view from the vantage point of international politics; but, they all have surely progressed from the analysis of human nature to its local milieu up to its international understanding.

Hornby (2000: 971) defines realism as "a way of seeing, accepting and dealing with situations as they really are without being influenced by your emotions or false hope". Ferguson, R. J. observes and correctly too that Classical realists like George Kennan, Nicholas Spykman, Herman Kahn and E.H Car understand realism as the drive for power and the will to dominate". Again, they argue that it is fundamentally the nature of man that pushes states and individuals to act in a way that places interest over ideologies. However plausible this understanding of realism would seem, it still does not hide the end which it provokes. For when the nature of man pushes states and individuals to act in such ways that disregard ideologies for interest, it must surely provoke violence, either in its physical or psychological or emotional form. The liberal realist school championed by Hedley, Martin Wight and Barry Buzan, in their definition, admits of anarchical international structure in order to form a society of states where order and stability will be achieved through common norms and interest than what obtains in strict realist view. This view looks like a hearty formation of a purported ugly situation, yet it still remains impossible in real life situation. It is only when one considers the situation where the U.S, after reconsidering their democratic foreign policy woke up to witness a terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre on the 11th of September 2001; that one would appreciate the elusive nature of this society of states with more stability and order. This, as one may argue, is a euphemistic way of presenting a somewhat nauseating situation. In a way, it may be right to say that there is a conspiracy to clothe violence here or to encapsulate it in a new garb, even though it refuses to bend its head in servitude.

Nevertheless, the Structural school has a different understanding of the subject and it is nearest to being the best in the context we are considering it in this discourse. According to Kenneth Waltz and others, realism is a view supporting the relativity of international conduct, consciousness of the action of states around it and zero hesitance to apply pragmatic approach in resolving conflicts as they arise. This definition is undoubtedly more real than the former, but it still does not consider what end the pragmatic method will produce, let alone what the very method meant. Before we finally begin to pitch our tent, let us consider one more school of thought. Neo-classical realism offers all we are looking for, if not for its theoretically based assumptions that has only academic than actual application. It advocates for distribution of power in the international system, domestic perception of the system or its incentives and then foreign policy decision; all, as what realism means. According to Ferguson, the basic approach, then, was for its champions like Randall, William, Aaron and others to refine and not refute

**REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL
STUDY-----Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu**

Kenneth Waltz, by adding domestic variables between system incentives and state's foreign policy decision. In this case effort will be made to evaluate the benefits obtainable within a local system vis-à-vis her foreign policy.

Fukuyama took a skeptical position in his understanding of realism. He took a position which almost disparaged, if not dissipated all realist claims, but which seems somehow plausible except his concluding submission which begs the question and automatically fling realism back to its leisure end. For Fukuyama (1992: 252-253) "realism is no longer fashionable given that it has already solved the problem of anarchy and war in the international level and therefore should not be applied to the modern system of states in the international level". This, he (Fukuyama) illustrates by arguing that both of these [realist] proposals remind one of a doctor who, after treating a cancer patient through a long and agonizing process of chemotherapy that finally forces the cancer into remission, tries desperately to persuade the patient to continue the chemotherapy on the grounds that it has been so successful in the past.

Arguing further, Fukuyama uses the word "remission" to describe the state of the patient's cancer. By definition, the word "remission" suggests a period during which a serious illness improves for a time and the patient seems to get better. This definition, however, suggest that the patient is only relieved temporarily and also, that his cancer had not been cured permanently. In this case, abandoning his medication is out of question. Therefore, for Fukuyama to suggest that realism is otiose based on the reason that it once solved a problem which no longer exists is a grave omission on his own part. The question here borders on whether human nature has changed, or rather, whether the anarchic character of states in the international level has changed since the end of World War II. Apologetically, one may argue that it has not; that it is only in remission, hence Fukuyama could be right. That human nature is unchanging, as realists opine, does not mean that it cannot be modified for desired rational purposes. This is, perhaps a position that is unwavering among the liberal realists. The common ground remains that anarchy, aggression and competition are eternal and exist both in the national and international scenes.

The history of mankind and the rise and fall of civilizations are unquestionably stories of conflict as Walter (1992: 1) rightly argues that "conflict is inherent in human activities. It is omnipresent and foreordained". All histories about man are undoubtedly histories about violence. The transition of societies from one socio- economic formation to another is characterized by struggles deep rooted in violence. This is the reason many realists, like Rourke would trace their intellectual heritage to such political philosophers as Thomas Hobbes who not only captured the primitive society in his writing but also, who believed that human beings possess an urge to dominate, "*an animus dominandi*". This prompts Rourke (1997: 16) to argue that "this 'animus dominandi' is a natural animal-like instinct to gain power as an end in itself". One could be right if he argues as Fukuyama (1992: 246) did when he understands realism "as a doctrine meant to apply to problems of contemporary politics, however, realism did not arrive on the scene until after World War II. Since realism was only properly called after World War II, is not suggestive of the likely assumption that realism has not been in the state system until after this period. In his *Essay in History, Politics and Culture*, Ferguson confirms that; while realism as a formal discipline in international relations did not arrive until World War II, its primary assumptions have been expressed in earlier writings. As man evolved he soon started engaging himself in being both in relation to his environment and to his fellow human beings. Consequently his true nature begins to involve him in competition and struggle for survival.

Idealism

Idealism, like the realist school of thought, ponders on the best possible approach to crisis resolution in human society. As a contemporary protégé of philosophy and international relations it almost appears to have drawn its inspiration from the famous statement of Karl Marx “that ideas rule the world”. But in an actual sense, it is almost innocent of the supposed ‘practice’ through which, according to Marxist epistemology, the world should be known. That is why we may argue that it is supportive of the modern day neurosis popularly called ‘dialogue’, and in the words of Rourke and Boyer (2004: 15):

Globalization’ or New World Order orchestrated by a kind of ego-withdrawal by the third world countries who trumpets it’s seemingly Salvationist promises. Be that as it may, it is necessary that we understand that idealists do not believe that acquiring, preserving and applying power must be the essence of international relations. They argue that, instead of being based on power, foreign policies should be formulated according to cooperative and ethical standards.

It should be noted also that there are different forms of power and so, it would be appropriate to distinguish between them. When foreign policy is not based on military power as the machinery for its realization, then it must stem from economic power mechanism for its realization. Hence, we can argue that power in the above premise was vaguely used. Nevertheless, it is apparent that cooperative standards are dictated by certain give -and -take principles that have coercive undertone.

Evaluating the mechanism of international politics according to ethical standards, as idealists argue, would lead us into examining the type of state in question. But before we do that, let us consider some views on this. It was Fukuyama (1992: 249-250) who confirms that

Morgenthau attacked the wide spread tendency among nations to identify the moral aspiration of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe, arguing that it led to pride and over reaching, while the concept of interest defined in terms of power saves us from both that moral excess and that political folly.

While we underline the ethical relativism inherent in Morgenthau’s argument, we need not lose sight of the fact that differing interests of nations in international politics are defined in terms of power. For instance, in the global village, the interest of the stronger states overrides that of the weaker ones. The moral relations introduced in this argument seem plausible on the basis that moral rules and regulations are relative depending on the circumstance, culture, and location. But it would be wrong to say that the whole of morality is entirely relative because moral laws are fundamentally universal, but with relative applications. Kissinger, arguing along the same line of thought with Fukuyama (1992: 250) reasons to the fact that:

There were two kinds of state system; Legitimate and Revolutionary. In the former... all member states accepted each other’s fundamental legitimacy and did not seek to undermine them or otherwise challenge their right to exist. Revolutionary states (the latter) on the other hand, were constantly beset by large conflicts because of the unwillingness of certain of their members to accept the status. The international community should, by this understanding, be seen as a

REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY-----*Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu*

community of states where the differing self interests of the individual nations may not allow any cooperative standard based on morality, as some realists argue.

Idealism also believes that humanity can and must successfully seek a new system of world order. This is because they have never been comfortable with a world system based on sovereignty. Hence, it is imperative for them, to find new organizational paths to cooperation. If that should be the case, then, the question would be; would there be an organization of states without sovereignty and which will not be under a sovereign power that overrides or receives obeisance? This leads us to an old question that bordered the intellectuals and scholars of Socio-political philosophy in the 18th and 19th centuries ago and that is: can the world be better off in a bi-polar system alone since the bipolar system of the U.S and Soviet Union Russia ended up in the cold war, after the League of Nations had failed? Adopting a Multi-polar system itself is a problem now, since the debate about world politics includes also, world economy. Can the principle of multi-polarity in politics be applied also in economics? For Goldstein (2006: 81) "Idealism emphasizes international law, morality and international organisation, rather than power alone as the key influence on international event". Goldstein reflects deeply along this understanding and argues that idealist think that human nature is basically good. With good conducts, education and appropriate international structures, human nature can become the basis of peaceful and cooperative international relationship. An international community of states with laws and morality is encouraging especially in managing conflicts and war. But international law, emanating from the moral law should be sought after for simplicity sake. Also, an international organization would be a near perfect panacea against aggression of all kinds emanating from strong states against the weak ones. But, it may be difficult to have an international organization without a leader or leaders who will moderate as well as manage its affairs. Again such organization guided by law and morality ought to have an arbiter who interprets the law. Even when the law is stipulated by all and sanctions also stipulated by all, there must be someone or a group who must interpret them; and such a person or group must be empowered to do so. This is the irony of idealism. At a certain point in these exercises such a nation or group of nations must be tempted to impose their will upon others while interpreting the international law. And when all the states involved play a collective role in this, then anarchy ensues. Apart from that, when the sovereignty of a state is removed, such a state becomes an ordinary territory or protectorate of a body that imposes itself on others. Hence, we may argue that idealism indirectly or unconsciously encourages imperialism. Rourke and Boyer (2004: 17) are of the same view that:

Idealists are divided, however in terms of how far cooperation can and should go. Traditional idealists believe that just as humans learned to form cooperative societies without giving up their individuality, so does states learn to cooperate without surrendering their independence or sovereignty. However, these idealists believe that the growth of international economic interdependence or the spread of global culture will create a much greater spirit of cooperation among the world's countries.

Here the traditional idealists makes a good effort to prescribe how international community of states should be; but has failed in telling us how these cooperatives can work without affecting the sovereignty of the individual states. Besides, the *modus operandi* of this cooperative community is not stated clearly, assuming it would be possible.

Another argument as regards the above was posited by Neo-liberals or neo-idealist school of thought. These analysts Rourke and Boyer (2004: 17) believe that these countries will have to surrender some of their sovereignty to international organizations in order to promote greater cooperation and, if necessary, to enforce good behavior. This is because the individual states are what they are as a result of the sovereignty they enjoy; it would be ridiculous to demand total submission from them but surrendering a portion is more acceptable. Yet the problem lies on how to obtain a general cooperation since some states have already taken the position of world leaders. States like the US, China, Britain, France and Russia are vocal about this especially the U.S; while states like South Korea, Iran, Israel and recently, North Korea who used a demonstration of their nuclear capacity to assert their power too. The question on how these countries could cooperate on equal standard with other non nuclear possessing states is still unanswered. Or, is there going to be a double standard other than a single one in achieving this cooperation?

Historically, Goldstein asserts that idealism was particularly active in World War I and II. But following the painful experience of World War I, the U.S president, Woodrow Wilson and other idealists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations as a formal structure for the community of nations. However, those hopes were dashed when that structure proved helpless to stop German and Japanese aggression in the 1930's. Consequently, since World War II, realists have blamed idealists for looking too much at how the world ought to be instead of how "it really is." Sobered by this, realists set out to understand the principle of power politics without recourse to wishful thinking. Since the League of Nations failed in the past, can we argue that U.N.O (United Nations Organization) and other world organizations may also prevail?

'Alternative Realism' as a Viable and Logical Option for Crisis Resolution in Nigeria

The epicenter of this paper is to verify the various claims of realists and idealists in order to prove that realism fits in well in the business of resolving conflict in Nigeria. In line with the realist argument, Rourke and Boyer (2004: 18) argue that "Not being at war is not necessarily the same as being at peace in a cooperative way, and suspicion, tension, and rivalry, rather than cooperation have been the most common traits of what we euphemistically call international peace". In addition to this, they also argue that it is also the case that even those who preach idealism often toe the realist line. For instance, Bill Clinton started as an idealist candidate but ended up on building realist policies as President of the United States of America. When Clinton was canvassing for the presidential vote in 1992, he castigated President George H.W. Bush for his realist foreign policies in relation with China and other autocratic regimes. He accused Bush of siding with the status quo in Baltics, Beijing, etc rather than seeking for a democratic change; and then promised a new liberal vision for the U.S foreign policy. On discovering his limited power in changing China's behavior and his incapacity to overtly antagonize another major power; he merged his liberalism with necessary realists' position which he admitted later on. The focus of the above argument is to enumerate how a political journey starting from liberalism or idealism could end up in realism. Thus, while ideas and concepts assert themselves in the form of new world cooperatives, the constant variable, which is human nature, remains the same.

There may also be cases in history where realism, manifesting in form of war or conflict, and later ended at a round table discussion called "dialogue". And from what idealists claim, this round table discussion has produced a more lasting peace. This is also true. But, it does not follow to say that there is no violence or competition in dialogue, especially when it involves states with different national interests. In dialogue, negotiation takes place and when negotiation proceeds, stakes are involved and sacrifices are made not solely for the sake of peace, but also

**REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL
STUDY-----*Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu***

because one party is more powerful than the other. Often times, these persuasive means result to psychological violence which accumulates over time and ends up in a full blown out war in the future. This is a case that calls for consideration but that is not the burden of this paper.

Philosophy concerns itself not only with viable solutions to problems, but also, with such solutions that are both objective and lasting. Much has been argued about realism and the violence it produces; just the same way we talk about idealism and the unrealistic blissful world it can produce. But serious attention has not been given to the end of realist actions. It is to the best of our interest to re-iterate our earlier argument that violence or counter violence would avail much effectively if one is to tackle the Nigerian crisis. Look at the timely submission of Fanon (1967: 168) “admittedly; it seems lofty to toe this line but not perhaps after the following considerations. Before then, we would like to stress that when the analysis of the real is always difficult, it does not mean to say that any analysis patterning the obvious or apparel is also difficult”. This is exactly what we have set out to prove.

Violence in its rational form and violence in its irrational form are two different things which should be noted. All realist schools of thought made no distinction between these two. They have all presented violence in its ugly form debasing its indispensable part which is both utilitarian and rational. In its rational understanding, violence is utilitarian. It produces happiness for the greatest number and also leads to the attainment of ends or goals that have moral justification. For example, the moral law forbids the taking of human life, but not when such life or lives pose or poses a threat to a lot of others in the state. This presupposes that for the entire state to perish in the hands of a village or a city of terrorists do not make any sense whatsoever. Instead, the entire village or city should perish as the state wills, to save the entire state. This is most fittingly the case with Nigeria and some other nations of the world. Following the above submission will definitely land us into another situation. But, the critics of utilitarianism would strongly object to this. Ekwutosi (2006: 54) argues that “the consequence of human action continue almost indefinitely. For him also an action which now appears to have good results may on the long run have much bad effects. Conversely, it also happens that in the long term good can come out of bad action.

Assessing this long term consequence of utilitarian action leads us not only to questioning the consistency of applying realist principles, but also to the intentions behind their application. To appreciate this points fully, Graham (2004: 139-140) could not but proffer the solution and toes the same line of thought that “it was said that the first world War began as a result of the assassination of the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand in the street of the Balkan town of Sarajevo ...because his driver mistakenly drove up to a dead end and was forced to turn back ... This consequently gave the assassins the opportunity to shoot Ferdinand to death.

We can immediately notice the difficulty in ascertaining the intentions behind human action. In this instance, the driver could be said to have sold Ferdinand off to the assassins, if we must argue that he ought to have mastered his vicinity well so as to recognize or know a dead end. Conversely, we may also argue that he must have been new in town even though he was a good driver very competent and experienced enough to have qualified him and gave him the rare opportunity of being chosen to be the driver of the Archduke. Whichever way we look at it, human thinking, whether logical or illogical must perform its functions. Since mind activities, in as much as they are not extended, are known by their physical manifestations; they could also be misleading. For instance, one who hits his head against the entrance door of a party hall or a wedding hall may put up a smile to save his face while in the actual sense, he is enduring heavy pains. Violence in its rational understanding cannot be debunked based on the uncertainty in underpinning human intentions.

Stressing the unending consequences of realist actions, Graham recounted the outcome of Ferdinand's assassination from the first world war, Russian revolution, the rise of Hitler and the holocaust, The much touted and ill-fated and much dreaded Second World War, development of nuclear weapons and the Hiroshima saga are historical whirl wind that blew no one any good as many think, but the truth is that in as much as these are negative consequences, there are also positive consequences that came with them and which the world is enjoying today. For instance, the first and second world war, up to the rise and fall of totalitarianism in the 17th and 18th centuries, led to the fall of authoritarianism and the introduction of liberal self government. Hence, when one speaks of consequences, attempts should be made to distinguish between negative and positive consequences and then weigh the two to ascertain the most desirable. However, this evaluation should be considered carefully since it does not perfectly apply in all occasions. It is best applied in situational basis; for instance where a group of notorious terrorists hold an entire Shopping Mall hostage. The state, in this situation, on seeing that the terrorists will detonate a bomb in the Mall may decide to eliminate the entire group by bombing the entire mall, including the innocent citizens therein. Whether this would be acceptable depends on the position of the rule utilitarians who contend that our actions should be judged based on rules whose consequences are conducive to the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people. Coming to the example above, there is likely a dilemma in its application. The president or whoever is in charge of such a state; on discovering that his wife is in the shopping mall, may not order the elimination of all in the mall.. He may, as well, if the law supports it order for total termination of all in the mall. But when it does not have the support of the law, it may be down to his personal discretion. But, since the law dictates human conducts in a state, the issue of discretion becomes inappropriate here.

In contradistinction to the act utilitarian's principle that does not see a dilemma here since for him, the balance of general good over individual loss or good had been assessed properly. Therefore, the innocent citizens in the mall should be sacrificed to end the activities of the terrorist group. The problem now is, will the killing of these terrorists group, alongside innocent citizens bring terrorism to an end? The possible answer will be no. If the answer is no, why kill innocent citizens because of some terrorists? This can only be resolved if we consider utilitarianism as a situational principle and then interpret the word 'greatest happiness' or "greatest good", from the ambient of what works. This is as a result of the fact that any state law which goes contrary to the universal perception of human life as the highest of value is repugnant to natural law of justice and good conscience and so should not be applied. Since both the terrorist and the innocent citizens are human beings alike, can we now cling to the law of value in this sense? This is why we contend that alternative realist principle, which adopts violence in its rational end, should be used in likely situations that tend to blow out of proportion. It should be used as a heuristic while respecting the fact that idealism could also work in certain situation and should not be applied consistently. In any case where values of equal proportion conflicts with each other it is our humble submission that the one that produces greatest good for the greatest number should be given utmost priority.

Concluding Reflections

Having examined the difficulties in applying both realist and idealist principles in resolving crisis, we were able to discover that, in as much as idealism is much regarded as a true means to resolve crisis in a democratic institution, it could best be described as a socio-psycho drama. It is a kind of ego withdrawal on the side of those who favored capitalism and nourish fear of losing all that they have accumulated to the hands of the society they exploit, have forced

**REALISM, IDEALISM AND CRISIS RESOLUTION IN NIGERIA: A PHILOSOPHICAL
STUDY-----Celestine Chukwuemeka Mbaegbu**

them into a kind of popular neurosis exhibited in the process of dialogue. Instead of resolving crisis once and for all, the capitalist prefers unending panel of inquiry and prolonged judiciary processes in order to buy more time for further exploitation. Having in mind this flaw, idealism could also preserve mankind from more-fearsome wars in the future. Again as a kind of game theory, idealism resolves conflicts leaving the parties involved with a tolerable degree of psychological violence. Realist principles are corrosive in their traditional forms, yet produce great result and serves as deterrent against future occurrences. It is the only language that mankind understands well because of its propensity to aggression. However, the basic flaws of the traditional schools of thought in realism were obviously examined and we discovered that there is an indispensable side of violence which has been left out. Having considered this properly, we discovered that the only viable option that will be propitious in resolving Nigerian crisis is what we have called "Alternative Realism." Alternative realistic measures must be inclusive in the workings of our democracy as a self-styled democratic practice in Nigeria, if we are to achieve a great fit in nation building. Again, having considered also the negative effects of alternative realist practices, we suggest that it should be in situational application if continuity is to be maintained. In the long run, we propose for a combination of both the idealist and alternative realist principles in resolving crisis. But, when these combined measures fail and the only truth remaining which is the maintenance of true federalism and restoration of nationhood to "sane" patriots, then, we argue strongly that rationally motivated violent revolution should be an issue to be considered seriously.

References

- Ekwutosi, C. M. (2006). *Basic Issues in Ethics*. Rex Charles and Patrick limited.
- Fanon, Franz. (1969). *Black Skin White Mask*. New York: Grove Press, Inc.
- Ferguson, R. J. *Essays in History, Politics and Culture* <http://.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/realism-in-international-relations>.
- Fukuyama, Francis. (1992). *The end of History and the Last Man*. London Penguin Books.
- Goldstein, Joshua. (2006). *International Relations*. 6th Edition. New Delhi: Pearson Education, MC and Dorling Kindersley Pub. Inc.
- Graham, G. (2004). *Eight Theories of Ethics*. New York Routledge.
- Hornby , A. S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*, 6th editions Wechment, Sally (Ed). Oxford: University Press.
- Isard, Walter. (1992). *Understanding Conflict and the Science of Peace: Introduction and overview*. USA: Black Well Publishers.
- Izunwa, Okechukwu. (2006). Utilitarianism, Democracy and Conflict Resolution in Igbo Africa Sub-region. In Ike Odimegwu. (Ed.). *Philosophy and Africa*. Pp. 135- 146. Awka Lumos Nigeria Limited.
- Mason, T. F. (1985). Towards a Philosophy of Pluralism, In P. O. Bodunrin, (Ed.) *Philosophy in Africa: Trends and perspectives*. Pp. 105-127). Ile-Ife: University of Ife.

- Mondin, Batista. (1991). *Philosophical Anthropology. Man: an Impossible Project*. India: Theological Publications.
- Rourke, John. (1997). *International Politics in the world Stage*. 4th Edition, Connecticut: Dushkin/Mc. Graw-Hill.
- Rourke. J. I. and M. A. (2004) *International Politics on the World Stage*. 5th Edition, New York: Mc-Graw-Hill.