

Chapter Twelve

ENVIRONMENT IN THE CULTURES OF WAR AND PEACE

Philip Osarobu ISANBOR

Seminary of All Saints, Uhiele-Ekpoma

Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria

osarobuisanbor@gmail.com

Executive Summary

The environment is the seat of all human actions and responsibilities exercised or expressed as far as the human persons remain subjects of lived experiences and agents of development. From the historical valuation of human lived experiences, both peace and war had remained the products of human actions through human and societal quests for growth, advancement and development. Both the causes of the *Culture of Peace* and the *Culture of War* are done on the valuation of the environment. Through values, the human societies live in peace just as they live in war. This is the conviction of many industrialists and multinational corporations. With this conviction, when humanity suffers; the environment continues to be at the receiving end of the products of human actions and policies. Most times, such actions lead to environmental pollutions and degradation, away from the promotion the courses of human common good and development. Hence, this essay assesses the effects of the *Culture of War* on the environment through national and international supremacy and subjugating cultures of development as against the establishment of the *Culture of Peace* that the human society should long to achieve its sustainability in order to sustain the values of the

environment and then projects the environment as our common home and heritage.

Keywords: Human Person, Conflicts, Environment, Human Actions, Culture of Peace, Development, Culture of War

Introduction

Everything the human persons as subjects of lived experiences and as agents of development do have effects on the environment that housed them. They either do so for the establishment of the *Culture of Peace* or for the enthronement of the *Culture of War* and other forms of inhumanization (cf Afolami and Isanbor 2019: 109). In fact, such effects on the environment depend on the magnitude and frequencies of human actions been expressed. When actions are spoken of, we readily talk more of the effects of the *Culture of War*. No human activities are carried out outside the environment that houses their possibilities, especially the *Culture of War*. For the existence of the environment makes every human action possible (See, Isanbor and Uzomah 2016: 57; Isanbor and Uzomah 2017: 65). From the leverage of human lived experiences, we can rationally acknowledge that both the avenues and quests for the *Culture of Peace* and the *Culture of War* are products of human actions (cf, Savage 2006: 23). They become cultures depending on the levels of interests the human persons as beings of actions and shared responsibility and as agents of development invest in establishing them in the consciousnesses and consciences of living and acting.

Despite these valuations of the indispensable nature of human civilization for its development, human existence is problematic and always in situations of struggle with the forces of development, as Wale Olajide:

The reality of human existence therefore is essentially characterised by conflict. Whatever may be perceived and characterised as peace is just a tiny fleeting transitory crack within contesting conflicts. The human existence is, *de facto*, conflict in perpetual motion. Ironically though, like it or not, it is still what defines the joy of existence. It is what makes it tick and pulsate with frenetic business of human tenure civilization. It is vitality; the elixir of human existence, its quintessence, its core.

It becomes existentially reasonable to submit to the fate of *Culture of War*, which has remained an indispensable part of human civilization due to some misguided interests and ideologies of development among nationals and groups. With the *Culture of War*, the human communities have been creating and changing the courses of histories. With such consciousness, some sociological and philosophical thinkers believe that the human society cannot obtain peaceful coexistence and positive symbiosis without some elements of wars or any other forms of conflicts. Such consciousnesses are still inherent in some contemporary humanities who are guided by the consumerist and hedonistic goals of multinational companies and corporations (See, Isanbor and Uzomah 2016: 58; 2017: 66). With this, wars and other forms of conflicts and violence become very accustomed in the minds and ways of living. The *Culture of War* becomes part of enduring civilization. Hence, there are few of these wars in our contemporary civilization that are formally undying in our minds, and which are still having ripple effects in the lives of contemporary humanities: the First and Second World Wars.

Hinged on their peculiarity, from the values of human lived experiences associated with national imperialistic quests for

territorial dominations and powers over other weaker nations, human community observed that the world has not forgotten the bombing of Japanese cities: Hiroshima and Nagasaki, precisely at 8.15am (local time) on August 6, 1945. And the world has not been elusive of the unending effects of such bombing on the environment. As such, the environment is always at the receiving end of any act of violence. Even with such consciousness, the world did not seem to have been learnt as more dangerous bombings have been witnessed in many part of same world since then (see, Iroegbu 1995: 194). It remained the most devastating bombing in the history of our scientific and technological driven world. Hence, from economic trading consciousness associated with scientific and technological innovations and creativities, some contemporary national communities are projecting the great dehumanizing bombings in the shortest future: projecting the possibility of "Third World War." This is due to the trending economic and political forces of arm-race and nuclear weapons development. Many similar events and incidents of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have been the fate of the human persons when wars and other forms of conflicts are employed as a means of development. According to Paul Oredipe (2005: 56-57):

The twentieth century also witnessed some of the most ferocious attacks and acts of barbarian and brutality against the human person, it has seen the abyss of human cruelty revealed in the horrors of the two world wars, the Holocaust and the gulags, the Cold War, endless bloody conflicts, some inimical political and social systems as well as large-scale eugenic programmes designed to eradicate ethnic, religious and cultural groups, our technology and information have been used not only to aid and develops, but also to manipulate, terrorize and control. We can now use our brilliance to create or to destroy. As the quantity and speed of information increase so do solitude and paradoxically inability to

communicate. Scientific and technological progress in our day puts into human hands possibilities which are both magnificent and frightening.

As contemporarily put, the reign of Cold War seems to be poisoning the international atmosphere through strife and conflict engineering and economies, and poisoning the national and international coexistence and interdependence through the neglects of peaceful negotiation of trade zones and dominance (De Soras 1963: 42). As contemporarily recognized, away from the economic-driven Cold Wars among technologically-driven imperialistic nations and their imposing and suppressive economic tensions, there have been political and diplomatic imposing violent conflicts across some continents, especially in the Middle East (Reidlmayer 2007: 108). These have been mostly religious initiated and then politically sustained. The trending nature of the *Culture of War* has been psychologically seated in the minds of many people in these regions, and possibly transcending their future generations, getting used to such culture of socialization and civilization. The acts for peace or war can be a culture of human psychological and creative disposition, seeing national acquisitions of modern weapons of mass destruction.

Here, the main objective of this essay is centred on the universal valuation of the human person in the faces of environmental pollution and degradation as a result of the trending of *Culture of War*. It is about environmental sustainability through the values of the human persons (cf Afolami and Isanbor 2019: 110). The social concern for the sustainability of the environment is conspicuously pronounced and universally premised on the values of the human families and on the respect for the human life and rights through the consciousness in maintaining good and healthy relationship with the environment. Hence,

methodologically, we are directed by the influences of contemporary longing and valuation of *The Culture of War* as against the embrace of the *Culture of Peace* that help in sustaining the environment for the sustenance of the same humanities. With this, humanities face the following questions to be answered:

1. Can there be development of any human society without some elements of the *Culture of War* and other forms of conflicts?
2. How can humanities outlive the greed and selfishness that are engineered by technological culture which necessarily ignite the *Cultures of War* and other forms of violence?
3. What is the fate of human generations and environment in the present age of nuclear weapon engineering, funding and high trending culture of arms race?
4. Is it not possible to value the *Culture of Peace* in order to sustain the environment as our common home and heritage?

Human Persons, Environment, and the Age of Conflict-Driven Culture

Confidently recognised, the human persons have been employing the tools of their rationality and intelligence, in most times and occasions wrongly (see, Oredipe 2005: 57). This is greatly evident in the application and employment of the products and tools of science and technology, and the wrong exhibition of moral prowess through freedom seeking culture they are advocating in every affair of human endeavour for the executions of the *Culture of War* simply for the sales of military hardware and intelligences. In instance, evaluating the applications of military technology, nuclear science and technology in the name of nuclear warfare, also biotechnological warfare, the negative results of mining and space technologies (See, Ekiugbo and Isanbor 2013: 106). These and many alike have been degrading the environment and reducing the life

expectancy of many human and non-human habitants of the earth, especially the regions where toxic chemical materials as waste or test products are disposed, or where technical testing of products are done.

On the same relatedness of relevance, culture is an aspect of what it means to be human and as a basis of human rights. Cultural encapsulation is a form of political manipulation of cultures and the aliened influences. Human beings learn their cultures through socialisation process and grow into the culture. People do not learn their cultures by heart as set of ideas and norms that are committed to memory, but are usually thought to correspond to material and non- material aspects of culture, which are resistant to changes in varying degrees. Seeing the effects of environmental degradations and pollutions dues to local, national and international conflicts in the last century, the human society cannot but assess the needs to monitor the and activities and employments of science and technology through the exercises of human creativities and innovations.

For the above existential assertions, we can easily figures the changing anthropologically driven consciousness for materialistic civilization and the enthronement of throw-away culture, and recognition that the human society is drifting heavily towards hedonistic, consumerist and relativistic culture of development (cf Afolami and Isanbor 2019: 111). But, the collective concerns for development away for the influences of the *Culture of War* are integrally humanistic, and owing that, the human society in the name and the employment of the science and technology is driven away from the very factors of development that make them more human. We are driven towards an automatic humanism rather than the embrace of godly and integral humanism. This is due to some national

mistrusts and international diplomatic failures. So, some nations threaten the *Culture of War* to put others under their diplomatic subjugation, alienation and suppression.

Just as 1997 Draft Oslo Declaration on the Human Rights to Peace (See Roche 2006: 118) stated that:

Every human being, all States and other members of the international community and all peoples have the duty to contribute to the maintenance and construction of peace, and to the prevention of armed conflicts and of violence in all its forms. It is incumbent upon them notably to favour disarmament and to oppose by all legitimate means acts of aggression and systematic, massive and flagrant violations of human rights which constitute a threat to peace.

Hence, in the hands of the United Nations Organization (UNO), there have been efforts by her in appealing to members-nations on the indispensable needs to value human life and rights through the sustainability of the environment, especially avoidance of the avenues and causes of the *Culture of War*. The organization has long recognized that all these resultants of the *Culture of War* are practically based on the contents of human actions, choices and decisions. Considering the placement of human actions in the development of the societies, the dazzling nature of *Culture of Peace* and the ever imposing of the *Culture of War* due to the currencies of national and international alliances for Nuclear Weapons and the increasing weight of arm races are based on the values the human person as a subject of lived experience, and the conception for the right to life and development. Then, UNO and other commissions of common development among nations have the sociological and psychological convictions that the *Culture of War* has resulted from the following causes of actions:

- a. *Violence Works Belief*: This is a socio-political and developmental consciousness which is centred on the conviction that true development is a product of violence and conflicts, and that there cannot be peace when there is no war or conflict to achieve it. This conviction adjudicates that violence is an indispensable part of human socialization and civilization due to the existing of conflicting ideologies and interests inherent in human nature.
- b. *Enemy Images and Mentality*: This is a part of particularist and isolationist consciousness and mentality which situate that every other self away from the influence of oneself is an enemy. As such, the human society can therefore have local or personal, national or group, and international enemies as far as development processes and policies of interests are concerned. Such consciousness is built on the foundational interests and influences of imperialism, false particularism and consumerist ideology of particularistic separatism, especially among the economical and diplomatic classified powerful nations as against the weaker nations in the name of territorial development and security.
- c. *Authoritarian Government* (Based on Supremacy Culture): The causes of many wars and other forms of conflicts have been traced or premised to this authoritarian model of governance or government of or by some particular nations over others through some false or subjugating diplomatic tendencies and policies. It is on the conviction that some nations are either divinely made or politically powerful or supreme over others, and when the weaker nations refuse the influences of this supremacy culture, they are coarse by

and with wars and other forms of economic and political suppression and subjugation to submit to such arrangement.

- d. *Propaganda and Secrecy* (Based on Non-Diplomatic Culture): It is based on the policy of economic dominance and control of resources of the other nations by those classified as World Powers, properly by the members of UN Security Council, who believe that some wars can be fought against the nations claimed to have possessed, acquired or developed some weapons of mass destructions, may be as a products of non-diplomatic propaganda or secrecy, for the purposes of possible threats to war and political dominance.
- e. *Armament and Arm Race Funding*: The management and development of weapons, even those for mass destructions have been the source of political power and domination by some nations, and the funding becomes necessary for them even to the detriment to the funding and policy to fight poverty, hunger and illiteracy. This remains the source of war and other forms of conflicts, especially at an international level, as some particular nations want to have the independent right and dominance in possessing weapons of war rather than other nations, and to have more sophisticated weapons at part of their political pride and for the threats to war.
- f. *Human Right Violation and Exploitation*: For many industrialists, development thinkers and multinational owners, there is no time or situation some particular human rights are not violated or exploited. By protecting and promoting some rights of some individuals or groups, some other individuals' and groups' rights are violated or exploited. As such no development is possible without some rights and privileges been violated or exploited. Then, war becomes very inevitable

- for the causes of development, as it will lead to a greater achievement of human rights and privileges, which may be considered without the fears of rights been violated or exploited.
- g. *Exploitation of Nature* (A Neglect of Forest Rejuvenation): This is a warring belief that nature can never remain the same as created, as far as development must take place. The exploitation of nature is readily inevitable, and war and other forms of conflict help to rejuvenate it what once destroyed by it. For the same of development, no better act of rejuvenation of nature is possible than the *Culture of War*. No fears for the destruction of nature should reside in the hearts of humanity if there must be peace and meaningful development.
 - h. *Patriarchy*: This is a belief or conviction that is traditionally rooted, and it conceived that the world is directed or governed by force. The world or nature is always rejuvenating or replicating itself by the acts of forces, conceiving the acts of development to be masculine in nature, and making the acts of wars and conflicts inevitable and indispensably relevant and necessary for making nature grows and develops.

Any model of development is not envisaged without indispensable effects of sustained actions on the environment. The environment houses the proposals, policies and implementations of any developmental model. Both the *Culture of Peace* and *Culture of War* are development depending on their societal values at some particular times of development (cf Afolami and Isanbor 2019: 111). They depend on the levels of human creativities and innovations, especially from the local and national political and economic contents of human intelligences, interests and desires (See, Ajai 1995: 135; Ifeakor and Eze 2019: 15). And the factors for the evaluation of the *Culture of Wars* have

been the following: Respect for Human Rights, Values of Life and Dignity; Respect for Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity; Obedience to Military Rules of Engagement; Obedience to Traditional Morality and Natural Law Principles; Respect for National and International Diplomacies, and the Consideration of Economic State Controls and Interdependencies.

With these factors of peace and justice, the human creativities and innovation define the society which the human persons live and have their essence structured. Through their creativities and innovations as products of their intelligence, they fashioned the nature of society for themselves, knowing that wellbeing is a product of their actions and freedom (Cf, Ajai 1995: 135; Ifeakor and Eze 2019: 15). As proof of the existence of the effects of mismanagement of human actions and freedom based on the hope and idea of better future generation, we can point to the many efforts which been made during the last few years, simply against the anarchical relationships of competition and opposition between nations, relationships organized on the basis of mutual understanding and agreement and of concerted collaboration on common tasks (See, De Soras 1963: 42). It is on this indispensable relationship between the human persons as subjects of experiences, creativity, innovations and as objects of history and socialization and the products of their actions, that the fate of the environment in the *Culture of Peace* and in the *Culture of War*, and as a seat of development and hollow of civilization is being discussed.

Disarmament, Arm Race Stoppage and Diplomatic Treaties on Proliferation of Arms

Social justice theory is a principle which is associated with the respect and regard the states of the world have given to protection and promotion of fundamental human rights of every individual (See, Isanbor and Uzomah 2016: 57; 2017: 65). It is a

vocation is a call that requires a free and responsible answer. Integral human development presupposes the responsible freedom of the individual and of peoples: no structure can guarantee this development over and above human responsibility (Benedict XVI 2009: no. 17). Social justice theory is the pavilion for the consideration of human common goodness. The demands are holistic in promoting the needed development in human society, because, without them man will not be fully forward nor have a meaningful living.

Hence, the effects of the *Culture of War* and other forms of violence on natural environment have been centred on the following: Global warming and other Greenhouse Effects (Ozone depletion and Acid Rain); Water, Land and Air Pollutions (E.g. Oil Spillage and Flaming, Mining Land sliding); Deforestation and Resource Depletion; d. Specie Loss; Force Migration, Draught, and Poverty; and the Politics of Social, Ethnic and Racial Mistrusts. Such effects of the *Culture of War* can be overcome by the consciousness of common living, that is, the consideration of the environment as our common home, hinged on the principle of social justice and the valuation of the *Culture of Peace*. The principle of social justice and the sense of the *Culture of Peace* are built on the political willing and respect of social obligation of the State toward the developmental causes for the promotion, respect and protection of human life, rights and dignity (See, Ajai 1995: 135; Ifeakor and Eze 2019: 15). Social, economic and political transformations called for, always, in the face of humanity, and she demands proper management and utility of the world's resources for her growth and development (see, Musa and Avong 2020: 108). This is reason a new world is technologically being built on the shares of commonwealth and diplomatic treaties. International Organizations such as the UNO, WLO, WHO and all its subsidiary agencies or

commissions are put at head of the global realities of all human organization in acquiring or should acquire much more relevance to sustain humankind. Through human actions and sincere responsibilities, justice becomes both the aim and the intrinsic criterion of all politics (See, Roche 2006: 118; Afolami and Isanbor 2019: 112). With the *Culture of Peace*, politics is more than a mere mechanism for defining the rules of public life: its origin and its goal are found in justice, which by its very nature has to do with ethics of living and development.

The state must inevitably face the question of how justice can be achieved here and now, and then presupposes an even more radical question: what is justice? The problem is one of practical reason; but if reason is to be exercised properly, it must undergo constant purification, since it can never be completely free of the danger of a certain ethical blindness caused by the dazzling effect of power and special interests (Benedict XVI 2009: no. 28). All these activities of progress and growth as demanded by competitive human societies seek the presence of peace and justice for their actualizations. Such development demands proper management of social relations and media, so that humanities will not be destroyed by what they feel to be freely expressed as rights. Therefore, the social justice theory is advocated for always, for humanity to desire and work toward the realization of world peace as these elements or factors of developments are put in place for the respect of human rights and dignity.

There is a common belief that under modern conditions peace cannot be assured except on the basis of an equal balance of armaments and that this factor is the probable cause of this stockpiling of armaments. Thus, if one country increases its military strength, others are immediately roused by a competitive spirit to augment their own supply of armaments

through the consciousness of the *Culture of War*. And if one country is equipped with atomic weapons, others consider themselves justified in producing such weapons themselves, equal in destructive force. This has been the cause of arm race and trading in modern society (See, Musa and Avong 2020: 109). Seeking the possible and positive approaches to security of life and properties, especially at the national and international levels of human interaction, the issues of disarmament and stoppage of arm race come to the forth. One cannot talk developmental peace and its accomplished justice without security. Development and security are inseparable, and they are highly considered together to achieve the needed human and national advancement. With these factors and condition of limitation and backwardness, armament or arm race is economic and social disasters that are designed in destroying humanity. This is because. This is because; they do not guarantee human justice and peace but threats and suppressions. The call for *Culture of Peace* as development beacons upon international bodies especially UNO for intensive in enforcing the policies of disarmament and stoppage of arm race.

Environment and the Sustainability of the *Culture of Peace*

The recognition of ecological ethics for the institutionalization of the *Culture of Peace* through proper management of the environment is based on the cultural epistemic dependence of human lived experiences and history of development (See, Isanbor and Uzomah 2016: 57; 2017: 65). Such conviction owes that actions determine the modalities of human living, and that for no individual is without the existential epistemic dependence of the other persons, dependence on the values of ecological humanism and spirituality, and vis-a-vis. With such conviction we recognize that the powers of the *Culture of Peace* are always outweighing the powers of the *Culture of War*. The existential

imports of the *Culture of Peace* as a model of integral human development are hinged on the valuation of the contents of conscience. This social conviction brings us to the valuation of truth- knowing how and what things are and expressing them as they are according to the dictates of natural law principles. It is about the sincerity of purposes and interests in the midst of conflicting demands of supremacies and diplomatic subjugations as results of human corruption, greed, pride in seeking for power, fame and wealth, sometimes, to the detriment of the otherness of living, common goodness and development.

Proper development is dependence on the valued embrace of the *Culture of Peace*, through the proper consciences for the oneness of living, locally, nationally and internationally. It is on this conviction that, Pantaleon Iroegbu (2005), in his analysis on the nexus of progress and development, explicates that “development is to a more advanced or a more highly organised state, to work out the potentialities of, to elaborate, to cause to grow or advance, to evolve, build up or construct to a greater magnificence or perfection” (p. 298). In a nutshell, the strength of any State is determined by the developmental policies and their implementations toward the betterment of the individuals of that particular State. All these are based on the value the State and the individual placed on human life and its rights. The “respect for life, and above all for the dignity of the human person, is the ultimate guiding norm for any sound economic, industrial or scientific progress” (John Paul II 1990: no. 6). The existential coordination of human affairs always infers the recognition of the placement of human rights and dignity, and it is an ethical engagement for the establishment of the *Culture of Peace* in the human society (Edema and Isanbor 2018: 40). Effectively, the issues for the respect of fundamental human rights have been, negatively, lingering factors which have been affecting their promotions and protections. They also, have

brought many outlooks on the nature of the human person, if and only if it deserves these rights which have attributed to it as human person. The human persons, out of their rationality have to recognise these natural rights, and holds tenaciously to them for the advancement of the *Culture of Peace*. It is on this situation that Douglas Roche states that:

A *culture of peace* is an approach to life that seeks to transform the cultural tendencies toward war and violence into a culture where dialogue, respect, and fairness govern social relations. In this way, violence can be prevented through a more tolerant common global ethics. The *culture of peace* uses education as an essential tool in fostering attitudes supportive for non-violence, co-operation, and social justice. It promotes sustainable development for all, free human rights, and equality between men and women. It requires genuine democracy and the free flow of information. It leads to disarmament (Roche 2006, 100).

On this, for many thinkers, peace remains unreal, merely an abstraction, unless it stands for an ethno-anthropological reality. But it would remain equally unreal if we do not attend to its historical dimension (See, Igwilo 2009: 10; Isanbor 2018: 124; Isanbor and Bature 2018: 59). Until quite recently the *Culture of War* could not totally destroy the *Culture of Peace*, could not penetrate all levels of development, because the continuation of the *Culture of War* was based on the survival of the subsistent cultures which fed it with the senses of greed and selfishness in the minds of owners of consumerist multinationals. Traditional warfare depended on the continuation of people's peace. Too many historians have neglected this fact; they make history appear as a tale of wars. This is clearly true of classical historians, who tend to report on the rise and fall of the powerful. Unfortunately, it is equally true for many of the newer historians

who want to act as reporters from the camps of those who never made it, who want to tell the tales of the vanquished, to evoke the images of those who have disappeared. Too often these new historians are more interested in the violence rather than the peace of the poor.

The observance of human rights presupposes the maintenance of the *Culture of Peace*. One will understand that development is what cannot be separated from human's minds and existence. It is the essence of the human person to sustain his or her *beingness*, and with this, he or she needs the enabling situation or environment which necessarily presupposes the reign of the *Culture of Peace*. As Alfred De Soras observed that:

The effective and concerted pursuits of the universal common good demands the progressive establishment of a balanced World Government as well adapted as possible to the shifting circumstances of history; it must be made increasingly effective by the constant and patient labours of construction and administration of a world-wide institutional apparatus which respects the complexity of a truly human "organised body politic" But the establishment of such as institutional apparatus, although it is a necessary condition, is not a sufficient one. It is also necessary, on a level which is no longer institutional or legal, but spiritual, that they should be an unanimous agreement of minds as possible on the recognition of true spiritual value, and as fervent an agreement of wills as possible in the pursuit of those values (p. 61).

The reign of the *Culture of Peace* or the *Culture of War* in any nation at any time or for any reason demands that the State must inevitably face the question of how justice can be achieved here and now. But this presupposes an even more radical question:

what is justice? The problem is one of practical reason; but if reason is to be exercised properly, it must undergo constant purification, since it can never be completely free of the danger of a certain ethical blindness caused by the dazzling effects of the *Culture of War* and its special interests. With the consciousness of the *Culture of Peace* rather than the *Culture of War*, our environment becomes a common home for all rather than a theatre of fears and anxiety for common alienation and possible extinction. Indeed, the level of human rights performance serves as an important index for any model of development should help the human persons to sustain this consciousness through the valuations of common good and solidarity of integral purposes for the sustainability of the created order.

Conclusion

In all, the various perspectives of the essay consider the effects of advanced technologies and technicalities of modern warfare and their inherent economic and political values, ideologies and interests, and the longing for the embraces of the *Culture of Peace* for the sustainability of the environment. We recognized that the environment remains very unsafe for living with the intending fears and anxieties for possible escalation of “Third World War” with the presences of Nuclear Weapons and the endemic natures of their proliferations and acquisitions the hands of many powerful and war-driven nations and terrorist groups. We observed that, in peace or in war, the environment is always to the receiving end of the effects of all human actions, positively or negatively. It is on this that Paul VI (1975) comments on the nature of the humanity and its challenges, which appear impossible to avert, and he says:

But we all know that it is not just men that change on the stage of history. Things change too. This is to say, the questions on the balanced solution of which depends

men's peaceful life together in society. No one can maintain that the organization of civil society and of the international context is perfect. Many, very many problems still remain potentially open. The problems of yesterday remain; the problems of today are arising; tomorrow others will arise. And they are all awaiting a solution. This solution, we declare, cannot and must not ever again spring from selfish and violent conflicts, still less from murderous wars between men.

Therefore, it demands that we must long for the *Culture of Peace* in order to sustain the environment for human safety and wellbeing. For, through the applications of the tools of science and technology, the environment is greatly endemic, especially before, during and after wars' engineering, executions and resolutions. In most cases, such actions lead to the endangerment and possible extinctions of some living species during the climatic pollution and degradation (Cf, Isanbor and Uzomah 2016: 60; 2017: 68). Hence, we live a global village though the application of science and technology, but with the same possibility of global alienation or extinction due to the simplistic or easy efficiencies of nuclear weapons and engineering. Away from this consciousness, we should desire to save and sustain the environment globally, revaluing the courses of the otherness of living and development, and relentlessly the attainment and the sustainability of the *Culture of Peace* through the projection of the environment as our common home and heritage.

Works Cited

- Afolami, E. A. and Isanbor, P. O. (2019). Ethics, environment, and the questions of anthropological cultures and challenges. *Albertine Journal of Philosophy and Related Disciplines*, 3: 107-114.
- Ajai, W. (1995). Achieving environmental protection through the vehicle of human rights: some conceptual, legal and third world problems. *University of Benin Law Journal*, 2(1): 134-145.
- Benedict XVI (2009). *Caritas in veritate*. Social encyclical on the attainment of the authentic human development in charity in truth. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- De Soras, A. (1963). *International morality*. New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Edema, P. A. and Isanbor, P. O. (2018). Philosophical conception of man: its contemporary African analysis. In M. A. Izibili, P. O. Isanbor and S. U. Attoh (eds.). *Studies in philosophy and society*. Vol. 1. (pp. 39-65). Kagoma: Albertine Institute.
- Ekiugbo, E. U. and Isanbor, P. O. (2013). Peace education and its place in human sociological development. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, 4(1): 100-107.
- Ifeakor, C. S. and Eze, R. C. (2019). Choosing between environmental conservation and development: an African perspective. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development*, 2(8): 11-24.
- Igwilo, M. (2009). Environmental ethics: human condition and the search for sustainable development in Africa. *Enwisdomization Journal*, 4: 1-15.
- Iroegbu, P. (2005). "Ethics of progress and development" In P. Iroegbu and A. Echekwube (eds). *Kpim of morality: ethics*, (pp. 289-303). Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

- Isanbor, P. O. (2018). Morality against environmental degradation: a review for sustainable development. *Scientia: Plasu Journal of General Studies*, 1(1): 119-126.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Bature, A. I. (2018). Morality, integral ecology and development in Francis' laudato si: a review. *Philectics: Benin Journal of Philosophy*, 1(2): 56-63.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Uzomah, M. M. (2016). Douglas Roche on cultures of war and Peace: the global ethics for human rights, social order and development. *EPHA: Ekpoma Journal of Religious Studies*, 11(1&2): 76-104.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Uzomah, M. M. (2017). Natural law philosophy and the quest for social order, justice and development. *Akungba Journal of Religion and African Culture*, 5(2): 62-72.
- John Paul II (1990). *Message for world day of peace*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Musa, C. M. and Avong, J. K. (2020). Environmental education: an exigency for climate change mitigation and adaptation. *Gidan-Waya Journal of Education*, 2(1): 101-114.
- Nwasi, J. (2008). An appraisal of the environmental impact assessment as a device for sustainable development in Nigeria. *Igbinedion University Law Journal*, 6: 193-214.
- Olajide, W. (2018). "Peace as conflict: the eternal catalyst and elixir of human existence." *The Guardian*, Monday, March 5, 2018.
- Omojola, M. (2011). The imperative for continued transmission of necessary values for a stable society in Nigeria: analysis of Matthew 28:20a. *Enwisdomization Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-12.
- Oredipe, P. (2005). Integral humanism: an ethical challenge on faith and reason. In Iroegbu P. and Echekwube, A. (eds.). *Kpim of morality: ethics*. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

- Paul VI (1975). *Message for world day of peace*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Prete Del, V. (2011). "The new era of humanity." In Pontifical Mission Union. *Studies for the Mission*. 2011 Edition.
- Reidlmayer, A. J. (2007). Crimes of war, crimes of peace: destruction of libraries during and after the Balkan wars of the 1990s. *Library Trends*, 56(1): 107-132.
- Roche, D. (2006). *The human right to peace*. Mumbai: Better Yourself Books.
- Savage, A. (2006). *Ecological Philosophy and Christian Theology*, UK: Trafford Publication.