

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Globalisation and Pattern of Violence: Why Many Parts of the World Boil Simultaneously

Dr. Daniel Serki Ortserga

Associate Professor of geography in the Department of Geography,
Benue State University, Nigeria

Dr. Sylvester Tarungwa Iorliam

Associate Professor, Department of Urban and Regional Planning,
Benue state university, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper analysed the link between globalization and the current pattern of violence in the world. It set out with the aim to show that the upward trend in violent conflicts is caused and facilitated by the global system of flows and cooperation. Information was obtained from secondary sources and analysed with the use of tables. The results showed that between 2012 and 2017, 25 major violent conflicts perpetrated by groups happened around the world; most of these conflicts were internal. Overall, 15 of the group conflicts occurred in Asia, 9 in Africa and 1 in South America. Within the same period, 5 deadly incidents of criminal violence committed by individuals occurred in Western Europe and North America. Political and religious reasons accounted for group violent conflicts. Violence perpetrated by individuals was motivated by sheer criminality, especially in Western Europe and North America. Losses from the conflicts were huge as group violence led to 565,485 deaths and displacement of 15,547,000 people; while criminal violence killed 272 people. The deaths and displacement are traceable to globalization which elevates local crisis to global involvement. The paper recommends observance of rights of individuals and groups, respect for sovereign rights of countries and liberalization of rights to nuclear arms capability to reintroduce the tested principle of balance of power in world geopolitics in order to stem the tide of violence around the world.

Keywords: Globalization, unrestrained flows, violence, power balance, peace

1. Introduction

The contemporary world is literally boiling as violence has become a standard custom in many societies and a visible trait in individual human beings. Desire for peace is fast declining and propensity toward anarchy has invaded the human mind in many places. Under the destructive ideology of avenging perceived grievances, or imposing parochial individual or group agenda through violence, human life has lost its sacredness in the eyes of the 'aggrieved.' Thus every little inter-personal misunderstanding is important enough to spill human blood for, and every dispute with government justifies subversion of a whole nation and entire human civilization. In this way, every region of the world is bedeviled by one form of violence or another such as insurgency, terrorism, civil wars, ritual killings, kidnapping, rape, human trafficking and violent economic sabotage in form of blowing up critical infrastructures.

The present human-induced widespread collapse of peace has no equal in known history. It cannot be compared with even the situation during the First and Second World Wars in terms of geographic spread, sustained anguish and pressure inflicted on people and economy. From many simultaneous wars and uncountable battles, war fronts and battle lines are too numerous and too extensive to define and attempt successful mediation. Obviously, United Nations Organization appears to be overwhelmed and frustrated by the situation due to its inability to speak with one voice on many issues, especially within its Security Council as the 'super members' of the organization readily globalize bilateral disagreement between them, or with any country, to become world bothers. Their divergent interests clash directly or indirectly with local interests or on local territories, thereby sustaining international and local conflicts. The situation in Syria, Iraq, Libya and Ukraine exemplify these scenarios. The same self interests sometimes make the 'leading nations' dictating the pace and contents of globalization to side with one party to sustain existing conflicts. The Afghan and Syrian conflicts are examples of this conflict-sustaining factional support.

This state of near-anarchy in the contemporary world could be traced to globalization which facilitates diffusion of extremist ideologies, weapons of mass destruction, evil strategies, and worldwide recruitment of fighters, fund mobilization and networking. According to Fondo (2006), globalization is the process of growing interrelationships and interdependence among countries of the world through increasing volumes of cross-border flow of goods and services, flow of capital; and diffusion of technology. Implicit in this notion are the benefits of such flows as they take capital, services, goods and technology, which ordinarily would have been beyond reach, to the door steps of people living in any part of the world. But equally implicit in the notion are problems of rapid dissemination of radical ideas, technology of

mass destruction such as bombs, capital to fund extremist activities and easy networking of people planning subversive activities.

Generally, the weakening of restrictions at international boundaries makes movement of people (including those with dubious intentions) and weapons of mass destruction easy. Through unified culture, ideas that could be products of personal idiosyncrasies with no universal value are quickly promoted to a world standard and allowed to contest with cultural values of local societies. This generates violent conflicts between advocates and those resisting. Put differently, most current violent conflicts may actually be outcomes of collision between international ideologues, who may be small but vocal minority, and local resistant groups. This paper set out to establish the link between violence and globalization in our contemporary world. The aim is to show the spatial pervasiveness of violence in the contemporary world and suggest a measure that can curb the phenomenon.

1.1. Theoretical Perspective on Globalization and Violence

Violence is the highest level of conflict which parties in dispute employ to enforce their opposing interests. Conflict itself is defined as 'a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aim of parties is to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals' (Coser, cited in Odoh and Chilaka, 2012). Such scarce and highly valued things over which competing claims usually result to violent conflict are things that confer wealth, prestige and power on those who possess or control them. Since these things are deeply desired by individuals as well as societies, there is always competition over them; and therefore conflicts result, most of them are usually violent.

One important thing to note about conflicts is that, they are one of the two main types of interaction among all living things, the other being consensus (Ukaegbu and Agunwamba, 1995). The inevitability of interaction is ordained by the geography of resources (physical and ideational) which prevents all the things we need from occurring in one place and even in one person. Therefore variation of environmental resources, talents, ideas and opportunities in space creates the basic context for interaction. The process of interaction reduces the natural inaccessibility of things imposed by areal differentiation of the earth surface. The process cannot be avoided by not just human beings but all animate things; and yet in the course of it, there is bound to be clash of interests that often results to violence. What this means is that a system which facilitates interaction also facilitates conflicts and possibly, violence. As of yet no process is known to facilitate interaction, especially boundless interaction, as efficiently as globalization.

In a crowded world characterized by highly fluctuating resource availabilities in which man lives today, the commonest form of conflicts to expect are resource-based conflicts. In such a world, goals and ambitions are easily set at cross purposes. Goal to control resources, economies, politics and values of other people; ambition of some individuals to perpetually remain in leadership in a nation and ambition of some nations to dominate the world more often than not clash with each other or with local interests and generate conflicts. Goals of this nature are at present generously watered by globalization through subtle international conventions and protocols that are largely scripted by globalizing nations and operated by world institutions which are controlled by the same nations. Within individual nations, lopsided justice systems and flagrant disregard for equity give effect to selfish goals and ambitions of individuals, families and groups, thereby placing them in positions of permanent control of scarce resources, power and status. These individuals, families and groups serve as local agents of world system. The rest of the people who are pushed to the periphery resent their position in every way possible, including insurgency.

Explanation of the nexus between violence and global culture is not only possible by specific case descriptions, but can be achieved through systematic models. Whether one attempts to explain current violence across the world by environment-based theory or by political ecology theory, globalization remains clearly implicated in the matter. Moritz' (2012) environmental security theory explains resource related conflicts, common in many parts of the world, by sustained damage inflicted on the world's environmental resource base by human action. The theory holds that the degradation of environmental conditions has been accelerated through human action which brings about deforestation, soil erosion and pollution. This has created instability and unpredictability in virtually all aspects of the environment, making it difficult to control. Owing to this abuse, resource availabilities dwindle, creating undue competition between groups that directly depend on natural resources of land. The fragility of the environment has been accentuated by climate change which makes onset of rainfall, duration and cessation of rainfall highly variable and unpredictable, causing incessant flooding and drought around the world. Climate change is directly linked to global warming which is man-made through the same action of over exploiting the environment for global consumption.

Two attributes of the global system mount increasing undue pressure on the environment. The first attribute is conversion of world resource base into a global common and the other is the ever rising level of resource consumption. Since mercantilist period (15th-18th centuries), no single portion of the environment is exploited for local consumption alone, but for world consumption. Beginning from 15th century to date, for example, labour from West Africa was harnessed to produce sugar, banana and cotton on American plantations; and gold, silver from American mines for consumption in Europe and Asia. From 1900 onward, Nigerian soils were harnessed to produce cocoa, palm oil, rubber, beniseed, cotton and groundnut; timber, tin and petroleum for consumption of population in foreign lands. Similarly, Zambian copper, Angolan oil, Thailand tin, Brazilian and Australian gold and diamond in Botswana have all been mined essentially for foreign consumption. In the same way, the paddy fields in Thailand are used to produce rice for export to other countries just like wheat fields in the American prairies and dairy production on the pampas of Argentina. Whether exploited for local consumption or not, such removals stress the local environment, and in some cases damage it irretrievably as oil mining has done in the Nigerian Niger Delta region and uranium mining has done in northern Mali. Both places experience violence as a form of resistance to global use of resources of the local environment.

The world today is inhabited by insatiable, comfort loving man who consumes everything in large quantities. High level of consumption has become a revered virtue, a sign of modernity and wellbeing, and it is used as one of the indices of human development upon which nations are respected and rated. However, though rate of consumption keeps expanding, the resource environment is ordinarily inelastic, and the extraordinary measures that are possible for intensifying its use are not altogether safely sustainable. This means modern man is 'over-feeding' from a resource base that possesses a finite carrying capacity which can be upset. It must be noted that abuse and over exploitation of environmental resources has been globalised; and therefore nobody should think that consequences of failed environments will be a sole headache for the poor regions where the failure occurs. The negative impact will be globalised too as it is well demonstrated by the ongoing uncontrollable migration into Europe and North America from Africa, Asia and Latin American countries which started peaking since 2011.

Another model which explains unrest in the world is political ecology which posits that conflicts are product of policy failures and non-functionality of social and economic institutions in an area. The theory explains that policies regarding land use, import and export components of economy, natives' and immigrants' rights of access to resources, indigeneship and state security encourage and discourage conflicts when they are inappropriate and appropriate respectively (Moritz, 2012). A malfunctioning political ecology permits lopsided political power possession in which one group enjoys concentration of power at the expense of another, thereby providing a fundamental basis for conflict which can be ignited at the slightest provocation (Blench and Dendo, 2003).

Until colonial phase of globalization emerged, political ecology in most African societies guaranteed symbiotic relationship among different segments of societies. Even leaders were not wholly parasitic and never created socially irresponsible property classes in societies. In order to establish structures for indirect rule and extend cultural influence, colonial powers created political power imbalance, or encouraged and sustained existing imbalance between ethnic groups in colonies. In most cases, they favoured and equipped groups that either did not stubbornly resist colonial occupation, or that had traditional administrative structures they considered appropriate for indirect rule. Such groups received all the favours especially if, in addition to the qualifications mentioned, they produced important export commodities. Hausa and Yoruba groups on one hand and most other groups on the other hand in Nigeria illustrate this asymmetric placement in Nigeria's political ecology.

Lopsided political power concentration at world level is even more glaring. After about seven centuries of manipulation, machination, persuasion and outright coercion that started with mercantilism in the 15th century, political power with its associated economic power have come to be concentrated in the 'cultural north' of the world (Morris, 2010). It is this region of power surplus that today defines human values, human rights, morality, legality, sex orientation, food preference, membership of nuclear power community, nuclear proliferation, poverty, development and any other concept and phenomenon that is there to define. Most conflicts around the world are reactions to this extreme asymmetry in the current political ecology of the world.

1.2. Materials and Methods

Data for this article were obtained largely from secondary information sources viz –internet and international Television Channels (Aljazeera Television and CCTV), none governmental organizations NGOs, World Health Organization WHO, Centre for Preventive Action- Council on Foreign Relations, and published works.

2. Findings and Discussion

2.1. Potentials for Violent Conflicts

At the peak of the Cold War, it looked as if it was the major cause of conflict around the world. Sometimes it even appeared as if it would turn into open 'hot war' as World War III. One remembers the Bay of Pigs crisis in 1969 in Cuba when USSR moved missiles for installation on the Caribbean Islands and USA went all out to resist the move. One recalls too, the military drills by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the block ally of USA, and by the Warsaw Pact, the block ally of USSR; and the activities of USA Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the Soviet Secret Service (the KGB) around the world, all intended to intimidate and out-manoeuvre each other during Cold War period. It was the race for supremacy between USA and USSR that was blamed for absence of peace in the world. It was thought that the end of the cold war would usher in enduring peace in the world. Today the world has no such war and it is witnessing greater insecurity, all manner of wars that humanity has not known before are raging. Symmetrical wars that are characterized by pitched battles mixed with asymmetrical wars in which the enemy mingles with innocent civilians and undertakes suicide bombings of both soft and hard targets, causing immeasurable destruction go on daily.

However one of the basic forces fuelling violence today is loss of values, canvassed through globalization. The other force is the ease with which equipment needed to unleash violence can be obtained. The third facilitator is the craze for adventure. But most importantly, the current violence around the world represents resentment towards the onslaught of globalization on local diversities. Each of these factors exists in today's world in abundance to fuel violent conflicts.

For the first time in the history of man tradition and customs no longer matter; so also are beliefs in the supreme being. Men and women have 'truly been liberated' from the restricting effect of traditions, customs and religion to think and do whatever they want. What this liberation means in practice is that there is no longer communal protocol of action to check the excesses of individuals in respective societies. Under this context, private instincts are allowed to spill over and affect social life of other people. Thus people kill other human beings for game, rape others for recreation, kidnap and traffic human beings for money, and use human body parts for rituals. These activities originate from thoroughly deviant

minds and quickly diffuse through global network of audiovisual communication far afield from their point of origin; and are received by a highly acquiescent people, themselves moulded by globalization, who accepts anything that is new and strange. The terror wars in Iraq and Syria were fuelled by relentless supply of young recruits from Western Europe who have nothing to do with Islamic faith, but were bored with the 'super-decent life' in home countries. They undertook adventure to go and fight for the Islamic State.

Another motive force for violence is the prospect to make money. Manufacturers of all kinds of goods hope to get expanded market to sell their wares. In this connection, those who manufacture weapons instigate and finance violence hope to create market for their weapons. In some cases, they encourage conflicts to create opportunity to appropriate raw materials from certain regions. In July, 2015, for example, Global Witness (an NGO) reported that some European logging companies had been paying rebel groups in Central African Republic as much as three million US dollars to protect their logging sites and facilitate passage at checkpoints (CCTV News, 17/7/2015). The rebel groups use this revenue to fund their fighting. Militia groups all over the world continue to acquire sophisticated weapons, sometimes more sophisticated than those of national armies, from manufacturing companies through illegal shipments. Violence therefore has every potential to thrive in a globalised world system.

2.2. Interpersonal Violence

While group violence rages on around the world, violence between individual citizens has become widespread and is almost assuming standard trait in many societies around the world. World Health Organization (WHO) (2002) report estimated that about 1.6 million people lost their lives in 2000 alone from interpersonal violence as shown in Table 1.

Type of Violence	Estimated No of Victims
Suicides	800,000
Homicides	533,333
Armed conflicts	320,000
Total	1,653,333

Table 1: Interpersonal and Group Violence That Occurred in the Year 2000 And Their Toll on Human Lives

Source: WHO (2000)

It may be wrongly assumed that terrorism by Muslim fundamentalists which is group violence is at present the most threatening form of violence. But records show that violence founded on other ideologies claims more lives and disrupts social life more than Islam based terrorist activities. Apart from records in Table 4, the 2005 National Crime Victimization Survey reported 191,670 victims of rape, attempted rape or sexual assaults in US alone. The 2014 Global Terrorism Index revealed that terrorist violence perpetrated by racists, antigovernment and other extremists have killed almost double the number of people killed by jihadist violence since the incident of September 11, 2001. What this means is that every form of violence is on the rise world over because globalization has promoted conflict through globalised system of communication, and has facilitated violence through unified system of transport that makes easy cross border movement of people and weapons all over the world.

2.3. Conversion of Local Crises to Global Conflicts

The world today is not only globalizing local resources such as minerals, crops, timber, livestock, capital and labour, but it is also globalizing local conflicts around the world. In the past global conflicts such as Napoleonic Wars, World Wars I and II were fought because of ideological disputes in Europe between revolutionary groups and conservative monarchies and desire of European nations to build empires. The Napoleonic wars which came in the wake of French Revolution started as a venture to preserve the revolution. According to Isser (2009), the ideological difference between the 'revolutionary France' of the time and 'monarchical Europe' sparked off the wars. In the course of time however, this driving principle was replaced by Napoleon's personal ambition to create an empire and rule as an emperor. World I was fought to check the threat posed by the emerging power of Germany and World War II was essentially waged to complete the unfinished task of checkmating Germany and any other nation would unilaterally seek dominance on the world stage (Ziemke, 2009). The wars shook the entire continental Europe and caused vibrations throughout the world. However, as Rubenstein (1999) maintained, after World War II, especially since the emergence of the bipolar ideological structure of the world which precipitated the world into a Cold War that lasted up to 1991, the super powers of United States of America (USA) and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) interfered in internal affairs of other nations with impunity, basing their actions essentially on the principle that 'my enemy's enemy is my friend' and deserve to be supported in a conflict involving 'my enemy'.

The two super powers which headed the capitalist and socialist blocks each were so powerful in comparison to other nations that they did not need any alliance to tilt the balance of power between them as was the case before World War II. Rubenstein (1999) observed that, the super powers practically changed the purpose of alliance from tilting power balance to establishing 'power satellite' which could be used as regional military bases from which attacks could be launched and for support at international forums such as UN General Assembly and Security Council. For these reasons, each super power competed for alliance with other countries, especially nations located within its geographic sphere. USA went into military cooperation with western European countries of France, Britain, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Greece,

Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and Spain to form North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). USSR on the other hand formed Warsaw Pact beginning 1955 with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland and Romania. Apart from direct members of military cooperation, the super powers wooed other nations into bilateral and multilateral relationships, sometimes enforcing such relationships militarily.

In this way, the world bipolar ideological structure created a convenient framework for globalization of local conflicts. For example, fighting the Soviets by proxy, USA sided with her enemy's enemy, supplying arms and equipment to the Mujahedeen until the Soviets withdrew troops from Afghanistan in 1989 (Rubenstein, 1999). A conflict that started as a local disagreement became internationalized and situated within the bipolar global system of conflict. It is even alleged that Osama bin Laden, the founder and leader of al-Qaida network, served in the Afghan war as USA Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) agent, spying against Soviet troops for USA. That he later became the most notorious and most wanted terrorist in the world in the eyes of USA, after his organization attacked World Trade Centre in New York in September, 2001, shows the extent to which local events can indeed be globalised with far reaching consequences in space and time on even the architects of globalization.

2.4. World Patterns of Violence

Violence occurs in several parts of the world but definite world patterns can be discerned. Generally, the main epicenters of violence in the world at present are in Asia, Africa and South America which all fall in the world 'cultural South' which has been defined by Morris (2010) as areas of non permanent European settlement. While not all countries in the regions are aflame, studies by Centre for Preventive Action-Council on Foreign Relations (2017) and Guehenno (2017) show that the major axis of violence covers countries of the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America as shown in Table 2

Serial No.	Continent	Country	Spatial Dimension	Nature of Violence
1.	Asia	Afghanistan*	Intra-national	Religious/political
2.	Asia	Syria*	Intra-national	Civil war
3.	Asia	China & others	International	Political
4.	Asia	China	Intra-national	Uighur conflict
5.	Asia	North Korea	International	Political
6.	Asia	Iraq*	Intra-national	Religious/political
7.	Asia	Pakistan	Intra-national	Religious
8.	Asia	Lebanon	Intra-national	Religious/political
9.	Asia	Ukraine*	Intra-national	Political
10.	Asia	Israeli-Palestinian	International	Political
11.	Asia	Yemen*	Intra-national	Political
12.	Asia	India-Pakistan	International	Political
13.	Asia	Nagorna-Karabakh	Intra-national	Political
14.	Asia	Myanmar*	Intra-national	Religious
15.	Asia	Russia	Intra-national	Islamic militancy
16.	Africa	Libya	Intra-national	Political
17.	Africa	Egypt	Intra-national	Religious
18.	Africa	Somalia*	Intra-national	Religious
19.	Africa	Nigeria*	Intra-national	Religious
20.	Africa	Mali	Intra-national	Political
21.	Africa	Central African Rep.	Intra-national	Political
22.	Africa	Burundi	Intra-national	Political
23.	Africa	Congo- DRC*	Intra-national	Political
24.	Africa	South Sudan*	Intra-national	Political
25.	S. America	Mexico*	Intra-national	Criminal violence

Table 2: Areas of Current Violence around the World

Source: Adapted From Centre for Preventive Action- Council on Foreign Relations (2017)

*Countries Who's Conflicts Are to Be Watched Due To Tendency to Escalate, According To Marie Guehenno (2017)

The nature of violence in the affected countries is that it is predominantly intra-national. In the Middle East, for example, Syria is almost grounded by internal war; in south Asia, violence in Afghanistan is ordinarily an internal affair between government and the Talibans fighting to overthrow the government. War in Somalia between Al-Shababs and government, war in South Sudan between rebels and government and war in Sudan's Darfur Region are all intra-national hostilities. In Mali, Tuaregs make desperate effort to overthrow the central government or secede. The insurgency in Nigeria's northeast by Boko Haram is not an international war, even though from time to time it overflows into neighbouring countries of Niger, Chad and Cameroon. Although violence and crimes that erupt in these countries have divergent causes, their roots could be traced to the negative outcomes of globalization.

In both Asia and Africa, fighting is caused mainly by perceived asymmetrical political ecology seen to manifest in unequal access to national resources. It however gets motive force from the ideology of religion which is severally referred to as Islamic fundamentalism, fanaticism whose spread is facilitated by the process of globalization.

In some cases discontent is expressed by criminal violence. Commotions in South America are drug related and therefore wear the outlook of economic and social disarticulations. Underneath however, violent crimes in Latin America are an 'ingenious' way of establishing a foothold in the world market that is dominated rightly or otherwise by developed nations. The method may be unethical, but it finds rationale in the philosophy that 'the end justifies the means' and that 'you use what you have to get what you do not have' in a globalised world. Admittedly, use of drugs and drug trade indicate collapse of social values in human society, considering its negative impact on human health and economy. The activities are however a revolt against sustained lack of equity in resource distribution both at local and world levels. By these activities, a section of the world is saying that the West cannot always define morality, legality and legitimacy for the rest of the world.

The 2016 Global Peace Index produced by Institute for Economics and Peace which based its assessment on 23 indicators of worsening peace which included violent crimes, level of militarization and imports of weapons listed Syria, Iraq, Nigeria, Afghanistan and Pakistan as the five countries where terrorist incidents were concentrated. The Peace Index assessed Europe as the most peaceful region in the world. The Middle East and Africa were ranked as the least peaceful regions of the world.

2.5. Violence in the Western World

Table 2 and the Global Peace ranking should not create any impression that the West (Europe, North America and the Antipodes) are free from current violence. Admittedly they are at present not engulfed by sectarian violence, but criminal violence is rife in all their major cities, depicting increasing dissolution of social adhesives that tie society together in relative peace. Table 3 shows criminal violence in the West.

Country	Nature of Violence	Year	Casualty Rate	Motive
Norway	Gun shooting at picnic scene	2012	92 killed	Anger over cultural permissiveness
France	Bombing of a night club in Paris	2015	129 killed	Religious motive
France	Gun attack on Jewish shopping centre, Paris	2015		Anti-Semitism
USA	Gun shooting in a church	2016	9 killed	To instigate racial war
Canada	Gun shooting at a Night Club	2017	42 killed	No motive; gunman killed self

Table 3: Incidence of Criminal Violence in the Western World between 2012 and 2015

Source: Aljazeera Television News, 9th June, 2015; 18th June, 2015;

23rd October, 2015 & October, 2017

Mass shooting in Norway, bombing in Paris, attack on Jewish shopping centre, gun shooting in USA and Canada were all variants of looming violence which come in the wake of intense globalization. Apart from the Paris attacks which bore religious connotation, the Norwegian picnic and USA church shootings were motivated by anti-globalization feelings. The gun man in Norway was quoted to be angry with extreme cultural permissiveness of the Norwegian society which allowed undue foreign cultural influences in the country. In other words, the gunman was protesting against globalization of way of life, and enforcing in his own way cultural distinctiveness in his society. The 21-year-old gun man in USA said he wanted to instigate a racial war which again points toward resentment against cultural unification which globalization promotes. Such feelings are pervasive in space and perverse in people as globalization deepens across the world.

2.6. Cost of Violence

Whatever causes violence and whatever nature it takes, violence leaves in its track huge human and environmental costs to be borne not only by parties involved but by even distant people. Each of the violence listed in Table 2 has inflicted huge cost on the nation of its occurrence in terms of loss of human lives, forced relocation, family separation and property destruction. Places far removed from theatres of violence also pay for it by accommodating large number of refugees and asylum seekers who stress existing resource environment and may introduce aberration in the social system. Table 4 depicts some of the costs imposed by violence.

Conflict	Country	No. of Deaths	No. Displaced
Taliban conflict	Afghanistan	29,918	
Syrian civil war	Syria	470,000	5,137,000
ISIL insurgency	Iraq		5,400,000 since 2014
Islamic militancy	Pakistan	4,000 since June, 2016	
Book Haram	Nigeria	51,567 since May, 2011	1,900,000 since May, 2011
Houthi rebellion	Yemen	10,000	3,110,000

Table 4: Inevitable Consequences of Violence around the World

Source: Centre for Preventive Action- Council on Foreign Relations (2017)

United Nations (UN) report showed that globally, about 65 million people were displaced by group conflicts in 2015. The conflicts triggered off forced migration of people from conflict zones who moved to Europe, resulting to refugee crisis in the European Union. US Council for Foreign Relations (2017) has reported 1.2 million asylum seekers in 2016 alone who applied to be allowed to stay in Europe.

2.7. Lessons from Contemporary Violence

If people in developing nations procreate beyond their resources, fail to develop and manage their resources efficiently, generate violent conflicts through bad governance or fail in all of these, do developed countries owe them any moral responsibility to allow them move in numbers to their nations? Responses to this question may vary depending on whether they come from developing nations or developed nations. Migrants, especially illegal migrants are unsolicited products of distant systems just like global warming is. Like global warming which is mainly caused by major industrial nations but its effect is suffered by all nations, any maladministration that generates conflict in any part of the world; or any instigation that fuels conflict in any part of the world for selfish economic gain, need to be condemned because the fallout from such conflicts ultimately becomes the burden of the world as a whole. This is especially the case under the present phase of globalization which provides easy and adequate information about 'greener pastures' and safe territory abroad and facilitates movement across international borders through improved transport systems and permissive protocol on movement of people.

The ongoing migration into Europe from the Middle East and Africa sufficiently demonstrates the contagious nature of the effects of violence in any part of the world. It also illustrates the typical response of developed countries as receiving areas. Despite vocal pretensions about fundamental human rights which recognize the right of every human being to basic humanitarian treatment, developed countries do not readily welcome migrants. Whether they welcome refugees from violence zones or not, desperate people will continue to undertake 'suicide journeys' to their territories, seeking for asylum and economic opportunities to survive. The best approach to the looming phenomenon is to take measures that reduce incidence of violence around the world. One sure way of doing this is for globalization to respect and preserve local diversities. Such measures to be taken are not mere claim to western style democracy; if they were USA would have been the most peaceful country on earth. Nations consciously try to take advantage of other nations through resource appropriation. Within even the most democratic nation, individual citizens replicate this relationship on fellow citizens who resist individually by street crimes, or in groups by organized group violence. Violence will reduce around the world when globalization is not used as an instrument to take away people's resources and sovereignty and at local level when globalization does not trample on local sensibilities, thereby depriving nations, communities and individuals to the point of destitution. Religion is only used as a means for mobilization of forces to fight resource cause. For all violence are ultimately struggles over scarce resources and/or statuses.

Marie Guehenno (2017) has suggested 'more cooperative management of world affairs' as a way of curbing violence around the world. However, such cooperation is not possible in a world of asymmetric political ecology in which some nations wield enormous economic and military power and show tendency to bully weak countries to do their biddings. A more likely solution to consider is the historically tested principle of balance of power among nations of the world in international relations. The theory of balance of power posits that the power of a state or an alliance is best checked by the equivalent power of other states; the existence of other states with similar capabilities prevents reckless show deployment of power resources among states when it is realized that there is effective counter force to face.

According to Howard (2009), balance of power was used among warring states in China in 403-221 BC and in Greece during the Peloponnesian War in 431-404 BC. The Austrian statesman Klemens von Metternich organized it in Europe in 1815 after the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte. Greater peace was in the world in the 1970s and 1980s when US and USSR matched equivalent arsenals. When USSR and her Warsaw Pact collapsed in 1991 the balance tilted in favour of US. She could invade sovereign states and cause regime change in Iraq and Afghanistan unchallenged. The current violence raging in Afghanistan is sustained by the feeling that there is an 'army of occupation' to resist. The same action of US gave rise to commotion in Iraq and indirectly caused endless instability in Libya.

UN should canvass balance of power among nations to reduce extreme power imbalance in the world. This can be done by removing threat of sanctions against countries that are trying to develop nuclear arsenals. North Korea and Iran should be allowed to pursue their nuclear weapon development programmes; and any other country wishing to join the race should do so. In the alternative, all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the armouries of nations should be discarded. This is the way to world peace.

3. Conclusion

Peace is rapidly eluding the world in the wake of intensified globalization process which facilitates dissemination of ideas and technologies to sustain violence. So far, attempts to curb violence with greater force seem not to be successful in many cases. The Taliban are still able to unleash havoc in Afghanistan after years of efforts by US and NATO to crush the group and restore peace in that country. It took unexpected long time and cost to decimate Islamic State in Iraq and Syria in spite of US led coalition against them. Boko Haram insurgents, thought to be made up of local militia still show resilience after years of Nigerian military campaign to oust them. Globalization facilitates access of groups to weapons and intelligence to wage war in reaction to perceived injustice that is implicit in the attempt to impose the western world view on other societies. This is the essence of the present phase of globalization.

The dominant powers that also drive the global system must come to terms with the reality that it is not superior weapons that will stop violence but justice. Countries which currently dictate the content and pace of globalization should

not only attempt to unify resource fields and markets into global commons, but should also globalize the right of other nations to aspire to heights they have attained: the right to choose style of government and the right to own nuclear weapons. The only sustainable way to reduce potentials for violence around the world is to transparently uphold the rights of individuals and groups, and sovereign rights of nations. Another way to reduce tension around the world is through possession of nuclear weapons by many nations which US and her Western allies refer to as 'proliferation of nuclear weapons.' This will create 'balance of power' and will ensure mutual check among nations for sustainable peace in the world.

4. References

- i. Ajazela Television News, 9th June, 2015; 18th June, 2015; 23rd October, 2015 & October, 2017
- ii. Blench, R. & Dendo, M. (2003) The transformation of conflict between pastoralists and cultivators in Nigeria. Paper in press for a special issue of the Journal Africa.
- iii. CCTV News, 17th July, 2017. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker> Accessed 17/10/2017
- iv. Fondo, S. (2006) Globalization and rural development in Africa: the case of the Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline. Working Paper. University of Warwick. Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization, Coventry.
- v. Guehenno, M. (2017) The 10 conflicts to watch in 2017. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/05/10-conflicts-to-watch-in-2017/>
- vi. Howard, P. (2009) Balance of Power. Microsoft Encarta ® 2009 (DVD)
- vii. Institute for Economics and Peace (2017): 2016 Global Peace Index. <https://www.dw.com/en/global-peace-deteriorating-as-world-violence-hits-new-all-time-high/a-19313212>
- viii. Isser, W. (2009) Napoleonic Wars. Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009 (DVD).
- ix. Morris, I. (2010) Why the West Rules – for Now. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- x. Moritz, M. (2012) Farmer-herder conflicts in Sub-Sahara Africa. In the Encyclopedia of Earth. <http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/15273ncidence4/>
- xi. National Crime Victimization Survey (2005) Report; <http://www.who.int/violence-injury-prevention>. Accessed on 18/10/2017.
- xii. Odoh, S.I. & Chilaka, F.C. (2012) Climate change and conflict in Nigeria: a theoretical and empirical examination of the worsening incidence of conflict between Fulani herders and farmers in Northern Nigeria. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)* Vol. 2, No. 1; Aug. 2012; pp 110-124.
- xiii. Rubenstein, J.M. (1999) *The Cultural Landscape: An Introduction to Human Geography*, 6th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- xiv. Ukaegbu, C.C. & Agunwaba, N.C. (1995) Conflict and consensus in rural development: the neglected dimension. In Eboh, E.C., Okoye, C.U. & Okohe, D. (eds): *Rural Development in Nigeria: Concepts, processes and prospects*. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Co. Ltd.
- xv. World Health Organization (2002) *World Report on Violence and Health*. http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention. Accessed on 18/10/2017.
- xvi. Ziemke, E.F. (2009) World War II. Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009 (DVD).