

RELIGIOUS TERRORISM IN NIGERIA AND ITS THREAT TO NATIONHOOD

Cyril Udebunu PhD
Department of Philosophy
Pope John Paul II Seminary, Okpuno

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to examine the threat posed by religious radicalism—particularly forms associated with extremist interpretations of Islam—to global culture and civilization, and to propose pathways for addressing this challenge. Using the analytical method, the study investigates the ideological foundations of religious fanaticism and its impact on democratic institutions, cultural heritage, and modern secular values. The scope of the study includes conceptual analyses of religion, culture, and civilization; historical instances of religious fanaticism in Christianity, such as the Spanish Inquisition and the persecution of early scientists; as well as an examination of contemporary forms of Islamic extremism within a global context. It also considers the destruction of educational institutions and cultural heritage in regions such as Syria, Iraq, Nigeria, and Afghanistan, alongside a critical evaluation of responses ranging from military coalitions to cultural and ideological countermeasures. The analysis indicates that while religious fanaticism is not confined to any single tradition, extremist movements can pose serious challenges to universal values such as reason, scientific inquiry, individual freedom, and secular governance. In some cases, these movements have contributed to the destruction of cultural memory and historical identity through attacks on monuments, manuscripts, and educational systems. The paper concludes that the international community must respond with coordinated and principled efforts to safeguard cultural heritage, democratic institutions, and human freedom. Such responses should avoid both uncritical generalizations about entire religious traditions and the escalation of reciprocal extremism, while promoting dialogue, education, and inclusive governance as long-term strategies for stability.

Keywords: Nigeria, religious terrorism, nation, and threat.

1. Introduction

In December 2009 came an international outcry over a Nigerian teen Umar Farouk Abdullallah, who was co-opted by Al Qaeda to blow the American en route to Detroit but was fortunately stopped aboard the airline in Holland. The American reaction was swift: the immediate listing of Nigeria among the 14 terrorist nations alongside Somalia, Afghanistan, etc. The implications were severe both at the individual and national levels: On the national level, was the reduction of the volume of economic transactions by the US with Nigeria, the lost of reputation on the international scene and possible scaring away of prospective investors especially as the bad economy still struggled to stabilize. On the individual level was the worsened manner the citizens started to be perceived outside Nigeria and profiled as constituting high security risk. Consequently, began to exist the unusual and embarrassing checks at airports, problems entering US due to increased security measures and difficulty seeking and getting job which in turn affected remittance. In the face of such tragedy, Nigerians inundated every communication media (esp. Newspapers and Internets) with reasons why Nigeria should be deleted from the terror list as not deserving such a treatment, since the whole nation should not be demonized on account of one young man, and particularly since such incident had never been connected with the nation's past history.

Some of the writers went as far as pointing out many other nations whose citizens have carried out terrorist acts against US or other countries of the world without being labeled terrorist states: France whose citizen attempted on December 12, 2001 to bomb the American Airline Flight #63 from Charles De Gaulle International Airport in Paris through shoes that wereaced with explosives; United Kingdom whose citizens, Ahmed Atdullah, Assad Sarwar, Tanvir Hussain, Oliver Savat, Arafat Khan, Waheed Zaman, Umar Islam and Muhammed Gulzarar plotted in 2006 to detonate liquid explosives during a Trans-Atlantic aircraft flight; and Kuwait whose national Ramzi Youseff, despite attempted effort to blow Boeing 747-283B that was on its return flight from Cebu to Tokyo on December 11, 1994 was not labeled a terrorist nation. On account of all these, these writers found it completely unfair and called on America to delete Nigeria from the terror list. The more aggrieved writers launched assaults on American administration for acting a bully against Africa and Africans. According to them, 'If Nigeria the giant of Africa can be treated with such indignity because of the action of ONE INDIVIDUAL- it is an indication that "bulliable" countries like those in Africa are not regarded as anything by Obama and his administration'. Some Senators even dared America with an ultimatum to delete Nigeria from terrorist list 'within one week or...'

But hardly did the dust of Umar Abdutallab settle than the blood of innocent children and women brutally hacked down by armed marauders streamed down the villages of Jos. And in the troubling madness, one woman lost her seven children. Another old woman who only delivered her first baby late last year after 25 years of marriage was killed together with her only child who was thrown into a seething firework. One awed witness claimed that the only thing heard from the baby was a cry as faint as the mewling of a cat Raped victims that escaped death were

traumatized and outraged to speak. Some watched their children butchered in their presence and within a little interval of time, more than 500 lives were lost to religious terrorism.

It is in the face of all these and other similar events that we wish to examine whether Nigeria's logic of self-justification, of not deserving to be listed as a terrorist nation on the sole event of Umar Abdultallab's terrorist act can actually be said to be true. We wish to know if Nigeria has developed sufficient proof of clean hands from religious terrorism. And where that is not the case, what necessary actions are needed for the survival of this nation, especially if the dreams of some citizens on the sacredness of Nigeria as one indivisible nation would simply be called a logical illusion.

2. Definition of Terrorism: Religious

Given the framework of our discussion, there is no better way to proceed than first defining our terms of reference, the very understanding of which can help derail the time bomb which is indisputably hoisted upon this country and threatening its corporate existence as a nation; it is even growing deadlier than ever says

Bread. According to him, "there exists more than one system to overthrow our liberty. Fanaticism has raised every passion Royalism has not yet given up its hopes and terrorism feels bolder than ever".¹

Etymologically, the word 'terrorism' derives from the Latin root 'terrere, "to frighten." Maximilien Robespierre, the leader in the French revolution employed the word 'terror' in 1794 as another name for redress and said of it is "nothing other than justice, prompt, severe and inflexible".² The term "terrorists" is applied to those agents that enforce the policies of "terrorism". They can be individuals, groups, or states. According to some definitions, clandestine or semi-clandestine state actors may also carry out terrorist acts outside the framework of war. However, the most common usage of terrorism is reserved to a small and secretive cell highly motivated to serve a particular cause and many of the most deadly operations. The word "terrorism" first entered into English-language dictionaries in 1798 to mean "systematic use of terror as a policy".³ There are however, many other definitions of terrorism. In Schmid and Jongman 1988 are found 109 definitions of terrorism that covered a total of 22 different definitional elements." But, the one common characteristic generally agreed upon is that terrorism involves violence and the threat of violence. This actually does not definitively settle all the problems involved because violence can also be associated with other terms and causes that do not connote terrorism.

In this regard, some scholars and recognized experts on terrorism have offered us further important ingredients of the definition Gordon Anderson stated that it is 'a form of violent aggression which is imposed upon a target with multiple and collateral objectives beyond the initial act. It can be physical or psychological in its initial manifestation; and this collateral effect is as significant as the act itself. It inflicts a deep physical or psychological trauma against the intended target(s) through violent acts, while at the same time intimidating and/or psychologically subduing others who might possibly be considered a threat in a similar manner'.⁵

For Raffoul Saadeh "a terrorist act is an organized act that sprouts from victimized individuals who have struggled severely and find no other way of opposing a government, country, or even a set of rules, and make an emotional and psychological decision to operate and achieve certain political objectives using violent methods of activism".⁶ Against those who insist that one man's terrorism is another's freedom fight and that one man's crime against humanity is another's resistance against oppression, Tamar Meisels advocates a consistent and strict definition of terrorism, and defines it as "the intentional random murder of defenseless non-combatants, with the intent of instilling fear of mortal danger amidst a civilian population as a strategy designed to advance political ends".⁷ He charged the liberals to uphold relevant distinctions rather than dismiss them in the name of consistency. This is where the philosophers, according to him, have a task in the on-going battle: to analyze and clarify definitions and evaluate their normative force rather than further obscure them."⁸ He pointed at Ted Honderich as not living up to this spirit, for he sneered at strict definitions and precise philosophical analysis, much as Jacques Derrida who attempted to "deconstruct" the concept of terrorism in Giovanna Borradori.⁹ He argued that a canonical and consistent definition of "terrorism" can and should be pursued by theorists and philosophers alike. Such definitions and their corresponding normative codes, which are desirable for legal systems and the states they represent, are absolutely essential for moral philosophers if they are to contribute anything at all to modern affairs.

Terrorism cuts across various motives, including religion. Religions exert enormous cultural influence in a society and it is understandable that the range of this influence might include both good and bad. Professor Mark Juergensmeyer wrote that 'religion is not innocent but it does not ordinarily lead to violence. It only does so with the coalescence of a peculiar set of circumstances -political, social, and ideological; it happens when religion becomes fused with violent expressions of social aspirations personal pride, and movements for political change'.¹⁰ Tragically, religions are in many ways disguised forms of political economy designed to carve out niches of economic and political power and this is regrettably the case of much religious violence in Northern area of Nigeria. This is not to say that the more fundamental thought of religious terrorism is not somehow

typically rooted in faith-based tenets or that the most terrorist acts over the centuries had not been performed on religious grounds with the hope to either spread or enforce a system of belief, viewpoint or opinion, like the Boko Haram from Northern Nigeria. The point is that the most common resort to violence seems to occur when a religious group feels threatened or deprived of its rightful share of resources.

3. Religious Terrorism in Nigeria

Whoever has lived in Nigeria knows that this is a nation replete with religious violence. When Nigerians woke up early hours of 8, March 2010 and saw the inhabitants of the little cities in Du and Barkin Ladi LGAs of Jos smoked out by fire, hacked and burnt, with their bodies littering the streets, heads decapitated, limbs violently disconnected from their positions and blood splattered everywhere, one is left with no other natural barrier to check tears from running down. Indeed, only people who have hearts of stones will not weep at the gory sight of the pictures spewing out from the theater of the violence in Jos; only those who have no blood in their veins will not squint their eyes in horrific stupefaction at the human barbecue from the carnage. One cannot but weep for Nigeria reduced to the level of Hobbes' state where life is 'short, nasty and brutish'. Given the wasted lives, the collateral damage and public condemnation that ensued, one would naturally think that it is now the end of an orgy of insanity. But no, you will be mistaken; the worst would still take place.

In the Daily Sun of Monday, March 15, 2010 Uche Ezechukwu wrote on "Why Jos will boil Again". He said: "I know, almost without an iota of doubt that many innocent and not-so innocent people will, again and again, come under the murderous wielders in Plateau State because there is absolutely nothing on ground to indicate that those who can stop its reoccurrence are willing, ready or determined to do so"¹¹ He regarded those at the root of it to be a tiny fraction of the population, a tiny cabal who for political reasons or ethnicity will continue to exploit and manipulate the ignorant and hapless populations whose sense of reason has been warped by extreme poverty and serial deprivations of manifold dimensions. against each other.¹² When he looked at those who had been caught and herded into the courtroom for prosecution, he pitied the malnourished Fulani cattle herders as cards in the hands of certain players. They deserve pity said Uche because, "the system has once again marshalled out another set of inconsequential scapegoat to die for the sins of their mighty manipulators and paymasters".¹³ It is partly for this reason, he concluded, that the mayhem in Jos will happen again since up till present, the solution had never been targeted at the roots but rather at the branches. He believes that the violence had been sponsored by powerful people on both sides of the religious, political and cultural divides.

The same judgment was passed by Matthew Hasan Kukah in his celebrated work Religion, Politics and Power in Northern Nigeria, where he dealt with Religion as a political platform of the Kaduna crisis of March, 1987; the crisis which according to him "were beyond any conventional interpretations that had followed other events of similar religious, social and political proportions". "This crisis had a religious basis but motivated by shift in power structures and because of the powerful figures behind it the root of the crisis was never addressed. The unwillingness to address the problem was seen, according to him, in the president's ambivalence in handling the riots, who at first, was genuinely set to deal with the issues raised by the riot "but midway, it became clear to him that at the heart of the riots was the legitimacy of the ruling class in Northern Nigeria. From within, this class managed to turn back the direction of government's determination to get to the roots of the people's grievances, and in the end managed to manipulate the outcome of the various committees which it set up to look into the events, and in the process, consolidated its position"¹⁵

The ethno-religious violence in Nigeria is therefore not news any more and it seems to have no end. This is the idea of every right thinking Nigerian, including Charles Kumolu. In his article "Jos Crisis: When a Mining City becomes an Eternal Killing Field", he wrote that 'even while the nation had not come to terms with the latest mayhem, another ethno-religious crisis hit the city again, just a week after'. For him therefore, reporting such brutal religious violence invokes no longer feeling of news because the frequency at which this continues to happen even when the latest event in that respect records casualty of no mean magnitude, it risks being dismissed in the media quarters as not sufficiently newsworthy. What rather would be news he said, "can only be found in a lasting solution to this perennial problem".¹⁶

The above judgment on the rapacious frequency of religious terrorism is easily confirmed casting a little glance at just our immediate past: We see the January 19, 2010 Killing of Muslims and dumping of their bodies in the mosques sequel to setting a Catholic church ablaze by the Muslim youths. It was a case where religion again served a platform of the violence going by the testimony of the Minister of Police Affairs, Ibrahim Yakubu Lame, who issued a statement blaming the violence on "some highly placed individuals in the society who were exploiting the ignorance and poverty of the people to cause mayhem in the name of religion." On Jan 5, 2010 the Muslim Religious rioters also killed hundreds of people in religious violence in Bauchi of Northern Nigeria. This was followed by the January 11, 2010 religious violence in which no fewer than 30 persons were killed in a

renewed clash between the members of an Islamic sect called Kala-Kato and security personal in the Zango area of Bauchi city after the sect had demanded the release of its leader arrested by the authority. This same group also attacked Christians and burnt churches on 30 Dec. 2009 killing 70 people. On July 26 2009 another Radical Islamic fundamentalist sect, Boko Haram [translated "Western civilization is evil"] went on rampage in Maidugiri, Yobe, Bauchi, Kano,(Northern Nigeria) burning churches, looting homes belonging to Christians and murdering them. Three Christian pastors were killed by beheading and 800 people were officially reported killed.

In 2006, Islamic fundamentalists protesting cartoon of Prophet Mohammed by Danish cartoonist killed hundreds of Christians in Maidugiri,(Northern Nigeria),burned down scores of Churches, and looted shops and homes belonging to Christians. Similar riots by Islamic jihadists were held in numerous twns in Northern Nigeria Katsina, Bauchi, Minna, Potiskum, Kam, Kotangora. Thousands of Christians were killed, scores of churches were looted and burned as well as personal homes and businesses of Christians. The list is inexhaustible and they are all clothed in religious garments whether they were politically motivated on faith based ideas.

In the event of all these therefore, the recurring question is whether the case of Umar Abdulmutallab still remains an isolated problem of religious terrorism by Nigerians? Do we argue actually that this young man's case is the sole event of religious violence in Nigeria or the only international religious terrorism undertaken by a Nigerian? Does the world really need more of it in order to be cautious as if that single attempt was not enough? Was that single effort not the first export of the overwhelming produce in the country? Indeed, is it not a better logic to think on how to address the very root of terrorism in Nigeria than engaging in the impotent rage of a drunken midget challenging a sober giant to about of boxing as our misguided National Assembly recently tried to do with its bluff to the Obama Administration to remove Nigeria from its infamous list within a week or-or what really...?

In any case, my impression is that Nigerians are not like our aforementioned writers or legislators who define terrorism only in terms of a single Nigerian hiding lethal explosives in his underwear and smuggling it aboard a jetliner with the wicked intention to commit mass suicide, but being shortsighted over countless instances of millions of Nigerians living in daily fear of attacks from murderers hawking their religion in one hand and damnation in the other for all who happen to look the other way than the direction they are facing. Terrorism doesn't have to be exported to qualify as terrorism with state imprimatur. Indeed, it will be a poor thinking to imagine otherwise. We must rather seek to uproot terrorism in Nigeria,not only to protect lives and appear decent before the world of nations, but because it actually threatens the corporate existence of this country as a nation. It is our obligation to seek a way forward but before an attempt in this direction, let us to what extent if any, terrorism can be justified.

4. Terrorism Any justification?

Terrorism is not a new phenomenon but since 11th September 2001, it has pushed the old questions concerning legitimate violence to the frontline of the agenda on good and evil. Although one may not resort to analytical tools of the philosophers in this matter, it is nevertheless vital for understanding current events and equally influencing future ones. True enough, philosophy cannot always supply one morally correct answer to the exclusion of all others. Even in a case of ethical objectivism, there is still room for some degree of value pluralism that enables balancing different morally acceptable principles against each other in a variety of legitimate ways, resulting in many cases in a plurality of morally valid political opinions. However, terrorism is no such case or one of those instances in which only one response is morally valid. This is so because terrorism, says Walzer "breaks across moral limits beyond which no further limitation seems possible, for within the category of civilian and citizen, there isn't any smaller group for which immunity might be claimed...Terrorists anyway make no such claim; they kill anybody".¹⁷

Terrorism is evil and to doubt this is to betray certain confusion if not corruption of mind. Writing on why the Fulani settlers in Jos struck, Andy Elewere claimed they were responding to a previous attack in which they lost their kinsmen amid silence and neglect on the part of considerable sectors of public opinion; the reprisal attack therefore aimed to redress the losses of the Fulani herdsmen. And they warned that their future responses would be no less grave until the society looks at injustices done to others. They maintained "Any society that refuses to be just and fir shall become a jungle where only jungle justice shall operate like the case in Plateau today".¹⁸ Surely we all know from our earliest youth that two wrongs do not make a right. Let it be, if you will, that the terrorist had grievances, even legitimate grievance, against their oppressors, these grievances could never justify their killing of innocent people. But, the violence of the terrorists is typically directed at civilians and civilian institutions. It is indiscriminate and violent, designed to cause terror among the people at large. Deliberate and intentional attacks on the innocent are unjust. That it is unjust to attack the innocent is something of a self-evident proposition. Justice is fundamentally a matter of giving each his/her due, but the deliberate infliction of harm or injury is not due to the innocent who, precisely as innocent, are owed peace and protection, not violence.

It is even interesting to note that terrorism's very livelihood depends on a reversal of the Kantian imperative to "act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law".¹⁹ The terrorists always wish and want to be assured of the precise reverse. They rely wholeheartedly on their maxim's not being universalized, on not being attacked in return by those who share their disregard for human rights and moral rights.

Terrorism, as we have defined defies the most basic standard of liberal-humanistic morality which fundamentally forbids the use of human beings merely as means, and commands their treatment as ends in themselves."²⁰ This imperative categorically prohibits the arbitrary use and intentional killing of innocents as mere means towards attaining practical ends. But terrorism is the intentional random murder of defenseless non-combatants, with the intent of instilling fear of mortal danger amidst a civilian population as a strategy designed to advance political ends. This understanding cannot be 'deconstructed' as Jacques Derrida attempted to do, nor can it be inclusively obscured. Regardless of its professed cause, terrorism is diametrically opposed to the requirements of liberal morality and can only be defended at the expense of relinquishing the most basic of liberal commitments

Terrorism, because it is directed against an entire people or a class, tends to communicate the most extreme and brutal intentions the tyrannical repression, removal or mass murder of the population under attack. Terrorist campaigns are most often focused on people whose national existence they have radically devalued and consequently against the principle that sees man as an end, enjoying supreme value. The Chinese permanent representative to the United Nations summarizes the harm of terrorism thus: "Terrorism which endangers innocent lives, causes losses of social wealth and jeopardizes state security, constitutes a serious challenge to human civilization and dignity as well as a serious threat to international peace and security".²¹ Having declared terrorism as an unjustifiable evil and considered it to threaten the existence of any particular nation as well as world peace, the question that follows is whether there is any way it can be forestalled? Aware that the terrorists sometimes have legitimate grievances, is there no way they can be gratified?

5. The Way Forward

Preventing religious teachings and vision from becoming a tool to perpetuate terrorism is crucial for the well being of humanity and the rest of the creation. Since religious communities are shaped by the plurality of circumstances and environment in which they are located, close cooperation and better understanding among Christians and Muslims is the only way to achieve this goal. In times of desperation and calamities, it is normal for people to turn to their ultimate visions for life. For most, these visions are provided by their religious heritage. Consequently, the states must promote greater understanding and relations between people of different faith and must try to maintain that endeavor as a binding spiritual and moral commitment regardless of the leaders' religious affiliations.

Secondly, the religious leaders must also be made to understand their duty, and the services religions owe to the civil society. This was made clear by Pope John Paul in his invitation to religious leaders of various faiths in Assisi at the beginning of 2002: "May faith and love of God make the followers of every religion courageous builders of understanding and forgiveness, patient weavers of a fruitful inter-religious dialogue, capable of inaugurating a new era of justice and peace."²² The evil of terrorism, we know, springs from many sources, and in particular it springs from the injustices, real or apparent, committed by others against what the terrorists hold dear. Such injustices give no excuse, of course, to the evil deeds of terrorists but we can neglect them only to our own peril. Religious values and views play a significant role in the lives of people as they deal with issues affecting their communities. Religions teach about ultimate claims on believers' lives and provide a core vision for it, which invariably colors its followers' socio-political aspirations, engagements and behaviors. Any macro level issue therefore cannot be addressed without being sensitive to such realities experienced by people. It means therefore that for a more just and peaceful order in the world, the quest for democracy has to go further than the political management of nation states. The democratic ethos should be equally applied to all segments of community.

Terrorism is not a pleasant enterprise either to the one who executes it or to the one at whom it is targeted. By design, it is an unpredictable use of violence against an individual; group, community, or nation to attain the goal of the perpetrators. And this phenomenon will not go away unless human communities deal with the issues perpetuating them locally and globally. In his Ash Wednesday Mass of 2003, Pope John Paul II emphasized that peace comes with justice: "There will be no peace on earth while the oppression of peoples, injustices and economic imbalances, which still exist, endure." The pope insists equally that these changes in structures, economic and otherwise cannot go without the spirit of love from every segment of the society: "But for 'the desired structural changes to take place external initiatives and interventions are not enough; what is needed above all is a joint conversion of

hearts to love."²³ In his Easter Sunday message of 2003, he charged the terrorists directly: "Let there be an end to the chain of hatred and terrorism which threatens the orderly development of the human family." Writing an article "Healing after Terror", Michael Lerner toed the same conviction. He maintained in reality that "the greatest security will not come through armies or counter-violence, not through revenge or hatred, but through building a world of love and open-heartedness, a world in which the recognition of the sanctity, of everyone on the planet shapes every economic, political, and social institution".²⁴

Although man is a bundle of possibility and we may never completely eliminate war and terrorism, we can considerably reduce their use, and definitely reduce the number of supporters and sympathizers for such, means in settling a community's frustration, anger, disappointment and desperation. Open forums can be created to express various views and to resolve disputes along the lines suggested by Jurgend Habermas in his Theory of Communicative Action; equally good are genuine programs and policies of justice to be promoted to deal with all prevailing injustices. Writing on promotion of justice as means to ending terrorism, Glen Stassen and Steven Brion-Meisels, gave the following principles for the eradication of the roots of terrorism: "address the roots not just symptoms; recognize the role of all parties; take independent initiatives that reduce violence and promote justice; re-engage with international forces; use force only to apprehend and protect; increase the capacity of multicultural, civilian-based organizations; and foster inter-cultural understanding and reconciliation".²⁵

6. Conclusion

It is a tragedy that established religions approve of certain measure of violence or religious warfare; they provide a mantle of respectability for terrorism like when it supports just war. Parts of the Bible make allusion to it, and St. Thomas Aquinas synthesized it in Summa Theologicae offering conditions and limits by which they are permissible e.g. the weapons of a just war must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants; must be engaged in only after all non-violent means have been exhausted etc. In like manner, Martin Luther, founder of Lutheran Christian church once said --"It is both Christian and an act of love to kill the enemy without hesitation, to plunder and burn and injure him by any method until he is conquered, except that one must beware of sin and not to violate wives and virgins."²⁶ The point of the discussion here is that both in just war case and the statement referring to Luther, there are always moral constraints to religious warfare. In the Qur'an equally, the prophet Muhammad gave priority to seeking reconciliation and peace with Jews and Christians, as well as with other opponents and enemies; no offensive war except when attacked. Surah 2:190 states it: "Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you. But do not transgress limits, for Allah loveth not transgressors." We see here again, a moral constraint and never to go against permissible limits,

However, the religious terrorists always cross the boundaries of fair play, and are always convinced in their own minds of the moral superiority of their actions. But this is not morality in the usual sense of having a broad social base. What makes religious terrorism so dangerous, so interested in apocalypse and catastrophe, is that the morality is usually personality-driven. Those who command them are always believed to have the vision: Religious terrorists are often their own constituency, having no external audience for their acts of destruction. This is possibly why the recommendations of Cardinal Ratzinger might worth a trial. He suggested that the three religions who share a heritage from Abraham return to the Ten Commandments to counteract the violence of terrorism and war: "The Decalogue is not the private property of Christians or Jews. It is a lofty expression of moral reason that, a such, is also found in the wisdom of other cultures. To refer again to the Decalogue might be essential, precisely to restore reason".²⁷

Nothing can excuse or justify an act of terrorism, whether it is committed by religious fundamentalists, private militia, peoples resistance movements --or whether it's dressed up as a war of retribution by a recognized government or group. The lives of thousands of Nigerians have been wasted to religious terrorism and the still lucky ones live in constant fear. Every effort therefore must be made to stem down the tide of this menace. But where all endeavors fail, it might not be a foolish idea to return to the 1960s regional system of government with regional constitution; that is, making the regions stronger which helps to avoid loopholes and feelings of injustice, and then the federal government weaker and unattractive, but resolving amicably the derivation formula of contributing to the central government.

References

1. John Walter, *The Times*, 30 January. 1795; cl. Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia.
2. See Early History of Terrorism, <http://Terrorism-Research.com>.
3. Harper Douglas "Terrorism" Dictionary.com, Online Etymology Dictionary (accessed: August 10, 2007).
4. Schmid, Albert J. Jongman, et al., *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988, pp.5-6
5. See "Scholars and Recognized Experts on Terrorism" http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Terrorism2_London_times-i?
6. Ibid.
7. Tamar Meisels, "The Trouble with Terror: The Apologetics of Terrorism A refutation", in *The Journal of Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 18, 2008, pp.465-481.
8. Ibid.
9. cf. Ted Honderich, *After the Terror*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2002, p. 94; Giovanna Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror - Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003, 85-172, esp. pp. 109, 152-3, 161.
10. Juergensmeyer, M., *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, University of California Press, 2004, p. 10.
11. Uche Ezechukwu, "Why Jos will boil Again", in *Daily Sun* of Monday, March 15, 2010, p. 56.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Matthew Hasan Kukah, *Religion, Politics and Power in Northern Nigeria*, Ibadan-Nigeria: Spectrum Books Ltd, 1994, p. 185.
15. Ibid. p. 190.
16. Charles Kumolu, "Jos Crisis: When a Mining City becomes an Eternal Killing Field", *Vanguard*, Monday, March 8, 2010, p. s
17. Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust War*, New York: Basic Books 1977, p. 203.
18. Andy Elewere, "Jos Crisis: Why we stuck Fulani Seuders", in *Daily Sun*, Friday, March 12, 2010, p. 7.
19. Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* translated by H.J. Paton, New York: Harper & Row Publishers 1964, p. 88.
20. See Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated by H.J. Paton, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964, p. 96); John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, (ninth edition), Chap III, section 29, OUP 1989, p. 179.
21. *China Daily*, Friday, October 5, 2001.
22. Cf. *Houston Catholic Worker*, Vol. XXIII, No. 4, July-August 2003.
23. Ibid.
24. Lerner, Michael. "Healing after terror" (Editorial), *Tikkun Magazine*, Nov./Dec. 2001. [Online]
25. Stassen Glen & Steven Brion-Meisek, "Ending Terrorism means Promoting Justice." <http://www.wcc.coe.org/wcc/behindthenews/analysis/>, 2001. [Online].
26. <http://en.Wikipedia.org/Wiki/>.
27. Cf. *Houston Catholic Worker*, Vol. XXIII, No. 4, July-August 2003.