

# The Twin Brothers of War and Peace

By Dr Fatai Aliu

**T**he essence of war is peace, without the yearning and search for peace, there can't be war and without war, no one appreciates the real value of peace. But again, nothing that can be settled on the battle field that can't be settled better by peace. In fact, if it can't be settled by peace, it certainly can't be settled by war. Therefore, every settlement is a fight against war and every war is a signal for peace.

Over the years, nations who have chosen war against peace never achieve the purpose. They ride on the back of the tiger. They ended up in the belly of the tiger- they got consumed by war.

As Ezeulu would advised his son Obika in the novel 'Arrow of God by Chinua Achebe' my son, it's good to be brave and fearless but at times, it's better to be a coward for often times we stand in the house of a coward to look at the ruins of where a great man had lived.' The greatest man ended up earlier in the grave.

But no peace is achieved on platters of gold. It comes with the blood of both the heroes and the villains and when it comes, it's carries with it the equivalent of grace proportional to the losses that saw the growth of the peace.

So Arms acquisitions and armaments of nations, multi- national break -troughs and modern supersonic economy's all exist to serve as deterrents to other nations in the global search for peace.

As Ronald Regan the late president of the United States would say' if you want peace, be ready for war". But there is peace of the graveyard. When every nation whether of the strong or of the weak goes on amassing armaments and acquisition of nuclear weapons, there is usually a general peace and this is what Prof. Thomas Imobigie of blessed memory called the graveyard strategy of peace as a factor in international strategies to maintain peace against war and aggression.

But, when the Japanese empire embarked on a large scale offensive and launched an attack on the United States in Pearl harbor on a Sunday in 1941 and went on a large scale offensive across the states on the Pacific Coast same day, it was not a deterrent against war. Or was it? of course not, because it sparked off Americans full involvement in the second world war which basically saw the destruction of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the twin atomic bombs thrown by the US. Then, automatically Japan Sue for peace, If the motive was peace why the initial aggressions.

*Whether a nation would know peace is the ultimate figuration of how much values lies in its understanding of the varied but sister concepts of peace and war as well as the approach on it to other nations whether allies or foes. It's a function of its acceptance and preparedness to fight to maintain peace and or use peace to avoid war.*

When war fail to achieve peace, it becomes a war in vain, what the Ibos would call a war of Blame. When peace does not come at the end of war, no matter how long it takes, the war continues. The ultimate end must be peace. But does the presence of peace imply that there is no war? Seemingly, the ceasing of hostilities and all forms of aggressions attracts peace in the open but inflames passions in the hiding, especially when there is no genuine agenda for peace after the ceasing of hostilities.

Thus, the ceasing of hostilities, restrictions on arms acquisitions and disarmaments are both embodiments of peace but signals for new dimensions of war fare. At times it degenerates into economic war where the use of sanctions on values interplay to back up new offensives.

Whether a nation would know peace is the ultimate figuration of how much values lies in its understanding of the varied but sister concepts of peace and war as well as the approach on it to other nations whether allies or foes. It's a function of its acceptance and preparedness to fight to maintain peace and or use peace to avoid war.