

**IMPLICATIONS OF TOLERANCE ON ETHNICITY AND RELIGIONS IN AFRICA:
PERSPECTIVES FROM KARL POPPER'S PHILOSOPHY**

OGUNNIYI, Olayemi Jacob

Department of History & International Studies, Faculty of Arts, Lagos State University,
Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria. +2348033207633, +2348057737342, olayemi.ogunniyi@lasu.edu.ng,
ayoyemlove@yahoo.com, temyem2014@gmail.com

&

OLATADE, Damilola Peter

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, Lagos State University,
Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria. +2347035051855, +2347084151340, damilola.olatade@lasu.edu.ng,
dammy.olatade@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the problems that have plagued Africa since time immemorial without any sign of leaving is the issue of tolerance. Undoubtedly, it is believed that the majority of African people are decent human beings who inherently desire to live in a tolerant society. An integral aspect of a tolerant society is people's ability to have and promote differing viewpoints i.e. freedom of speech. However to declare such freedoms as unlimited is to give unsavoury voices a place at the table. This explains why Karl Popper's paradox of intolerance asserted that unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed including tolerance with them. While adopting historical and qualitative research methodologies, the paper argues that ethnicity and intragroup religious activities both spatially generate spill-overs and such spill-overs are exacerbated by value-frictions between and among groups. Tolerance is therefore required not to put too much weight upon such externalities. The paper submits that tolerance has to be induced and sustained among ethnic and religious groups. That the same instrumentality required for inducing tolerance is required to sustain it. Tolerance thrives best through the creation of a culture of mutual respect and civility. Thus peaceful coexistence among ethnic and religious groups in Africa is based on tolerance and tolerance subsists upon mutual respect and understanding one another differing needs.

Key words: Tolerance, Ethnic, Africa, Religious, Groups

Introduction

Africa as a nation is characterized by intense ethno-religious polarization and conflict. Africa no doubt has all it takes to propel itself to a truly great nation in every respect, given the material and human resources at its disposal. The focus on political development vis-à-vis the state of interrelationship among the various ethnic and religious groups in Africa is designed in the main to accentuate the cruciality and necessity of the existence of a viable and strong political order as a springboard for the development of the African society. Unfortunately, the problem of tolerance has been of a serious hindrance towards achieving the desired goals of the African society. The problem of tolerance has plagued Africa since time immemorial without any sign of going away. Far more importantly, it is believed that majority of African peoples are decent human beings who inherently desire to live a tolerance society (Awoniyi 2015).

An integral aspect of a tolerance society is people's ability to have and promote differing viewpoints i.e. freedom of speech. However, to declare such freedom as unlimited is to give unsavoury voices a place at the table. This brings us to Karl Popper's paradox of intolerance "unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed along tolerance with them. However, it must be stressed that Popper did not suggest intolerant ideas to be silenced that is the paradox he used to limit freedom of speech. Rather, actions of interlace such as violence or oppression should be eradicated from a liberal society even through force (Raz 2012).

Against this background, the paper is structured into eight sections. Section one serves as the introduction; section two examines an overview of Karl Popper in philosophy of tolerance; section three looks at implication of the philosophy of tolerance on ethnicity and religious groups in Africa; section four discusses ethnicity and religious pluralism in Africa; section five reflects on manifestations of religious intolerance and their short coming; section six highlights on implications of violent ethno-religious conflicts; section seven is based on towards a culture of tolerance and cooperation among ethnic and religious groups in Africa; while section eight of the paper gives the conclusion.

An Overview of Karl Popper's Philosophy of Tolerance

In his 1945 book *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Karl Popper a political philosopher posited that tolerance need not be extended to those who are intolerant. According to Popper if we extend unlimited tolerance to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant then the tolerant will be destroyed and tolerance with them. This does not mean that we should always suppress the utterance of philosophies as long as it can be countered by rational argument and keep them in check by public opinion suppression would certainly be most unwise. But we should claim the right to suppress them if necessary even by force, for it may easily turn out that they are not prepared to meet us on the level of rational argument, but by denouncing all argument, they may forbid their followers to listen to rational argument because it is deceptive and teach them to answer arguments by the use of their fists or pistol (Popper 1945, 167-172).

We should therefore claim, in the name of tolerance, the right not to tolerate the intolerant. we should claim that any movement preaching intolerance places itself outside the law and we should consider incitement to intolerance and persecution of criminal, in the same way as we should consider incitement to murder, or to kidnapping or to the revival of the slave trade, as criminal. Popper wants to stop tolerance from being destroyed (Rajeev, 1994:45). If intolerant people are a tiny minority then they don't pose much of a threat. And if there are some intolerant people who don't pose a threat they shouldn't be suppressed if they can be kept in check by criticism. An examination of this paragraph shows that it is not clear and it is inconsistent. For example, if somebody advocates starting up the slave trade but doesn't specifically say some particular groups should do it, should be prosecuted according to Popper.

Notably, the attempt to make heaven on earth invariably produces hell. It leads to intolerance. It leads to religious wars and to the saving of souls through the inquisition and according to Popper, based on complete misunderstanding of our moral duties. It is our duty Popper went on to help those who need our help; but it cannot be our duty to make others happy, since this does not depend on us, and since it would only too often mean intruding on the privacy of these towards whom we have such amiable intention (Dave 2008). The political demand as Tronto (1994) asserted should be for piecemeal (as opposed to Utopian) methods corresponds to the decision that fight against suffering must be considered a duty, while the right to care for the happiness of others must be considered a privilege confined to the close circle of their friends.

In their case, we may perhaps have a certain right to try to impose our scale of values – our preference regarding music, for example (and we may even feel it our duty to open to them a world of values, which, we trust, can so much contribute to their happiness). This right of ours exists only, if, and because, they can get rid of us, because friendships can be ended (Rachels 1999). But the use of political means for imposing our scale of values upon others is a very different matter. Again, suffering, injustice and their prevention, these are the eternal problems of public morals, the ‘agenda’ of public policy according to Bentham (2003), the ‘higher’ should very largely be considered as non-agenda and should be left to the realm of *laissez faire*. Thus, we might say: help your enemies, assist those in distress, even if they hate you; but love only your friends. So Popper seems to regard tolerance as being about not using political and coercive means to impose your ideas on others.

Implication of the Philosophy of Tolerance on Ethnicity and Religious Groups in Africa

To understand the implication of Popper’s philosophy of tolerance on ethnicity and religious in Africa, we must possess an appropriate conceptualization of the human society. The human society is not a mechanistic structure in which the whole is the direct sum of the parts or in which simple oiling ensures the smooth running of the parts or in which the parts or in which the parts (the elements of the structure) are fixed and constant. If the human society were, a mechanistic structure, its problems will respond deterministically to prescriptions. Rather the human society is a complexity of flawed parts and of changing units; it is an association of at once cohering and conflicting interests, and adaptive system evincing sometimes stochastic and sometimes deterministic behavior patterns (Hjerm et al 2019).

The parameters which define the state of any particular human system assume their values from the combination of three scarcities, namely freedom scarcity, positional scarcity and resource scarcity (Finsterbusch 2002). These scarcities and their distributions generate corresponding conflicts namely latitudinal conflict, positional conflict and market conflict within the system. The architecture of human society then is architecture of complexity. But in spite of this complexity, the human society can be defined by and effectively studied through the principal dominant common interests which activates and propels it as a community.

Be that as it may, tolerance is necessary for peaceful coexistence as well as for reconciliation of ethnic and religious differences as well as the preservation of the centrality and integrity of the society’s common interest. The increase in the number and violence of open conflicts revolving around ethnic and religious identities in Africa provides the need for tolerance ethnic or religious problems emanates out of our reaction of the so called problem of the ‘other’ (Cocodia 2008). By the problem of the ‘other’ we are referring to a psychological as well as epistemological problem. It is the problem, which occurs immediately when the self is confronted with any form of difference. There are various manifestations of difference, the management of which generates groups. In essence, ethnic identities are formed in the management of divergent features between peoples in the society. But the problem of the other self is as old as humanity.

In fact it is traceable to the time of Adam and Eve. In other words, the problem of the ‘other’ refers to the anxiety that an individual develops when he is confronted with another person. The problem of the ‘other’ arises out of the human desire to understand the other person and decide the appropriate relationship that should be developed with him. The problem is that of how to react to socio-cultural differences. We cannot deny that confrontations with another person create not only a psychological problem but also a cognitive one. This same problem manifests itself in philosophy as the problem of other minds. In philosophy, it has generated a perennial ontological and epistemological dilemma. The problem of other mind in philosophy is simply the problem of whether or not the other mind exists, and if it does then how does one know its real nature, given the fact of the privacy of the mind and its operations (Blackburn 1994).

Just as the problem of other minds in philosophy creates an epistemological problem so is the problem of the 'other' in social relations presenting us with an epistemological challenge. While the problem of 'other' as discussed above is very relevant, it still boils down to tolerance in order to absorb the differences that may exist among ethnic and religious groups in Africa.

Ethnicity and Religious Pluralism in Africa: A Historical Discourse.

In this section, an attempt is made to understand the historical underpinnings of ethnicity and religious pluralism in Africa. It can be argued that ethnicity has frustrated the effort at national integration and development in Africa. A creation of the foreign and indigenous elites to perpetuate their dominance and division in Africa. The proliferation of the African society by ethnic and religious groups is a product of hegemonic interests of the foreign and indigenous elites whose desire is to keep groups in Africa apart in order to achieve them in selfish ambitions. Scholars such as Nnoli, 1995 and Mamdani 1996 have argued and popularized the idea that cultural groups that are called tribes in Africa are not natural but a creation of colonial matters, which needed divisions and hostilities between groups to perpetuate their exploitative interest in the continent.

To this, it could be added that the indigenous African elites who became heirs to the throne further propagated this idea in order to actualize their ambitions. On the attainment of independence, many African elites used ethnicism as a basis for achieving their political ambitions without realizing its potential dangers to the subsequent unity and co-existence of the continent. After independence ethnicity reared its ugly head in virtually every aspect of African socio-cultural, economic and political life. It is in this sense that Christopher Miller in his book, *Theories of Africa: in a dynamic and artificial sense of the concept* sees ethnicity as "relation of forces within space, power and religious culture. Ethnicity has thus become a fluid process of composition, decomposition and recomposition (Christopher 2000).

It is important to stress here that it is not that ethnicity is not a reality, but the conflict generated by them are created by tribal fictions invented. Ethnocentric ideas employed in keeping the groups apart. Ethnicity has generated tension whether in its ordinary form because of the underlying belief that groups come not equal. This prejudice deliberately invented and propagated by the elite within the in-group will consistently generate antagonism and hostility between groups. It cannot be denied that colonialism and post-colonial oppression were made possible and convenient because of the constant propagation of ethnicity in Africa. In actual fact, it is this ethnicity at the centre of the colonial discourse that made European imperialism to be subtle and yet effective (Asselin 1995).

For this reason, it is said: "The successful colonization of Africa was achieved more by the colonizers ideological justification of their rule than by sheer brutality of arms. The entire colonial discourse, the various ideas and knowledge, the mystery of the written word, what Hami Bhadha calls "signs taken for wonder" are all effective instruments of colonization and the tools for the creation of ethnic identities in the colonized world. But the tragedy of the situation is not so much that colonial discourse invented artificial differences between the colonizers and the colonized. But it is that it has reproduced this ideology of difference in the form of ethnicity which has become an impediment to national integration and development in Africa (Hami 2000).

The pluralism of religion in Africa, that a situation where there are several autonomous but independent religious groups in Africa are also traceable to the way in which the various religions came to existence and its spread to various parts of Africa. The advent of the Arab traders and the Europeans in the century before colonization were responsible for the spread of Islam and Christianity in Africa. The easily adoptable, tolerance and flexible tenets and doctrine of Islam made it grow rapidly among the people. This was helped further by the campaign of the jihadist, which gave them great prominence in Africa. Christianity found its way into Africa in different stages.

The first stage came through the Portuguese in 1488 as in the case of Nigeria, in the neighbourhood of Benin and Warri, but failed to make lasting impact. As Kenny points out, Christianity introduced particularly by the Portuguese was found in a moribund condition by missionaries in the late 19th century. Finally, Christianity began to take permanent root in Africa with the coming of the Christian mission in Africa (Kenny 1999). With this, Christianity began its slow but steady growth in Africa. Its spread was slower than that of Islam because of its strict and sometimes, uncompromising demands on the new converts. However, the religion grew phenomenally during the colonial rules and even though there were no official commitments to either a Christian or a Muslim cause, the gradual spread of the two religions, the conversion of the vast majority of Africans into either of the two religions, cutting across tongues and tribes, soon dissipated the evolution of relations of one sort or the other among citizens of the same country even at times among members of the same family, tribe or community, belonging to tribe or community belonging to different faiths.

Manifestations of Religious Intolerance and their Shortcomings

History is an important element of society. It is the store-house of the past and current social conditions, circumstances, events, causal factors and effects on the people, relationships, institutions and other aspects of society in relation to civilization, progress as well as well-being of society. Society also learns from a historical experience of how it met successes and failures in the course of its history. This section therefore sheds light on manifestations of religious intolerance and their consequences in order to re-orientate Nigerian society. Religious intolerance can be explained as a state or condition when someone or group of people are not willing to endure and respect or honour difference of beliefs, ideologies or world-view particularly in a religiously pluralistic society (Crane 2017).

Thesaurus also gives the meaning of religious intolerance as being synonymous to religious bigotry, narrow-mindedness, parochialism, fanaticism, chauvinism, insularism, one-sidedness among others. Religious intolerance in Nigeria has manifested through incessant civil unrest and internal armed conflicts in Nigeria. The observation of Boyle and Sheen in this respect maybe worthy of note; According to them, Intolerance of religion and belief in Nigeria has manifested itself through sporadic civil unrest and internal armed conflicts in Nigeria. The observation of Boyle and Sheen in this respect may be worthy of note. According to them,

Intolerance of religion and belief in Niger has manifested itself through sporadic civil unrest and some internal armed conflicts. In places where Christian and Muslim religious revivalisms are in geographic proximity, the results can be explosive. Close to about 8,000-10,000 Nigerians died in religious violence between 1980 and 1987 (Boyle & Sheen 1998).

Otite & Albert (2001) indicate further that:

There is a high degree of religious intolerance in Kano, the most populated and industrialized city in northern Nigeria, add this explains the incessant intra-religious and inter-religious conflicts in time city. Religious intolerance cuts, across all religious groups. Hence the Muslims are opposed to the Christian and the orthodox Muslims would have nothing to do with the members of the fundamentalists' sects.

Religious crisis are usually ignited by seemingly innocuous factors. Take, for example, the "Kafancha crisis", began at a College of Education. The Muslim Students Society' objected to a banner erected by the Fellowship of Christian Students "Welcome to Mission 87 in Jesus Campus". Eventually the banner was removed but a talk during the programme was 'considered offensive. Subsequently, Christians and

Muslims in Kafanchan attacked each other and this culminated in a lot of destruction (Egharevba & Iruonagbe 2015)

Implications of Violent Ethno-Religious Conflicts

Literatures have shown that the consequences of ethnic and religious violence are outrageous. The most obvious consequence of ethno-religious violence has been loss of lives and property. Innocent souls have given away their lives unwillingly to violence, which had engulfed the nation in the past. Aggrieved rioters have destroyed properties belonging to both the public and private individuals worth billions of naira. According to Egwu (2001), violent ethnic and religious conflict has the potential of resulting into large-scale physical displacement and forced relocation of individuals, families and groups. He noted that the state of this violence in the last three decades has certainly resulted in varying degrees of internally displaced persons. It is significant to state that an insecure, crises and violence-ridden polity can never attract foreign investments.

Despite Obasanjo's globetrotting to various capital cities in search of investments, no investor knowing frilly well that the polity is a security risk would venture the capital there. Where the polity is scaring away foreign investments, the economy becomes stagnant and democracy dividends equally becomes a mirage (Mabogunje 2000). Another implication of violent ethno-religious conflict is the retardation of growth and development. Violence, regardless of its nature tends to slow down development because development can only take place under a peaceful atmosphere. As it would be difficult for a blind man to see even in the broad daylight, so it would be difficult for a nation to experience any form of development when there is no relative peace. That is, no amount of national unity and social integration can be achieved under any kind of unstable atmosphere.

With instability pervading the system, the call for military intervention becomes imperative to the military apologists, thereby justifying the fear of Welch (1995) which he expressed long before transition to civil rule of 1999.

Towards a Culture of Tolerance and Cooperation among Ethnic and Religious Groups in Africa

It is important to stress that too many scholars treat tolerance as a single, one-dimensional attitude and overlook that different areas of people's lives require different forms of tolerance. Their work assumes that religion is not essentially different from other elements of people's identities and that a person who is generally tolerant is ipso facto religiously tolerant. The empirical research which does recognize that different types of tolerance ought to be treated differently focuses solely upon the distinctive nature of racial tolerance. For example, after 2001, however the rise of Muslim extremism as a political force and the increasing religious diversity of the United States have brought religious tolerance to the fore. Political conflicts are increasingly rooted in religious conflicts. Religious tolerance also commands particular interest because a peculiar and unique dilemma lies at its heart that has not been adequately addressed in the theoretical or empirical literature.

The strength of many Africans' religious beliefs both requires that the state aggressively promotes a particularly robust form of tolerance regarding religion and simultaneously places strong limits on what type of religious tolerance the state can legitimately promote. On the one hand, the centrality of religion to identity and the strong exception many people take to slights about their religion means that it is not sufficient to passively forego support of public policies and laws that discriminate against ethnic and religious groups to be considered religiously tolerant. People must also take action to protest ethnic and religiously intolerant public policies. Far more importantly, the strength of many Africans' religious beliefs described as orthodox believers is exactly the reason that the state must be careful about what sort of religious tolerance it encourages among believers (Emile & Patrick 2006).

An overly vigorous attempt to promote religious tolerance may illegitimately push some believers to betray their faiths by encouraging them to accept the value of religious beliefs contrary to their own. Be that as it may, the question is how we proceed to extend that context of tolerance and cooperation among the ethnic and religious groups in Africa. First, we must cultivate tolerance and understanding so as to facilitate the realization of the common objective of building a peaceful humane and materially and spiritually prosperous society. Each ethnic and religious group in Africa must strive for positive understanding, that is, understanding from various points of view. Positive understanding smoothens communication and keeps the common objective in focus.

Peaceful coexistence is necessary for the reconciliation of positional, latitudinal and marked conflicts as well as for society's common interest. Peaceful coexistence has its ideal optimum in a society in which scarcities are nil and in which all conflicts have evaporated and in a society which all conflicts have evaporated and in a society which generates with one mind, one interest and mentally consistent goals. Its lower limit is realized in a society wherein all conflict categories, however frequently they occur in whatever magnitude they occur with whatever subtlety they rear their heads, can be resolved through the instrumentality of either practical institutions or cultural signals and sanctions in the system. Clearly, the former, the ideal optimum is a utopia; the latter possesses degrees of attainability. This attainability in turn constitutes one of the greatest challenges to our intellectual ability and to our fund of practical wisdom.

At root, what makes peace and peaceful coexistence difficult to achieve? Peaceful benefits everybody. Why do individuals then act in ways that put peaceful coexistence in jeopardy? In his interesting little book, *The Religions of Man*, Houston Smith (1999) adverted to a statement of the late president Eisenhower which ran thus: "With everyone a loser in every new war a better understanding than ever before is essential among people and among nations". Whatever circumstances that warrants this statement, it is a significant statement coming from a celebrated war general, a hero of the Second World War. When extended further, the late president's notion which seems to be saying that in every violent altercation, in every violent confrontation, everyone is really a loser for at least disrupting the bond of unity for contracting the circle of human relations and for obstructing the growth of human understanding.

In respect of human understanding the view of Houston Smith is worth noting. According to him: "In a word the motive (for understanding) is peace. The word (Peace) rings so sweet that our own first impulse is to clasp it as the final goal of all seeking. But this would be wrong. Peace as we usually use the word is the absence of war, and as such however indispensable is negative. The final argument for understanding another cannot be to keep out of trouble with him; it is to enjoy the wider angle of vision such understanding affords. The vision can carry a thousand derivative benefits, silent harvest of the yields of wisdom, but the basic reward is the view itself".

The benefits of peaceful coexistence ramify more rapidly through society and by inducing insecurity in the individual threaten his private peace of mind. Why, we must ask again do private actions conflict with the demand of peaceful coexistence which demand is in the best interest of the individual? The answer simply is this: that peaceful coexistence is a social commodity that cannot be called into a state of optimal existence as the direct sum of uncoordinated individual actions; it is not the product of *laissez-faire* atomism. Correspondingly, peace by its social nature must be studiously organized, it never comes easy, by its very nature it must be induced and systematically sustained! Its induction has a price; its sustenance requires a trade-off.

Parenthetically, we should note that the type of reasoning pursued here provides a nontrivial analytical justification for the establishment by the Federal Government of the Advisory Council of Religious affairs.

The analysis undertaken here also leads one to the issue of those who express fear, despondence and apprehension about these matters following the retort: how much organized effort have been put into the creation of an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence? The point bears repetition; peace and peaceful coexistence require organization. Religious peace is a species of peace and must therefore also be organized. Precisely why is tolerance required? If we may continue with our analytical framework, we can say that intragroup religious activities both temporarily and spatially generate spill overs and such spill overs are exacerbated by value frictions between and among groups.

Tolerance is therefore required not to put too much weight upon such externalities. On the other hand, consideration (a form of altruism) is also required from the source of the activities to effect a tempo that minimizes the spill over. The same instrumentality required to induce tolerance is required to sustain it. Tolerance thrives best through the creation of a culture of mutual respect and civility. Thus peaceful coexistence is based on tolerance and tolerance subsists upon mutual respect and mutual respect is enhanced through the understanding and appreciation of one another's differing needs. To achieve this, there must be the continuous rejection of particularistic claims in which one ethnic and religious group sees itself as the Messiah.

Christianity must play down passages such as "He who believes and is baptized will be saved; he who does not believe will be condemned" Islam should also refrain from using injunctions such as "Whoever seeks another religion than Islam it shall be among the losers". Due recognition must be given to the independence and the capability for each ethnic and religious groups. This kind of attitude will go a long way to removing lurking narrow mindedness which is capable of creating disaffection and discord. Furthermore, there should also be the continuous encouragement of the spirit of cooperation which will afford the ethnic and religious groups in Africa opportunity of working together in order to fight the common societal enemies in our growing materialistic community.

Such enemies are corruption in all its forms, injustice, oppression, nepotism and all other forms. Chukwulozie (1999), in recommending the use of dialogue to achieve the right attitudes and cooperation between the different ethnic and religious groups, identifies the spirit in which the task should be undertaken. These are:

- (i) Real friendship; the ethnic and religious groups must cease to go their separate ways. Rather they must be full of welcome for one another. This welcome means accepting themselves as they really are from their historic background, feelings and patterns of thought.
- (ii) There is the need for serious study of each other's history and religion: with this it will afford full knowledge about the claims of each other. With such knowledge the various ethnic and religious groups will come to respect each other's stand point
- (iii) The various ethnic and religious groups must be ready to make frank statement to show clearly their positions when taking part in dialogues to show that no ulterior motives are intended. This can lead to nothing but the joy experienced in discovering that the partner in dialogue really believes in his thought and faith and also finding out that there is the sharing of certain ethnic and religious affinities in common.
- (iv) All the above will lead to a new understanding of each other's ethnic and religions. Moreover, this understanding contains values that contribute to the realization of God's plan for mankind. It is the will of God mankind to live peaceful and cooperative with each other.

When all the above guidelines have been observed, we may begin to foretell a future where the different ethnic and religious groups will regard themselves as one and corporate seekers in an identical quest. From this standpoint it will not be out of place to begin to predict future solidification of the tolerant and

peaceful co-existence of the various ethnic and religious groups. A development that will not allow the type of ethnic and religious conflicts often witnessed in Africa to stand in the way of Africa's National progress, cooperation and brotherhood. Such a relationship if achieved would, as Kenny opines, put Africa in the fore front toward good ethnic and religious relations.

Conclusion

The study has taken cursory look at the Karl poppers philosophy of tolerance and its implication on ethnicity and religions in Africa. The expositor of Karl Poppers philosophy has brought into being the problem of tolerance and its implications in ethnic and religious groups. This problem has led to wanton destruction of life and property. It now behooves on Africa governments to rigorously promote a robust form of tolerance regarding ethnic and religious groups in Africa by placing strong limits on what type of tolerance the state and legitimately promote

References

- Asselin Charles, Colonial Discourse since Christopher Columbus, *Journal of Black Studies* Vol. 26, No. 2 (Nov., 1995), 134-152 Sage Publications, Inc
- Awoniyi Sunday, African Cultural Values: The Past, Present and Future, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Volume 17, No.1, 2015)*.
- Bentham Hami, Colonization and Tools for the Creation of Ethnic Identities in the Colonized World, London, Oxford University Press, 2003, 3
- Blackburn Simon, "Other Minds", in *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Boyle Kevin and Sheen Juliet, eds. Freedom of Religion and Belief: A World Report (New York: Routledge, 1998), 475.
- Christopher Miller, Theories of Africa; New York, New York Publishers, 2000, 67
- Chukwudozie M.C. "Dialogue for Religious Tolerance", Lagos: Guardian Newspaper Ltd, 1999
- Cocodia, J. Exhuming Trends in Ethnic Conflict and Cooperation in Africa: Some Selected States *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* / Vol. 8 No. 3 2008.
- Crane T, The Meaning of Belief: Religion from an Atheist's Point of View. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Dave Snowden, Happy Clappy- The Cynefin Co Making of Sense of Complexity 2008 Retrieved 25th July, 2023 from: <https://thecynefin.co/happy-clappy/>
- Egharevba, M.E. & Iruonagbe, C.T. "Ethnic/Religious Insurgencies and Nation Building in Nigeria". *The Journal of International Affairs and Global Strategy* Vol. 29. 2015. 75
- Egwu C, Religious Intolerance in Nigeria in Nigeria, Lagos, Abpoint. 2000, .2

- Emile Lester and Patrick S. Roberts, The Distinctive Paradox of Religious Tolerance: Active Tolerance as a Mean between Passive Tolerance and Recognition, *Public Affairs Quarterly* University of Illinois Press, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 2006), 329-362
- Finsterbusch, K, Scarcity and its Social Impacts: Likely Political Responses. In M. N. Dobkowski & I. Wallimann (Eds.), *On the Edge of Scarcity: Environment, Resources, Population, Sustainability, and Conflict* Syracuse University Press. 2002, 93-107
- HamiBhadha, Colonization and Tools for the Creation of Ethnic Identities in the Colonized World, London, OUP, 2000. 3
- Hjerm M., Eger M. A., Bohman A., Connolly, F. F. (2019). A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance: Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance, Respect, and Appreciation of Difference. *Social Indicators Research*, 147, 897–919.
- Houston Smith., *The Religion of Man*, New York, New York Publisher. 1999, 10
- Kenny Joseph, Christians and Muslims in Nigeria: A Case of Competitive Sharing: Nigerian Dialogue. 1999, 2
- Mabogunje A., *Geographical Boundaries and Ethnic Pluralism in Nigeria*, London, OUP. 2000, 2
- Mamdani M, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Oxford, Kampala & Cape Town: James Currey, Fountain and David Phillip 1996
- Nnoli O, *Ethnicity and Development in Nigeria*, Aldershot, England: Avebury for UNRISD 1995
- Otite O., & Albert, I. O., *Community Conflicts in Nigeria: Management, Resolution and Transformation*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books. 2001.
- Popper Karl Ryan, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1945, 167-172
- Rachels, James. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill, 1999
- Rajeev Bhargava. "Karl Popper: Reason without Revolution". *Economic and Political Weekly*, December 31, 1994.
- Raz, Joseph, 'Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective', *Ethics in the Public Domain: Essays in the Morality of Law and Politics* (Oxford, 1995; online edn, Oxford Academic, 22 Mar. 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198260691.003.0008>, Accessed 24 July, 2023.
- Tronto, Joan. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1994
- Welch S., *The Military and Ethnicity in Africa* New York, New York Press, 1995, 3