

The Eclipse of Dialogue and the Culture of Death

Rev. Fr. Dr. Benjamin Nzenekwesi Eze
Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu,

Abstract

Man is a being with others. The nature of man therefore, is that which is relational – vertical to God and horizontal to man. In his horizontal nature, man interacts, shares, enriches and develops himself in this encounter. Nevertheless, one experiences within this encounter, a Hobbesian world, in which man becomes a wolf to other man. The being – with – others in a society which is propelled naturally through the process of dialogue, has turned into oblivion by an obnoxious, paganistic and atheistic culture of death instead of life. The root of this culture stems from the absence of the vertical relationship with God. By living “as if God did not exist”, man not only loses sight of the mystery of God, but also of the mystery of the world and the mystery of his own being.

The methodology used in the work is descriptive and analytical.

Key words: God, Man, Eclipse, Dialogue, Culture of death

Introduction

Martin Heidegger (1962) states that no epoch has been known to conquer many and so various knowledge of man as ours, yet no epoch has understood man as little as ours. In no epoch has man become so problematic as in ours. It is not easy to state effectively where the origin of this incomprehensibility of man lies. Nevertheless, the difficulty mainly dwells in the complexity of his constitution - organic, psychic, social and spiritual, summed up as in body and soul. Despite his complexity, the question of man still remains a puzzle and his being a mystery. Unfolding the mysteriousity of man, one discovers that man is a *homo relationis* – a relational being, vertical to God and horizontal to men. By these twofold relationships one observes therefore, that man is equally a *homo religiosus et homo socialis* – a religious and social being. He is equally a dialectical being, a being in movement. As a religious being, the council fathers (1995) observed that, Men look to their different religions for an answer to the unsolved riddles of human existence. The problems that weigh heavily on the hearts of men are the same today as in the ages past. What is man? What is the meaning and purpose of life? What is upright behavior, and what is sinful? Where does suffering originate, and what end does it serve? How can genuine happiness be found? What happens at death? What is judgment? What reward follows death? And finally, what is the ultimate mystery, beyond human explanation, which embraces our entire existence, from which we take our origin and towards which we tend?

Reflecting on the dialectical nature of man, the problem remains, to what extent man has responded to this dialogical nature - to God and to man. More worrisome is the eclipse of this dialogical nature in man. Requesting to a combined effort in search of solution, Francis Cardinal Arinze (1999), addressing the world religious leaders in Rome on inter religious dialogue reminded the audience in his words, “Our common task which begin today ask of us patient listening, mutual trust and honest sharing. We are quite numerous. We are different

one from, not only because of our religious belonging, but also because of our languages and geographical origins. And yet we could like to work at shaping a common message which we wish to address to the entire world. Let us not forget that religion is the soul of society, it is like leaven that can transform humanity.” The truism that religion is the soul of the society is linked with the religion itself viewing from its etymology.

The word religion comes from the Latin etymology *religio, religare*, to bind, to retie, to refix, to reunite, to sow together. It can also mean recognition of a higher unseen controlling power or powers, with the emotion and morality connected therewith. In a simple parlance, the essence of religion consists in the feelings of absolute dependence on the supra-ordinate.

According to Anih S. N. (1990),

Religion is essentially an arena where “tradition meet tomorrow “, where conservative encounter ultra progressives, where fundamentalist concelebrate with fool –hardy liberals and where orthodoxy must of necessity embrace with avant-gardism, because religion is by its nature both divine and human. It is both time space bound and equally at home in eternity. Philosophers reflect on religion, anthropologist make it an essence of their studies, psychologist claims that religion is there exclusive preserve, sociologist stumble into religion for their social constructs, phenomenologist cannot but accept the ubiquity of religion while theologians aver their religion is their personal property. All this fields and more have tried to define religion from there tangent of action. This has not made the definition and study of religion an easy matter (p. 4).

Even though religion as music is not easy to define, however, a better understanding of the etymology of religion gives us a clue to our task, the eclipse of dialogue and the culture of death.

Statement of the problem

The restlessness of man

The task ahead is properly captured by Francis cardinal Arinze (1999) thus: What has representatives of the various religions to say to this? Our world knows tensions, conflicts, inter-ethnic wars, so called ‘ethnic cleansing,’ genocide, mass expulsion of people from their homes, lack of openness to people of other cultures, languages or religions, hatred, intolerance and violence. We also notice denial of objective moral norms of right and wrong, moral decadence, erosion of family values, etc. these painful and alarming conditions are often the result of selfishness and greed on the part of us humans. They are visible expressions of a mentality which is contrary to the highest ideals of our respective religious traditions. They do, in fact, tarnish the image of religion (p.29).

The danger of extinction

If the religions do not act decisively and together, are they not in danger of marginalizing themselves in society into the object of interesting study of the past, instead of being relevant, dynamic forces of action in the present and future? What have the religions to contribute that will be of lasting value to world? Learning from the past, what have the religions to resolve for the future? What message do they want to give the world that is asking for one?

The societal challenge

Many world problems and challenges today goes beyond boundaries of one particular religion. Example are poverty, inflation, the growing cap between the poor and rich, drug,

AIDS, terrorism, religious extremism, oppression of the poor and weak, dictatorship, corruption in public life, weakening of family ties, promiscuity. It is necessary for the flowers of various religions to join hands in seeking a lasting solution of these problems.

Avarice and scandalous inequality

As we survey the situation of the humanity, is it too much to speak of a crisis of civilization? We see great technological advances, but these are not always accompanied by great spiritual and moral progress. We see as well a growing gap between the rich and the poor – at the level of individuals and of nations. Many people make great sacrifices to show solidarity with those suffering want or hunger or disease, but there is still lacking the collective will to overcome scandalous inequalities and to create new structures which will enable all peoples to have a just share in the world's resources.

Explication of terms

➤ **What is eclipse?**

When we speak of eclipse especially in relation to dialogue we refer to the disappearance. As disappearance, it is seen as loss, vanishing; disappearing trick, escapology. It can equally be seen as sleight; flight. It means also escape; exit. It is seen as departure; evaporation. It can equally be seen as vaporization, decomposition, decrease, fade away, fade to appear etc. According to Juddy Pearsall (ed.) (2001) New Oxford Dictionary of English, eclipse as a phrase is used to designate, “losing or having lost significance, power or prominence.” (p.586)

What is dialogue?

Dialogue is seen in different forms and takes different approaches. It can take the form of an argument. It is a kind of discussion, symposium, exchange of views, cut and thrust; disputation, controversy, debate. Dialogue has a logical sequence of thesis which leads to anti – thesis and which may lead to synthesis. The synthesis can form a thesis of another dialogical movement. Organized meetings for experts are good, but “living in dialogue” is more vital and better. Spirits of openness and sharing, readiness to listen and learn from one another, letting the other person explain are sine qua non in an authentic dialogue.

The experience of recent years gives evidence on the many ways in which dialogue is expressed. We have become used to talking about four distinct but related forms of dialogue: informal contact that takes place in day to day life through a net work of relationship where people live, work or meet, collaboration that takes place when people belonging to different religions unit in common action to confront to some problems and challenges of the world, dialogue between specialists and experts who discuss religious matters, and dialogue in the form of exchange of religious experience.

➤ **What is culture of death?**

According to Federal Republic of Nigeria: Cultural Policy for Nigeria (1988),

Culture is the totality of the way of life evolved by a people in their attempts to meet the challenge of living in their environment, which gives order and meaning to their social, political, economic, aesthetic and religious norms and modes of organization thus distinguishing a people from their neighbours (p.5)

By way of summary, Okafor R. C and Emeka L. N, (2013) opined that,

“all people have culture and culture exists only when there is a human society. There can be no dichotomy between both. Culture has to do with the community or nation – not with individual skills. Culture is central to the life of a society. The feeling of national identity springs from a common cultural identity. Culture is not static. Any

culture that does not develop, develop atrophies and dies. What it was in the past, it is not now. And what it is now, it will not be in the future.” (p.20)

The concept of life and death

Life, *Ndu*, is a word like every other word in Igbo language, but it is also a special word because it has a special meaning and place in Igbo traditional society. It is a pregnant word. Eze B. N. (2015) noted that “it holds together or, put in other words, it gives the Igbo cosmology meaning. It is a moment, which no Igbo man will like to pass by without being involved in it. It is that period between birth and death.” (p.69) When we speak of life, we speak of that distinguishing character between living things and non-living things. Life includes the capacity of growth, reproduction, functional activities and changes leading to death. One can interpret it as existence. It is an existence in the world whose being brings meaning and order into being. With regard to our work, we have to narrow our analysis of life to human life; that is to say, life as it pertains to man and his environment. Human life is seen not only from the biological perspective, but also from diverse aspects of life as time, affairs, vigorousness, life, biography, vocation, and activity.

Life in relation to God, human beings, ancestors, spirits, community and land is a communion. For E. I. Metuh (1991), life is communion. Communion is not limited to the relationship with the created order - the universe, the spirits, ancestors, his family and community but also relationship with the creator himself: *Chukwu* (p.100). This relational dimension of man is seen in man as a covenanted entity. F. Njoku (1992) writes, “the Igbo African is a covenanted entity always in communion with God, the spirits, the land, the ancestors; etc. The visible and the invisible meet and commune in him. In man is the communion of beauty, life and all. As the beauty of life, he is the beauty of all. His all is his life, and every other thing - value system, symbol, and structure has to be interpreted in relation to his life. His life is his totality.” Life and its increase, and the sense of community are the values most prized by the Igbo and these are what they looked forward to having in the after-life.

Basic in the Igbo traditional belief system is that life is a continuous process, a never-ending process. According to Uchendu V. C. (1965), “to know how a people view the world around him is to understand how they evaluate life; and a people’s evaluation of life, both temporal and non temporal, provides them with a “charter” of action, a guide to behaviour.” (p. 11)

On the other hand, death is a reality, a mystery, a thief, and an undertaker. It is blind, deaf and without hand or leg, yet when it grips a man, it renders him powerless and incapacitated. Death is a source of terror to the Igbo whose culture challenges him to achievement. It is seen as an end of all ambitions. Man in face of death is first of all confronted with fear and solitude.

Before death we are like cities without walls, defenceless.

When we speak of culture of life and culture of death, we mean what necessary ingredients that makes sustains this great gift of God, life and what can rob us this treasurable value away from us.

Causes of the eclipse of dialogue and the culture of death

John Paul II (1995, no. 21), observes that in seeking the deepest roots of the struggle between the “culture of life” and the “culture of death”, we cannot restrict ourselves to the perverse

idea of freedom mentioned above. We have to go to the heart of the tragedy being experienced by modern man: the eclipse of the sense of God and of Man, typical of a social and cultural climate dominated by secularism, which with its ubiquitous tentacles, succeeds at times in putting Christian communities to the rest. When the sense of God is lost, there is also a tendency to lose the sense of man, of his dignity and his life; in turn, the systematic violation of the moral law, especially in the serious matter of respect for human life and its dignity, produces a kind of progressive darkening of the capacity to discern God's living and saving presence.

Consequently, when the sense of God is lost, the sense of man is also threatened and poisoned, as the Second Vatican Council (1965) concisely states: "Without the Creator the creature would disappear...But when God is forgotten the creature itself grows unintelligible (GS, 36). The Igbo adage which states that the mouth said that the head should be cut off, and the head was cut off and the mouth followed. Why? The mouth is mouth because of the head. Without the head is the mouth useless. The creature without the creator becomes *orientierungslos* that means, loses its bearing and floats in the air. He becomes any other thing but what ought to be, a mysterious being. The more he neglects, jettisons and distances himself from God in his existence, the more he reduces himself to *onticles*, to mere things. Man, therefore, according to John Paul II, (1995 no. 22) is no longer able to see himself as mysteriously different from the earthly creatures; he regards himself merely as one more living being, as an organism which, at most, has reached a very high stage of perfection. Enclosed in the narrow horizon of his physical nature, he is somehow reduced to being "a thing", and no longer grasp the "transcendent" character of his "existence as man".

By living "as if God did not exist", man not only loses sight of the mystery of God, but also of the mystery of the world and the mystery of his own being.

The eclipse of the sense of God and of man inevitably leads to a practical materialism, which breeds individualism, utilitarianism and hedonism. Here too we see the permanent validity of the words of the Apostles: "And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a base mind and to improper conduct" (Rom. 1:28) The value of being is replaced by those of having. The only thing that counts is the pursuit of one's own material well-being.

When the values are replaced from being to having, the Latin adage which states that *nemo dat quod non habet* - No one gives what he has not - is proved alright. In a simple syllogism, when the premise is faulty, the conclusion can never be correct. That explains why John Paul II (1995, 24) declares:

It is at the heart of the moral conscience that the eclipse of the sense of God and of man, with all its various and deadly consequences for life, is taken place. It is a question, above all, of the individual conscience, as it stands before God in its singleness and uniqueness. But it is also a question in a certain sense, of the "moral conscience of society; in a way it too is responsible, not only because it tolerates or fosters behavior contrary to life, but also because it encourages the "culture of death", creating and consolidating "structures of sin" which goes against life.

Effect of the eclipse of dialogue and culture of death

Worthlessness of man

Man by jettisoning God, and treating the other with ignominy only knowing the language of self, has not only exposed his wretchedness but equally portrays the eclipse of his being. Anih S. C (1992) captured the picture well when he observed that

Meaninglessness is dreadfully a terrifying experience. It is indeed a deeply disturbing experience both for the believer and the unbeliever, for the faithful and the apostate, the young and the aged. In the presence of problems and mysteries we could be totally puzzled but in the face of meaninglessness we are bismally reduced to ridicule and perturbation. This is because meaninglessness creates alienation, otherness and frustration; the umbilical cord of belongingness is put asunder while the nebulous chain of intersubjectivity is broken to an irreparable strangeness. (p.x)

Faced with meaninglessness, one quickly abandons thinking and turn to self-hypnotism, mass hysteria, necromancy or quick nostrum which of necessity do produce frustration, self-deceit, socio-cultural anomaly and goallessness.

The Sadness of man

The effect of the eclipse of the dialogue resulting to the culture of death is well articulated by John Paul II (1995:24) comparing the saddened state of Man with that the picture which St. Paul in his letter to the Romans captured. According to him, a large part of contemporary society looks sadly like that humanity which Paul describes in his letter to the Romans. It is composed “of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth” (1:18); having denied God and believing that they can build the earthly city without Him, “they became futile in their thinking” so that “their senseless minds were darkened” (1:21); “claiming to be wise they became fools” (1:22), carrying out works deserving of death “they not only do them but approve those who practice them” (1:32).

Violence

By bracketing out God in his existence and enthroning himself as the super man, he becomes then the Lord and master and the resultant effect is confusion, conflict, corruption and catastrophe. Man having broken the relationships of the vertical and the horizontal dimensions of his being, turned to attack mechanism, of self, of the other, of the environment and a shifting responsibility syndrome.

As a result of this, there are many conflicts continually breaking out around the world – wars between nations, armed struggles within nations, conflicts that linger like festering wounds and cry out for a healing is that seems never to come. Inevitably it is the weakest who suffer most in these conflicts, and violence becomes the order of the day.

“Via” was the classical Greek word for “violence”. Homer once said that “insolence and violence reach the iron heaven”. Its Latin equivalent derived from “vis” (force) was “violentia.” Having missed the road to life, man becomes confused and frustrated. In his frustration he becomes aggressive leading to violence. Baron, R. A. et al. (1974, p. 271) observes that in line with Freud’s view is the famous “frustration-aggression hypothesis” proposed by Mc Dougall, Dollard Doob, Miller, Mower and Sears. The view suggested that frustration, that is, interruption of goal-directed or purposeful activity is conducive to aggression of which violence is a major type. But we are aware of the fact that aggression is not always as result of frustration. And so, “the suggestion that all acts of violence are necessarily preceded by the blocking or thwarting of goal-directed behavior does not seem tenable.” However, it is of utmost important to note that not all violent action is prompted by frustration. However, a frustrating event increases the probability of acting aggressively. So, despite its odd, extreme frustration may result to violence.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) had argued that men in their state of nature are aggressive and violent. This recalls the celebrated “homo homini lupus” of Plautus (254-184 BC), the Roman comic poet. Hobbes, “the father of modern analytic philosophy”, was of the opinion that man

by nature has three main sources of conflict, namely, “competition,” “differences”, and “glory”. Each of these, lead man to look naturally for “gain”, “safety”, and “reputation”, respectively. Man uses violence to establish his superiority and defend by all means his whole possessions against the other competitors. While man’s existence is marked by individualism, selfishness and self-centeredness, man becomes a wolf to other men.

Woodbridge F.J.E ed. (1930, p.253) cited Hobbes in his own words: The life of man (is) solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

Kourvetarris, G. A, and Dobatz, B. A (1980, p.222) presented Vilfredo Pareto’s (1848-1923) thought that saw violence as a “method by which the aristocratic classes hope to maintain their high social status, and even their existence, since “history is a cemenry of the aristocracies”. This point out to the fact that the dominant elites have their own praxis opposed to the revolutionary praxis as Freire argued. For him, “manipulation”, “regimentation”, “sloganizing”, “prescription”, and “depositing”, are components of the praxis of domination. And so:

in order to dominate, the dominator has no choice but to deny true praxis to the people, deny them the right to say their own word and think their own thoughts. He cannot act dialogically, for him to do so would mean either that he had relinquished his power to dominate... or that he had lost that power through miscalculation.(p.97)

In his words: Machiavelli, N. (1941) said, “...the prince needs to be a fox that he may know how to deal with traps, and a lion that he may frighten the wolves It is therefore necessary that he has a mind capable of turning in whatever direction the wind of fortune and the variations of affairs require... (pp. 148-149). Hannah Arendt has argued that violence can at least “serve to dramatize grievances and bring them to public attention”. Sorel went further than this to argue that the structure and change of society are based on violence and violence for him is not evil, since history has proved it an instrument of progress. He said violence is important for keeping high morality of the workers and for being a necessary tactic in perpetuating the class struggle which is the evidence of social health because element of “grandeur” would be restored to humanity as its outcome.

Evil is evil and when the moral conscience is dead, is everything dead. This portrays glaringly as some people take delight in causing and learning violence or even rewarding people for destruction of lives and properties. Baron R. A, et al (1974,pp.272-273), presents Albert Bandura, who hinted on the ability of the individual to learn to act in a violence way by direct experiences in which he was rewarded for such behavior. This suggests that the individual could be trained to act in a violent manner under appropriate conditions. Besides, a neophyte in the act of violence could learn through observation. In this case, the people may meet- neighbours, school-mates, friends, members of the family and the environment play an unavoidable role. In addition, acts of violence, produce material reward at all levels of human existence-childhood, adulthood and nation wise. Violence, therefore, breaths in the social reward and approval. But unfortunately, this theory: Remains controversial, due to the fact that all of the experiments on which it has been based involves minor changes in a few stimuli, and not major changes in the entire culture.

In this connection, Moa Tse-Tung, who said that “to cut off heads changes nothing... it is what is inside the head which has to be changed” welcomed violence and asserts that “power grows out of the barrel of a gun”.

It is this line of thought that we should mention Fanon who asserted that violence is conducive for modernization. Suffice it here to say that for him colonial oppression and dehumanization can be eradicated through violence.

Kourvetaris, G. A. and Dobratz, B. A.(1980, p.222), presents Lowry and Rankin who said in the final analysis that, "... popular attitudes about violence are substantially influence by cultural views and biases... violence is a natural outcome of certain kinds of social and cultural situations and to view it only as a pathology is to make appropriate response to violence all but impossible. For Onwuanibe R. C. (1983, pp. 8-9), the definition of violence would then embrace the physical, sociological, psychological and even ethical aspects. And violence becomes then a "great force which is capable of injuring, damaging or destroying a man or property, or intensive psychological attack or incendiary attack on a person or property." The ultimate objective of such a force is the reduction of men to things and the effect is a loss in human ability towards thinking, planning and action in regard to the metaphors of his cultural inheritance. Confronted with the reality of life, coupled with being cut the cross road, man's stage becomes a stage or life situation of fear.

Fear

Man's thought, plan and action now diverts from divine and human relationship to agent and victim relationship. However, the intensity has been compromised.

Zygmunt Baumann (2006, p.2) observes that fear is at its most fearsome when it is diffused, scattered, unclear, unattached, unanchored, free floating, with no clear address or cause; when it haunts us with no visible rhyme or reason, when the menace we should be afraid of can be glimpsed everywhere but it nowhere to be seen. Fear is the name we give to our uncertainty: to our ignorance of treat and of what is to be done – what can and what can't be – to stop it in its tracks – or to fight it back if stopping it is beyond our power.

In his uncertainty therefore, coupled with the unclearness of the fear, man is then in danger. Baumann Zygmunt (2006, pp.3-4) observes, "dangers one is afraid of (and so also the derivative fears they arouse) may be of three kinds. Some threaten the body and the possessions. Some others are of a more general nature; threatening the durability and reliability of social order on which security of livelihood (income, employment) or survival in the case of invalidity or old age, depend. Then there are dangers that threatens ones place in the world – a possession in the social hierarchy, identity, (class, gender, ethnic, religious), and more generally an immunity to social degradation and exclusion."

Jean Pierre Dupuy writes Baumann Zygmunt (2006, p.15) found a name for what was about to happen: "The irruption of the possible in the impossible". He warned: to prevent a catastrophe, one needs first to believe in its possibility. One needs to believe that the impossible is possible. That the possible always lurks, restlessly, inside protective carapace of impossibility, waiting to irrupt. No danger is so sinister and no catastrophe strikes so hard as those that are viewed as of negligible probability; thinking of them as improbable or not thinking of them at all is the excuse for doing nothing to stop them before they reach the point at which the improbable turns into reality and it is suddenly too late to mitigate its impact, let alone to stave its arrival.

The meeting point of man's quest for God.

Religion being natural to man no matter what class, creed, country other may belong should serve as a base for the meeting point. The Church has also a high regard for the Muslims. They worship God, who is one, living and subsistent, merciful and almighty, the creator of heaven and earth, who has also spoken to men.

The council Fathers (1995) observes that we cannot truly pray to God the Father of all if we treat any people in other than brotherly fashion, for all men are created in God's image. Man's relation to God the Father and man's relation to his fellow-men are so dependent on each other that the scripture says "he who does not love, does not know God" (1 Jn. 4:8)

Conclusion

There is no basis therefore, either in theory or in practice for any discrimination between individual and individual, or between people and people arising either from human dignity or from the rights which flow from it.

God is a merciful Father, a sincere rethinking of man on himself as Socrates called, man know yourself, will in no small measure help in cubing the gab especially in our dual relationship with God and our neighbour. There is a call on man to return back to God his creator. The commandment of God which is summarized with the love of God and of neighbour should be a watch word that will not only reunite man to God but will inculcate the spirit of tolerance and oneness.

Suggestions/Remedies of the eclipse of dialogue

Dialogue

The church, therefore, urges her sons to enter with prudence and charity into discussion and collaboration with members of other religions. Let Christians, while witnessing to their own faith and way of life, acknowledge, preserve and encourage the spiritual and moral truths found among non-Christians, also their social life and culture.

Over the centuries many quarrels and dissensions have arisen between Christians and Muslims. The sacred council now pleads with all to forget the past, and urges that a sincere effort be made to achieve mutual understanding; for the benefit of all men, let them together preserve and promote peace, liberty, social justice and moral values. (Vat. 11, Nostra Aetate, 28 October, 1995 no. 3)

Therefore, the Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against people or any harassment of them on the basis of their race, colour, and condition in life or religion. Accordingly, following the footsteps of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, the sacred Council earnestly begs the Christian faithful to “conduct themselves well among gentiles” (1Pet. 2:12) and if possible, as far as depends on them, to be at peace with all men (Rom. 12:18) and in that way to be true sons of the Father who is in heaven (Mt. 5:45) (Vat. 11, Nostra Aetate, 28 October, 1995 no. 5)

All Christians must therefore be committed to dialogue with the believers of all religions, so that mutual understanding and collaboration may grow; so that moral values may be strengthened; so that God may be praised in all creation. (John Paul II, Manila, 21.2.81)

Our meeting here also lays great emphasis on prayer, the universal cry of the heart towards GOD, the source of life. Through the expression of prayer, each religion in accordance with its proper identity, we would like to meet before GOD like brothers and sisters and together commit ourselves to seeking the path of peace.

Cooperative pastoral

Believers building together God's kingdom: As a Christian, it is my conviction that flowers of the various religions, inspite of their fundamental in beliefs and rites, can strive to build together a word more and more according to the will of God, the creator. Therefore effort is required to in two dimensions, vertical and horizontal: vertical because they want to promote religions and spiritual values (recollection, meditation, prayer, adoration of God thanksgiving to God, repentance for faults of commission or commission and humility before God), and Horizontal because as a consequence they went to promote together greater solidarity among all the members of the human family.

REFERENCES

- Anih S. C., (1990). *An Introduction to the Fundamentals of Religious Ecumenism in Nigeria*, Enugu, Nigeria: Snaap
- Anih S. C. (1992). *Religious Ecumenism and Education for tolerance in Nigeria*. Enugu, Nigeria: Snapp
- Arinze F. (1999). *Towards a culture of Dialogue*, Vatican City: Editrice Vaticana
- Baron, R. A., et al.(1974). *Social Psychology*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Baumann Zygmunt (2006). *Liquid Fear*, London: Polity.
- Eze B. N. (2015). *Challenges of Health care workers vis-à-vis Evangelical mission of Jesus Christ in Igboland, Nigeria*, Munster, Germany: LIT,
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1988). *Cultural Policy for Nigeria*. Lagos: Fed Govt. Press
- Flannery A., (ed), (1996). Vatican Council II, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*, 7 Dec.1965. Vol. 1, Dublin: Dominican,
- Flannery A., (ed), (1996). Vatican Council II, , *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian religions, Nostra Aetate*, 28 October, 1995
Dublin: Dominican,
- Flannery A. ed. (1996). Vatican 11Council. Pastoral constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, Dublin: Dominican
- Freire, P. (1982). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, trans by Ramos, New York
- Heidegger, Martin (1962). *Kant e il problema della metafisica*, Milan,
- John Paul 11 (1995). *The Gospel of Life. Evangelium Vitae*, Rome: Editrice Vaticana,
- Kourvetaris, G. A. and Dobratz, B. A. (1980). *Political Sociology*, London: Transaction
- Machiavelli N., (1941). *The Prince*, trans by Allan, G. H. Chicago: Packard and co
- Metuh E. I., (1991). *African Religions in Western Conceptual Schemes: The Problem of Interpretation* (Studies in Igbo Religion) Jos, Nigeria: Imico
- Njoku F., (1992). *An understanding of life within the perspective of African Theology in "Encounter"*; A Journal of Life and Religion, vol. 1- No.1, Rome,
- Okafor R. C., Emeka L. N. (2013). *Nigerian People and Culture*, Enugu, Nigeria: New generation,

Onwuanibe, R. C, (1983). *A Critique of Revolutionary Humanism: Frantz Fanon*, Missouri: Warren H. Green

Pearsall Juddy (ed.) (2001) *New Oxford Dictionary of English*, London: Oxford,

Uchendu V.,(1965). *The Igbo of South East Nigeria*, Philadelphia, U.S.A,;Harcourt Brace Jovanovich