THE WORD AND THE WORLD: PRINCE OF PEACE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN THE CANONICAL GOSPEL NARRATIVES

Olugbenga Seun AINA, Temitope A. OLAIFA and Olakunle Olasupo THOMPSON
Peace and Development Studies Programme,
Institute of Communication and General Studies,
Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta
Correspondence to: E-mail: ainaos@funaab.edu.ng
Tel No: 08169217836

ABSTRACT

The lifetime of the Prince of Peace (Jesus Christ) from his infancy to the cross was conflict-laden. Despite the duality of his nature, his unparalleled love and peace blueprint for humankind, both physical and supernatural forces resisted the divine mission of Christ for the liberation and redemption of the world in order to avert its fulfilment. This article focused on the recorded conflicts encountered by Jesus Christ during his short redemptive ministry, particularly in his attempt to correct long established but wrong notions, hypocrisies and corrupt traditions under the guise of religion. The synoptic gospel writers and the gospel of John documented the conflicts that led to grave conspiracy against Christ and culminated in his death, but without exposition on his conflict management styles. This article therefore adopts a critical-analytical method to examine the importance of the dual nature of the Prince of Peace, the recorded conflict scenarios involving him and other parties as well as the conflict management approaches he adopted in varied circumstances, which are analogous to but predated the Thomas-Kilmann model. This paper also underscores mediation and reconciliation as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods employed by the Prince of Peace to resolve the age long conflict, end the alienation and restore peace between God and man. This paper concluded that the utopia peace, which is the quest of the world and the eschatological essence of Christ's title of the Prince of Peace, would only be attained during his millennial reign.

Keywords: Religion, Violence, Humankind, Redemption, Conflict Management

Introduction

The end of the war in heaven and the casting down of Satan alongside the rebellious angels to earth marked the beginning of the historical accounts of sin, conflict, violence,

bloodshed, atrocities and troubles in the world (Onu, 2021). Satan the chief rebel deviously instigated man to flout a lone divine instruction and sin against his Creator and the episode culminated in severe divine judgement leading to alienation between God (Word) and humanity (world). Man lost the divine nature and there was no hope of regaining the peace of God that was lost on earth in Eden by humanity until the coming of the Prince of Peace. The heralded prophecy of hope and peace in the golden verse six of the book of Isaiah chapter nine concerning the coming of the Messiah lastly described excellently as the Prince of Peace, was timely given to the nation of Israel plagued by persistent armed conflict and insecurity, which are the current realities and major challenges of the present world.

The two opposing forces of conflict and peace are integral parts of human nature and occupy human existence's center stage. Human societies are suffering from unending conflicts and lingering insecurity in diverse forms, which have made an innumerable number of people on a desperate search and craving for safety and peace in different climes across the world (Hawksley, 2015). However, the quest for peace and security in an unsafe, conflict-ridden and violence-engulfed global society through human ingenuity, intellectual prowess, and strategic efforts has failed to yield the desirable expectation of an enduring and utopian peace. This is due to the overwhelming sovereignty of negative peace, the dominance of structural violence, and countless armed conflicts in all regions of the world, arising from the depravity of human nature, greed, and man inhumanity to man, which has led to the premature demise of numerous individuals and frustration of many people who live helplessly in hopelessness and perpetual misery. Since the depravity and wickedness occupying the heart of humankind continually work against peace (Chappell, 2017), the degree of conflict in the world is asymmetrical with peace and the attainment of global peace has become a futile endeavour for human civilizations (Bonnie, 2010).

The Prince of Peace represents God's provision of hope for the rebellious and suffering Israel and by extension the entire humankind, not only for the remission of her sin but also for deliverance from violence and ordeals of life. The synoptic gospel writers made use of these texts of Isaiah in trying to expound the personality of Jesus, the Prince of Peace as a figure who demonstrated God's unwavering covenant of love and faithfulness to humankind. However, the advent of the Prince of Peace did not portend the coming of a powerful man, insusceptible to human misery and unaffected by conflict and insecurity in the world. Rather, the Prince of Peace was endangered by conflict and violence right from the earliest days of his life and later suffered humiliation, abuse and death. Like countless other people in contemporary times who are victims of religious

bigotry and violence, "the Prince of Peace died silently, anonymously, tragically and - to the watching crowds – ambiguously" (Hawksley, 2015). Even though his antagonists were ignorant of the purpose of Christ's earthly ministry and the cross in God's redemption agenda for humanity, the crucifixion of Christ symbolizes the peak of human violence and the crowning of human repudiation of and resentment towards God as portrayed by the gospel writers. The reality of his resurrection on the third day gave a regenerate man the optimism of peace in this world and eternal peace with God (Hawksley, 2015).

THE DUAL NATURE OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE

The Council of Chalcedon, the fourth ecumenical council of the Christian Church, met in A.D. 451 to resolve some of the Eastern Church divisions and eventually formulated the faith of the church regarding the person of Jesus Christ – the Prince of Peace. It asserted that Christ is "to be acknowledged in two natures without confusion, without change, without division without separation; the distinction of the natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one subsistence not parted or divided into two persons". Since the declaration, the church has upheld the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, an orthodox doctrine precludes anyone either to divide the person or to confound the natures. The position of the Council that his person could not be divided means that Christ does not have two personalities (persons) but one. He did not have a perfect divine mind and a limited human mind- Christ has only one mind. The gospel accounts present Christ as a person having one mind, one set of emotions and one will (Towns, 2003).

 The Prince of Peace is human and divine, the Son of Man and the Son of God. The reality of the pre-existent son of God assuming human nature having both human flesh and blood is a phenomenon that is shrouded in mystery. It shows an unexplainable supernatural capability of the infinite to physically come into finite relations and the historical life of the world. The early church accepted the doctrine of the two natures in one person not because they fully comprehend it but because of the conviction that it is a revelation by the word of God. The church has therefore upheld it as an article of faith because of its incomprehensibility by any mortal man (Berkhof, 2005). Thus, "the doctrine of the two natures in one person transcends human reason. It is an expression of supersensible reality, and of incomprehensible mystery, which has no analogy in the life of man as we know it, finds no support in human reason, and therefore can only be accepted on the authority of the Word of God" (Berkhof, 2005:322).

Although, many thinkers, theologians, and scientists in the annals of history advanced diverse arguments against the virgin birth and the doctrines of the two natures of Christ, modern open-minded theologians and scholars could not categorically refute the metaphysical sonship and the supernatural conception of Christ established on the infallibility of the word of God. Besides, any refutation of the transcendental personality of Christ is indefensible and inconclusive since the complete body of human knowledge of the ages past has undergone several modifications and the possibility of human reason to fully comprehend the ultimate reality is in doubt. The awe-inspiring truth that surpasses human intellect is that the beloved Son of God took upon himself human nature and this incarnation depicts a transition from God to man (Jn. 1-14, Berkhof, 2005).

The designation of the son of God was bestowed on the Prince of Peace in the supernatural senses in the biblical accounts (Rm.1:3, 8:3; Heb1:1, Jn. 1) and the scriptural proofs of the deity of Christ manifested in His divine titles, attributes, works, and honour attributed to him. The Old Testament predictions of a divine Messiah authenticate his deity (Ps. 2:6-12 , Isa. 9:6, Dan. 7:13; Mal 3:1.) while Jesus in the New Testament referred to himself as the son of God and other people ascribed it to him. At his baptism and transfiguration, a voice spoke from heaven confirmed Jesus as the son of God (Matt 3:17; 17:5; Mk 1:11, 9:7; Lk. 3:22, 9:35). In fact, the gospel of Luke attributed the source of his human nature directly to the supernatural fatherhood of God (Lk. 1-32). The deity of Christ is also established in numerous passages of the gospel of John and Pauline epistles (John 1:1-3; 14; 18, 3:16-18; II Cor. 5:10, Phl. 2:6; Heb. 1: 1-3). The reality of Jesus being a truly divine and supernatural personality portrayed as the Son of Man and the Son of God is presented throughout in the gospel narratives (Matt. 5:17; 9:6; 11: 1-6, Mk. 8: 38). Christ demonstrated his awareness of being the Son of God by declaring God as "my father" in several passages of the canonical gospels (Matt. 7:21, 10: 32,33; 11:27, Lk. 2:47, Jn. 15:1) (Berkhof, 2005).

The veracity of the humanity of Jesus, which is equally established by his human development and limitations, suggests that his deity should not be stressed to the level of obscuring his real humanity. Jesus called himself man, and other people likewise referred to him as a man. The most common self-designation of Jesus, which is the *Son of Man,* is an indication of the certainty of the humanity of Christ. The canonical gospels clearly reveal that Jesus possessed both a physical body and a coherent soul, which are indispensable features of human nature (Berkhof, 2005).

CONFLICT AND THE PRINCE OF PEACE

Conflict is a pervasive phenomenon which arises over perceived incompatibility of goals or interest. It is typified with diversity that arises from differences in cultures, opinions, convictions, value systems and cravings. It is unavoidably part of human relationships manifesting in our actions, conversations, decisions and thoughts (CBC, 2023).Conflict is a significant element that has a prominent influence in the gospel accounts of the life and public ministry of Jesus. The four canonical gospels described the ministry of Jesus as intensely plagued with conflicts, which culminated in his death on the cross. (Soares-Prahbu, 2003). The significance of the theme of conflict in the gospel narratives of the ministry of Jesus is evident right from the infancy narrative of the Prince of Peace in Matthew which Schlatter (1963) portrayed as 'the conflict of the Two Kings' (Herod and Jesus). Besides, conflict is obvious in the infancy narrative of Luke, through the prophesy of Simeon that 'this child is set for the fall and for the rising up of many in Israel' (Lk 2, 34 -35).Jesus is not only the Prince of Peace but also a Master of conflict who knew when to avoid conflict and when to bear it. Jesus was not afraid to provoke conflict when it was necessary such as his confrontations with the scribes and Pharisees and the turning over of the tables in the temple. He never ran away from conflict after his prayer at Gethsemane, but having foreseen the suffering and humiliation ahead, he surrendered himself to his adversaries (Adam, 2021).

At the wake of redemptive account lies the conflict between Christ and Satan. The declaration of God after the fall of man that "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head and you shall bruise his heels" initiated the conflict. Satan's temptation indicated the continuation of this conflict between the two parties and the devil began his attack on Jesus at the level of identity and security (Mathison, 2008). Jesus and Satan were in conflict from the wilderness to the Garden of Gethsemane until Christ's resurrection. The encounter between the Holy Spirit (which led him to the wilderness) and the Devil (the tempter) was one of the attempts to frustrate the fulfillment of the purpose for which God sent him (Matt. 4; Matt. 16; Mt. 13; Lk. 22-28). A regular theme is the friction between the apparent power of Satan and the sovereignty of God in the whole events (lan, 2019). Although the episode of the conflict is depicted in the narratives as an encounter between Jesus and the devil, it is noteworthy that the tempter did not approach him as a living external entity- as the narrative might seem to suggest- but Satan subtly tempted Christ in his human nature through a thought process.

The conflicts between Jesus and the Jews were caused by theological, legal and political intricacies. This is because clashes over religious and socio-political values degenerated into a power tussle between the Jewish authorities and Jesus alongside with his

disciples. It became evident in the gospels that many members of the Jewish authorities saw Jesus as a rabble-rouser and wanted to eliminate him. Thus, the interface between Jesus and the Jews and the religious leaders during his ministry was conflictual in nature based on his disapproval of their hypocritical lifestyles, casuistic interpretation of the Law and strict adherence to religious legalism (Mt 5, 21-48; Mk 7, 1-23). The grouse of his adversaries was that Jesus placed himself above the authority of Moses and the Law when he preached that God did not require strict observance of the prescriptions of the Law but shows gracious mercy towards sinners. The Jews therefore challenged Jesus' authority, convicted him as a 'blasphemer' and labelled him as a false Messiah (John 8:42-59; Cunningham, 2003).

He was in conflict with the multitude following him because of his utter refusal to grant their messianic expectations (Jn. 6, 15; 6, 26) and with his family for his rejection of their preferential claims on him (Lk 2, 41-52; Mk 3, 31-35). He was in disagreement with his disciples, whose persistent misinterpretation of his teachings he had to correct from time to time (Mk 4, 13; 8, 14-21; 10, 35-45). He was also in conflict with his own natural clinging to life and his instinctive aversion to suffering, when these attempted to prevail against his Father's will (Mk 14, 32-42; Mt 4, 1-11). Moreover, his encounter in the cleansing of the temple, the prophetic utterances on the temple's demolition, the call to follow him, his contravention of the Sabbath laws and his declaration of forgiveness of sins, reveals that the knowledge of Jesus about God is diametrically opposed to the understanding of his antagonists who upheld the traditions of the Law. Therefore, the teachings of Jesus led to the conflict between him and the religious leaders who believed that he had gone beyond the confines of the Law. Jesus contradicted the hopes represented in messianic prophecies and future events as understood by the Jewish leaders. They tagged Jesus as a false prophet who instead of denouncing sinners and tax collectors gave them the privilege to access unrestricted love and grace of God that allows the lost to obtain reconciliation with God (Cunningham, 1996).

The conflicts shared similar features with many other inter-group confrontations, which are laden with issues of power, values, goals and social change. Many of the Jews were not ready to accept the changes that Jesus was suggesting through his preaching or by his actions and his mission to bring peace and new life to the suffering world placed him in conflict with the Jewish leaders. However, The critics have challenged his name as the Prince of Peace with reference to one of the sayings of Jesus in the synoptic gospels that 'Do not think that I have come to bring peace upon the earth: I have not come to bring peace but the sword' (Mt 10, 34; Lk 12, 51). However, the kind of 'peace' he did not promote was the one that opposes his divine mission but guarantees a happy

compromise with Mammon (Mt 6, 24), and of a contented adjustment to a radically unjust and oppressive society, powered not by love but by greed. The 'sword' that he brings is the sword of division (Lk. 12, 51) that could divide even the members of a family into violently antagonistic groups who take up sides for or against him (Mt 10, 35-36).

The intensity of the conflict became obvious in the desperation of the scribes and Pharisees through their several attempts to trap Jesus with a view to bringing about his downfall. Some of the encounters recorded in the gospels suggest that the Pharisees were attempting to force Jesus into conflict in the hope that he would place himself in an awful position with the Law. This is a theme running through the gospel but Jesus always prevailed through his responses and escaped their traps and temptations (Matthew 22, Luke 10.25, and Matthew 12.11). When the Pharisees called upon Jesus pass a judgement on a situation, he refused to become their judges. This made the Jewish leaders to perceive that it was a zero-sum conflict situation. The conflict eventually degenerated to violence that culminated in violent death of the Prince of Peace on the cross (Schlatter, 1963).

PRINCE OF PEACE AND THOMAS-KILMAN'S MODEL OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

The response of Jesus to conflict in terms of management is dynamic and varied according to situations (Cunningham, 2003, Ituma and Peters, 2021). The Prince of Peace applied what was later formalised and popularly referred to as Thomas-Kilmann's Conflict Mode Instrument. The Thomas-Kilmann's conflict management styles present two distinctive factors known as assertiveness and cooperativeness. These factors produced five conflict management styles namely; avoidance, accommodating, competing or confrontation, compromising and collaborating. In this framework, the basis for assertiveness is self-interest, while cooperativeness emanates from concerns for the other party or relationship (Akinwale, 2010).

During his public ministry, whenever Jesus was confronted with a conflicting situation, he made choices out of the five approaches. Avoidance simply means walking away from the situation. Accommodating means getting along with others, even when what they want is not what you want. Competing means arguing or even contending to have things done your own way. Compromising means give and take, finding a way to get some of what we want and letting others have some of what they want. Collaborating means working together to find a solution that actually satisfies the need of everyone, others and ourselves. Jesus applied all of these approaches at different times depending

on the circumstances because each approach has situations when it is more appropriate to adopt (Jean, 2024).

The early record of avoidance of conflict was at infancy when he was taken to Egypt to escape the terror of Herod (Matt. 2-13). Jesus as a grown man avoided conflict when they wanted to make him king by force and also when they tried to arrest him (Jn. 16: 14-15, Jn. 10: 39-40). In these situations, Jesus deliberately avoided conflict when it was the appropriate action because he knew that walking away from a conflict without engaging in it would afford him the opportunity to accomplish his divine mandate (Jean, 2024). Jesus recommended going out of the way to accommodate those that His followers might have issues with (Matt. 5: 22-24). Jesus commanded his followers to love their enemies who are hostile to them as individuals or groups (Lk. 6, 27-28). He taught the multitude to accept and endure personal injury without complaining by asking them to turn the other cheek when struck on the right one; to give up one's cloak when one is sued for one's tunic; to carry a burden two miles, when someone is compelled to carry it one mile (Mt 5, 39-41). Accommodating as a conflict handling style requires humility in accepting the needs and preferences of others as well as showing the willingness and ability to adjust to situations (Jean, 2024).

Although Jesus is loving and caring for those he encountered, Jesus also adopted confrontation as a conflict management style. His action in the cleansing of the temple was confrontational because he forcefully evicted the moneychangers (Matthew 21: 12-13; Mark 11: 15-19; Luke: 19:45-48; John 2: 13-22). Jesus, like John the Baptist, used some intense words and phrases by calling the religious leaders a brood of vipers and also pronounced woes upon them in condemnation of their hypocritical attitudes of elevating the act of gifts giving to the temple at the expense of the weightier matters of the law, which are justice, mercy and faith (Adam, 2021). However, Christ's perception of conflict cannot be adjudged as a confrontation that will ultimately result in win-lose situation because His supreme goal of life is unconditional love, but that love does not necessarily rule out violence as it may demand violence for the protection or the correction of the beloved persons (Jean, 2024).

Compromising as a conflict handling style was adopted on the issue of payment of taxes (Matt. 22: 17-21). The questioners probably expected Jesus to oppose payment of taxes to the emperor and support the rebels against the Roman rule. Instead, he advocated a compromise that would allow the people to live in peace under the control of a foreign power. Although with compromise, no one is completely satisfied by the result, but both parties might be a little happier and able to move on (Jean, 2024). On collaborating,

Jesus emphasized the need to work together with others in solving problems, particularly in the instance whereby John informed him that the disciples forbade the person they saw casting out demon in his name because he was not following them (Mk. 9: 38-40). Of all the options, collaboration leads to a resolution that is most stable and long lasting. It provides an atmosphere whereby previously opposing parties come together to work as a team. Collaboration usually takes more time and efforts than other approaches. It provides the best hope for a lasting solution to conflicts as well as a foundation for addressing complex issues in the future (Jean, 2024).

PRINCE OF PEACE'S MODEL OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) refers to methods of resolving disputes or conflicts without litigation. Some of the ADR mechanisms include mediation, conciliation, negotiation and arbitration. Mediation is a non-binding procedure or intervention of a third party who assists the conflicting parties to reach an agreed settlement with major focus on the cause(s) of the conflict. The Christian theology of mediation concentrates on the mediation between God and humanity through the Prince of Peace (Jesus Christ) - the Mediator. It is the restoration of broken relationship through the process of reconciliation between the disputing parties on one hand and between each party and God on the other hand (Kegan, 1987). An analysis of Jesus Christ's role as Mediator therefore provides the foundation for a theology of mediation and elucidates the nexus between mediation, reconciliation and conflict resolution in theological terms (Cunningham, 1996). The account of the fall of man in Genesis places the responsibility of sin on Adam and Eve who by their own freewill acted out of self-centeredness and separated themselves from God. The fall corrupted human nature to the extent that all later generations of humankind are depraved and operating under the power of sin (Romans 3: 10). Thus, the conflict that ensued from the fall is a condition of alienation, which was an aftermath of sin. Owing to the fall, people lived in alienation from God and hurtful relationships prevailed in the world.

The nature of man placed limitations on him such that it was impossible for him to overcome the alienation caused by sin. Humans became helpless and estranged from fellow human beings and from God. Since there was nothing they could do to overcome the separation and its attendant consequences, the alienation of God and humankind requires mediation. Two crucial factors qualified Jesus Christ as the Mediator in the alienation between God and humankind. First, the incarnation of Christ that reveals the Prince of Peace as the Divine-Human revelation of God. Christ wholly identified himself with God's cause and identified himself completely with humankind. He gave

himself interminably to humankind in order to feel the whole misery of humanity. Jesus Christ is the Mediator and owing to his dual nature, therefore, he was able to carry out the mediation between the Creator and the fallen world (Cunningham, 1996, Lauterbach, 2024).

The event of the cross is the crucial action in which Jesus Christ mediated the encounter between God and humankind. The Person of the Mediator (Prince of Peace) cannot be separated from the work of the Mediator. Jesus is the Mediator because of his work, and because of who he is in himself. He is the Mediator because in him the eternal Word is present, because in him the eternal light enters into the darkness of the world, and because in him the eternal purpose of God is made known. The incarnation and the cross are inextricably united in the mediation of Jesus Christ. The significance of his suffering on the cross lies in the fact that the Mediator acted vicariously both for humanity and God. As the Mediator for the people, he not only stands between them and God but also for them before God. The willingness of the Prince of Peace to suffer on the cross made him the Mediator and his identification with God and with God's love for humankind leads him to the suffering on the cross as the only way to redeem humanity. (Cunningham, 1996, Guliuzza, 2021).

The second perspective that makes him the Mediator is his work of reconciliation. In the act of reconciliation, Christ brought humanity into a favourable light of God's mercy. On the cross, Christ succeeded in bringing together two enemies and making them friends "that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:19). This work of reconciliation was accomplished by the removal of the enmity between God and man through the transformation of man himself. Jesus came and died "that He might reconcile them both to God in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity" (Eph. 2:16). Christ through his death abolished in his flesh the enmity that formed "the middle wall of partition" (Eph. 2:14) which was the law (Eph. 2:15). Reconciliation with an injured brother or sister must precede reconciliation with God (Mt 5, 23-24) because an unlimited forgiveness of others is a necessary precondition for an effective prayer (Mk. 11, 25; Mt. 6, 4-15).

Although, there were attempts to associate him with the Zealots, Jesus did not initiate or support armed conflict. Instead of countering violence with violence, Jesus overcomes violence by freely submitting to it (Mt 26, 51-54). He therefore made human reconciliation with God possible by taking upon himself all the innate violence of humankind. Reconciliation, which refers to a state of well-being with God, self and

others is a wider concept and a process. The precursor to reconciliation includes confession, repentance, restitution and forgiveness. Therefore, reconciliation is a product of a process leading to a restoration of relationship with God and a transformation of a conflicting situation. Reconciliation encompasses the intention of God, focusing on the problem of alienation, brokenness and distress, through the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ-the Prince of Peace and Mediator who reconciles the universe to God (Cunningham, 1996).

The mediation of Jesus Christ through the cross and resurrection made reconciliation between God and humans possible. He resolved the age-long conflict in the form of alienation between God and humanity triggered by humanity's selfishness, egocentricity and rejection of God. Jesus' mediation through his life, death and resurrection met the needs of God and of humanity thereby paving way for the restoration of humanity's future relationship with God. The mediation of Jesus Christ is not a process of conflict resolution. This is because conflict resolution is a human approach of terminating an existing conflict between two or more equals (though not certainly equal in potency or advantage). In other words, the term conflict resolution is used in secular terms, to refer to the strategy of ending a conflict between persons, groups and organizations all of whom may be considered as equals because of the shared human nature. However, the conflict between God and humankind caused by the sin of humanity is not between equals. It is between the Creator and the created, between Ultimate purpose and human desire. In a theological sense, therefore, the conflict or separation of God and humankind cannot be settled by conflict resolution but rather reconciliation through the mediation by the Prince of Peace, while conflicts between individuals are also best settled by reconciliation based on the classic teaching of the Prince of Peace (Cunningham, 1996; Kruger, 2023).

CONCLUSION
The prophetic title of Jesus Christ as the Prince of Peace by Isaiah around 700BC has spiritual, relational and eschatological dimensions. Jesus- the redeemer and mediator- is the source of inner peace and through him humanity receives forgiveness of sin, attains a sense of spiritual well-being and reconciliation and regains its lost peace with God (Wijaya, 2024). He is the peace offering for humanity who endured the cross in order to end the hostility occasioned by sin and restore the broken relationship between man and God (Abundant Life, 2022). It has been argued that peace is essentially the presence of a relationship founded by God (Walt, 2021). Christ is therefore the source of true inner peace by ending the separation of humankind from God and giving man the prosperity of the spirit and the restoration of his lost glory through his death and resurrection.

The Prince of Peace also emphasized the need for societal or relational peace through his message of peace. The Sermon on the Mount is a classic teaching that emphasizes love, forgiveness, forbearance and reconciliation with the aim of promoting peaceful co-existence, harmonious living and maintaining cordial relationship with one another. Peace is one of greatest need and desires of all human beings and the kind of peace that Christ offers is neither derivable from depraved human nature nor attainable by possessing worldly treasures, prestige and powers except by being united with him (Campbell, 2019, Kaigama, 2022). He is therefore regarded as the Prince of Peace because he is the only source of true peace, redemption, restoration for humanity and reconciliation between individuals in any social context and ultimately between an individual and God (Abundant Life, 2022).

Finally, the Prince of Peace will set up a kingdom of peace and justice on earth at his second coming (Wijaya, 2024). This is because there is no system created by man that can bring about the perfect peace promised by God through the biblical prophets. Humankind agreements for an enduring peace never last (Howard, 2005; McNeely, 2009). The two concepts of power and peace are central to discussions on world politics and since international politics remains a struggle for power, the quest for global peace remains a mere wishful thinking (Morgenthau and Thompson, 2005). The awful trends in destructive weapon technology, great powers rivalries, continuities and change in armed conflicts, racism and globalized terrorism, famine, pestilences, fear and the prevalence of other signs of end time are pointers to the fact that man's pursuit of societal or global peace in a chaotic world will continue endlessly (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004). Therefore, the dream of perfect and enduring peace in the world cannot be realized by humanity until the return of the Prince of Peace to establish his millennial kingdom on earth.

REFERENCES

Abundant Life (2022). Why Jesus is Called the Prince of Peace. https://livingproof.co/why-jesus-is-called-the-prince-of-peace/

Adam, E. (2021). The Top Five Ways Jesus Dealt with Conflict. The Raven Review, Religion. https://www.ravenfoundation.org/the-top-4-ways-jesus-dealt-with-conflict/

Akinwale, A. A. (2010). "Integrating Traditional Modern Conflict Management Strategies in Nigeria" in *Dynamics of Peace Process* (eds.) Albert, I.O. and Oloyede, I.O. Publication of Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

Amissah-fynn, K. (May 8, 2022). What is the Inner Meaning of the Temptation of Jesus? https://owlcation.com/humanities/The-lnner-Meaning-of-the-Temptation-of-Jesus

Berkhof, L. (2005). Systematic Theology. First Banner of Truth Edition, United Kingdom.

Bonnie, A. (2010). Curriculumising Peace Education as a Strategy for Conflict Management in Africa. In: *Dynamics of Peace Process* (eds.) Albert, I.O. and Oloyede, I.O. Publication of Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

Calvary Baptist Church (2023). The Gospel Approach to Every day Conflicts (the Gospel-Centred Life). https://cbckalkaska.com/the-gospel-approach-to-everyday-conflicts/

Campbell, M. (2019). Jesus: the Prince of Peace-Experience Revival. https://experiencerevival.com/2019/12/27/jesus-the-prince-of-peace/

Chappell, P. (2017). The Prince of Peace| Daily in the Word. https://devo.paulchappell.com/prince-peace-0.

Cunningham, T. F. (1996). 'Conflict Resolution Strategies and the Church. The Church's Role as an Agent of Social Change in the Political Conflict in South Africa' PhD Thesis, University of South Africa. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43175838.pdf

Guliuzza, R. J. (2021). Jesus Christ is Our Perfect Mediator. Institute for Creation Research. https://www.icr.org/article/jesus-christ-perfect-mediator/

Hawksley, T. (2015). Prince of Peace| Thinking Faith. The Online Journal of the Jesuit in Britain. https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/prince-of-peace

Howard, D. (2005). Disunited Nations: Why Can't Man's Best Efforts Bring Peace? Beyond Today. https://www.ucg.org/the-good-news/disunited-nations-why-cant-mans-best-efforts-bring-peace

Ian Paul (2019). Does Jesus Bring Peace or Division and A Sword? https://www.psephizo.com/biblical-studies/does-jesus-bring-peace-or-division-and-a-sword/

Ituma, E. A. & Peters, P. E. (2021). The Approach of Conflict in Luke12: 49-59 through Form Criticism and its Application. Verbum et Ecclessia 42 (1),a 2208. https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v42i/2208.

Jean, R. (n.d.). How Did Jesus Handle Conflict? Getting to Know Jesus. World Press.

https://jeanrisley.com/how-did-jesus-handle-conflict/

Kaigama, I. A. (2022). Prepare the Way for the Prince of Peace. https://ignatiuskaigama.com/page/20/?wordfencelogHuman=1&hid=55D887 96BEBFC3EB9D8EC7F7D47B6949

Kegan, J. M. (1987). Peacemakers: Biblical Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation as a Model Alternative to Litigation, The. Journal of Dispute Resolution, Vol. 1987 (4). https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jdr/vol1987/iss/4

Kegley, C.W. and Wittkopf, E. R. (2004). World Politics Trend and Transformation. Thomson Wadsworth, USA.

Kruger, C. B. (2023). The Mediation of Jesus Christ. Perichoresis Press. https://perichoresis.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/The-Mediation-of-Jesus-Christ.pdf

Lauterbach, R. (2024). The Mediator Who Brokers Our Peace. Core Christianity. https://corechristianity.com/resources/articles/the-mediator-who-brobers-our-peace

Mathison, K. A. (2008). The Temptation of Jesus| Reformed Bible Studies & Devotional. https://ligonier.org/learn/devotionals/temptation-of-jesus

McNeely, D. (2009). Restoration: Not by Might nor by Power. Beyond Today. https://www.ucg.org/world-news-and-prophecy/restoration-not-by-might-nor-by-power

Moltmann, J. (2015). The Crucified God. London: Fortress Press p. 142

Morgenthau, H. J. and Thompson, K.W. (2005). Politics among Nation: The Struggle for Power and Peace. McGraw-Hill Education, 7th Edition.

Onu, B. O. (2021). Biblical Approach to Conflict Resolution for the 21st Century. South-South Journal of Humanities and International Studies, 4 (1). https://ssjhis.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/2.-Biblical-Approach-to-Conflict-Resolution-For-The-21st Century.pdf

Schlatter, A. (1963). Der Evangelist Matthaus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, (Fifth Edition) p. 25

Soares-Prabhu, G (2003). Jesus and Conflict in G. Soares-Prabhu & F. Y. D'sa (eds.), The Dharma of Jesus, pp 14-23, Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY

Thomas, K. W. and Kilmann, R. M. (1974). The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode

Instrument. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc. https://kilmanndiagnostics.com/overview-thomas-kilmann-conflict-mode-instrument-tki/.

Towns, E. L. (2003). Bible Answers for Almost All Your Questions. USA: Thomas Nelson,
    Inc.

Walt, C. (2021). Peace is Not the Absence of War but the Presence of a Relationship Founded by God- Shalom in Isiah and Micah. In Skriflig (Online), 55 (2), Pretoria. https://dx.doi.org/10.4012/ids.v55i2.2728

Wijaya, P. (2024). What Does It Mean that Jesus Is the Prince of Peace? (Isaiah 9:6). Christianity.com. https://www.christianity.com/wiki/jesus-christ/what-does-it-mean-that-jesus-is-the-prince-of-peace.html.