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ABSTRACT

The intrinsic nature of man as alluded and discussed by Aristotle, and as seen in the chapter above, demonstrates that the human nature presents for itself uniqueness of being. The rational, the social, the political and the moral are some of the inner qualities that are just proper to the human person. One may argue that these are the realities in the natural make up of man, making him act the way he does. If this assertion is true, then we need to ask ourselves, what is that through which the individual actions can be said to be rational, social, political and moral? This article exemplifies on the practical application and expression of Utuism in the real life. The practical application of Utuism is demonstrated in the life of a man in different perspectives. The paper further looks into hindrances that inhibit the practice of Utuism. The paper presents illustrations of the practical absence or presence of Utuism to enhance better understanding of the theme of the study.
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Introduction
There must be the marking scheme of man’s rational behaviour, man’s social behaviour, man’s political behaviour, and man’s moral behaviour. If as put in the abstract, man has intrinsic reality that qualifies as a marking scheme of natural specifying difference in a subject, then it must also be natural and distinctive quality in the human person. This is what, borrowing from Swahili speaking people, we call *Utuism*. That is, coining two terms: *Utu*, meaning active humanness, and –*ism*, as an art of the former term.1 We seek to show how this is the natural marking scheme of the rest. According to Aristotle on his treatment of the *De anima*, the word actuality has two senses corresponding respectively to the possession of knowledge and the actual exercise of knowledge.2 He also advances his argument by saying that in the history of the individual, knowledge comes before its employment or exercise.3 Hence, in the case of *Utuism* in the human person, it is the knowledge of it (its operative engine) that precedes its actualization. Thus to say that “he has *Utu*” is to say he has demonstrated the act of humanness. This may seem like using two actions in the same sentence, which linguistically would be erroneous. When the act and humanness are put together, the term act preceding humanness, it shows that humanness is active.

I. **UTUISM IN THE HUMAN PERSON**
   1) *Utuism* and the acting person
We may ask inquisitively if the active characteristic of the human person is as a result of him looking for his identity in a real universe. Perhaps the many actions and reactions experienced by the human person from the same human person emanate from this issue of his identity. This means that man as such is in a continuous search of his identity in a universe full of realities that are co-existential to him. As already known, philosophers like Hume and Berkeley heightened the issue of “identity”, and in particular “personal identity”, as a philosophical problem. For instance Hume argued: There are some philosophers who imagine we are every moment intimately conscious of what we call our SELF; that we feel its existence and its continuance in existence; and are certain, beyond the evidence of a demonstration, both of its perfect identity and simplicity. The strongest sensation, the most violent passion, say they, instead of distracting us from this view, only fix it the more intensely, and make us consider their influence on self either by their pain or pleasure. To attempt a farther proof of this weakens its evidence; since no proof can be derived from any fact, of which we are so intimately conscious; nor is there anything, of which we can be certain, if we doubt of this.4 In the second paragraph after this indication of the philosophical problem, Hume reiterates: Unluckily all these positive assertions are contrary to that very experience, which is pleaded for them, nor have we any idea of self, after the manner it is here explained. For from what impression could this idea be derived? This question it is impossible to answer without a manifest contradiction and absurdity; and yet it is a question, which must necessarily be answered, if we would have the idea of self-pass for clear and intelligible... It must be someone’s impression that gives rise to every real idea. But self or person is not any one impression, but that to which our several impressions and ideas are supposed to have a reference. If any impression gives rise to the idea of self, that impression must continue invariably the same, through the whole course of our lives; since self is supposed to exist after that manner. But there is no impression constant and invariable. Pain and pleasure, grief and joy, passions and sensations succeed each other, and never all exist at the same time. It cannot, therefore, be from any of these
impressions, or from any other, that the idea of self is derived; and consequently there is no such idea.\(^5\)

In his essay, Locke suggests that the self is: A thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, “the same thinking thing, in different times and places” and continues to define personal identity simply as “the sameness of a rational being”. So long as one is the same self, the same rational being, one has the same personal identity. Given this assertion, any change in the self reflects a change in personal identity, and any change in personal identity therefore implies that the self has changed.\(^6\)

Despite their extensive touch on this issue, they never exhausted it, meaning the struggle on the problem of identity continues. This is more so when we embrace the action on the concept of identity. This view that we propose was supported by Ramose\(^7\) in reacting to D. A. Masolo’s contextual work *African Philosophy in search of Identity*. With the same view, according to Carl Rogers, a fully functioning person is one who is in touch with his or her deepest and innermost feelings and desires. These individuals understand their own emotions and place a deep trust in their own instincts and urges. Unconditional positive regard plays an essential role in becoming a fully functioning person.\(^8\)

Rogers suggested that people have an actualizing tendency, or a need to achieve their full potential – a concept that is often referred to as self-actualization. But we would need to venture more on the motive of man as an active being especially if we would consider Kaunda’s argument that: The master fears the slave from demanding his right. The exploiter is in constant fear of the exploited. Wealth is the means of control on power over others. Passive exploitation precedes all active exploitation. It is essential denial of one’s humanity to one’s fellow man. It is the refusal of human fellowship. It is the withdrawal into the self. While man’s ‘truth’ lies in man as man in community, his ‘untruth’ lies in man as the isolated self. Passive exploitation, the withdrawal into the self, already an act of fear, can only breed fear and thus it evolves inexorably into active exploitation. He adds: Humanism in Zambia is a political philosophy which endeavours to devise a social, political and economic order which is based on man’s truth rather than on man’s untruth. Success will largely depend on a reappraisal of the forces ranged against us, and their neutralization by the state acting on behalf of the masses.\(^9\)

Rogers believed that a fully-functioning person is an individual who is continually working toward becoming self-actualized. This individual has received unconditional positive regard from others, does not place conditions on his or her own worth, is capable of expressing feelings, and is fully open to life’s many experiences.

\[\text{ii) Utuism and Man’s Self-Actualization}\]

To treat each man as an end and strictly not as a means is fundamental to all socialistic or humanistic conceptions of man. This we argue in direct connection with the preceding section on the acting person. It is through acting as a human person that man actualizes self. A representative of the modern age, Immanuel Kant identified this as a cardinal value and principle of ethics.\(^10\) Using the guiding principle of *Utuism*, which we have maintained that it is ever active, man can actualize himself. But what exactly is self-actualization? Located at the peak of Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy, he described this high-level need in the following way: What a man can be, he must be. This need we may call self-actualization. It refers to the desire for self-fulfilment, namely, to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially. This tendency might be phrased as the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everyting that one is capable of becoming.\(^11\) Though the theory is generally portrayed as a fairly
rigid hierarchy, Maslow was quick to note that the order in which these needs are fulfilled does not always follow this standard progression. For example, he notes that for some individuals, the need for self-esteem is more important than the need for love. For others, the need for creative fulfilment may supersede even the most basic needs. Thus, man reaches his “Self-Actualization” by doing and acting according to the mode of his being. By this we mean that for him to reach God, his Creator, or to reach the other human beings, or even other constituents of the universe, man must be human; not any other being in the structural hierarchy. Since this ‘reaching out’ of man to the “others” is an activity, this activity imperatively embraces his being. It is through this natural activeness which despite being natural is expressive through a deliberative power of the human person, that man reaches his “Self-Actualization”. We can affirmatively argue, therefore, that man reaches his “Self-Actualization” in Utuism which is defined by this grand activity when narrowed down to specifically “other human beings”. We beg to investigate whether our argument may be what someone like Maslow was talking of “Self-Actualized people”. In addition to describing what is meant by self-actualization in his theory, Maslow also identified some of the key characteristics of self-actualized people. Before we engage some of these characteristics, we think that another expression which can embrace the same understanding of the “Self-Actualized people” would be “a Healthy Society”. Healthy because we encounter the men and women in the institution of the “Self-Actualized people”, not in the deficiency of their being (absence of good where it should be), but in the beauty of it, where harmony of being exists. Thus Maslow’s given characteristics of “Self-Actualized people” became relevant in our argument in that they explain the beauty and harmony of Utuism.

### iii) Utuism versus Acceptance and Realism

A sense of realism is another major characteristic of self-actualized people. But before embracing this part of the self, self-actualized people tend to accept themselves and others as they are. They tend to lack inhibition and are able to enjoy themselves and their lives free of guilt. This is as a result of having a sense of worth and goodness in both themselves and others and relate to each guided by the same. Other people are treated the same regardless of background, current status, or other socio-economic and cultural factors. Rather than being fearful of things that are different or unknown, the self-actualized individual is able to view things logically and rationally. Self-actualized people have realistic perceptions of themselves, others and the world around them.

### iv) Utuism as a Definition of a Fully Functioning or Acting Person

The moment we bring the real meaning of functioning or acting person, we embrace the ontological basic structure whereby the human person is the subject of both existence and acting. Since the concept of “acting person” is analysed by Wojtyla’s take on self-determination and freedom, we embrace his understanding of acting and what happens in the very human person who is acting. Earlier in this work we argued that acting as an individual without connection with other individuals would be somehow irrelevant and meaningless. For an action is only positive by an individual to an individual in as far as it can be said or signified to and by another individual. Essentially, we can argue that the fully functioning person is completely congruent and integrated. Rogers sees people as basically good or healthy or at the very least, not bad or ill. It is worth noting that he sees mental health as the normal progression of life, and he sees mental illness, criminality, and other human problems, as distortions of that natural tendency. The entire
theory is built on a single “force of life” he calls the actualizing tendency. It can be defined as the built-in motivation present in every life-form to develop its potentials to the fullest extent possible. We’re not just talking about survival; Rogers believes that all creatures strive to make the very best of their existence. If they fail to do so, it is not for a lack of desire. Such a person is able to embrace ‘existential living’. By this he means they are able to live fully in the here and now with personal inner freedom, with all its accompanying exciting, creative, but also challenging, aspects. This ontological basic structure by Wojtyla made him discover that between the person and action there is “a sensibly experiential-causal relation which brings the person, that is to say, every concrete human ego, to recognize his action to be the result of efficacy”. Such a person experiences in the present, with immediacy. He is able to live in his feelings and reactions of the moment. He is not bound by the structure of his past learning, but these are a present resource for him insofar as they relate to the experience of the moment. He lives freely, subjectively, in an existential confrontation of this moment in life. A comparative study shows that maybe Wojtyla in his concept of “the acting person” had read on and influenced by Rogers, who like Maslow, is just as interested in describing the healthy person. His term is “fully-functioning”, and involves the following qualities:

1. **Open to experience**: both positive and negative emotions accepted. Negative feelings are not denied, but worked through (rather than resort to ego defence mechanisms).
2. **Existential living**: in touch with different experiences as they occur in life, avoiding prejudging and preconceptions. Being able to live and fully appreciate the present, not always looking back to the past or forward to the future (living for the moment).
3. **Trust feelings**: feelings, instincts and gut-reactions are paid attention to and trusted. People’s own decisions are the right ones and we should trust ourselves to make the right choices.
4. **Creativity**: creative thinking and risk taking are features of a person’s life. A person does not play safe all the time. This involves the ability to adjust and change and seek new experiences.
5. **Fulfilled life**: person is happy and satisfied with life, and always looking for new challenges and experiences.

The flexibility of a fully functioning person constantly evolves self-concept. This is what makes someone realistic, open to new experiences, and capable of changing in response to new experiences. This means that rather than defending against or distorting one’s own thoughts or feelings, the person experiences congruence: one’s sense of self is consistent with her emotions and experiences. As a result, the actualizing tendency is fully operational in him or her. In turn, he or she makes conscious choices that move her in the direction of greater growth and fulfilment of potential.

v) **Utuism demonstrates a fully functioning or Acting Person**

We advance our goal by borrowing further on both Carl Rogers and Karol Wojtyla on their view of the active element in the human person. As a summation, the characteristics of a fully functioning or acting person include: openness to experience, lack of defensiveness, the ability to trust one’s experiences and form values based on those experiences, the ability to interpret experiences accurately, and a flexible self-concept and the ability to change through experience. The unconditional self-regard on the other hand can be said to be the tendency to be open to new experiences and does not feel the need to distort or deny experience – is open to feedback and willing to make realistic changes, and lives in harmony with other people. Rogers also developed a form of therapy known as client-centred therapy. In this approach, the therapist’s goal is to offer unconditional positive regard to the client. The goal is that the individual will be able to
grow emotionally and psychologically and eventually become a fully-functioning person. Critically understood, Utuism re-echoes this activeness in expressing the inner growth emotionally, psychologically or intellectually in the society of human beings. It is at this realization that we then can firmly declare that the person is holistically mature. That is, even his religiosity will be gauged and experienced in this relationship of the active beings. We cannot embrace the divine and the entire reality if we are practically unable to experience the physical reality or world, and specifically, the fellow human beings.

vi) Utuism and unconditional positive regards
This can be well explained by David G. Meyers in one of his books: People also nurture our growth by being accepting by offering us what Rogers called unconditional positive regard. This is an attitude of grace, an attitude that values us even knowing our ailings. It is a profound relief to drop our pretenses, confess our worst feelings, and discover that we are still accepted. In a good marriage, a close family, or an intimate friendship, we are free to be spontaneous without fearing the loss of others’ esteem. For this reason, Utuism becomes both an interior positive disposition in and with the “self” and an exterior positive experience in and with the “other”. It is this relationship that perhaps differentiates the human person from other animals. That is, the human person embraces these experiences consciously, spontaneously, rationally and willingly.

vii) Utuism and Moral Education
Moral education is the process through which an individual develops proper attitudes and behaviours toward others in the society, based on social and cultural norms, rules, and laws. In other words, it nurtures in a person those virtues and values that make him a good person, thus developing his thinking skills of moral judgment about what is right and wrong and rational judgment about difficult matters. This being the general understanding of moral education or even ethics, we can therefore say that Utuism is the end proactive process of it. Moral education influences an individual on how he thinks, feels and acts regarding issues of right and wrong. Therefore, the moral feature of the human act is based mainly on what action is right and what is wrong. For this reason it is very important to gradually tutor children on how to make the right choices from the beginning of their lives, and help them to exercise their freedom in a responsible manner. Moral education also helps them to begin to appreciate common values such as honesty, liberty, justice, fairness and respect for others. Moral education, then, helps children acquire those moral habits that will help them individually live good lives and at the same time become productive to the nation. It therefore contributes not only to the students as individuals, but also to the social pulling together of a nation or community. The necessity of moral education is as a result of the conflicts of cultural, status, exposure, education, social, economic, prejudicial and scientific explosions, to mention but just a few. These factors create accidental differences even in thinking, thus affecting the human behaviour especially in regards to other human beings. An argument has been presented on Aristotle’s ethics that entreats on new understanding on pleasure. Pleasure can never be the gauge or final end of the human family or person. Pleasure is only one of the human values that goes with the human nature but does not encompass the holistic person. Utuism thus becomes a positive recourse to the original nature of the human person.
II. PRACTICAL ISSUES on UTUISM

i) Colonialism demean Utuism
To colonize someone, you must reduce the other person either below your class or deplete completely the humanness in that person. This reduces the “other” to the level of an instrument, an animal or even as a means instead of an end. All the new nations faced severe problems, for political independence did not automatically bring them prosperity and happiness ... They were seldom free of external influences. They were still bound to ... structures developed earlier by the colonial powers. According to Sandra Marker, colonialism destroyed the harmony that existed in the indigenous communities. Around the world today, intractable conflict is found in many areas that were once colonized or controlled by Western European or Soviet powers (i.e., Africa, the Balkans, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and South America). The source of many of these protracted conflicts, in large part, lies in past colonial or Soviet policies, and especially those regarding territorial boundaries, the treatment of indigenous populations, the privileging of some groups over others, the uneven distribution of wealth, local governmental infrastructures, and the formation of non-democratic or non-participatory governmental systems. It is therefore essential, if one wants to understand intractable conflict and its causes, to examine not only the issues and problems of the moment, but also influential historical factors – most notably, past colonial and Soviet policies – and their lingering effects. It is worth noting that the status, privilege, and wealth of colonial and Soviet ruling populations were often maintained and upheld through the use of policies that violated the human rights of those living in the colonized areas. These masters made very absurd and unjust policies which subjected colonized populations to the loss of their lands, resources, cultural or religious identities, and sometimes even their lives. What bond the so-called primitive indigenous peoples had was destroyed, and to some extent they were treated as sub-humans or even animals. Examples of these brutal policies include: slavery (e.g., British-controlled West Indies), apartheid (e.g., South Africa), and mass murder (e.g., the Incas of Peru, Aborigines of Australia, Hungarians after the 1956 uprising). The negative effects are rife even today when many post-colonial and post-Soviet governments have adopted unjust colonial practices and policies as a means to preserve their dominant status. The definitions of major concepts like “Rights” and “Ownership” are dictated by foreign policies, making rights with regards to traditional lands, resources, and cultural language denied to many populations. Groups that were marginalized under colonial occupation continue to be marginalized under post-colonial governments. Human-rights violations, for example, including horrific events of mass murder and genocide, can be found in post-colonial and post-Soviet states such as Cambodia, Rwanda, Kosovo, El Salvador, and South Africa. Colonialism is ever done in the name of discovering, missionary, civilization, education, economical issues, political issues and humanitarian issues to indicate just a few. From the face value there seems to be a justification, but a critical analysis would reveal that those conquered are used as means, not ends. During the colonization of Africa, for example, the owners of the continent were used just as one would use a donkey as a beast of burden. They were forced to work in deplorable conditions and many lost their lives while others were jailed in pathetic jails, or separated from their families and loved ones. These and many others depleted the principles of Utuism which hinges on the Golden rule.

ii) World Wars demean Utuism
When we talk of conflict in whichever proportion, we are surmounting the human’s deliberate divisive attitude and acts which are against each other. In this case we only give examples of
World Wars that affected the whole world directly or indirectly, leaving millions dead, and others injured or in deplorable and pathetic states. It is these wars that made the ‘so-called’ advanced nations produce weapons of mass destruction against other human beings. Even today, part of the qualification of being a super power is the possession and ability to make the weapons of whichever magnitudes, not against animals, but fellow human beings. No wonder we talk of “dog eating dog society”. The phrase “dog eat dog” is used to indicate a ruthless mindset, one in which causing harm to others is an acceptable means to achieve a goal. While at first glance the phrase seems to refer to wild animals fighting for survival, “dog eat dog” is most often used to describe difficult social situations such as a working environment. It implies that all competitors share a similar view, and that everyone is willing to fight to survive and thrive, regardless of the consequences to others. This very attitude distorts the social and filial aspect of Utuism and its actualization in the entire society. It creates a world’s new mindset (to an extent of a new heart-set) of individualism that never mind about the well-being of other human beings. Henry Gaudet argued: “Dog eats dog” echoes the sentiment of the so-called jungle law, known by the phrase “kill or be killed.” Another common phrase, “every man for himself”, repeats this theme as well. According to these adages, wild animals, and dogs in particular, are willing to fight and kill one another to survive. “Dog eats dog” goes a step further, stating that these creatures will resort to cannibalism. Both “dog eats dog” and “kill or be killed” use the harsh realities of life in the wild to justify selfish and ruthless actions in society. Thus our main enterprise is to recapture the original nature of the human person and this is what Utuism is all about.

iii) Cold War demean Utuism
According to the World War II allies that were fighting the Germans, Italians and Japanese, one would have thought that both the USA and USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) would be great friends. But each took and branded the other as “devils incarnate”. The Cold War is the name given to the relationship that developed primarily between the USA and the USSR after World War II. This somehow lasted from after World War II to around 1980. As it was experienced, the Cold War was to dominate international affairs for decades and many major crises occurred – the Cuban Missile Crisis, Vietnam, Hungary, and the Berlin Wall being just some. For many, the growth in weapons of mass destruction was the most worrying issue. But one would ask the art and nature of the cold war. This was basically a clash of very different beliefs and ideology – capitalism versus communism – each held with almost religious conviction, formed the basis of an international power struggle with both sides vying for dominance, exploiting every opportunity for expansion anywhere in the world.

iv) Extremists groups’ uprising demean Utuism
According to the 2014 Merrian-Webster Dictionary, the term “Uprising” is usually a violent effort by many people to change the government or leader of a country; uprising, open fighting against authority (as one’s own government). Its synonyms are insurgence, insurgency, insurrection, mutiny, outbreak, revolt, and revolution. While its related words are coup, coup d’état (or coup d’etat), overthrow; misprision, sedition, treachery, treason, sabotage, and subversion. Whenever these forms of uprising occur, use of weapons of whichever magnitude, depending on accessibility and the ‘supporters’ supply, is what makes it completely dehumanizing and deplete Utu in the human person. People are killed in great numbers while others, as said in the previous subsection, are left in deplorable and pathetic states. The 20th to 21st centuries will remain in record to have experienced the highest number of political uprisings,
killing millions and leaving behind a lot pains as effective. Some of these uprisings, though not chronologically and exhaustively put, include: Warsaw Ghetto (Jewish insurgency within the Warsaw Ghetto in Poland), Wachang (which led to the end of the monarchy in China), Libyan, Ukrainian, Syrian, Cote d’Ivoire, Egyptian, and many others.

v) Terrorism and Genocides demean Utuism
The idea of Genocide is ever threatening. The international legal definition of the crime of genocide is found in Articles II of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. In Article II of the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. Killing members of the group includes direct killing and actions causing death. Causing serious bodily or mental harm includes inflicting trauma on members of the group through widespread torture, rape, sexual violence, forced or coerced use of drugs, and mutilation. Deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to destroy a group includes the deliberate deprivation of resources needed for the group’s physical survival, such as clean water, food, clothing, shelter or medical services. Deprivation of the means to sustain life can be imposed through confiscation of harvests, blockade of foodstuffs, detention in camps, forcible relocation or expulsion into deserts. Prevention of births includes involuntary sterilization, forced abortion, prohibition of marriage, and long-term separation of men and women intended to prevent procreation. Forcible transfer of children may be imposed by direct force or by fear of violence, duress, detention, psychological oppression or other methods of coercion. As a matter of law, the Convention on the Rights of the Child defines children as persons under the age of 18 years. Genocidal acts need not kill or cause the death of members of a group. Causing serious bodily or mental harm, prevention of births and transfer of children are acts of genocide when committed as part of a policy to destroy a group’s existence.33 There has been many Genocides in all continents of the world; the Armenian Genocide, the Assyrian Genocide, the Greek genocide and the Rwanda Genocide.

vi) Al-Qaeda, Al-Shaabab, Militia groups, Gunmen demean Utuism
All the above groups use the same principle, of “I”, “me” and “myself” as the centre of the universe. Al-Qaeda is a global Islamist and takfiri militant group meaning “The Base” in Arabic language, founded by Osama bin Laden around 1988–9. This is according to their origins, traceable in Afghanistan during the Soviet War.34 The pain and destruction of the Al-Qaeda is globally felt as they attack both civilians and military, children and adults, and their extremism is directed more to the Christian world. This is due to the fact that they brand any other, other than themselves who are from the Muslim world, as Kafir.35 The greatest irony experienced from the extreme radical Muslims in general, and from Al-Qaeda (which includes it child Al-Shabaab in Somalia and its sycophants spread in neighbouring countries) in particular, and nowadays coming up as Islamic Extremists, is that when they are killing the innocent, they claim they are executing a holy war for Allah and they shall be rewarded. Al-Qaeda sought to open the “offensive phase” of the global Salafi jihad. Bosnian Islamists in 2006 called for “solidarity with Islamic causes around the world”, supporting the insurgents in Kashmir and Iraq as well as the
groups fighting for a Palestinian state.\textsuperscript{36} Reward for killing the innocent and defenceless? In the current year, even as we write this work, we are experiencing brutality \textit{enmasse}. Consider how in Nigeria a militant group, Boko Haram, has terrorized the people in the name of religion: Boko Haram: Why terror group kidnaps schoolgirls, and what happens next? It is a parent’s worst nightmare: Your child goes to school, never to return home. Scores of Nigerians are living that horrific reality after 230 schoolgirls were abducted, allegedly by Boko Haram, under the cover of darkness on April 16, 2014. Of the hundreds of girls herded into vehicles, only 43 have escaped\textsuperscript{37}. And as their parents wait and hope, the government is grappling with an Islamist terror group that has gotten more brazen. So has its abductions of women and girls in northern Nigeria, the region most affected by the insurgency. Why does Boko Haram kidnap girls? The Islamist militants’ name translates to “Western education is a sin” in the local language. The group especially opposes the education of women. Under its version of Sharia law, women should be at home raising children and looking after their husbands, not at school learning to read and write. It has repeatedly targeted places of learning in deadly attacks that have highlighted its fundamental philosophy against education. The spate of kidnappings began in May 2013 when Boko Haram leader, Abubakar Shekau, announced in a video that this was part of its latest bloody campaign. The kidnappings, he said, were in retaliation for Nigerian security forces nabbing the wives and children of group members. Those kidnapped, he said, would begin a new life as a “servant”.\textsuperscript{38} This would be extremely inhuman, something that \textit{Utuisim} would not embrace but would instead try to eliminate from the face of humanity.

\textbf{vii) Xenophobia demean \textit{Utuisim}}

The \textit{Urban Dictionary} defines the term Xenophobia as a phobic attitude towards foreigners or strangers, or even of the unknown. Racism in general is described as a form of xenophobia.\textsuperscript{39} The same dictionary advances an explanation of the very term in some aspects or extents: Taken to the extreme, an irrational fear of strangers or more broadly, a fear of those who are different. Taken in a more moderate way, a rational fear of those who are different in some significant way, such as race, ethnicity, culture, politics, and religion. Since people live together in families and communities where blood ties and cultural similarities foster cooperation, those who are different undermine this social solidarity. The very presence of people who are different in appearance or belief or language make the majority of people in a community wary of those who do not share a common interest in preserving the dominant group.\textsuperscript{40} The argument for this fear against the foreigner may be justified on the ground that people naturally view those who look, believe, and act in a similar manner as extensions of themselves. The same dictionary indicates that people are naturally selfish and that they will give aid and befriend those whom they see as similar to themselves. Conversely, since people are naturally selfish and seek to dominate others to enhance their own power, they will naturally first seek to dominate those who are different. People who are different are more likely to be seen as objects rather than fellow humans.\textsuperscript{41} But this assertion of people being “naturally selfish” negates the natural good of man’s original creation, before man as such, through historical painful and negative experiences, diverted that goodness. Martin Luther King used to preach in the African-American churches. His main theme using scriptures was to fight the nuclear arms race. He is popularly known for denouncing the American war-making in Vietnam, despite himself being an American (Black). It is his opening and concluding phrase, “Drum Major Instinct” that interests our course.\textsuperscript{42} According to him, there is always in the human person, right from birth, egocentric feelings which each should do everything possible to remove. It is through this phrase that he used to subordinate his innately
selfish desire to a stronger wish to serve humanity. King borrowed the phrase “Drum Major Instinct”, from another preacher, Wallace Hamilton. Both based their argument on the verses of Matthew, which tells of James’s and John’s request to sit near Jesus in His glory. They argued that the request was selfish and attributed the selfishness to a universal desire to feel important, to be a drummer at the head of a parade. Both preachers organized their sermons around the powerful – albeit mixed – metaphor of the drum major instinct. Both recall Alfred Adler’s postulate that the longing for recognition serves as the strongest impulse of human personality. King’s account of his desire mirrors Hamilton’s.

III. RULE “OVER” OR “WITHIN” AS A GAUGE OF UTUISM
The concept of ruling is directly connected to a group of people, not a single person. Even when this act is in reference to a single person, it is out of the fact that an individual has a number of inner faculties or powers that dictate his daily endeavor. Thus, when an individual is told to rule oneself, for example, he or she is being admonished to control or direct one or more of his or her own faculties. These faculties include: the sensibility, emotions and passions, rationality, appetites and attitudes, to mention but just a few. As a matter-of-fact, even when we refer to a person to rule in reference to others, some of these individual faculties come into use either singly or in multiples. Politics is about leadership in the larger society from the grassroots to the top of a given group. In political leadership, we have experienced some leaders who “rule over the people” and others “rule within the people”. The former leader exerts power to be felt or obeyed, and even acts as if he is not part of the group of people, or the society he is leading. Since this makes him look alien to the people and their needs, he uses the organized group machinery and buys some few individuals to guard him from the aggression and any revolt that may arise as discontent. While on the other hand, the latter rule with the people, for the people. For him, the source of his power is the people themselves, whom he rules. To this latter person, his rule is through leadership. It is from this background that we assess how different leadership styles and methods have affected Utuism and its very pillars.

i) Tribal clashes and Ethnicity
The Merrian-Webster Dictionary defines tribalism as loyalty to a tribe or other social group, especially when combined with strong negative feelings for people outside the group. It is elevating one tribe above others which is intrinsic selfish. By selfish we mean when the needs and feelings of other tribes do not seem to matter, or do not matter at all. But this definition can only be given a positive dimension as organization, culture, or beliefs of a tribe. At the same time a strong feeling of identity with and loyalty to one’s tribe or group. The dictionary defines and describes ethnic as pertaining to, or characteristic of a people, especially a group (ethnic group) sharing a common and distinctive culture, religion, language, or the like. This is through referring to the origin, classification, and characteristics of such groups. The term also refers to a member of an ethnic group, especially of a group that is a minority within a larger society like ethnic Chinese in San Francisco. A matter of human memory of genocide, a good, albeit horrifying, example is the Rwandan genocide. The successive colonial administrators constructed, shaped, and used opposition of Tutsis and Hutus, and hostility between them heated up in the passage to independence. Hutu and Tutsi are culturally identical, not distinct ethnic groups. Never were they two organized tribes. They are political categories that were constantly reworked before, during, and after the colonial era.
There started existing an artificially generated fault line which became worse and unstable in the years before the genocide, as the market for Rwanda’s main export (coffee) collapsed, foreign military aid poured in, regional tensions increased, and international agencies took greater control. Negotiated power sharing arrangements between Tutsi and Hutu were on the verge of cutting out the northern Hutu clans that had previously been the main beneficiaries of state power. Hutu leaders unleashed a ferocious propaganda campaign blaming the Tutsi for everything. In doing so, they tapped deep cultural themes and symbols, and created panic over an imagined Tutsi plot to kill and enslave the Hutu. When the killing began, the army and militia were given orders, but many other Hutu were recruited with a mix of threats, bribes, and propaganda. The Rwandan genocide was not simply a matter of Hutu killing Tutsi. Many Hutu (especially southern) were also targeted for death. Many Hutu would not kill, and shielded the Tutsi. According to many analysts from whichever discipline, especially humanities, they would agree that to call this tragedy “tribal” or “ethnic” violence makes it more difficult to understand. The same is true in many other conflicts around the world labelled religious, tribal, clan, or ethnic.

ii) Nepotism
This is a term that originated in the Catholic Church where both Popes and Bishops used to appoint nephews into high positions like cardinalate. The term originated from the Italian language, _nepotismo_, meaning nephew. The general understanding is where someone in high power brings on board either filial or consanguine relatives, not out of qualification, but just because they are related. The main problem with this arrangement is that it is done at the expense of the other qualified persons, and instead of being a public work, it elevates into a family endeavour. The needs of others are not catered for as such and the presence of relatives depletes objectivity of doing things. Nepotism has been blamed as one of the main cause of community and tribal animosity. Many animosities in various societies may be traced to emanate from nepotism. This starts by putting a single family man in a higher position, then two, then three and so forth, at dire disregard of other human professional or qualified persons. Before the society wakes up from the slumber, the damage is too big to heal. This is directly against the principles of _Utuism_, which are principles of humanity.

iii) Marginalization
Using a common man’s understanding of this term, we can say that marginalization is the process of putting someone or something to the furthest and remotest state of being. The _Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary_ puts it as to put or keep (someone) in a powerless or unimportant position within a society or group. From this understanding we conclude that in the human social interactions, there are those who feel so superior at the expense of others. Human nature is created equally and this is a basic intrinsic quality. Other observable human traits or qualities are only accidental and cannot in any way exist independent of the human nature. Thus, the act of marginalization is an act of dehumanization; it is depleting the nature of humanity in the specific individual human persons. This, even from the linguistic, material and formal understanding, does not only project a material quality contradiction, but a contradiction of terms. A human being is a person with natural worth and at no point of time and space, or at no
cause of reason, should he be treated otherwise by another human being. To uphold his humanity is the basis of *Utuism*.

iv) Riots crushing
We want to just highlight this aspect of crushing the people’s riots by states’ or governments’ law enforcers since it has of late become a convention. In both local and international media, reports must include news of a particular police department quashing a demonstration or riot. We do not in any way want to generalize and say that all demonstrations and riots are justified or right, but we want to generalize that in either case, the human principles, dignity and worth must be upheld. Some so-called ‘riots and demonstration crushing’, instead of preventing more violence and bringing deterrence, act or appear like punishment. But punishment is only imposed because someone has done wrong. In the legal context this is called a crime or offence, and in the theological context it is called a sin. The two terms are by no means interchangeable. As Aquinas says, “the commands of human law cover only those deeds which concern the public interest, not every deed of every virtue”. However, most crimes are also morally evil and are, therefore, also sins.

v) Police torture and Rapes
This is a direct call to the consciousness of humanity. With the individualistic mentality and capitalistic or economic materialism, evil minded individuals may be in monetary equilibrium or political plain to be able to ‘sell’ (or ‘buy’) or influence negatively against the ‘less fortunate’ in the society. Not all who suffer under police are wrongdoers (to use the law language), or sinners (to use morality language). Even at an open case, punishment in itself has a human limit. We punish for correction, not for injuring. Kant on one hand argues for retribution that: Judicial punishment can never be used merely as a means to promote some other good for the criminal himself or civil society, but instead it must in all cases be imposed on him only on the ground that he has committed a crime; for a human being can never be manipulated merely as a means to the purposes of someone else ... He must first of all be found to be deserving of punishment before any consideration is given of the utility of this punishment for himself or his fellow citizens. The issue of punishment, since it seems to have been misused, may be the reason why J. Bentham, on the other hand stated: General prevention ought to be the chief end of punishment as its real justification. If we could consider an offence which has been committed as an isolated fact, the like of which would never recur, punishment would be useless. It would only be adding one evil to another. But when we consider that an unpunished crime leaves the path of crime open, not only to the same delinquent but also to all those who may have the same motives and opportunities for entering upon it, we perceive that punishment inflicted on the individual becomes a source of security for all. That punishment which considered in itself appeared base and repugnant to all generous sentiments is elevated to the first rank of benefits when it is regarded not as an act of wrath or vengeance against a guilty or unfortunate individual who has given way to mischievous inclinations, but as an indispensable sacrifice to the common safety. But then, even Bentham’s theory was based on a utility/benefit conception of man and that man as such would be deterred from crime if punishment was applied swiftly, certainly, and severely. This is the critique given by Roberta Allen. But being aware that punishment is an evil, he says: If the evil of punishment exceed the evil of the offence, the punishment will be unprofitable; he will have purchased exemption from one evil at the expense of another. On our side we seek to know the final end of punishment. The basic idea of deterrence is to deter both
offenders and others from committing a similar offence. But also in Bentham’s theory was the idea that punishment would also provide an opportunity for reform. There is nothing that dehumanizes a human person than rape. This is out of the fact that it touches sex, an act which is very dignified, sacred and which should be out of free will and love. Its responsiveness makes its partakers completely have different acts from that of the animals. This is out of the fact that it encompasses the holistic human faculties especially those that deal with the heart, mind and soul. The presence of choice, deliberation, moral consciousness and direction, informed and formed moral order and reason, to touch but only a few, makes sex experience spiritual, self-giving and a sacred act. Now, a force against this moral, spiritual and sacred foundation dehumanizes, traumatizes and forces inner rejection and to some extent, social rejection and isolation. Any relation to another human being, whether preventive, punitive or any other, must have in its background, or the final end, the human person, who should be embraced as a person.

vi) Cultural Bias
The reality that cultures make assumptions about conventions, including conventions of language, notation, proof and evidence, makes us understand ‘cultural biases’ as the phenomenon of interpreting and judging phenomena by standards inherent to one’s own culture. Belonging to or deriving from the cultural, racial, religious, or linguistic traditions of a people or country, like cultural dances, makes culture unique in a way. But this uniqueness is not natural, material or formal, but accidental, which may be initiated through various encounters like with environment, other people, by necessity and the like. To be biased against someone else just because he/she is not from your culture is not only inhuman and retrogressive, but goes against the natural order of animals, birds, insects, and all those that belong to the same species; the bond. Instead of having cultural bias which is negative and provokes a beholder into extraneous behaviour against the one that do not hail from one’s culture, we should embrace cultural diversity. The inclusion of diverse people in a group or organization is to embrace cultural diversity in the workplace. The act of accepting and sharing with others, because there is a shared oneness and sameness in nature and causality, builds Utuism. Through this, one is well embraced, treated and experienced just because that other person has a natural worth.

vii) Chauvinism
We learn from Encyclopaedia Britannica that: Chauvinism is excessive and unreasonable patriotism, similar to jingoism. The word is derived from the name of Nicolas Chauvin, a French soldier who, satisfied with the reward of military honours and a small pension, retained a simple minded devotion to Napoleon. Chauvin came to typify the cult of the glorification of all things military that was popular after 1815 among the veterans of Napoleon’s armies. Later, chauvinism came to mean any kind of ultra-nationalism and was used generally to connote an undue partiality or attachment to a group or place to which one belongs. The term chauvinism also may describe an attitude of superiority toward members of the opposite sex, as in male chauvinism. Some animal rights advocates have used the term to indicate a similar attitude on the part of human beings toward other species, as in “species chauvinism.” We realize from this definition that chauvinism does not consider positively the value of other persons especially if not in the category of those to be glorified. Similarly, it is unethical to justify some things if they do not value human life and dignity just because they are done by a certain group of persons, like the military.
Conclusion
We have tried to demonstrate in this paper that Utuism is a reality that is experienced in our daily endeavour. Concepts like the acting person, self-actualization, freedom and human worth, were key to this endeavour. The human person is a reality of contemplation. Through this contemplation we discover that we can only refer to an individual human person as mature “if and only if” he is acting in accordance to the mode of his very being. We realized that the privation of Utu demean the very nature of the human person. This was the reason why we touched some demeaning acts like those of terrorism, tribalism, genocide, and torture among others. We at the same time brought to the front the fact that the human person, through his social and transcendence nature, can either “rule over” or “rule with” and “rule within” or “rule without”. And since this human nature is engulfed by freedom and will, the individual human person can deliberately opt to use his faculties either positively (that means constructively) or negatively (that means destructively). To use this right of choice to the constructive end is to concur metaphysically to the nature of Being qua Being. When this reality of the individual acting as dictated by his very being is negated to a point of producing a destructive end, and especially when directed to another human being, then we say that the Utu of this particular person is distorted or dead. It is that voluntary distorted nature of an individual that brings about elements like tribalism, nepotism, marginalization, riots, torture, rapes, cultural bias and chauvinism. This does not mean blanketing the entire human family under the destructive structure and attitude in the human person towards others. The greatest majority, despite some few elements in an individual of “drum major instincts”, use their Utuism constructively, thanks to the “Golden Rule” and religious consciousness.
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