

MULTICULTURALISM AND THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL INTEGRATION: A PERSPECTIVE OF GODFREY OZUMBA'S INTEGRATIVE HUMANISM

Fidelis Chuka Aghamelu *

&

Helen Chinenye Obinabo *

Abstract

Nigeria's basic problem has been to attain unity despite diversity. Nigeria's unity has continued to be threatened by embedded socio-cultural and political dichotomies. The minority suffers the problem of personal identity, inadequate promotion of culture and poor representation in government. This paper is an attempt to insightfully explore some of the impacts of multiculturalism in Nigerian politics toward promoting a positive approach on the need for cultural integration in Nigeria's political development. This study seeks to address cultural diversity in Nigeria and the effects this has on national integration using Ozumba Godfrey's philosophy of Integrative Humanism. Through the methodological approach of critical analysis, this study will propose that the minority ethnic groups must be integrated in government in line with the method of integrative humanism. It concludes that for an integrated Nigeria, the people must lead the vanguard of change, restructuring and consensual agreement reached by its diverse ethnic nationalities, followed by implementing Ozumba's theory of Integrative Humanism.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Humanism, National Integration

Introduction

In recent years, conflicts caused by differences in multicultural societies have plagued most of the countries of the world. The past decade has seen the retreat, if not the demise of multiculturalism in various western societies as well as in African countries. For instance, South Sudan seceded from Sudan due to political and cultural differences in 2011, mainly religious dissent caused by the introduction of Sharia law by former president Jaafar Nimeiri's government. Ethno cultural conflicts have become inherently linked to political violence and have been the major cause of political

dissent in most countries today. Will Kymlicka (1995: p. 1) stated that since the end of the cold war ethno cultural conflicts have become the most common source of political violence in the world, and they show no sign of abating.

Although multiculturalism has been tagged the cause of many political crisis in the world, its strengths and positive impacts must not be overlooked. Multiculturalism has been useful in that it includes the perspectives of women, minorities and non-western cultures in recognizing the increasingly diverse character of life. Society by nature is pluralistic and this pluralism can be seen in language, belief systems, boundary and historical of a society. Multiculturalism is a transformative project, both for minorities and for majorities, it gives both dominant and historically subordinative groups the opportunity to engage in new practices, enter new relationships and to embrace new concepts and discourses all of which profoundly transform people's identity. Nigeria, no doubt is a multicultural society and a home of diverse ethnic and religious groups. As Morris Hale (1997: p. 191) noted, evidence of its ethnic diversity is the two hundred and fifty different languages and dialects spoken within its boundaries which the three largest are the Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba, as well as the myriad religious practices. Apart from these numerous ethnic groups, there are also various religious denominations, although Christianity and Islam are the major two religions. The ethnic and religious separation heightens regional differences and causes frequent factional clashes amongst Nigerians. Mamdani (2001: p. 661) argues that the colonial system created laws and structures that made cultural identity the basis for political identity in Nigeria and this has inevitably turned ethnicity into a political identity. By this, he means that the colonial system of government adopted in Nigeria systematized its political structures around ethnic affiliations, creating a society where ethnicity was the for appointment into political office.

One would expect Nigeria after attaining a century old as a nation-state on January 2014 to have overcome the problem of national identity and crisis of integration resulting from its multiethnic composition, the continuous agitation by various ethnic nationalities

ranging from militancy in the Niger delta south region which has resulted to oil bunkering, armed robbery etc to various form of religious fanaticism in the northeastern axis which has recently metamorphosed into terrorism including Boko Haram, Fulani herdsmen attack etc are some of the issues and problem that multiculturalism is posing to democracy and integration. This is so because of the failure to enlighten the people on the strengths of multiculturalism and lack of an atmosphere where every cultural group has no fear of marginalization.

The term ‘multiculturalism’ is used in this work to describe the political or cultural diversification of a society; more precisely, it is used to describe a society where a variety of different political parties with different cultural backgrounds coexist to seek for political power. These have resulted in poor representation, lost of personal identity and absence of cultural promotion of the minority ethnic groups. As a result of this, there is need for redress and corrections to be affected to enhance political stability in the country. What we seek to achieve is to show the developments that tends to undermine Nigeria’s multicultural state and suggest ways of improving the coexistence of the different cultural typologies in order to ensure political stability in Nigeria. We contends that, Nigeria is a multicultural country with a multicultural political structure, and these have caused political, social and economic instability due to poor management of cultural and ethnic structures of the state by political parties and government fully dominated by the larger ethnic groups. It has caused a serious damage to the political character of the country due to poor management of the ethnic and cultural character of the country that has resulted to political instability. This paper contends that there is need to restructure our political system by integrating all political groups in line with the method of integrative humanism. And attempt must be made to integrate the interests of the different ethnic nationalities that make up Nigeria.

Defining the Term ‘Multiculturalism’

Multiculturalism in this sense is a concept that is used to describe the cultural diversities that exist in a particular society. A society that has more than one culture and ethnic group can be said to be a multicultural society. This is a society where a variety of diverse cultures coexist for common social, economic and political goal. Many countries around the world are culturally diverse, because in such countries they have diverse languages, belief systems (religious beliefs), and cultural practices. Nigeria is one example with the Annangs, Igbos, Yorubas, Hausas, Fulanis, Efiks, Ibibios, Tiv and many others. Some of these ethnic groups apart from Hausa, igbo and Yoruba belong to the minority in terms of equal representation and participation in national development. Diversity in sense manifests in the people’s culture, language and religion. Different cultures have different days in which they celebrate the cultural heritage of their people. For example, in Urua Inyang, a community located in Annang ethnic group in Akwa Ibom state Nigeria; the people celebrate what they call *usen edia afa* (new yam festival). The *usen edia afa* is quite different from any other cultural day. It is celebrated to mark the end of the planting season, and to allow yam be sold publicly in the market place and to prepare for a new planting season. It is a very significant day for the people of Urua Inyang and it takes a very different shape on how it is celebrated each year.

Furthermore, multiculturalism through diversity can manifest in the language, boundary and historical background of society that makes it different from any other society, thus it seeks for the recognition of minority cultures than assimilation, every other culture is important and has the right to be respected.

Historical Background to Ethnic and Cultural Conflicts in Nigeria

Ethnic and cultural conflicts in Nigeria are rooted in the 1914 merger of the Northern and Southern Protectorates by the colonial administration of Lord Frederick Lugard. The amalgamation brought

about the involuntary unification of culturally and historically diverse ethnic groups, some of which had been rivals and overlapping imperialists in the pre-colonial times. For instance, Benin, at the height of its power from the 15th century, had established imperial control over some states in the fringes of present-day Northern Nigeria, including Igala and Nupe-speaking areas, which, by virtue of their vassalage were compelled to pay tolls and tributes as vassals to the Benin monarch. Benin had also extended control to the South and enjoyed suzerainty over several Yoruba states, including Eko (now Lagos), Ondo, Ekiti. This overbearing influence of Benin over the Yoruba states had pitted Benin against the declining Oyo Empire before British colonization.

Similarly, Oyo Empire, prior to its decline and fall, had wielded considerable amount of influence in the entire Western part of Nigeria and had also upturned the Benin hegemony to gain control of significant Benin provinces and former vassal states. Oyo's influence also resonated in Ilorin, Ebiraland, Igalaland and Nupeland. Thus, the relationship between the Yoruba and Edo-speaking people before colonialism had been that of the proverbial cat and mouse, which had led to cold war, mutual distrust and mounting tension. In the North, the fourteen Hausa states (Hausa *Bekwai* and Hausa *Banza*) were embroiled in a prolonged and chaotic relationship of overlapping imperialism. Even the seven legitimate states (*Bekwai*) had no love lost between them, let alone cultural or political synergy between the *Bekwai* and the illegitimate states (*Banza*). Kano rose to power at the expense of Gobir's decline, while Kororofa and Kebbi besieged Kano and Rano to rise to power and fame and it is on record that it was during the imperial reign of Kebbi under Kotal Kanta that the Hausa states reached their height of disunity. According to Balogun (1980: p. 117), it however took the intervention several decades later of the Islamic jihadists led by Othman dan Fodio to forcefully unify the Hausa-speaking states under the Islamic religion.

In the South-South, as culturally homogenous as they seemed, they were far from united. The Efik and Ibibio were constantly at loggerheads, while the Urhobo and Itsekiri had ceaseless

confrontations. The divisiveness and fissiparous tendencies among the ethnic nationalities in this region were capitalized upon by the Europeans to “divide and rule” and in the process establishing their hegemony and colonization. According to Osaghe (1991: p. 237), the 1914 amalgamation was therefore a marriage of convenience; that is, it was to suit the sole purpose of ease of administration and exploitation of the colonial powers. The union of the over 250 ethnic nationalities was therefore unity by a rope of sand for Folarin (2012: p. 18). Nigeria was not meant to work because it was not unification by natural evolution. The Nigeria project was a distant comparison to Italy, Germany and Spain whose unification from the Middle Ages to the 19th century was by the freewill or choice of the people under dynamic leadership. The act of merger by the European colonial powers merely forced the diverse ethnic groups of Northern and Southern Protectorates into a single entity without consultation with the various ethnic groups or their leaders. This autocratic and undemocratic British colonial policy, therefore, marked the origin of ethnic conflicts in the country.

It is pertinent to note that the primordial ethnic underpinnings in the creation of the Nigerian State began to resonate before independence. For instance, in 1953 when the nationalists representing Nigeria were offered the platform to come to terms with an agreed date of independence, ethnic sentiments and insecurity came to the fore as the Northern (Hausa-Fulani) delegates at the constitutional conference objected to a 1956 date proposed by the Southern delegates, among whom was late Chief Anthony Enahoro who moved the motion. The Hausa-Fulani leaders had made it clear by their stout objection that they were not ready for independence as the fear of Southern dominance in a post-colonial Nigeria was rife. Similarly, as the country prepared for independence, political parties emerged from erstwhile vociferous and respected political movements and organizations, which were basically ethnic unions. The Northern People’s Congress (NPC) as the name suggests was a cultural movement for Northern peoples’ development. The Action Group (AG) was a modified version of the *Egbe Omo Oduduwa*, a pan-Yoruba socio-cultural group; while National Congress of Nigeria and the Cameroons metamorphosed into the National

Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC), a Southeastern group led by Igbo ethnic unionists. Other clear ethnic unions that changed to “national” parties included the Northern Elements People’s Union (NEPU) and the United Middle Belt Congress (UMBC), which struggled for the control of the centre.

Interestingly, however, these regional cum ethnic parties had internal infractions. The UMBC, for instance, grew unpopular because of the disagreements among the Nupe, Igala, Idoma, Birom, Angas, Jukum, and the others, whose interests the party claimed to represent. This was so because these were the same ethnic groups that constantly engaged one another in warfare in the pre-colonial times in search of conquests and glory. The NCNC too had issues - the Igbo were distrusted by the South-South groups and would prefer to be politically insulated from the former. Incidentally, one of the tribal parties, the NPC won the elections and constituted the national government in 1960, thus crystallizing an ethnic-based leadership. The events of 1960 to 1966 were a critical test of an evolving nationhood. The NPC and NCNC subsequently formed a coalition government, which technically meant that the Hausa-Fulani and Igbo had reached an understanding while the Yoruba (AG) had been pushed to the political margins as Opposition. The power equation between the ethnic nationalities had left the ethnic minorities in the cold, but the understanding between the Igbo and Hausa-Fulani soon broke down with the military coup of January 15, 1966. Ademoyega (1981: p. 11) stated that, the coup, because of the Hausa-Fulani elements that were the most casualties, was perceived as ethnic motivated.

The catalogue of events that followed, including a Northern Nigeria-led counter coup, ethnic cleansing in military barracks and the North in which Igbo elements were the victims, and the 30-month Civil War, demonstrated an outburst of the deep-seated ethnic resentment and hate that had etched into the polity before and shortly after independence. After the Civil War, rather than abate, ethnic equation became the underlying factor in much of national life in the Nigerian State. According to Omoruyi (2008: p. 55), these included appointment and promotion in the armed forces, employment in the civil and public services, political appointment into public office,

admission into institutions of learning, revenue allocation, infrastructural development and formation of political parties as well as coup plots. The federal character principle and quota system, initiated in 1976 and institutionalized by the Babangida administration in the mid-1980s became schemes to ensure ethnic balancing in public life. The level of separatism and volatility of ethnicity also led to the conception and establishment of the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) in 1973 according to Taiwo (2000: p. 60) in his book *Nigeria on Gunpower*. It is interesting to note that in spite of the plethora of ethnic crisis from 1966 to date, the basic underlying factor in election, allocation of resources, party formation and political appointment is ethnic consideration. The concepts and propositions such as geopolitical zones, zoning and rotational presidency seem to be more modest ways of perpetrating ethnic politics. An uglier dimension of ethnic crisis is intra-ethnic and intra-regional disagreements which have led to fratricidal wars and conflicts such as the Tiv-Jukun, Tiv-Hausa, Andoni-Ogoni, Umeleri-Aguleri, Ife-Modakeke, and Birom-Fulani conflicts. One basic factor that is comprehensible about these developments is that ethnic conflict has gained momentum because the polity from the top-down is structured along ethnic lines and conditioned by a primitive tribal and primordial culture.

Factors Militating Against National Identity and Integration in Nigeria

One of the major factors militating against an ideal national identity and integration is the heterogeneity of the ethnic groups that made up Nigeria and the interethnic jostling for the control and distribution of national wealth. On ethnicity, many scholars write that Nigeria is such a multiethnic, linguistic and religious community, where traditional social structure as well as the imposed western and oriental ones provides such a mosaic effect that to call it a pluralistic society sounds like an understatement. J. Gunther (1955: p. 44) observes in this direction that the lack of homogeneity is beyond doubt its (Nigeria's) overriding political and national problem. The curse of this great country in fact is sectionalism. Nigeria is a geographical monstrosity-three country in one.

Secondly, any meaningful attempt to understand the crisis of national identity and integration in Nigeria has to be historically contextualized in terms of system of rule and domination instituted by the Colonial powers. The Colonial Government clearly marked out the critical role it is to play in the process of ethnic identity formation and the political use to which such identity or consciousness is going to be put. Odeyemi (2014: p. 9 - 10) concludes that;

the failure of the various tribal groups to negotiate their amalgamation is the root of many tribal wrangling and agitations, ethnic hues and cries of marginalization, greed, controversial and inconclusive censuses, vote rigging, stagnated economic growth and nepotism in Nigeria, and not necessarily its huge territorial and population size with its multifarious ethnic groupings.

The British colonial political strategy of divide and rule which was aimed at introducing the legacy of transforming the existing flexible and fluid identity relation between the various ethnic groups in Nigeria to one based on rigidity was clear indication of their double barrel intention. They achieved this by relying on the often biased research findings of colonial anthropologists in ranking the ethnic groups on the basis of their physiognomy and culture as perceived to be suitable for their quest for domination. Kuna (1998: p. 83) comments that the construction of a Northern Nigeria identity from the inception of colonial rule was rigidly defined as “Islamic” and “Hausa”, thus elevating these social categories into a more politically dominant position within the area. Colonialism so to say played a unificatory role in the amalgamation (not unification) of the different ethnic groups of Nigeria into one country, but it equally sows the seed of disintegration by the structural disunity it instituted administratively and legally. Until 1914 the colonial masters ruled Nigeria not as Nigeria, but as disparate nations at least four: the colony of Lagos and three protectorates the West, the East and the North. This was so distinct to the extent that national frontier were

demarcated between these. Even an agreement was signed and rigorously implemented that hindered any southern penetration to Christianize the North. Direct efforts were even made by the British to encourage, not national but regional thinking. The constitution gave enormous autonomy and control over resources to each of the regions.

The 1951 Macpherson constitution for instance made the regions the more important centre of political life. Since the regions correspond to the ethnic groups, Nigerian politics became ethnic politics both in form and in result. Election campaign was characterized by blatant appeals to ethnic prejudice and vituperates rhetoric. The Federal system, created by the 1954 Constitution of Littleton did not seem to diminish the rising ethnic conflicts all to the advantage of the colonial government. The thinking of many analyst of Nigeria historical development is that the colonial government did not want such conflict to diminish fast as it distracted the people from coming to the center to demand leadership cum political independence. Nonetheless, this demand had to be made. The first general election was conducted in 1959, which paved the way for Nigeria to receive her political independence from Britain the following year, but the loaded gunpowder of tribal politics of bitterness was set for explosion and this happened in 1966. The first military coup-d'état in Nigeria was as a result of extreme ethnocentrism and political corruption of politicians in the corridors of power. Since then till now Nigeria's has not grown out of this hydra headed ethnocentrism in her political, social and administrative life. It led to the Nigeria-Biafra civil war and the collapse of the first Republic and subsequent coups and counter coup.

Thirdly, ethnic politics has created a deep-rooted structural inequality in the distribution of education, employment and sharing of power. This has resulted in what we may describe as individual, tribal and regional, religious and at times gender ethnocentrism. There is on the individual level a colossal dearth of fair and equal participation in national life. Those who happen to be in power (political and economic) corruptly enrich themselves from the public treasury. This has few wealthy people in the midst of the poor

majority. Educational inequality is at three levels, the first being the historical fact that the Northern Muslim leaders for fear of converting their faithful to Christianity were initially reluctant to allow western Christian missionaries to introduce western education and have today come to be legally recognized as educationally disadvantage area which is used as criteria for admission in all government own educational institutions. The other being that while some southern Nigeria ethnic groups or regions have free education programs for their members others do not. Hence in those regions without free education only those families who are wealthy can afford to pay for the education of their members. From the above one can see that there is a total absence of equality of opportunity in Nigeria right from the start. The same inequality of opportunity rules in the realm of employment with the entrenchment of federal character which sacrifices merit at altar of mediocrity. Merit is replaced by family, ethnic, or religious members or what can be called bribing power and friendship.

On the religious side, the external elements of colonization with its Islamization and Christianization side projects according to Iroegbu (1996: p. 11) played its own part in creating its own conflict. African traditional religions never quarreled or conflicted among themselves as is the case with the European and Eastern religion. Islam from the East is a vowed opponent of Christianity from the West. And Christianity is involved in internal conflicts between its denominational parts that were imported from Europe and America. However the sharpest point of conflict now is the renewed attempt by Muslim fundamentalist to Islamize Nigeria through the large scale introduction of Sharia code of law and terrorist activities of Boko haram in some parts of Northern States in Nigeria. Even in official government circle, the government that proclaims its fidelity to the secular character of the state is seen to be patronizing the Islamic religion at the expense of other religions. These hinder the emergence of national identity and integration of Nigeria multiethnic diversity.

Another factor is what determines the citizenship of a state in Nigeria. Geo-ethnicity is used to determine one's citizenship of a

state. For instance, a child whose parents come from Anambra state which is in southeastern part of Nigeria dominated by Igbo ethnic group, but was born and brought up in Lagos southwestern Nigeria dominated by Yoruba ethnic group cannot be considered as an indigene for any benefit in Lagos even though his/her parent lived and paid their tax to Lagos state government, because he/she is first considered to be an Anambrian. If he/she is not careful he/she may lose his/her rights and privileges in Anambra because the child lacks, contact there. Where this happens, the child may be thrown into a very hopeless dilemma which can bring about disillusionment in his/her entire life. While, of course this may contribute to the development of state identity, it could be considered to be detrimental to national identity.

Similarly, the issue of leadership in Nigeria and the orientation and behavior of elite and politicians present a serious challenge to national integration. The Nigerian state has had ill luck of parading and recycling selfish and inept leaders who operate along ethnic lines and sectional loyalties. While in office, they concentrate the allocation of national wealth on those from their ethnic region thereby discarding Nigerian nationalism and the inculcation of national identity and integration. They show a high level of insensitivity to the yearnings and aspiration of the citizens. Because of government's unresponsiveness to the issues of citizens' welfare, the people begin to look for other avenues to survive. These other avenues could be dysfunctional to national progress and inimical to national identity and integration. Ethnicity is held so sacrosanct that even the elite whom one would ordinarily think that their behavior and attitude to national issues would be conditioned by their universalistic orientation occasioned by their level of education and wider experience rather profess and practice it very deeply. It is very clear that the elites of Nigeria involved themselves more intensely in ethnic power play than other people within the middle and lower echelons of society. Three major factors responsible for the inclination of the elites to ethnic antics are that ethnicity may be more important to them than to people with lesser opportunities. The society is believed to function as a series of ethnic power groups; and potential elites feel the need to join one of these in order to

succeed: secondly, politicians finds it difficult to win votes by universalistic appeals to ideology, rather a communal war cries were popular and successful. Thirdly, there were many things which went wrong in the system and ethnic “scape-goating” was a useful way of easing pressure for reform.

In fact what has been called tribalism or the so-called marginalization by some ethnic groups is seen to be part of the mechanism through which the political elite maintain itself in power and exercises its influence. Ethnic manipulation therefore is an attitude of elite behavior. The elite became the chief proponents and purveyors of parochialism and particularistic values. Every prospective elite therefore believes that a strong inclination to ethnic chauvinism will avail him of most of the opportunities he wants. With this in mind, the particular pattern of seeing ethnicity as the quickest way out of some prevailing personal or communal problem is established. This, belief of course establishes self interest in his mind and therefore convince him to believe that ethnic or sub ethnic identification can easily expose him to some opportunities. Odeyemi (2014) observed the above trend when he states:

that the elites keep themselves in political office by playing and preying on the ignorance and the fears of the poverty stricken majority of their people. Thus, the elite use the ethnic factor to retain themselves in office as political leaders, directors or managers of national corporations and parastatals by making false claims of representing their ethnic groups. Even when they do not perform well in political office, they deceive the people by whipping up ethnic sentiments; raising fears and tensions of the threat that would be posed to their ethnic group if other groups should gain political ascendancy.(p. 10)

The resultant effect is indifference toward national concerns. National identity and integration under this condition cannot be attained. The last in this list of the numerous factors is what some

scholars call cultural imperialism which is often describe as the infiltration of western culture into the African indigenous society. This is done through the use of foreign educational materials like, films, books, internet and other publications and programs from the print and electronic media which profess the western/American attitude to life as the original and modern, and therefore, the best. The worst aspect is that the youths pick the negative ones that expose and promote selfishness, violence, immoral and individualistic attitudes. These behavioral attitudes and orientations are not acceptable to most Nigerian ethnic cultures. In fact, those who live in Nigerian cities today suffer from cultural confusion. They now prefer foreign goods to Nigerian made ones. They do not identify with indigenous productions. The clothes they put on, the food they eat and even the values they prefer are very much foreign. A people who do not respect their cultures and values are a people without identity. Such people therefore cannot be assumed to show patriotism and loyalty to their country.

Integrative Humanism: The Solution to Nigeria's Problem of Integration

Integrative humanism is a philosophy and also a method of doing philosophy that gives credence to social integration, inter-ethnic unionism and harmonization of thought within and among a people's reality. Integrative humanism is a philosophy and also a method of doing philosophy championed by Godfrey Okechukwu Ozumba, a Nigerian born philosopher, born on the 6th of December 1960. He founded the idea to show how the society can be integrated through philosophical conceptualization of ideas. Integrative humanism as a philosophy according to Ozumba (2010: p. 23) is seen as follows:

Integrative humanism as a philosophy adopted as a guided but open attitude in approaching issues of knowledge as they affect humans directly or indirectly. This attitude takes a serious that all parts of reality constituting matter and spirit, the plant and animal world as an integrated ecosystem of which no part can be isolated without dire consequences. Integrative humanism as a philosophy can therefore be applied as

Integrative humanism as a method he further contends:

Integrative humanism becomes a method when it is articulated and used either in interpreting a mass of reality or an instrument in conducting a research or as a way of bringing a new understanding to bear on old facts. For instance, a student applying the method of integrative humanism in research may want to know what different positions exist, and what constitute the limitations of these different positions (of say truths) and how an integrative approach of sifting and welding can bring about a better or more acceptable harmonious whole... (p. 23)

It is a ratio-empirico-spirito-centric approach to doing philosophy where realities are contraries rather than contradictions. The essence of integrative humanism is to show that through physical and spiritual insights we can provide answers to most of the questions that confront us in our daily lives. These questions may be ethical, epistemological, metaphysical, logical, jurisprudential, political, religious, aesthetical or scientific. The methodical demands of integrative humanism are contextual, analytic and mutual integration. Therefore, integrative humanism is a cautious management of relevant variables in a context-dependent dynamic network for resolutions of tasks that would rather prove difficult for mono sequestered and non-contextualized theoretic applications.

This study adopts the above method as a panacea to the prevailing issues of multiculturalism in Nigerian political development. Through the application of this philosophy, Nigeria's problem and multiculturalism and lack of integration will be eliminated by developing and promoting policies of the minority interest. Rural development is one of the essential measures on how to revitalize a democratic state. For Ozumba et al. (2014: p. 44), from an integrative stand point, integrative humanism as a method of

philosophizing is of the opinion that there is need for proper research to unfold new possibilities within all necessary links of reality. As such it becomes a fundamental issue in the growth of Nigerian politics to promote political activities, enhance minority groups for the growth of such society. If this is not done, the multiculturalist status of Nigeria will still be questionable. Nigeria will only grow if all the ethnic cultures are integrated and promoted. By this no culture should be seen as superior to the other.

Again, government should be formed from the grass root level. The grass root is one of the key powerhouses of a true democracy; it involves house to house renovation, rejuvenation and development in all the ethnic communities, proper orientation of the uneducated rural people and seeing their importance in political affair. This is called Town Hall Meeting in modern politics.

Appointment of leadership role to all ethnic groups is also another factor that will help in solving this problem. Most times, the minority are not given any role to play in a democratic state like Nigeria. This is because of the role democracy plays in effectively promoting leadership by majority. Integrative humanism as a method of doing philosophy do not totally agree with the negligence of the minority; in other words attention should be given the ethnic minority if Nigeria's political development must be revitalized. The minority should have a quota in leadership role of every country, because they form part of the whole, and if bifurcated, they become missing links and their problems, voice and demands can never be achieved. Within an integrative standpoint leadership roles should be assigned to all ethnic groups for an integrative government. There should be a political accommodation between the minority and the majority. And if the minority is in power they must give political accommodation to the majority as demanded by multiculturalism. Integrative humanism sees every ethnic group as constituting link in the formation of the full spirit of the nation and therefore should not be marginalized.

Furthermore, the execution of key national project across all ethnic groups, the essence of democracy as against dictatorship is the

existence of equality, fairness and justice; these three concepts are well connected to give the masses freedom to seek social equity, freedom in fair hearing and a just treatment. By implication, it means that economic distribution, execution of vital projects must cut across all ethnic society and must be equally distributed not from the formula of majority rather from the minority. This is the only way of showing the importance of government to the minority ethnic groups. Another important thing is educating the youth on the needs for integration. Some of the major political violence in Nigeria, and the problem of militancy, terrorism (Boko Haram) are all driven by the youth as majority. The youth constitute a centripetal force of Nigerian political development and as such they are to be educated and controlled. To avoid some of these major issues propelled by the youth; integrative humanism recognizes proper orientation of all the youth, and not in some part of the country but across all the ethnic groups. Thus, integrative humanism understands the concept of holism, and not in parts. By implication, the youth can only be rescued from wrongness if they are properly educated. This education policy will take place through public awareness, workshops, seminars etc. The focus of this education must cover the needs for the country to be free from political violence, the benefits of peaceful coexistence and how national integration can be attained.

Conclusion

Multiculturalism is a body of thought in political philosophy about the proper way to respond to cultural and religious diversity. By natural endowment, Nigeria has continued to enjoy her multicultural status and these manifests in the way the people socialize, worship, and extensively the political structure they operate. This political structure is such that the larger ethnic groups who are the majority (the Igbos, Hausas and the Yorubas), make the minority to suffer the problem of personal identity, inadequate promotion of their culture and poor representation in government. Thus, Nigerian government has continued to undermine the existence of these other diverse cultures, creating a gap between the major ethnic groups with the minor groups. These have caused Nigeria to lose her multiculturalists status.

This study has pondered on the above issues and their various manifestations and has posited that, for there to be a political stability within the various ethnic strains of the country, the minority ethnic groups must be integrated in government in line with the spirit and philosophy of integrative humanism. Integrative humanism is a philosophy and also a method of doing philosophy that gives credence to social integration, inter ethnic unionism and harmonization of thought within and among a people's reality, and this could be a better approach for social justice, equal representation, and inter-ethnic complementarity in Nigeria's political development. What we are saying is that majority culture should allow the minority culture to thrive in a mutually benefiting harmonious existence. The majority culture should not force the minority culture to be assimilated into their culture; assimilation policy is a violation against multiculturalists spirit.

***Fidelis Chuka Aghamelu, PhD, Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.**

Email: hele.fidelis@yahoo.com

*** Helen Chinenye Obinabo, Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.**

Email: helenchinenye2016@gmail.com

Phone: 08103620514

References

Ademoyega, A. (1981). *Why We Struck: The Story of the First Nigerian Coup*. Lagos: Sunshine Books.

Balogun, S. (1980). "History of Islam up to 1800", in Ikeme O. (ed), *Ground Work of Nigerian History*. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

Folarin, S. (2012). "Ethnicity and Power Politics: From June 12 to Boko Haram", *National Mirror*, August 15.

Gunther, J. (1955). *Inside Africa*. London: Hamilton.

Iroegbu, P. (1996). *The Kpim of Political Communalism: Towards Justice in Africa*. Owerri: International University Press Ltd.

Kuna, M. J. (1998). "The Sokoto Caliphate, Colonialism and the Formation of Identities: The Construction of Northern Nigeria," *Annals of Social Science Council of Nigeria*, 10 January-December.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mamdani, M. (2001). "Beyond Settler and Native as Political Identities: Overcoming the Political Legacy of Colonialism," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43.

Morris-Hale, W. (1997). *Conflict and Harmony in Multi-Ethnic Societies: An International Perspective*. New York: Peter Lang.

Odeyemi, J. O. (2014). "A Political History of Nigeria and the Crisis of Ethnicity in Nation-Building," *International Journal of Developing Societies*, 3.

Omoruyi, O. (2008). *Disillusioned Democrat: Reflections on my Public Life in Nigeria 1959-1999*. Ibadan: Heinemann.

Osaghe, E. (1991). "Ethnic Minorities and Federalism in Nigeria", *African Affairs*, 90.

Ozumba, G. O. (2010). *Philosophy and Method of Integrative Humanism*. Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers.

Ozumba G.O, and Jonathan O. C. (2014). Njikoka Amaka: *Further Discussions in the Philosophy of Integrative Humanism*. Calabar: 3rd Option Publishers.

Taiwo, V. (2000). *Nigeria on GunPower: The Climax of Misrule*.
Ibadan: Omo-Ade Press.