

INTEGRAL HUMANISM AND THE MORALITY OF CULTURE OF PEACE

Ikechukwu Anthony Kanu, PhD

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies

Tansian University, Anambra State

ikee_mario@yahoo.com

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1977-202X

&

Philip Osarobu ISANBOR, PhD

Department of Philosophy, Seminary of All Saints, Ekpoma, Nigeria

osarobuisanbor@gmail.com

OCHID No: 0000_0002_9128_6467

Abstract

For peace, the human society must be guided by a conscious sensibility and application of its morality. This is all about the development of the human persons and their society occasioned by the values of solidarity of values and sincerity of purpose through responsible and humanised actions of development. No one talks about development without due reference to the nature and values of human actions. When and where are possible consideration of human actions, there is necessarily the consideration of morality that is suppose to guide such actions in order to achieve moral order in the forms of social order and justice, which are basic conditions for the Culture of Peace as against the Culture of War. Actions define the human person as a being of rationality, as an agent of development and as a subject of lived experiences. Such are factors of the individual, existential object of social change and development that classifies his or her humanness, by his or her consideration of the values of other persons in his or her actions and valued choices. The lack of this moral disposition demands that the human person should be evaluated integrally, knowing that he or she is a being of the composite of body and soul, and as such, he or she needs the other persons to develop integrally. Therefore, the paper concluded that human actions should be morally directed to promote the unity of person and the care for one another. This brings us to the pragmatic and conceptual valuations of integral humanism as a moral foundation of the Culture of Peace.

Keyword: Morality, Human Person, Culture of War, Integral Humanism, Truth, Culture of Peace,

Introduction

In 2011, Nick Megoran with his article: *War and Peace? An Agenda for Peace Research and Practice in Geography*; recognised that “geography is better in researching war

than peace"¹, especially in relation to the valuation of the ecology. In the search for truth, it means that geography is based on its historical directedness for its socio-developmental values and interests. From such observation, Megoran recognised that some many disciplines like Peace Studies, Biblical Studies and International Relations Theory have been more concerned with what peace is, even than geography and its subsidiary disciplines, and also, he posited that the discourses of peace are frequently seen and heard from and by politicians, journalist, academics, and even activists. But, peace has been assuming different meanings and values to them all.² Then, what can be said of philosophy, as a non-empirical discipline in research postulations, especially its ethical interrogations of human actions, conducts and ideologies? As hypothetically inferred, philosophy can be said to be so concerned in researching peace than war, as the indispensable tenets of its ethics (Morality of Development) are mainly on the nature of the good of human actions and valued choices than the otherwise.

The issues of moral development are necessarily linked with the social factors of human relationships for the realization of integral humanism: truthfulness, trust, sincerity, love, open-mindedness, generosity, solidarity and common good.³ For many social and existential thinkers, these factors are indispensable contents of human conscience for happy and peaceful living.⁴ They are dear to true human's heart, the seat of truth. The exercise of the heart that is enlivened by true freedom and sense of authentic responsibility of choices made, and whether peace or war is a product of choice.⁵ The human person lives with peace as with violence, according to many peace and peace culture researchers like Hugo Grotius on the *Law of War and Peace*; Gray Cox on the *Philosophy of Peace as Action*; Andras Riedlmayer on the *Nexus of the Crimes of War and the Crimes of Peace*, and Johan Galtung on the *Relation of Peace and Gender*. For Gray Cox, anything outside the *Culture of Peace*, creates madness of living in the society and the degeneration of human minds. Away for the operability of natural law and morality, no

¹Cf, Nick Megoran, War and peace? An agenda for peace research and practice in geography. *Political Geography*, Vol. 30, 2011, pp. 178-189.

²N. Megoran, War and peace? An agenda for peace research and practice in geography, p. 178.

³See, P. O Isanbor, Valuing Culture of Peace for Sustainable Development in John Paul II's Philosophy. *Enwisdomization Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2014 pp. 94-122; P. O. Isanbor and E. U. Ekuigbo, Socialization of Religion for Advancement of Culture of Peace in Nigeria. *Journal of Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology in Practice*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2014, pp. 37-43; P. O. Isanbor and P. O Folorunso, An Africentric Concern for Peace: Towards Authentic Development of Benedict XVI's Socio-Philosophy. *AICI Journal of Religious Studies and Theology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2015, pp. 153-165.

⁴See, J. I. Omoregbe, "Ethics and Aesthetics." In F. N. Ndubuisi (ed). *Philosophy, Logic and Philosophy of Science*. Lagos: Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos 2011, p. 42.

⁵Johan Galtung, Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2010, p. 171.

meaningful positivity can be ascribed to the *Culture of War*.⁶ To them all, the increasing rate of the acts of dehumanization is dependence on the natures of violence that contemporary humanity is exercising or expressing in showing the level of civility, social and economic cruelty, inhumane creativity and innovation. It can be personal or structural in nature.⁷ When true freedom and authentic responsibility are not expressed in our actions and valued choices, especially in our scientific and technological creativities and innovations, human rights are bound to be limited and violated, especially in the institution of wars and other forms of conflicts.

The ideas of the *Culture of Peace* are by making the influences of one's lived experiences of the past occasioned by the *Culture of War* and other forms of dehumanization to be pragmatically relevant in the present through the preservation of the values of human life, rights and dignity.⁸ To remember the past is to value more the present in order to safeguard the future, otherwise, one will be living in the past with no hope for a better future. With the respect and application of the values of truth in right conscience and freedom, the individual as an agent of development and as a subject of lived experience is informed that the *Culture of Peace* is an assured possibility and a reality, not a mirage, despite the imposing economic influences of utility principle shrouded around many heavy national budgets and financing in militarization and weaponries.⁹ As observably put, in many instances, our contemporary quests for social and innovative stills and engagements are making due reference for the values of conflicts to that of peace, and adopting conflicts as to be very prominent and lucrative in many human minds and their modes of living. The society, with its dualistic consideration of events or realities, has projected possible understanding the nature of woman from man, night from day, evil from good, objectivity from

⁶Cf, G. Cox, *A way of Peace: The Philosophy of Peace as Action*. Mumbai: Paulist Press, 1986, p. 3.

⁷ Johan Galtung, Violence, Peace and Peace Research, p. 171.

⁸Cf, Ademola B. Ekanola, Towards an enduring Social Peace in the Violence Ridden Society: From a Culture of War and Violence to a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence. *West African Journal of Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 8, 2005, pp. 93-112, see, p. 94.

⁹See, E. U. Ekuigbo and P. O. Isanbor (2013). Peace Education and its Place in Human Sociological Development. *Journal of Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology in Practice*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 44-53; A. O. Fasuyi, and P. O. Isanbor (2013^a). Indoctrination as a Methodology of Social Enlightenment in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 54-60; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor (2013^b). Peace Education and Human Right Argument. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 88-96; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor (2014). Educating Socio-philosophical Nature of Religion for National Symbiotic Living. *Enwisdomization Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 22-45.

subjectivity, the sense of common good from greed and selfishness, destruction from construction, etc, and vis-a-vis.

Morality of Integral Humanism

The conceptualisation of human development to be integral should be based on the philosophical functioning of the developmental ideology, known as "humanism", and in the case, "integral or true humanism." Over the times, the human society has developed many models of humanism. The concept 'humanism' does not necessarily and generally connotes negativity of conceptual understanding of human actions and beliefs in using his feelings for the assessment of realities and conditions.¹⁰ Integral or true humanism amongst other models of humanism, considers the operational relationship of God in human choices and affairs. It is about the development of the human person that is integral and holistic, considering the fullness of the person as subject of experience in the policies and agenda.¹¹ As the humanistic conception of development is the morality of common interests.

Within moral sense of development, humanism as an ideology adjudges human rationality and intelligibility, and helps to define the individual as a thinking entity that can take care of his or her affairs and be responsible for his or her actions.¹² Ontologically speaking, within the pragmatic application of common sense, we can epistemologically adjudge the human persons will be socially tempted or phenomenologically unguided to judge their very selves as the only thinking entities in the created world. That may be wrong, because, the human persons don't know what the fullest of the nature of other animals and it may be possible that they have minds. If they do, the human persons may not be able to fully determine what they think about and the extended powers of such consciousness and intelligibility. The mind, as it has been evaluated, is the thinking capacity of any reality. But, if rationality is the same as coordination, then it presupposes that the other animals think since they coordinate themselves and their affairs at some extents of their intelligent evaluation, and as such, it can be said that they have minds as humans, then they are rational, maybe not the level of rationality of which human persons judged themselves.

¹⁰See, Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009, no. 17.

¹¹John Paul II, *Fides et Ratio*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998, no. 68.

¹²Godwin Azenabor, Sustainability of university education in Nigeria: a philosophical discourse on problems and revival strategies. In O. M. Ogbinaka (ed.) African Studies Monographs. Lagos: Onosomegbowho Ogbinaka Publishers Limited. 2005, p. 33.

Although, with coordination then, it is possible that other animals have minds, but they may not as reasonable, rational as the humans. They may not have teleological end, but the human person is sure of himself or herself, just because, he or she is certain of his or her mind, soul or spirit as the case may be.¹³ This philosophy of the mind is the hallmark of human religiosity and sociality. The mind is the essentiality of human existence and living. Human rationality is its sociality, communality, education, spirituality, essentiality and informed personality. The human mind defines the culture of development and growth process. It fashions the choices the individual makes, and such choices determine the nature and level of its wellbeing and ultimately, its ends. The quests for integral humanism in any given human society necessarily demand for human' constant struggle, the conditions for common survival and development, and the situations that appears inevitable to human existence.¹⁴

From the philosophical reflection of humanistic conception of development, we understand the indispensable valuation of the human person in developmental processes of the world. This has continually becomes a veritable tool for true religion, commerce, industry and other human social institutions when reasonably adopted.¹⁵ With such philosophy of development, the theological imports of ontologised *ethics of living* becomes very timely in assessing the values of human life, rights and dignity in the faces of contemporary developmental manipulations and dehumanization. The good of human life is to value the life that he possesses in relating with other creatures, a venture of harmonised universe, and a culture of accommodative interests. When one is talking about the possibility of social order and justice by and from all actions today, simply implies the ethical management of human actions in promoting human life, rights and dignity. This is the propelling developmental force of interest inherent in personalistic civilisation of developmental ideologies and interests. In the same light of understanding human actions, Benedict XVI in his *Caritas in Veritate*, substantiates this conviction of the realization of integral humanism through "charity in truth" hinged on the phenomenological analysis of the *Mission of Theology* in contemporary society.¹⁶ He recognises the indispensable unity with God and

¹³Cf, Ademola B. Ekanola, p. 94.

¹⁴See, E. U. Ekuigbo and P. O. Isanbor, 2013, p. 45; A. O. Fasuyi, and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^a, p. 55; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^b, p. 90; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2014, p. 30.

¹⁵See, Paul VI, *Populorum Progreessio*, Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1967, no. 42.

¹⁶Cf, P. O Isanbor, Valuing Culture of Peace for Sustainable Development in John Paul II's Philosophy. p. 100; P. O. Isanbor and E. U. Ekuigbo, Socialization of Religion for Advancement of Culture of Peace in Nigeria, p. 40; P. O. Isanbor and P. O Folorunso, An

human ability in knowing himself in truth, and being charitable with creative love and mutual self-giving. He owes that the currencies of truth depends on the healthy employment of the interplay of faith and reason in assessing the contents of integral humanism. From all indications, the contrary will never be for the benefits of the human society that fully desired the *Culture of Peace* to develop integrally. Such conception of the *Culture of Peace* presupposes the universal acceptance of human togetherness and symbiosis.

Morality of the Ontological Concerns for the *Culture of Peace*

Central to this discourse of development is that of the conceptualization of the human person as divinely or ontologically organised being, as a subject of lived experiences that works for the possibilities of social harmony and justice.¹⁷ Everyone is born with the sense for the *Culture of Peace*, and the sense for the *Culture of War* is learnt over time. For this, we talk about the interplay of religion, politics and the advocacies of human rights as they relate that human actions should be expressed in truth, and the evidence of their *inseparateness* of social commitments should be on the true expression of human inter-subjectivity. The conscious and conscientious pursuance of the social ingredients of integral humanism helps the human person to properly understand the essence of creation and the purposeful operations of God in the created arrangement of the world, such understanding owes that “creation is intrinsically ordered by the supernatural life of grace as its deepest dynamism and final goal.”¹⁸ The grace here is the phenomenological exactness of hope for human wellbeing in the operational interplay of faith and reason in understanding human nature. As the ordering of the true societal development is made concrete in the human person- the crown of creation- whom God created in such a way that he or she could be a receptacle of divine life in knowledge, love and freedom.¹⁹

The sustained possibility of *Culture of Peace* is based on social integration of human values and interests especially by functional and vibrant governments and the peoples.²⁰ Such characterization and definition of the human person implies that he or she is ontologically configured to be a recipient of a moral directive that is

Africentric Concern for Peace: Towards Authentic Development of Benedict XVI's Socio-Philosophy, pp. 157.

¹⁷Cf, Ademola B. Ekanola, p. 96.

¹⁸Karl Ralner, *Theological Investigation*. Vol. 13. NY: The Seabury, 1972, p. 306.

¹⁹Karl Ralner, *Theological Investigation*, p. 306.

²⁰Cf, Ademola B. Ekanola, p. 96.

regarded as an imperative, or the norm or standard for human actions.²¹ Here the individual incorporates his or her actions and inactions within the demands of duty and a moral regulation, while simultaneously hoping to discover in the regulation a proper expression of his or her own individuality.²² Such social receptability of human interests in reference to the *Beingness* of God is expected to be seated on the *Otherness of Living*. These becomes are the ingredients of integral human development when expressed in "truth." With this consciousness the human person is to remain in good relationship with God, and the individual as an active agent of development is to continually hope for well being for himself or herself and for *Others* through his or her actions. This is to maintain the human self-communication with God, and "at the same time that this divine self-communication remains a wondrous, un-exacted gift to the human person, and for which he continuously thirst as his or her fulfilment."²³

In the fate and faith of human integrity and on the values of human life, that truth remains what it is. That is, "truth is truth", unchanging and immutable, owing and hinging on the indispensable worthiness and unblemished character of God in relation with humanities. Truth to be truth may sound tautological, but that what it is. It is about being sincere to the true nature of existence and living. There is no modern and contemporary way of presenting or representing the truth- for the values of life are what they are, recognising the fact that life does not belong to man but to God. The individual is not fully developed when he is alienated or isolated from the truth, a truth when fully enlivened in right freedom and conscience sustains the courses for the *Otherness of Living*. The cosmological relevance of *Otherness of Living* is on the moral principle of development on which the value of the life of the human person is weighted, simply through the principles of participation and integration which make him or her to enjoy the natural rights.

In a nutshell, the individual as an active agent of development has no option rather than to work in an atmosphere where he or she is convinced of positive lived experiences and to maintain the stewardship of the earth entrusted to him or her. He or she must be developed along the ontological stewardship of the environment that is bestowed upon him or her, truthful to his or her existentiality

²¹ See, E. U. Ekuigbo and P. O. Isanbor, 2013, p. 45; A. O. Fasuyi, and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^a, p. 55; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^b, p. 90; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2014, p. 30.

²²B. A. Lanre-Abass and E. A. Layode, "Moral Basis of Governance." In O. A. Oyeshile and F. Offor (eds). *Ethics, Governance and Social Order in Africa*. Ibadan: Zenith Book House, 2017, p. 83.

²³Karl Ralner, p. 306.

as subject of lived experiences, if properly channelled, will shape his or her future for teleological ending. The individual as an active agent of development needs peace as a right to be fully developed as a communal being. Peace as a right makes all individuals of identical worth simply because they are humans. This estimation is not based on the natural history of the human race, but the placement of natural law. It is the explicit and conscious work of rational penetration and transformation of reality by ethical consciousness built into the concept of right.²⁴ This consciousness explicates the workability of the general or universal principle of morality: “Do Good and Avoid Evil”. This consciousness of living is the foundational belief for the societal erection of the advocacy of integral humanism.²⁵

So convincingly, the truth about the real meaning of human existence necessarily situates some social consciousness in every peace for the love and care for the *Culture of Peace* rather than the *Culture of War*. It shows that there is an undying and ever-enduring desire and quest for peace in order to be whole, integral and happy.²⁶ This is because; no other condition of living is satisfactory outside the *Culture of Peace* that engenders the true human inter-subjectivity that promotes the true fullness of existence when the divine nature of the created order is fully situated.²⁷ This demands a mutual respect for the full spiritual dignity of the person. For moral and spiritual natures of the human person especially indicate that violence and conflicts are aberrations to the goodness that is inherent in true happiness and freedom.²⁸

Moreover, the pursuit for the courses of happiness and freedom demands that humankind must know the value of integral humanism in truth and charity, and

²⁴T. Rendtorff, “Christian Concepts of the Responsible self.” In L. Rouner (ed.). *Human rights and the world religions*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1988, p. 43.

²⁵ See, E. U. Ekuigbo and P. O. Isanbor, 2013, p. 47; A. O. Fasuyi, and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^a, p. 57; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2013^b, p. 92; A. O. Fasuyi and P. O. Isanbor, 2014, p. 32.

²⁶See, Z. Zdybicka, “Function of Religion in forming a Personal Model of Culture.” K. Kaminoka, et al (eds). *Theory of Being to Understand Reality*. Lublin: Catholic University Press, 1980, p.40.

²⁷David Mary Odunsi, Authority as the Most Veritable Source of Knowledge: An Essay in Transcendental Existentialism. *Enwisdomization Journal*, 4(3), 2010, p. 17.

²⁸Cf, P. O Isanbor, Valuing Culture of Peace for Sustainable Development in John Paul II’s Philosophy. p. 102; P. O. Isanbor and E. U. Ekuigbo, Socialization of Religion for Advancement of Culture of Peace in Nigeria, p. 42; P. O. Isanbor and P. O Folorunso, An Africentric Concern for Peace: Towards Authentic Development of Benedict XVI’s Socio-Philosophy, pp. 159.

then pursue with all sense of morality to obtain and sustain it.²⁹ Hence, the theologico-philosophical valuation of the *Culture of Peace* indispensably directs humanities to take their salvation seriously, and call for integral socialization of human life, rights and dignity. This is on the ground that human person is considered as a composition of matter and spirit that must be redeemed in its wholeness without any of alteration or aberration. Consenting to the needs of globalised humanised society that should be hinged on the human consciousness for the principles of common good and solidarity, we can posit that, this developmental consciousness is integrally characterised by substantiality, communality and interpersonal influences and evaluation. Such consciousness of communality desires to both conceal and un-conceal itself and the *other*.³⁰ It is in redemption of the human person that the whole of eco-environment is safe, because the respect of human life presupposes the respect of the whole of ecosystem. This is development that is envisaged always in the course of time and space of earthly existence.

The currency of global system is in state of dilemma as the culture of misplaced freedom is trying to overshadow human history, where everybody is talking, nobody is actually doing anything for the common and universal ethical living.³¹ We are in a culture where nobody is doing anything for anybody and each particular individual want everything to be done for him or herself, but he is individualistic and selfish rather than being personalistic and selfless. At the global level, in the name of international communities, the few individuals who are seen to be working for peace have been seen to be politically and diplomatically clouded with imperialistic vision of sectional growth of their economies, at national level they are bedevilled with egoistic consciousness that clothed with the fear of the unsecured future (the unknown fate of the future, therefore, working for their own glories, and at the individual level, educated ones who are there just to showcase academic prowess). We only have a very few concerned individuals who understand that humanity is going into extinction if not properly monitored, and that without peace there is no meaningful development that can take place. Flowing from these concerns, our social and political environments, most especially, are clouded with myopic visions and selfish acclamation of the factors of integral human development through the conscious monitoring of human actions.

²⁹See, Pope Francis, *Fratelli Tutti*. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2020, no. 95.

³⁰Cf, F. H. Odimegwu, *Globalization and African Identity*, p. 316.

³¹See, P. O. Obi. "Adler's Social Interest: The Kpim of Social Order in Nigeria." In G. U. Ukagba, et al (eds). *The Kpim of Social Order*. USA: Father Pantaleon Foundation, 2013, p. 152.

Moral Demands for Common Existence

The basic moral conscience and autonomy of any society is examined by the cultural dispositions of the individuals at large. The quest of ethical and cultural development is about the requirement of healthy morality, which is hinged on the promotion of human life and its dignity. Though, these developments are determined by the input of man himself into the society which he belongs. And these inputs define his essence as a rational being (animal). The human person has to be moral in his or her dealings and approaches, to be identified with rationality. The morality which differentiates the acceptance of the good from the bad actions and opinions, is built also on culture, which is the way of a particular people. So, human work and everything associated with human person find meaningfulness and completeness for accomplishment with the kind of cultures which the individual is known for. The culture with right moral or ethical principles or dictates brings the true meaning of the value of human person. Then, cultural and ethical development of the individual and the State at large cannot be pushed aside when the issue of the agitation of developmental peace is made. Peace as a gift in nature is greatly known in culture and the value of morality of any particular society.

Morality is all about the all-round development of the human person, and according to Kantian theory: any action is *right* if it can coexist with everyone's freedom in accordance with a universal law." This limit has the positive effect of channelling our unsociable sociability into ways that lead to the development of culture and commerce. Here, Immanuel Kant sees this as a central way in which the causal workings of nature play a role in the moral progress of humanity. Even so, this limit cannot effect the moral change needed to leave what he calls "the ethical state of nature" in which the maxim of our actions remains inverted. Kant thus introduces a notion of "the ethical commonwealth" as the ideal form of human social relationship through which the social occasions and consequences of radical evil are to be overcome.

As greatly observed in the course of human history, the quests for the liberation and development of the human person and his or her society have been founded on the respect of his or her human rights and dignity as a person. With such qualities of recognition the society acknowledges the human person as a created creator, image and likeness of God. The qualities of rationality and reasonableness remain the basis of differentiation of the individual as a person from other existing beings. The relevance of human rights has been highly founded on them, especially in modern society, where social and political demands for development are so beclouding human sense of judgment, and where many people have been

educated and exposed to the importance of seeking social benefits and privileges to the detriment of human values.

In freedom, the human person as an acting agent of development propels what promote the commonness of creation. Such commonness of developmental interests in freedom and truth is engineered by the forces of human solidarity. Owing to the fact that, "if human solidarity implies responsibility for the other, the responsibility is to empower the other so that the other could achieve conditions for a dignified life"³², and they are directed towards human authenticity and intersubjectivity. Common existence helps to define and classify our actions. It is a philosophy of life and its development. Through our action and responsibility, our sense of human togetherness and *Otherness* demands that we learn from our common struggles and commitments in order to give to *others*, and we teach from the depth of our intelligibility and sense of purpose in order to learn from *others*, and we strive to live within the resource of the worlds around us in order to love *others*. Hence, the quest for peace, justice and all aspects of development become a philosophical spirit of evaluation of human actions, and constantly longs for an orientation that situates the conditions for better living.

Morality of the *Culture of Peace*: Living for Tomorrow

Understandably put, socialization is an indisputable process in the advancement of human society and it brings out the maximal efficiency of the individual when properly adapted to. With the society, the human person has indispensably remain an interactive being, and without this process of his or her development, he or she will be very redundant, and in fact, he or she will be very ineffective. This demands the wholeness of training of the individual to be relevant in the developmental goals and objectives of the society in which the individual is being developed. As human society develops, the individual develops as well, and vis-a-vis. Through proper interpretation and integration of lived experiences, the individual becomes what he or she can and should become, and then fashions his or her conscience on the needs to understand the human family and the society. The true essence of the human family is understood on the indispensable values of human togetherness and integration, as against the culture of individualism

³²John Kusumalayam, *Human Rights*, p. 311.

which indispensably destroy the human society through greed, selfishness, avarice and envy.

The individual as an active agent of development needs to understand people in their actualities, in their possibilities, knowing that in their ideologies they choose things beyond or outside the contents of their conscience and true freedom. He or she must also know how to foster desirable changes in them. The contents of the patterning of the individual determine the developmental inroad of the society. So, the education of the individual which inevitably starts from and the human family setting must be closely monitored and valued to have well fashioned and mannered individuals for the proper ordering of the society. With these, social order and justice are guaranteed, especially as they are highly needed and priced in our contemporary societies that are currently housing many blinded human interests and desires in the domain of faulty civilisation and development that are conflicting with communal ones which enhance peace and equity.

For the sake of continuity of the human family, many scholars have been recommending the essence of proper socialisation of every individual in its definition; and, in most cases, they correspond it with the necessity for enabling environment that fosters the courses of integral humanism. Socialisation is the process by which an individual learns through the participation of his or her lived experiences, and internalises attitudes, values, competencies and roles that are acceptable in the individual's family, community and society. Such socialization is existentially meaningful and purposeful when morality is allowed to define such social activities. Hence, such morality enables the individual to function effectively in his society by exhibiting acceptable behaviour and patterns of interaction such as friendliness, co-operation, honesty, hospitality, integrity, justice, diligence, humility, self-control, modesty etc., relating it to the sense of common good. Such socialization remains communal and it demands integrated mentality of common living where the human person grows to a very full and reasonable maturity, situates common living on a common soil engenders distinctive likenesses in the members of a group. The recognition of these qualities of socialisation reinforces community sentiment and development. We have been considerably observing the imposing *Culture of War* on our common existence. The social events or situations such as hooliganism, terrorism, kidnapping and other forms of social insecurity have remained very evident in modern society. They remain the issues and concerns of insecurity and strongly suggest the reign of environmental immorality or indecency, and which have made the parents to be overprotective and have sense of lack of trust in the human's affairs.

Conclusion

In all, we recognise the fact that the culture of philosophical engagements is a need of constant reformation of the minds integrally. Such conviction ontologically recognises that the human person is a composite being, composed of mind and body. It is a healthy and sound mind that generates sound abstract ideas which the human person uses in solving the problems of life, like that of lack of peace in the society. Not really religion or politics, but the human person himself or herself. The observance of human rights presupposes the maintenance of the value of peace and justice. In all, we should be reassured that ethical living for the purpose of societal order and peace is not negotiable, because, ethics as the science of morality, defines the human person and his or her evidential coordination, even, religion. Morality defines religion, always, within the confinements for the respect for human life, rights, dignity and freedom, as the indispensable thrust for human existence and societal development. The ethical dimension of our existence is to make the world which we have fashioned ourselves a better place to live in, devoid of conflicts and selfish cohesion. Hence, the subjectivity of human interests within the culture of moral and social relativism and nihilism constantly appear to have promoted and still promoting conflicts over peace due to some myopic economic reasons or advantages, and such is associated with contemporary global colonization of some nations and the promotion of suffering and poverty in under-developing countries

Therefore, the morality of integral humanism demands that our ethical engagements should help us to authenticate our existence by promoting the *Otherness of living*, that is, the *Culture of Peace*. This is because; our moral restiveness should constantly help us to differentiate existence from living. Morality is a social construct, as many existentialists maintained. Nietzsche, for instance, maintains “that morality is neither rational nor absolute nor natural. All moral systems are therefore particular, serving a specific purpose that disciplines human beings for social life by narrowing our perspectives and limiting our horizons.”³³ It is the case that we look for the ways to change the world but it has rather turn, some many times and occasions, to the case that it is the world that is changing us because of the imposition of the force and modernity and globalization has on us and debases our sense of right judgment, and we succumb to the demands of such impositions, even more to the negative. Moral systems are only for the living. It is in living that the individual realises his or herself, a culture of self-realisation, subjectivity and authenticity.

³³R. C. Holub’s “Introduction” of Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, p. xvii.

References

- Aghamelu, F. C. (2019). The human Persona and Social Order: A Moral Perspective. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development*, 2(3), pp. 91-108.
- Benedict XVI (2009). *Caritas in Veritate*. Social Encyclical on the Realization of Authentic Human Development in Charity in Truth. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Berlin, I. (2013). The Pursuit of the Ideal. In I. Berlin (ed). *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas* (pp. 1-20). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Edefejeko, V. I. O. (2013). Morality as the Foundation of Social Order. In G. U. Ukagba, et al (eds). *The Kpim of Social Order*. (pp. 107-122). USA: Father Pantaleon Foundation.
- Ekanola, A. B. (2005). Towards an enduring social peace in the Violence Ridden Society: From a Culture of War and Violence to a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence. *West African Journal of Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 93-112.
- Ekuiqbo, E. U and Isanbor, P. O. (2013). Peace Education and its Place in Human Sociological Development. *Journal of Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology in Practice*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 44-53.
- Fasuyi, A. O. and Isanbor, P. O. (2013^a). Indoctrination as a Methodology of Social Enlightenment in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 54-60.
- Fasuyi, A. O. and Isanbor, P. O. (2013^b). Peace Education and Human Right Argument. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 88-96
- Fasuyi, A. O. and Isanbor, P. O. (2014). Educating Socio-philosophical Nature of Religion for National Symbiotic Living. *Enwisdomization Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 22-45.
- Francis, pp (2020). *Fratelli Tutti*. Social Encyclical on the Fraternity and Social Relationship. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Galtung, J. (2010). Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, pp. 170-180

- Isanbor, P. O. (2014). Valuing Culture of Peace for Sustainable Development in John Paul II's Philosophy. *Enwisdomization Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 94-122.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Ekuigbo, E. U. (2014). Socialization of Religion for Advancement of Culture of Peace in Nigeria. *Journal of Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology in Practice*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 37-43.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Folorunso, P. O. (2015). An Africentric Concern for Peace: Towards Authentic Development of Benedict XVI's Socio-Philosophy. *AICI Journal of Religious Studies and Theology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 153-165.
- John Paul II (1998). *Fides et Ratio*. Apostolic Exhortation on the Interrelation of Faith and Reason. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Kusumalayam, J. (2008). *Human Rights*. Mumbai: St Pauls Publication.
- Lanre-Abass, B. A. and Layode, E. A. (2017). Moral Basis of Governance. In O. A. Oyeshile and F. Offor (eds). *Ethics, Governance and Social Order in Africa*. Ibadan: Zenith Book House.
- Nsikanabaso, U. W. and Jarikre, M. (2017). African Culture and the Problem of Social Order. In O. A. Oyeshile and F. Offor (eds). *Ethics, Governance and Social Order in Africa*, (pp. 283-297). Ibadan: Zenith Book House.
- Obi, P. O. (2013). Adler's Social Interest: The Kpim of Social Order in Nigeria. In G. U. Ukagba, et al (eds). *The Kpim of Social Order*. USA: Father Pantaleon Foundation.
- Odimegwu, F. H. (2006). Globalization and African Identity. In M. F. Asiegbu and J. A. Agbakoba (eds). *Philosophy and Praxis in Africa*. Proceedings of the 2004 Annual Conference of the Nigerian Philosophical Association. (pp. 309-328). Ibadan: Hope.
- Odunsi, D. M. (2010). Authority as the most Veritable Source of Knowledge: An Essay in Transcendental Existentialism. *Enwisdomization Journal*, 4(3), pp. 10-20.
- Omeregbe, J. I. (2011). Ethics and Aesthetics. In F. N. Ndubuisi (ed). *Philosophy, Logic and Philosophy of Science*. Lagos: Department of Philosophy, University of Lagos.

Paul VI (1967). *Populorum Progressio*. Social Encyclical on the Development of the Peoples. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Ralner, K. (1972). *Theological Investigation*. Vol. 13. New York: The Seabury.

Rendtorff, T. (1988). Christian Concepts of the Responsible Self. In L. Rouner (ed.). *Human Rights and the World Religions*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame.

Zdybicka, Z. (1980) Function of Religion in forming a Personal Model of Culture. In K. Kaminoka, et al (eds). *Theory of Being to Understand Reality*. Lublin: Catholic University Press.