

International Journal of Culture and Religious Studies

(IJCRS) **Philosophy of Utuism and its Positive Affirmation**



PHILOSOPHY OF UTUISM AND ITS POSITIVE AFFIRMATION

 ¹*Simon Njuguna Waitherero

*Corresponding email: simnjug@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents activities that demonstrates and actualizes *utuism* in the life of a man and his surroundings. It is important to note that having an aspect of *utuism* serves as a daily engagement to the reality of being truly human, consciously active towards the other person and actualizing the self in the mode of *our* very being. *Utuism* would be an on-going individual positive struggle to shun off anything that would in any way demean the human integrity and dignity. It is a positive response towards the suffering other, and a relational celebration of life in the other human person and with the other human person.

Keywords: *Utuism and Positive Affirmation*

1.0 INTRODUCTION The Golden Rule actualizes *Utuism*

Something is called “golden” if it stands out among the rest in matters of value, worth and necessity. Gold as a mineral is conventionally taken to supersede the others in value and worth. Thus, to call a law “golden” means that any other human law draws its worthiness or meaning from it. The Golden Rule thus says that “in everything, therefore, treat people the same way you want them to treat you, for this is the Law and the Prophets.”¹ This verse carries in itself the Golden Rule of doing unto others what one would wish done to self. Marcus George Singer embracing this golden rule saw how the one doing to the other, and the one receiving the experience of doing, reciprocates.² This same view was shared by Walter Stace when he said: This concept describes a “reciprocal”, or “two-way”, relationship between one’s self and others that involves both sides equally, and in a mutual fashion. This concept can be explained from the perspective of psychology, philosophy, sociology and religion. Psychologically, it involves a person empathizing with others. Philosophically, it involves a person perceiving their neighbor as also an “I” or “self”.³ As a matter of record, the founder of this Golden Rule is not known. It is encompassed in all religions and it seems it is as old as humanity. Perhaps we understand better the concept by taking commandment 31 of the *Hadith* in the Islamic books, written by Amir almu’minin for al-Hasan ibn `Ali (his son – peace be upon them), when Amir al-mu’minin encamped at al-Hadirin on his way back from Siffin.⁴

My dear son, so far as your behaviour with other human beings is concerned, let your ‘self’ act as scales to judge its goodness or wickedness: Do unto others as you wish others to do unto you. Whatever you like for yourself, like for others, and whatever you dislike to happen to you, spare others from such happenings. Do not oppress and tyrannize anybody because you surely do not like to be oppressed and tyrannized. Be kind and sympathetic to others as you certainly desire others to treat you kindly and sympathetically. If you find objectionable and loathsome habits in others, abstain from developing those traits of character in yourself. If you are satisfied or feel happy in receiving a certain kind of behaviour from others, you may behave with others in exactly the same way. Do not speak about them in the same way that you do not like others to speak about you ... Avoid scandal, libel and aspersion as you do not like yourself to be scandalized and scorned in the same manner.⁵

The rule is entrenched in our nature, one doing to the other, and the one receiving the experience of doing, reciprocates. This is what makes it golden. And the reason of this last assumption is that it deals with the direct relationship to the other person in a positive way. For this reason we are prompted to equate it to the same foundation to *Utuism*. We use the following cases to demonstrate our argument of *Utuism* and show their support to it.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW 2.1 Empirical Review The Christian Bible: Matthew 5–7; 25:31–46 demonstrate *Utuism*

The New Testament Bible can be summarized as the Gospel of Love of God and neighbour. The four canonical Gospels demonstrate the life with and in Christ. He was physically and historically present in this world. The Acts of the Apostles, the various Apostles’ and Disciples’ letters

demonstrate the life with and in the Holy Spirit as a commentary of the Gospels. In all of them, love of neighbour is key to love of God and vice versa. Matthew chapters 5–7 encompass the beatitudes and admonitions of how we should behave and react to the neighbour. Through these chapters, we experience directly the teaching of *Utuism* though not given the same term, but demonstrated. In Chapter Six, for example, the followers of Christ, who today are referred to as Christians, are admonished by Him to live and act with righteousness, not like hypocrites as commented. But what is the nature of hypocrisy? Hypocrisy (*hypokrisis*) means that what one appears to be is different from what one is. Cf. 15:7–8, “You hypocrites! Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you. ‘These people honour me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me.’” The verb *Hypokrinomai* means “to play apart, hence ... to simulate, feign, or pretend.” Thus in the case of each practice discussed in 6:1–18, the individuals in question appear to be serving God, but in fact they are serving only themselves: “to be honoured by men” (6:2); “to be seen by men” (6:5); “to show men they are fasting”.⁶ In summation to these chapters, we see key themes that are interrelated to each other. At the same time, they directly attune to our understanding of *Utuism*. The specific themes are: Jesus applies Principles in God’s Law (5:17–48), Christians must obey God’s Law: God’s Law connects every individual to God, to parents (this embraces even the elders even if not connected in consanguinity), the other fellow human beings (this includes even foreigners and enemies), the individual “self”, and the entire creation as such.⁷ Angry enough to Kill (5:21–26). Do not covet others sexually: Sex is a Divine gift to humanity and makes us sexual beings, not only for propagation but also for bonding. Nevertheless, it is a power which has been misused and abused.⁸ Do not betray your Spouse by divorce: This indicates the permanency and indelibility of marriage, being the primary institution of any human society or convention.⁹ Oaths are a poor substitute for Integrity (5:33–37), Avoid retribution and resistance (5:38–42), Love your Enemies (5:43–48). Matthew 7; Appropriate Judgment (7:1–27), Do not judge others (7:1–6), Good Gifts Guaranteed (7:7–12).¹⁰

These given verses in the given chapters demonstrate how Christ underlines the key requirement of an individual in matters pertaining to and relating to other fellow human beings. According to Christ, one is supposed to be known through his actions in relation to others, whether positive or negative. This is *Utuism*. According to our considered opinion, the summary of Biblical support to our great concept is Matthew 25: 31–46. This section gives Christ’s revelation on God’s standard of last judgment. It is given in the form of a parable (and is the most vivid parable), and the teaching is very clear – God shall judge us in accordance with our reaction to human needs. William Barclay, commenting on this our interested text said that: God will judge us in accordance with our reaction to human needs. His judgment does not depend on the knowledge we have amassed, or the fame that we have acquired, or the fortune that we have gained, BUT on the help that we have given. And there are certain things which this parable teaches us about the help which we must give. (i) It must be help in small things ... (ii) It must be help which is uncalculating ... (iii) Jesus confronts us with the wonderful truth that all such help is given to Himself and all such help is withheld from Himself ...¹¹ The things that Jesus Christ picks out are so ordinary, which are not only basic needs to the human person, but most often go unnoticed. Consider giving a hungry man a meal, or a thirsty man a drink, welcoming a stranger, cheering the sick, visiting the prisoner – these are things which anyone can do. When these acts are done to a particular individual either as

an individual or amongst other individuals, the joy and happiness that engulf him say it all. More than the physical act having been done in the spatiotemporal world, Jesus Christ in this text elevates the act to be a direct union with Him, the Creator. To be in a position of granting such help, there must be a telepathic, sympathetic and empathetic connection between the giver (acting-person who is actualizing himself as a total and real human being), and the given, the needy person (completing the human matrix and network). All these connections are grafted into active whole by love itself. It is in this argument and realization that we realize that the human person must daily embrace ethics to arouse his morality.

The Muslim Quran demonstrate *Utuism*

Prophet Muhammad said, “None of you has faith until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself.”¹² Some critics assert that “brother” in this *Hadith* refers only to fellow Muslims, but nothing supports this presupposition. In fact, Islam goes beyond the Golden Rule in teaching to respond to others with an even greater act. Prophet Muhammad said, ‘Help your brother, whether he is an oppressor or he is oppressed.’ The Prophet was asked: ‘It is right to help him if he is oppressed, but how should we help him if he is an oppressor?’ He replied: ‘By preventing him from oppressing others.’¹³ Thus, it is not just the duty of a Muslim to treat others as they would want to be treated, but also to have compassion on those oppressed and help them win their freedom from oppression, without them even having to ask. But despite this very positive admonition, we are not in congruent with an argument put that: Islam’s teaching is superior to the Golden Rule. Islam teaches that Muslims must treat others well no matter how they treat the Muslims: “Verily, Allah enjoins justice, and the doing of good to others; and giving like kindred”.¹⁴ This argument would be tantamount to saying that Islamic teaching on dealing with the human being is abnormal to humanity which defines the interrelation between one man to another. Or we may tend to ask: since the Golden Rule is an imperative connection from one person to another and vice versa, what is that in the human relation that is superior to the subject that needs to guide the principles of doing? But unlike the Old Testament’s teaching of equal retribution, the Holy Qur’an urges Muslims to forgive: And the recompense of an injury is an injury the like thereof; but whosoever forgives and his act brings about reformation, his reward is with Allah. Surely, He loves not the wrongdoers.¹⁵

Despite that, this finds a parallelism to the New Testament’s teaching given a vast summary in Matthew Chapter Five and whose contextualization is found in the entire four Gospels. The Holy Qur’an teaches that Muslims must deal justly with everyone, even those who may hate them: O ye who believe! Be steadfast in the cause of Allah, bearing witness in equity; and let not a people’s enmity incite you to act otherwise than with justice. Be always just, that is nearer to righteousness. And fear Allah. Surely, Allah is aware of what you do.¹⁶ The Golden Rule teaches to do unto others, as you would have them do unto you. In the aforementioned verse, the Qur’an commands Muslims to always treat others with justice, even if they act with animosity and injustice towards you. In other words, the Qur’an commands Muslims to treat others as they would like to be treated, even if they must suffer through negative treatment. The aforementioned example of amnesty Prophet Muhammad offered to his Meccan persecutors excellently personifies this teaching. In fact, Prophet Muhammad added that: A Muslim, who kills a covenanting disbeliever, would not

even be able to perceive the breeze of paradise.¹⁷ The Qur'an likewise teaches that a Muslim who kills a covenanting disbeliever even unintentionally or by mistake, must in addition to fully paying the blood money to the heirs of the deceased, also free a slave. Such is the level of respect afforded to those with whom Muslims have pacts.

The Aristotelian 'mean' actualizes *Utuism*

According to Aristotle, good life is at the mean of two extremes. He argued that it is a common characteristic of all good actions that they have a certain order and proportion, and virtue is a mean between two extremes, the extremes being vices, one being a vice through excess, the other being a vice through defect. It is noteworthy that in Aristotle's eyes, virtues equal good actions. We realize that for one to develop *Utuism*, one must have a good character. To demonstrate that this is a universal quality, we beg to venture into Aristotle's argument. He says that for us to develop goodness of character in general, we start by having a capacity for it, but that it has to be developed by practice. This development is gained by doing virtuous acts. Accordingly, we become virtuous by doing virtuous acts. But how can we do virtuous acts unless we are already virtuous? Aristotle answers this in his work *Eudemian Ethics*¹⁸ that we begin by doing acts which are objectively virtuous, without having a reflex knowledge of the acts and a deliberate choice of the acts as good, a choice resulting from a habitual disposition. He seems to support (or we seem to follow) his action orientation and disposition of man in realization of his character. Aristotle says that we can describe virtues as things which are destroyed by deficiency or excess. Someone who runs away becomes a coward, while someone who fears nothing is rash. In this way the virtue "bravery" can be seen as depending upon a "mean" between two extremes. For this reason, Aristotle is sometimes considered a proponent of a doctrine of a "golden mean". This he developed in argument of happiness as the ultimate goal of every virtuous person, and he developed this in *Nicomachean Ethic*.

For instance, a child may be told by its parents not to lie. He or she obeys without realizing perhaps the inherent goodness of telling the truth, and without having yet formed a habit of telling the truth; but the acts of truth-telling gradually form the habit, and as the process of education goes on, the child comes to realize that truth-telling is right in itself, and to choose to tell the truth for its own sake, as being the right thing to do. It is then virtuous in this respect. The accusation of the vicious circle is thus answered by the distinction between the acts which create the good disposition and the acts which flow from the good disposition once it has been created.

Virtue itself is a disposition which has been developed out of a capacity by the proper exercise of that capacity. Aristotle's ethics is strongly teleological (that is, towards a given goal) and practical (meaning, it should be the action that leads to the realization of the good of the human being as well as the whole). This end is realized through continuous acting in accordance with virtues which, like happiness, must be desired for themselves, not for the short-term pleasures that can be derived from them. When in our venture we positively support the argument that *Utuism* is an active self-actualization of humanism, we mean that a fire cannot rest till it utilizes its "fireness" to whatever it touches; same with *Utuism* in a person. It is only after this that an individual would claim to be moving towards happiness or gaining happiness, which is the ultimate goal.

This is not to say that happiness is void of pleasures, but that pleasures are a natural effect, not the purpose. In order to act virtuously, we must first acquire virtues, by parental upbringing, experience and reason. It is very important to develop certain principles in the early stages of life, for this will profoundly affect the later life. Aristotle's ethics is centred at a person's character, because by improving it, we also improve our virtues. A person must have knowledge, he must choose virtues for their own sake and his activities must originate from a firm and unshakeable character, which represents the conditions for having virtues. If we behave like this, our happiness will have a positive influence on other people as well, and will improve their characters.¹⁹ In the *Politics*, Aristotle criticizes the Spartan Polity by critiquing the disproportionate elements of the constitution; for example, they trained the men and not the women, and they trained for war but not peace. This disharmony produced difficulties which he elaborates on in his work.²⁰ Aristotle says that whereas virtue of thinking needs teaching, experience and time, virtue of character (moral virtue) comes about as a consequence of following the right habits. According to Aristotle, the potential for this virtue is by nature in humans, but whether virtues come to be present or not is not determined by human nature.²¹

Justice, Love, Charity and Forgiveness and living virtuously as pillars of *Utuiism*

Justice, Love, Charity and Forgiveness and living virtuously may be claimed to be the hinges, cardinal virtues in a person with *Utuiism*. *Utuiism* seems to be a power that really pulls an individual and magnetically connects him to the other person to effect some changes, or at least share the magnetism of their being. This magnetism of their being is enshrined in justice, love, active love (charity), forgiveness (as an act of healing of any friction or injury that might result through the magnetic impact of the connecting experience) and in general, living virtuously. This is a natural call – *Utuiism* is this call. Have justice and equity when dealing with people. There is evidence in the Qur'an about this, like the verses which order one to be just, such as the saying of Allah (which means): {O you who have believed, be persistently standing firm in justice, witnesses for Allah.}²² Justice can never be cardinal in the human interrelation arena if it compromises the individual *Utui*. The basis of justice can be found "if and only if" the *Utui* is enhanced and vice versa. Forgiveness and Reconciliation are found in writings in various disciplines of socio-humanities. Taking just two examples from the Christian Holy Book, the *Bible*,²³ and Luke 6:27–36; Matthew 18:21–35 summarize the Gospel's teaching on the two great values of humanity; Forgiveness and Reconciliation. The Gospel presents one of the greatest and a difficulty call to humanity, FORGIVENESS. Forgiveness in its meaning goes beyond all human definitions because it has everything from the transcendental attributes of God, that is, being good, oneness, truth and beauty. No science, no research or discipline can exhaust Forgiveness. This is out of the fact that Forgiveness touches the researcher and the researched, the injurer and the injured and both parties are at stake in the absence of Forgiveness. Forgiveness has no old or young, men or women, the rich or the poor, the master or the slave, the politician or the ordinary citizen, the clergy or the laity. Forgiveness transcends or builds different religions of the world, no matter the region. All are affected and need it. Forgiveness encompasses all within and without the circumstances. It reminds us all that no one is free of weaknesses! Only the GRACE of God raises us up, as St. Augustine would put it.²⁴ Forgiveness is that which has everything of God in it – it is the power to

heal the wounds that engulf the human person, physically, psychologically, spiritually, socially and economically. It should heal all the institutions, the family, the church, the state, or two individuals – indeed it transcends tribes, races, nations, or even religions. The power to heal in a wholesome manner has in it something immortal and infiniteness. Thus, it belongs to God alone who is infinitely Good. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, extends this faculty to those who understand the benefits of human healing. Reconciliation involves intimate people. It's part of life. It occurs between two intimate people, for example parents and children, spouses, friends and colleagues, and classmates among others.²⁵ When an injury occurs between two intimate people, it's very hard to forgive, thus hard to forget. It's difficult because there was love involved. Forgiveness is not the same as pardoning; it's not forgetting. To forgive, one must remember the past, put it into perspective and move beyond it. Pardoning is to those people who have no intimate relationship. Forgiveness is not accomplished through a pronouncement of real damage that has resulted between people. There are no mere words that can effect significant repair.

After Desmond Tutu was appointed to lead the Truth and Reconciliation Commission by the first president of independent South Africa after decades of apartheid, he had to be faced by the reality of the hatred that engulfed both the blacks and those who had been their cruel masters. Due to this reason, he wrote in one of his books, *No Future without Forgiveness* that: True reconciliation cannot be achieved by denying the past. But nor is it easy to reconcile when a nation “looks the beast in the eye”. Rather than repeat platitudes about forgiveness, he presents a bold spirituality that recognizes the horrors people can inflict upon one another, and yet retains a sense of idealism about reconciliation.²⁶ With clarity of pitch born out of decades of experience, Tutu shows readers how to move forward with honesty and compassion to build a newer and more humane world. This, correctly understood, was not just a onetime call to a geographical South Africa, but an all-time endeavour to all nations of the world, all humanity. The concepts of love and charity are directly related. That is, according to our understanding, charity is love when it is translated into action. Love would be useless without reaching out to other people. That would be likened to making a good fire for nothing. Even the above and other virtues that when embraced by an individual, and one is said to be living a virtuous life, can never be real in the absence of love. The act of embracing these virtues for real is through their expression to others, and this is what we call *Utuism*.

Utuism and Virtues

Utuism is about human behaviour which when positively embraced, yields virtues and when not, yields vices. The examination of human life, both in general and in particular, would reveal that we all exonerate good life (virtuous life) and we abhor bad life (‘vice-ous’ life). There is great wisdom in this and this has been our detailed exposition in the chapters showing that some types of human behaviours are recognized, in the greater part of culture, as an expression of a certain excellence in the manner in which the human being lives and realizes its own humanity: acts of courage, patience in trials and in the difficulties of life, compassion for the weak, moderation in the use of material goods, responsible attitude in regard to the environment, and dedication to the common good. Ethical conduct defines the grand lines of a properly moral ideal of a life “according to nature”, that is, in conformity with the profound being of the human subject. On the other hand,

some behaviour is universally recognized as objects of reprobation: murder, theft, lying, wrath, greed, avarice. This is perhaps why Justus Mbae reacts on how many embrace the teaching of morality. Moral education transcends the class, or a given specific group, to a more transformative attitude and life. Mbae argues that moral education must be clearly distinguished from such activities as moral training, indoctrination, moralising, or moral propaganda. Two of the characteristics which distinguish moral education from these activities are: (1) its objectivity and (2) its dedication to moral methodology. Moral education is not a matter of training or instruction in this or that set of moral doctrines. Even though it aims at an important prescriptive function, it does not involve teaching specific rules or codes of behaviour. Moral education is based on the idea that the individual, by means of rational reflection, can arrive at those actions, values or attitudes which are considered moral.²⁷

Mbae explains the meaning of the English word “ethics” which is derived from the Greek word “ethos” – which means usage, character, custom, disposition, manners; he retaliates the centrality of ethics as such. Ethics is thus generally defined as the scientific or systematic study of morals, and is concerned with the analysis of such concepts as “ought”, “should”, “duty”, “moral rules”, “right”, “wrong”, “obligation”, “responsibility”, and so forth. Ethics may be regarded as the inquiry into the nature of moral actions, while on a more practical level, it is the search for the morally good life. This is so because moral education has little to do with factual or descriptive claims, being rather more concerned with the judgement of values and with rational thinking. As such, moral education may be said to be concerned less with right and wrong factual answers and more with right dispositions, attitudes and right reason. Indeed, the best that moral education can do is to teach the student how to reason morally in order to make correct moral decisions and to make him want to abide by those decisions. Understood in this way, moral education differs very significantly from moral training. Moral education aims at making the student understand the reasons why a given action is said to be moral or immoral, moral training aims at making students carry out the desired action. It may be said that moral training aims at producing moral conformists or individuals who will exhibit a required mode of behaviour. In this connection, the moral trainer is quite happy with the overt or outward observance of what he regards to be moral rules or principles.²⁸

As we engaged this project, by investigating the human person as an acting being, we had in mind his ethics. It appears, and as a matter-of-fact, there are attacks on the dignity of the human person and on the just requirements of life in society. One is justified, therefore, in seeing in such consensus, a manifestation of that which, behind diverse cultures, is the human in the human being, namely the “human nature”. That is why our interest of the person stimulates the key role ethics plays in human formation. Bolin supported this by saying that: One must admit that such accord on the moral quality of certain behaviours coexists with a great variety of explanatory theories. Whether we look at the fundamental doctrines of the *Upanishads* of Hinduism, or of the four “noble truths” for Buddhism, or the *Tao* of Lao-Tse, or of the “nature” of the stoics, every wisdom’ or every philosophical system, understands moral action within a general explanatory picture that seeks to legitimize the distinction between what is good and what is evil. We have to deal with a variety of justifications that renders dialogue and the foundations of moral norms difficult.²⁹

Russell Razzaque, both a medical doctor and a psychiatrist, in his analysis of the psychopaths, most probably reason in support with Mbae. After several years of development, he launched a new therapeutic innovation; Sileotherapy. In his work *Human Being to Human Bomb: Inside the Mind of a Terrorist*, he starts by asking an experiential question: what makes often intelligent young men (and women) violently kill themselves and others in the name of religion and politics? They all had strict fathers and obsessive personalities. They all studied sciencebased subjects. They lived in the West, grew to despise it and ultimately killed themselves and numerous innocent others.³⁰ We remember in November 2001, Osama Bin Laden proclaimed: ‘We love death. The West loves life. That is the big difference between us and the West.’ But then, any critical analyst would ask: who is this ‘we’ in Osama’s strong anti-human attitude and sentiment? How does someone go from being an unremarkable school-leaver to a human bomb? And how can this transformation, from teenager to terrorist, be detected?

These are questions that Mbae, in his own experiential world, would have reflected not as they are *per se*, but with other similar experiences. The human person ought to be taught morality continuously for both knowledge and as a qualitative necessary tool of living. Having had his first of many encounters with extremist Islam at university in London in 1989, Russell Razzaque has watched this harrowing conversion from close quarters. Unique, personal and expertly researched, *Human Being to Human Bomb* shines a light on the real psychology behind Islamic suicide bombing. It is explored by a writer within the religion itself and concludes by unveiling a new psychological device that will expose those who are vulnerable to extremism before it is too late.³¹

2.2 Theoretical Review Humanness without Virtue

According to *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, the definition of the adjective English term of humanness is (i) That of, relating to, or characteristic of humans: the course of human events; the human race. (ii) Having or showing those positive aspects of nature and character regarded as distinguishing humans from other animals: an act of human kindness. (iii) Subject to or indicative of the weaknesses, imperfections, and fragility associated with humans: a mistake that shows he is only human; human frailty. (iv) Having the form of a human. (v) Made up of humans: formed a human bridge across the ice.³² Taking these meanings as our guide, the first meaning properly shows the actual relation of a human person to his nature. That first meaning is demeaned by the third meaning which brings about the negation of the positive aspect by nature of the human person. This may be the reason why various people have tried to relate both adjective terms directed to the human being, one being by nature, and the other by negative action against that nature, that is, humanness and dehumanizing respectively.³³ As we had highlighted from Aristotle’s view, man’s definition befits virtuous being which he furthered by saying that virtue is the mean of two extremes. From this assertion, we can only say that there is no humanness without virtue, that is, no one can claim to have humanness without demonstration of virtue, or claim to be virtuous without humanness. An equilibrium of these two, humanness and virtuous, is what we are properly calling, by borrowing from the Swahili term of *Utu*, to be *Utuism*.

Humanities without Virtue

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*,³⁴ the humanities are academic disciplines that study human culture. The humanities include ancient and modern languages, literature, philosophy, religion, and visual and performing arts such as music and theatre. The humanities that are also sometimes regarded as social sciences include history, anthropology, area studies, communication studies, cultural studies, law and linguistics. It is in any attempt of studying these humanities, or following them, that we claim they cannot be justifiable or relevant without virtue. Being subjects or disciplines that deal directly with the human person as being of history and culture, a *Dasein* in the spatiotemporal world, is the main reason we land to this ground. It is imperative that any attempt to tackle the human person from whichever perspective or dimension, must be guided by the principles of humanity. Man is a being that earns his dignity as a unique being in the creation.

Reason without Virtue or Humanity

Reason is one of the highest gifts naturally endowed by the Creator to the human person. No wonder he is called a rational being. Any other distinguishing character of the human person hooks itself, or its foundation is based, on reason. As a result, any endeavour that at the same time touches the human person must be guided by reason, but reason that does not contradict the very human being or person. In the definition of the human being as a person of reason, we find other major foundational qualities and faculties: freedom, will, consciousness, conscience, choice, expressional, religious, and relational among others. These qualities and faculties make the human being so unique, superior to any other created being, and even transcend all other created order. This is a fact that man in his own right discovers. By using this faculty of reason, man has not only developed himself in the universe, but at the course of doing this destroyed himself by being self-centred, selfish and using fellow human beings as a means rather than an end. This provokes us to assertively say that there is no reason without virtue that brings into realization the human person as such a being of dignity and integrity. *Utuism* is a continuous present reminder, a call, an actualization of the humanity of the other human being as a being with feelings.

Religion without Virtue

Religion is a set of beliefs concerning the cause, nature, and purpose of the universe, especially when considered as the creation of a superhuman agency or agencies, usually involving devotional and ritual observances, and often containing a moral code governing the conduct of human affairs. A specific fundamental set of beliefs and practices generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects: the Christian religion; the Buddhist religion. The body of persons adhering to a particular set of beliefs and practices: a world council of religions. It also includes the practice of religious beliefs; ritual observance of faith. And lastly, it is the belief in and worship of a superhuman controlling power, especially a personal God or gods.³⁵ With this understanding, we can analyze where Marx was coming from. One person who attempted to examine religion from an objective, scientific perspective was Karl Marx. Marx's analysis and critique of religion is perhaps one of the most famous and most quoted by theist and atheist alike.

Unfortunately, most of those doing the quoting do not really understand exactly what Marx meant. Austin Cline thinks that this in turn is due to not entirely understanding Marx's general theories

on economics and society. Marx actually said very little about religion directly; in all of his writings, he hardly ever addresses religion in a systematic fashion, even though he touches on it frequently in books, speeches and pamphlets. The reason is that his critique of religion forms simply one piece of his overall theory of society – thus, understanding his critique of religion requires some understanding of his critique of society in general.³⁶

What is the origin of Marx's comment that religion is the "opium of the masses"? According to Marx, religion is an expression of material realities and economic injustice. To him, the problems in religion are ultimately problems in society. Thus, he argued that religion is not the disease, but merely a symptom. It is used by oppressors to make people feel better about the distress they experience due to being poor and exploited. As analyzed by Cline, Marx's thoughts are much more complex than commonly portrayed. For Marx, economics are what constitute the base of all of human life and history – generating division of labour, class struggle, and all the social institutions which are supposed to maintain the status quo. Those social institutions are a superstructure built upon the base of economics, totally dependent upon material and economic realities but nothing else. All of the institutions which are prominent in our daily lives – marriage, church, government, arts, et cetera – can only be truly understood when examined in relation to economic forces.³⁷

According to Marx, religion is one of those social institutions which are dependent upon the material and economic realities in a given society. It has no independent history but is instead the creature of productive forces. As Marx wrote, "The religious world is but the reflex of the real world."³⁸ We explored this line of Marx's thoughts on religion since it seems to be the base of most people who claim to be religious. Could this be the reason why we have so many mushrooming religious groupings, denominations, sects, inter-denominational conflicts and abject reasoning of atheists to take just a few? If religion is the experience between man and his Creator, and this is primarily vertical interaction, and only horizontal in relational expression, what would be the cause of human animosity in matters pertaining religion? These questions and many others lead us to argue that unless we are virtuous, we can never embrace religion. *Utuism* is an expression virtually and practically enhancing positive religious stance to God, others and the entire universe. Similarly, we cannot in any sense claim to be religious without our human interactions being positive, embrative, selfless, outreaching and forgiving.

Politics without virtue

From the *Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, Political development is given broadly as the development of the institutions, attitudes, and values that form the political power system of a society. Political development has been defined in many ways that reflect the passage of societies' and analysts' preoccupations.³⁹ Without going into finer details of what politics entail, Political development enhances the state's capacity to mobilize and allocate resources, to process policy inputs into implementable outputs. This assists with problem-solving and adaptation to environmental changes and goal realization. The contemporary notion of good governance also dwells on efficient, effective, and non-corrupt public administration. The establishment of bureaucracy, displaying characteristics like division of labour and functional specialization, hierarchy and chain of command, and merit-based recruitment, is connected.⁴⁰ Venturing on these different views, we claim that any government leader, in administering his duties, should enhance his moral integrity.

This moral integrity is a quality that does not stand in isolation from other virtues. Through these combined virtues, any political leader finds the needs of every citizen central.

Theology without Virtue Theology from a lay man's language is the study and embracement of the knowledge of God. This in all rights can never be legitimate without enhancing the individual attitude towards self and other fellow human beings. When this attitude is practicalized, we have been bracing it as *Utuism*. Man is the physical representation of the unseen God and thus, studying and loving him makes us be in a good position to study and appreciate God. When people popularly say that 'some people preach water and take wine', they mean that our spirituality and religiosity should be seen in the way we relate and interact with others. No wonder in most theological writings from different religions, as we saw earlier in this chapter, enhance the Golden Rule as a basis not only of our interactions to fellow beings, but also to the Supreme cause of our very being.

Man as an end not as a means

In the hierarchy of creation and of Being *qua* Being, man as a being stands out. This is out of the fact that he knows of his being, appreciates it and transcends it towards his ultimate cause. At the same time, man knows and experiences his Creator and other beings consciously and is able to measure himself in relation to these realities. He takes the universe both as the whole to which he the man is part of, while at the same time the universe is part of him. This is one of the greatest mysteries that man has learnt to live with. With this in mind, and as he understands himself as superior to the entire universe,⁴¹ man is ever an end, not a means. Man – every man – is an end in himself, not a means to the ends of others; he must live for his own sake, neither sacrificing himself to others nor sacrificing others to himself; must work for his rational self-interest, with the achievement of his own happiness as the highest moral purpose of his life.⁴² Unfortunately, man, due to the economic pressure which has socio-status orientations, demean the dignity of man as an end in himself. This social alienation is fitted on to activity and product alienation in the following manner: If the product of labour does not belong to the worker, if it confronts him as an alien power, this can only be because it belongs to some other man than the worker ... Man's relation to himself only becomes objective and real for him through his relation to other men. Thus, if the product of his labour, his labour objectified, is for him an alien, hostile, powerful object independent of him, then his position towards it is such that someone else is master of this object, someone who is alien, hostile, powerful, and independent of him ... Every self-estrangement of man from himself and from nature appears in the relation in which he places himself and nature to men other than and differentiated from himself.

⁴³ To correct this misuse by man against man that turns man as instruments of science, tools of war (killer machines), instruments of trade and market of killer and/or dehumanizing chemicals, we enhance *Utuism* as a positive attitude towards the other. This would make the very man a beneficiary of his advancement, not a culprit of exploitation.

Human "Being" to Human "Person"

This section will re-echo a debate that each man is first a human being, then a human person. John Locke's Essay, *Concerning Human Understanding*, defines the 'human being' as a biological

concept and the ‘person’ as a psychological concept. Locke seems to suggest that coincidence under the one is in no way a guarantee coincidence under the other. His argument brought about far reaching implications that continue to influence disciplines, both practical and theoretical, ranging from ethics and psychology, to social policy and medical technology. From this distinction, Locke provides the earliest systematic treatment of the issue of personal identity in modern thought.⁴⁴ From this proposition, human beings are seen by some at the earliest stages of development as having not developed the moral accountability to be assigned positive rights. For example, some thinkers like Daniel Dennett, who was a philosopher, believed that a class of human beings exists that is not yet persons. Let’s call this class of *Homo sapiens* “non-personal human beings.”⁴⁵ Let us concede for the sake of argument, that certain humans are not persons, just as certain persons are not humans. To be sure, human persons are no less human beings than any manner of non-human person. By definition, being a human being is essential to being a human person. This argument was the one adapted by abortionists to justify their evil acts by saying that it is one thing to kill non-personal human beings (such as human embryos), and another to kill human persons. But we cannot kill a human person without killing the human being as well. There is no way you cannot kill any type of person unless it is embodied as a living, biological being.

The Spanish may be able to kill Great Apes, but lawyers cannot kill a corporation. What is being killed is not the person but the being. This distinction is important because those who argue that it is acceptable to kill non-personal humans base their rationale on the claim that what matters is not the being (the living biological organism), but the personhood (a set of functional criteria such as consciousness or rationality). This view has become a common persuasion in bioethics.⁴⁶ If we followed these views to their logical outcomes, most reasonable people, a category that does not always include some bioethicists, would be horrified. Ethicist Joseph Fletcher (1905 – 1991), for example, believed that: Humans with an IQ below forty might not be persons, and those with an IQ below twenty are definitely not persons. “People [with children with Down’s syndrome] ... have no reason to feel guilty about putting a Down’s syndrome baby away, whether it’s “put away” in the sense of hidden in a sanatorium, or in a more responsible lethal sense. It is sad; yes, dreadful, but it carries no guilt. True guilt arises only from an offense against a person, and a Down’s is not a person.”⁴⁷

This is absurd coming from Fletcher, who was a medical Doctor. This is the man who served as president of the Euthanasia Society of America (later renamed the Society for the Right to Die) from 1974 to 1976. He was also a member of the American Eugenics Society and the Association for Voluntary Sterilization. Similarly, Princeton philosopher Peter Singer believes that; Since patients with Alzheimer’s and infants up to the age of twenty-four months are not persons, it is not wrong to kill them.⁴⁸ This notwithstanding, we know without contradiction of terms that a person is a human being and a human being is a person. At least this is what most people believe and this is why these two terms are used interchangeably as if they were synonyms. But are they really same or is there any difference? Who, in his right assessment, can claim that a human being is just a skeleton of bones and flesh; he is much more than that. In the human being we are dealing with an entity that has both physical and spiritual realities. While the human body is composed of flesh,

blood and bones, the human soul is composed of human spirit. A human being is a psychosomatic entity that is a union of human flesh and human spirit.

But it is when we refer to this human flesh that we talk of persons.

This is what creates a dichotomy of reference especially when we want to name and blame those who injure and inflict unwarranted pain to the other human person. Even a hardcore criminal, a terrorist, a thief, and a killer are persons as they possess human flesh. What these individuals lack is the good use of their *Utu* and the moral choice. These are the judgments of their trained behaviors. We call these behaviors trained since they are not inherent. The two words, human and humanity, are related and persons having humane qualities of sympathy and compassion are humans. In short, we support those who claim that a person is a human being as long as his body and soul are connected or united. A man on his death bed, having lost all his intellectual and emotional capacities, is still a human being. But anyone who does not have any feelings towards fellow human beings and is ready to kill or injure, either physically, psychologically, spiritually, or even emotionally other human beings, is certainly not behaving as a human being. He is a person but devoid of *Utuism* or of qualities that go into making a person a human being. This is what should be corrected. This analysis of the dichotomy between a human being and a human person is a subject of a huge philosophical debate that never seems to end as people have opinions for and against. However, it is noteworthy that despite the fact that every individual is born a human being, from the moral and social perspectives, it is the moral duty for everyone as one develops his reasoning capabilities and moral consciousness to develop his human “personhood” to the fullest. This is a deliberate act.

Relation between *Utuism* and Truth

It is worth noting in this section that the subject in the created world of both truth and *Utu* is the human person. In the concept of *Utu*, from the African (Bantu) perspective, the term *mtu* is the key which means the human person. Now *Utuism* is the inner activity, and since it is a ‘volcano’ when pressed inside the human person without letting it out, it can only be useful when directed to other human persons. It is through this active and positive interaction that *Utuism* makes the individual persons actualize themselves. Primarily, the *Utu* concept, which advocates values of human dignity and identity, reminds us of the necessity of clarifying what is meant by ‘values’ in education today since not all aspects of life and practices attributed to ‘culture’ contain values worth of human dignity.⁴⁹ This is a relation of the human person. The same is experienced in the understanding of truth. Truth is a core entreats of philosophy and theology. As a quality of the mind and heart, it is a concern of anthropology as such. Truth is most often used to mean in accord with fact or reality, or fidelity to an original or to a standard or ideal.⁵⁰ The commonly understood opposite of truth is falsehood, which, correspondingly, can also take on a logical, factual, or ethical meaning. The concept of truth is discussed and debated in several contexts, including philosophy and religion. Many human activities depend upon the concept, where it is assumed rather than being a subject of discussion; these include science, law, and everyday life. *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* says of Aristotle: Aristotle sounds much more like a genuine correspondence theorist in the *Categories* (12b11, 14b14), where he talks of “underlying things” that make statements true and implies that these “things” (*pragmata*) are logically structured situations or facts (viz., his

sitting, his not sitting). Most influential is his claim in *De Interpretatione* (16a3) that thoughts are “likenesses” (*homoiosis*) of things. Although he nowhere defines truth in terms of a thought’s likeness to a thing or fact, it is clear that such a definition would fit well into his overall philosophy of mind. (...)”.⁵¹

Avicenna (Ibn Sina) defined truth in his *Metaphysics of Healing, Book I, Chapter 8*, as: “What corresponds in the mind to what is outside it”.⁵² Aquinas also said that real things participate in the act of being of the Creator God who is Subsistent Being, Intelligence, and Truth. Thus, these beings possess the light of intelligibility and are knowable. These things (beings; reality) are the foundation of the truth that is found in the human mind, when it acquires knowledge of things, first through the senses, then through the understanding and the judgement done by reason. Reevaluating Avicenna and Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas stated in his *Disputed Questions on Truth*: A natural thing, being placed between two intellects, is called true insofar as it conforms to either. It is said to be true with respect to its conformity with the divine intellect insofar as it fulfils the end to which it was ordained by the divine intellect ... With respect to its conformity with a human intellect, a thing is said to be true insofar as it is such as to cause a true estimate about itself.⁵³ For Aquinas, the truth of the human intellect (logical truth) is based on the truth in things (ontological truth).⁵⁴

Following this, he wrote an elegant re-statement of Aristotle’s view in his *Summa I.16.1: Veritas est adæquatio intellectus et rei* (Truth is the conformity of the intellect to the things.) Aquinas also said that real things participate in the act of being of the Creator God who is Subsistent Being, Intelligence, and Truth. Thus, these beings possess the light of intelligibility and are knowable. These things (beings; reality) are the foundation of the truth that is found in the human mind, when it acquires knowledge of things, first through the senses, then through the understanding and the judgement done by reason. We note that even in the definitions and understandings of truth, whether is the beliefs, opinions, theories, facts and realities, all are centred on the human person as the gauge of the very truth. This does not water down the objectivity of truth or the object of truth, but the truth is brought down to the realm and grasp of the human mind, the faculty of analysis, evaluation and re-evaluation. Thus, both *Utuism* and truth encroach the same being, and a harmony of the two dignified qualities should be experienced and enhanced.

The Continuous becoming of the Human person as Intrinsic Power of *Utuism*

According to Aristotle’s analysis, there are three kinds of things which come to be present in the soul that virtue is: a feeling (*pathos*), an inborn predisposition or capacity (*dunamis*), or a stable disposition which has been acquired (*hexis*).⁵⁵ In fact, it has already been mentioned that virtue is made up of *hexeis*, but on this occasion the contrast with feelings and capacities is made clearer – neither is chosen, and neither is praiseworthy in the way that virtue is.⁵⁶ These qualities help any conscious and free person to continuously endeavour a journey of becoming a human person. The act of becoming a person is not, according to our assessment, as natural as being a human being. The latter is automatically achieved through conception into the human biological network, and this is not a continuous process, but once a human being, always one. Even the dehumanization

experience from other human beings can never deplete or annihilate this nature; once a human being, ever a human being – while the former quality of being a person is an act of becoming.

Self-Determination of the Human person as the essence of *Utuism*

Martin Heidegger explains the meaning of “Everydayness” as the “how” of *Dasein*’s life in the world. This argument confirms the Africans’ way of defining themselves.⁵⁷ The term *Dasein* has been used by several philosophers before Heidegger, most notably Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, with the meaning of human “existence” or “presence”. It is derived from *da-sein*, which literally means being-there/there-being. In German, *Dasein* is the vernacular term for “existence”, as in “I am pleased with my existence” (*ich bin mit meinem Dasein zufrieden*). *Dasein* for Heidegger was a way of being involved with and caring for the immediate world in which one lived, while always remaining aware of the contingent element of that involvement, of the priority of the world to the self, and of the evolving nature of the self itself.⁵⁸ Its opposite was the forfeiture of one’s individual meaning, destiny and lifespan, in favour of an (escapist) immersion in the public everyday world – the anonymous, identical world of the “They” and the “Them”.⁵⁹ With this meaning of the human being thrown or put in the world, it is not for passiveness on the part of the *Dasein*, but an active command of self-determination and realization. These two qualities help man to actually discover himself in the universe. The other human person becomes the mirror of this self-determination and actualization. By doing this, man discovers his God and His daily meaning to man’s life. No wonder St. John Paul II said: The greatest deception, and the deepest source of unhappiness, is the illusion of finding life by excluding God, of finding freedom by excluding moral truths and personal responsibility.⁶⁰ Both the self-determination in the “self” and the “other” and discovering and appreciating God in his daily life may be the reason why man, who is by nature an animal, very active consciously and reflectively.

The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It is not distinct from that activity; it is that activity. Man makes his life activity itself an object of his will and consciousness. He has conscious life activity. It is not determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life activity directly distinguishes man from animal life activity. Only because of that is he a speciesbeing. Or, rather, he is a conscious being – that is; his own life is an object for him, only because he is a species-being. Only because of that is his activity free activity. Estranged labour reverses the relationship so that man, just because he is a conscious being, makes his life activity, his essential being, a means for his existence.⁶¹ Man’s relation to his species differs qualitatively from the other relations that were examined. His relations to his work, product and other men are tangible, both ends of which exist in the present, while the relation between man and his species is removed, in which living people are measured by the standard of what it means to be a man. Perhaps this facet of alienation can be more clearly grasped if we consider it a reformulation of man’s alienation in his work, product and other men, viewed now from the angle of the individual’s membership in the species.⁶² As Marx says: In tearing away from man the object of his production ... estranged labour tears from him his species life, his real species objectivity, and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him. Similarly, in degrading spontaneous activity, free activity, to a means, estranged labour makes man’s species life a means to his physical existence.⁶³ Thus, this selfdetermination of man makes him actualized

inasmuch as his *Utuism* tackles the other person as necessary identical being to his existence. Through this realization, man transcends his earthly barriers and reaches the realm of his Maker, to whom he experiences in the material world.

2.0 CONCLUSION

Utuism provokes the individual person to act as a normal human being towards himself, other human beings, and the rest of creation. *Utuism* is a quality by virtue of being in the person inherently and not acquired, is active, not passive. It is with this understanding that we are committed to analysing the personhood of man. The art and social science of responsibly defining all human beings as equal and being a true and real acting being⁶⁴ is what we intend to construe as a *Philosophy of Utuism*. This is not a new philosophy as a discipline but a daily engagement to the reality of being truly human, consciously active towards the other person and actualizing the self in the mode of our very being. *Utuism* would be an on-going individual positive struggle to shun off anything that would in any way demean the human integrity and dignity. It is a positive response towards the suffering other, and a relational celebration of life in the other human person and with the other human person. We can affirmatively claim that man is more than just a *cogito ego sum* of Rene Descartes, that is, ‘I think therefore I am’ but also ‘I connect with other human beings, feel with them, charitably relate with them and embrace human dignity and inner worth, therefore I am.’

Bibliography

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.
- Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (H. Rackham, Ed.) *Book II*, Chapter 1, 1103a–1103b.
- Aristotle. *Politics*, trans. B. Jowett. New York: Modern Library, 1943.
- Asante, M. K. *Afrocentricity*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1988.
- Bollin, Joseph. *The Search for Universal Ethics: A New Look at the Natural Law*. Vatican: International Theological Commission, 2009, Second Chapter: The perception of moral values.
- Cameron, Nigel M. de S (Ed.). *Embryos and Ethics*. Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 1987.
- Cary, Phillip, John Doody, & Kim Paffenroth (Eds.). *Augustine and Philosophy*. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Childers, J. and Hentzi, G. (eds.). *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Clarke, W. Norris. *Person and Being. The Aquinas Lecture*, 1993. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1993. 182
- Cohen, S. Marc. “Hylomorphism and Functionalism” in Nussbaum & Rorty (eds.), *Essays on Aristotle’s De Anima*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Cole-Turner, Ronald. *The New Genesis*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1993.
- David, Marion. “Correspondence Theory of Truth” in *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, Stanford, CA: The Metaphysics Research Lab., 2005.

- Dennett, Daniel. *Kinds of Minds. Towards an Understanding of Consciousness*. London: Phoenix Books, 1996.
- Descartes, Rene. *Meditations on the First Principles*, Rev. ed. Trans. and intro. By L. J. Lefeur. New York: Library of Liberal Arts, 1960.
- Egner, E. Robert and Lester E. Denno (Eds.). *The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell, 1903– 1959*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- Evans, C. Stephen. *Preserving the Person*. Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979.
- Eze, Michael Onyebuchi. *Intellectual History in Contemporary South Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Fletcher, Joseph. *Morals and Medicine*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.
- Friedrich, Carl J (Ed.). *The Philosophy of Kant*. New York: The Modern Library, 1949.
- George Rudebusch. *Socrates, Pleasure, and Value*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1956.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Sense of the Beautiful and the Sublime 1764*, ed. by Peter Y. Chou, www.wisdomportal.com
- Karl, Jasper. *Man in the Modern Age*, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: Doubleday and Company Inc. 1957.
- Lemay, Eric and Pitts, Jennifer A. *Heidegger for Beginners*. Danbury: Steer forth Press, 2007.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London: Everyman's Library, 1971. Chapter 27.
- Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic 1844 Manuscripts*, trans. by Martin Mulligan, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1956.
- Mbae, J. G. "Is there an African Philosophy". In *The Philosophical Focus on Culture and Traditional Thought Systems in Developments*, ed. J. M. Nyasani. Nairobi: Rahice Printing Works Limited, 1988.
- Mhina, Vincent Eustace. "Education for Youth Development in Bantu Africa." The subtitle "Utu-Centred Anthropology and Pedagogy: A case Study of Tanzania" in *Salesianum*, Annus LXXIII, n. 1 (Ianuarius-Martius, 2011).
- Michael, Tooley. "Abortion and Infanticide". In *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 2:1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Noble, Mary. UK and Iet Veenland, Netherlands. *Humanity and Gender: Utu Na Undugu, a Gathering of Vision in a Time of Change*. Cf. www.templatenetwork.org
- Nyasani, Joseph, M. *The African Psyche*. Nairobi: Theological Printing Press Limited, 1997.
- Ollman, Bertell. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971; 2nd ed., 1976, Chapter 22.
- Osman, Amin. "Influence of Muslim Philosophy on the West." *Monthly Renaissance* 17:11, 2007.
- Paul II, John. *Homily on World Youth Day*. Toronto, July 28, 2002.
- Preus, J. Samuel. *Explaining Religion: Criticism and Theory from Bodin to Freud*. American Academy of Religion Texts & Translations Series, 1996.

Russell, Razzaque. *Human Being to Human Bomb: Inside the Mind of a Terrorist*. London: Icon Books, 2008.

Singer, Peter. *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Sonal, Panse. *Ubuntu – African Philosophy* (buzzle.com).

Stace, Walter T. *The Concept of Morals*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937; and also reprinted by Peter Smith Publisher Inc, January 1990.

Tutu, Desmond. *No Future without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

William Barclay. *The Daily Study Bible: The Gospel of Matthew. Vol. 2*. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1995.

Endnotes

¹ *The New African Bible* (Nairobi: Paulines Publications-Africa, 2012), Matthew 7:12.

² Marcus George Singer, "Generalization in Ethics," *Mind* LXIV (1955), p. 119.

³ Walter T. Stace, *The Concept of Morals* (New York: The MacMillan Company; and also reprinted by Peter Smith Publisher Inc, January 1990), pp.178, 179 (chap. 7).

- ⁴ Ibn Maytham al-Bahrani (Vol. 5, p. 2) has quoted Abu Ja'far ibn Babawayh al-Qummi to have stated that Amir al-mu'minin wrote this piece of advice in the name of his son Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, while al-'Allamah as-Sayyid ar-Radi has written that its addressee is Imam al-Hasan (p.b.u.h.). But the fact is that Amir al-mu'minin wrote another piece of advice to Ibn al-Hanafiyyah in brief which included a part of the same which he wrote to al-Imam al-Hasan. (Kashf al-mahajjah, Ibn Tawus, pp.157–159; al-Bihar, vol.77, pp. 196–198)
- ⁵ Nahjul-Balaghah, <<http://www.hadith.net/english/sources/nahj/letters/31.htm>>Accessed on 07.06.2014.
- ⁶ Knox Chamblin, *Commentary and Lesson on Matthew 6:1-18*. <http://www.thirdmill.org/newfiles/kno_chamblin/NT.Chamblin.Matt.6.1-18.pdf>Accessed on 09.05.2014.
- ⁷ *The New African Bible*, Matthew 5:17-20.
- ⁸ Ibid., Matthew 5:27-30.
- ⁹ Ibid., Matthew 5:31-32.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ William Barclay, *The Daily study Bible: The Gospel of Matthew*. Vol. 2 (Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1995), pp. 325–326.
- ¹² Muhammad Ismâ'il al-Bukhârî, *Book on Faith*, To love for a brother what one loves for himself is part of faith.
- ¹³ Ibid. Vol. 3, #624.
- ¹⁴ Qur'an 16:91. See more <<http://www.muhammadfactcheck.org/muhammadfactcheck/myth25>> Accessed on 08.04.2014.
- ¹⁵ Qur'an 42:41 ¹⁶ Qur'an 5:9.
- ¹⁷ Bukhârî, Kitâb al-Jizyah Wa'l-Muwâda'ah, Bâb Ithm Man Qatala Mu'âhadan Bi-GhairiJurm, Ḥadīth.
- ¹⁸ Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics*, 1233b15.
- ¹⁹ <http://www.anus.com/zine/articles/draugdur/golden_mean>Accessed on 08.04.2014.
- ²⁰ Frederick Copleston, Aristotle's Ethics "A History of Philosophy" <<http://www.uefap.com/reading/exercise/ess2/copleston.htm>>Accessed on 08.04.2014. ²¹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (H. Rackham, ed.) Book II, Chapter 1, 1103a–1103b.
- ²² Quran 4:135. <<http://www.islamweb.net/emainpage/index.php?page=articles&id=166129>>Accessed on 08.04.2014.
- ²³ *The New African Bible*, Luke 6:27–36; Matthew 18:21–35.
- ²⁴ Phillip Cary, John Doody, & Kim Paffenroth (eds.), *Augustine and Philosophy* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010), p. 191.
- ²⁵ To the Africans this intimacy was shared right from the biological family, through the extended family to the entire society. It is worth noting that to the Africans, even the dead were part of the society and they were deemed to influence the living either positively or negatively. ²⁶ Desmond Tutu, *No Future without Forgiveness* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), pp. 255–282.

To demonstrate this important aspect of the human living in relation to each other, he devoted a whole chapter on forgiveness.

²⁷ Justus G. Mbae, “Social Ethics in Kenya: Education or Indoctrination?” <<http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-10/chapter-22.htm>> Accessed on 02.03.2014.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Joseph Bollin, *The Search for Universal Ethics: A New Look at the Natural Law*. (Vatican: International Theological Commission, 2009), Second Chapter: The perception of moral values.

³⁰ Russell Razaque, *Human Being to Human Bomb: Inside the Mind of a Terrorist* (London: Icon Books, 2008).

³¹ Ibid.

³² *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Fourth Edition copyright ©2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Updated in 2009. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. ³³ Cf. Paul G. Bain, Jeroen Vaes, and Jacques-Philippe Leyens (eds.), *Humanness and dehumanization* (New York: Psychology Press, 2013).

³⁴ “Humanity” 2.b, *Oxford English Dictionary* 3rd Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

³⁵ Dictionary.com. © Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

<<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/religion>> Accessed on 14.06.2014.

³⁶ Austin Cline, “Religion as Opium of the People: Karl Marx, Religion, and Economics” <http://atheism.about.com/od/philosophyofreligion/a/marx.htm> ³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ J. Samuel Preus, *Explaining Religion: Criticism and Theory from Bodin to Freud* (American Academy of Religion Texts & Translations Series, 1996).

³⁹ “Oxford Dictionary of Politics”. In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

⁴⁰ See the argument at <<http://www.answers.com/topic/political-development#ixzz34>> ⁴¹ Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic 1844 Manuscripts*, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1956), p. 79.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic 1844 Manuscripts* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1956), p. 79.

⁴⁴ <http://philevents.org/event/show/9769>

⁴⁵ Joe Carter, “Being a Person” posted on Jan. 26, 2011

<<http://www.firstthings.com/webexclusives/2011/01/being-a-person>>

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Bard, Bernard; Joseph Fletcher, “The Right to Die”. *The Atlantic Monthly*: 59–64, April, 1968.

⁴⁸ Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), Chapters 2–7.

⁴⁹ Vincent Eustace Mhina, “Education for youth development in Bantu Africa. “Utu”-centered anthropology and pedagogy: a case study of Tanzania.” In *Salesianum* LXXIII–N.1. (Rome:

LAS, January–March, 2011), p. 76. He quotes argument of Joseph Ratzinger in *L'universalizzazione della cultura europea e la sua crisi*, in Ratzinger- M. Pera, *Senza radici. Europa, relativismo, cristianesimo, islam*, Mondari, Milano, pp.58–66.

⁵⁰ Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, "truth", 2005.

⁵¹ Marion David, "Correspondence Theory of Truth" in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (2005).

⁵² Osman Amin, "Influence of Muslim Philosophy on the West", *Monthly Renaissance* 17:11, 2007.

⁵³ Thomas Aquinas, *Disputed Questions on Truth*, 1, 2, c, reply to Obj. 1. Trans. Mulligan, McGlynn, Schmidt, Truth, Vol. I, pp. 10–12.

⁵⁴ Ibid., "Veritas supra ens fundatur" (Truth is founded on being). *Disputed Questions on Truth*, 10, 2, reply to Obj. 3.

⁵⁵ Ibid., *Categories*, pp. 3-24.

⁵⁶ Ibid., *Book II*, Chapter 5 1105b-1106a.

⁵⁷ Cf. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit, Teil, Teil I, Abschnitt I*, 5:34 (par. 167); and *Abschnitt II*, 4:17 (par. 371). In these sections, Heidegger confronts the *Dasein* in its daily life and how it realizes itself.

⁵⁸ J. Childers and G. Hentzi Eds., *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism* (Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 70.

⁵⁹ Eric Lemay and Jennifer A Pitts, *Heidegger for Beginners* (Steer forth Press, 2007), pp. 64-8.

⁶⁰ John Paul, *Homily on World Youth Day*, Toronto, July 28, 2002.

⁶¹ Karl Marx, *The German Ideology*, Part I&II (London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., 1938), Chapter 1.

⁶² Bertell Ollman, *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* (Cambridge University Press, 1971; 2nd ed., 1976), Chapter 22.

⁶³ *1844 Manuscripts*, p. 76.

⁶⁴ The phrase "acting being" is here intended to mean operation, that is, "not passive" but consciously being responsive to self and other human beings as a single family, and to the entire creation meant to exist harmoniously.