

SOCIO-CULTURAL INCLUSION AS OPPOSED TO OTHERIZATION AND ITS EFFECTS ON HUMANITY

Joseph Monday Orji

Department of Philosophy and Religion
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki
okosisimj@yahoo.com

Donatus Oluwa Chukwu

Department of Philosophy and Religion
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

Anacletus Ogbunkwu

Department of Philosophy and Religion
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

&

Nkechi Emma-Echiegu

Department of Psychology and Sociological Studies
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

Abstract

Human beings are called social animals. They love being included within the group they find themselves and abhor socio-cultural exclusion. As opposed to the culture of exclusion, group influence is learnt, developed and strengthened within the culture of inclusion, hence, the principle of Ubuntu - "I am because we are." However, within the culture of exclusion, certain key concepts are systematically maintained: "They and us" or "we and them" or "our gain or their gain." These concepts unjustly put the "other" outside the circle of insiders and tag them with derogatory names. Using qualitative method, this work highlights the ethno-tribal sentiments in Nigeria cum Africa, the criminalization of Africans in Europe, and the ill-effects of ethnophaulism on the individual as well as on the society. It also found out that otherization is assumed to be normal by many ethnic groups. It recommends conscious relearning of the principles of inclusion. It recommends the culture of inclusion because it leads to development, while exclusion tears the community apart. It raises some research questions. Why is inclusion better than exclusion? How can inclusive culture be nurtured?

Keys words: Inclusion, culture, ethnophaulism, racial-profiling, discrimination.

Introduction

Self-protection is a social norm. And the instinct of specie-preservation is also natural to humanity. Therefore, to protect one's specie is a goal in all societies. The aim of this work is to highlight the socio-cultural ills of exclusion in the form of racism, ethnophaulism, racial-profiling, etc., and their effect on the society. To promote the culture of inclusion and to aid in the formation of good conscience as regards otherization in the society. (Ogbunkwu & Orji, 2022, 14). The difficulty in the study is that discrimination and belongingness are two sides of the same coin. It is human to belong to an ethnic group and to promote tribal identity. Often, the interest of other groups clashes with one's own group interest. Hence, it appears natural to fear what one doesn't know and to cling to the *status quo*, thereby promoting xenophobia, however, without intending it. Another difficulty is the protectiveness of what is our way of life. The

foreigner is an intruder and should be resisted. This work brings to the fore the fact that inclusion is far better than exclusion because inclusion builds; exclusion shatters.

The methodology of the work is Qualitative Research Method, “which entails the collecting and analyzing of non-numerical data. It is based on the analyses of texts, videos and audios,” and the use of library and other media of information technology. “Qualitative Research Method represents opinions and feelings that cannot be presented in figures. It gives descriptive insights that cannot be numerically articulated.” (Orji, 2022, p. 25-26). The paper raises some research questions such as; what are the possible causes of exclusion? What causes tribalism and exclusion of the other? How can we eradicate discrimination and “otherization”? Is it the fear of “the other” or the inferiority of the self that causes ethnophaulism?

The theoretical background to this work is the fact that it appears to be a crime to be an Igbo man or woman in Yoruba Land or Hausa/Fulani in Igbo Land. After the Nigerian Biafran Civil War, “People were fed with stories of how each side to the war was out to exterminate the other from the face of the earth.” (Eruchalu & Okafor, 2018, p. 197). It seems also to be a crime to be an African in European countries, where many Africans are often seen as little devils out to prey on their innocent citizens. (Clarence, 2009, 4). Even though some of the countries that made up the Eastern Bloc are in Europe, many of them do not belong to the European Union. Not being democratically developed and economically well off to fit into the standard of First World leave them at the same level with those who are from the third world countries. Nationalities are now distinguished between Europeans and Eastern Europeans, the Third World and the First Nationals, Europeans and others living in Europe, European Union member and non-European Union member state. At the port of entry into every European Country, you will see it boldly written: European Citizens and Other Citizens; European Passports and Other Passports. The ethnophaulism and otherization begin right from there. Therefore, there is still with us: the haves and the have nots, the Europeans and Others. The haves are the civilized and the have nots are the barbarians. The have nots who migrated to Europe and the non-European Union member states who migrated into the European member states are “the suspects” and “the other” in the society of the haves. The criminalization of foreigners is sometimes coded in expressions such as those with immigration background, “those with foreigners’ background” and “the we” and “the others” exhibited at the point of entry. Their offence is the background of their nationality. This work adopts the theory of Masoud Kamali that rejects ethnophaulism, racism, discrimination and all forms of marginalization and exclusion in the society. (Kamali, 2009, p. 3-5).

The scope of the work is African and Europe. There are other continents such America, Australian, Asia, etc. These are not within the context of the work. This work follows a simple structure. It has conceptional theories and the explication of key terms. This is followed by divergent opinions on inclusion and methods of otherization, which is followed by evaluation and conclusion.

Conceptual Review

By culture we mean the totality of people’s way of life, “which manifest itself in behaviours that have certain factors in common or culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, custom, belief, arts, moral, law and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man (woman) as a member of a society.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 3). It is not static but changes through time, which could be for healthier or shoddier growth. There are material and non-material elements of culture. The material elements of culture are the visible aspects of the culture such as artifacts, working tools, musical instruments, clothing, food utensils, building, etc. The non-material elements of culture are “the invisible aspect of culture which are the intangible aspect of cultural values that deals with all human thoughts, feelings, idea, ethics, beliefs, laws, folklore, religion.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 4). The language is not seen, yet the power of tribal languages cannot be overemphasized because when you speak the language of the ethnic group, the hearers are captivated; their interests are awakened.

Belongingness is essential to everyone. We all love and appreciate being loved. We all long to belong to one group or the other. In Nigeria, we have different tribes and ethnic groups. According to

Ezinwa Vincent Chi, “tribe refers to a group of people of the same race and with the same customs, language, religion, etc. Tribe also means living in a particular area and often led by a chief or tribal leader.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 205). We have the Igbo, Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba, Efik, Tiv, Edo, etc. These groups maintain systematically ethnic and tribal sentiments that are often detrimental to the growth and harmony of the country. This is because “Ethnicity crates ethnic group consciousness which gives rise to ethnic conflict against other ethnic groups for example, in Nigeria; it is experienced by the Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo, etc.” (Ezinwa, 2014. P. 344). Ethnic sentiments fuel otherization.

The Igbo aphorism says, “to kill a dog, you will need to give it a bad name.” Because the need to belong is fundamental, it seems universal also that people take delight in giving derogatory names to those who do not belong to their group. They base their one-sided judgment of “the other” on the tribe, race or country that “the other” are coming from. They believe that their own culture and ethnic origin are better than “the other.” Thereupon, we speak of xenophobia, which is a dislike for an ethnic group or the fear of strangers or anyone who is different from us. Xenophobia involves the belief that there is an ingroup and an outgroup classification of people. Cultural xenophobes opine that their culture is superior and that of “the other” is inferior. (Elina, 2021, 300). They want the outsider to know that there is the insider outsider dichotomy; “we belong here” but “you don’t belong to us.” There is the inner hatred for the outsider group within the same society. Examples abound. We have Igbos against the Yorubas, the Hausa/Fulani against the Igbos and Christians and Muslims, which can also be reversed. These ethno-cultural and religious groups rarely see anything good in each other. They easily slip into the narrow mindedness of ethnic and religious bigotry; group hatred and scornfulness. Ezinwa Vincent Chi opines that “only conflict characterized contact among African tribes.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 345). This mindset blinds those who discriminate against “the other” so that they think and feel that people from these ethnic groups, tribes and countries are criminals and would behave alike. This is dangerous because it does not allow diversified unity and unity in diversity. It does not encourage self-actualization. The fear of the ingroup does not allow them to have teammates who fall under what they call outgroup. The mediocre from the ingroup is preferred to the expert from the perceived outgroup. This affects not just the individual but the entire society including the economy, politics and culture of the state. It breeds hate speech, intolerance, genocide, discourages intermarriage and free association of teammates and peer groups. It stops “the other” from learning the culture of “the other” people. This is the bane of the culture of exclusion that can only be corrected by the culture of inclusion. The culture of inclusion looks at competence, ability and creativity. It does not ask, where are you from; rather what can you contribute to the wilder society?

There is also racism which clearly looks down on a particular race that “the other” comes from. There was the racial purification by Adolf Hitler who wanted the “pure race” made up of tall and elegant men and women with blue eyes and pointed nose. He went about eliminating “people of colour” also called mulatta, and those who were mentally or physically challenged. He described blacks as “little demons” with flat noses and big heads. (Lusane, 2009, p. 4). This ideology is characterized by belongingness and “the other,” “we and they and they and us syndrome.” There is always the conflict of interest which insinuates “us against them” or “their gain or our loss” or “either us or them.” (Volf, 1996, 99). These racial concepts reduce the society into a mere theatre of war of one ethnic group against “the other” and places one racial group against “the other.”

Discrimination is the culture of unfair or unjust or prejudicial treatment of categories of people especially on the grounds of race, age, sex or disability. Some people are treated as if they are inferior to “the other”. They are seen as societal rejects. Sometimes, people are unfairly treated because of preferences of one ethnic group against “the other” or what they want to gain. This can also be based on tribe, which is nepotism. In the Scripture, the Hellenists (Greek speaking Jews) were discriminated against by the Hebrew speaking Jews because they could not speak Hebrew Language (Acts 6:1). Paul outrightly rejects discrimination when he says there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male and female, for you all are one in Christ (Gal 3:28). The expression “in Christ” becomes the melting point of all forms

of discrimination. Those who discriminate against “the other” try to show love and honour to what is “their own”. They construct mental walls and invisible compartment of people. Sentimental expressions like “our people first,” “the other” can wait, which is often based on bias and inferiority superiority complexes; while meritoriousness and competitive spirit are lost.

Cultural exclusion, xenophobia, racism, and all the *isms* put together divide the society and create enmity within the people. All elements of cultural exclusion militate against the culture of inclusion which enhances individual and societal development. Development means event and processes that bring about change that is for good. It leads to success and makes the society better, larger and stronger. “Development occurs in every physical phenomenon, it can be a change-in-state, transformation or metamorphosis; it can also be evolutionary or revolutionary; a growth or tilt. But drawing the issue of development down to human sphere, it can be viewed from individual level or social/group level.” (Ezinwa, 2014, 303).

Ethnophaulism and the Culture of Exclusion

Ethnophaulism is the combination of two Greek words: the prefix ethno and phaulism which come from the Greek word φαυλίσειν (phaulizein), meaning to hold cheap, to malign or to vilify or to disparage and φαῦλος (phaulos), that which is bad, unjust, unfair or undeserved treatment of “the other” ethnic groups. It is the creating of a negative imagery about a given ethnic group. It can mean the caricaturing of a group in order to disrespect them or to show them that they worth nothing. We speak of Ethnophaulism as insinuating words such as nigger, monkey, etc. They are derogatory ethnic slogans used to insult specific race and nationality; who are treated like outcasts. When ethnophaulic meet their target on the way, in the school, shops, bank, etc. they distance themselves from “them”. They claim that they have offensive body odour. They scorn at their mode of dressing, types of food, method of eating, skin colour, etc. They want to tell “the other” at the least chance that they are primitive and do not belong to the group. The otherization makes “the other” know that you can live within our society, but you are not part of us. You are barely tolerated, but your presence and existence within the community is nothing other than mere offensive occurrence that should be eliminated but for the force of the law. Masoud Kamali opines that “there are many forms and variants of ‘racism’, hence the coining terms such as biological racism, genetic racism, cultural racism, religious racism, and so on ... Such a category may be linked to visible physical characteristics, such as skin colour, hair type, or anatomical sex that are relatively easy constructions for distinguishing between ‘Us and Them,’ but also imagined or real ‘cultural properties’ are used as ‘ethnic markers’ in the process of ‘Otherization’.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 3). Masoud Kamali rejects all these theoretical forms of otherization. Those who discriminate against the group will always ask: Why are they here? What are they doing here? When are they going away? They are treated as criminals and any crime committed within the vicinity must have been from them. Masoud Kamali affirms that, “Discrimination does not only exist in the form of observable social actions, but also as subtle, hidden, and sometimes unintentional actions, that indirectly harm some groups of people in a society.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 5). These social constructs ought to be pulled down.

One is simply born into a streamlined system. They are made to grow up with defined principles. The analogy of Jerome Murphy-O’Connor fits into the society of discriminations. “Just as those living in polluted environment have no alternative but to breathe in toxins, so those born into the world are automatically infected by its attitudes and standards, its root principles.” (Murphy-O’Connor, 1996, p. 209). Their efforts are nothing compared to the fast-flowing thread of thoughts into which they are born. In this way the society one is born into makes things difficult for them. The society molds you into what she wants you to be; and goes on to justify itself. It propounds theories and principles to this effect. Examples are the slogans “might is right,” “wealth confers authority and honour” or “the rich should marry from the upper class while the poor should marry from the lower class” or “the richer you are the happier you shall be.” These divisive theories are counterproductive. However, practice is different from theory. The negativity of being described as a “racist” makes people perpetuate these theories behind smoke screens. But there are still the First World and the Third World distinctions, blacks, niggers, monkeys and the Europeans. It is a

problem to come from the Third World, Africa, Asia, Latin America, etc. It is an issue to be “identified as the Roma.” In the Book *Peaceful Coexistence or “Iron Curtain?”*, Suppan Alron & Wolfgang Mueller put it like thus, “As the ‘people’s democracies’ were forced by Stalin into isolating themselves from Western Europe, contacts became more and more restricted, and Austria began to be shut off from its Eastern neighbours and former trading partners. Beginning in 1948, an Iron Curtain was erected directly on Austria’s eastern border: a deadly wall of barbed wire, watchtowers, guards, and minefields that separated the Eastern bloc from the West and prohibiting undesired human movement.” (Suppan & Mueller, 2009, p. 9).

Tünde Puskás expresses it thus, “There are two factors which can explain the differences in experiences of migration to Sweden. Firstly, Hungarians from Romania and Yugoslavia were identified by the Swedish authorities as Romanians and Yugoslavs and their place in the ‘pyramid of migrant’ was determined accordingly. Secondly, by the end of the 1980s and early 1990s Swedish migration policies and the Swedish society’s attitude towards immigrants had gone through considerable changes.” (Puskás, 2009, p. 17-18). However, the members of the committee on United Nation experts on the elimination of racial discrimination sharply criticized France and Italy for their maltreatment of the Roma. They held the opinion that racism and xenophobia were undergoing a “significant resurgence” and warned of “resurgent racism.” According to Daniel Boyarin, “group identity has been constructed in two ways: as the product of either a common genealogical origin or a common geographical origin.” (Boyarin, 1994, p. 229). Masoud Kamali maintains that, “all societies have ideologies and discourses which discriminate by placing, in a hierarchical order of superiority, groups of people on the basis of sociocultural, religious, physical, or innate hereditary characteristics. In Europe, more recent stereotypes and prejudices are added to earlier forms, for instance against Jews and Roma.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 4). The Roma were deported from France and Italy for being sources of crimes in the society. Africans were deported from Switzerland and Austria for the same reason. (Kamali, 2009, p. 2). In this context, being a Roma like being an African in Europe is associated with being a potential criminal. To resist this bias is to question the authority of the State you and to risk deportation. It is easier to know who is an African in Europe. Their pigment colour of the skin is dark brown and their dark hair is noticeable from a distance. They carry the stigma of colonial imperialism. They are offspring of dead or liberated slaves, and as such the product of slavery; hence treated as second class citizens and documented citizens. Take away their document, and they return to where they came from, children of African slaves. When any person confronts this imagery and constructed identity, it is seen as an affront against the State. The consequences are grave, law suit and if convicted, deportation follows immediately. Sometimes, the Police threatens you with deportation for merely questioning the rationale behind classism and racial preferential treatments.

The effort to limit the mixture of cultures in the modern European society is the new form of Iron Curtain. This problem is attested to by Suppan Alron & Wolfgang Mueller who say, “the full integration of the Central European states into the European Union and NATO, the role of Ostpolitik and neutrality has been reduced further ... The icebreaker has been scraped... No diplomatic post-box is necessary... However, this fortunate development should not let us underestimate the historic merits and the shortcomings of past efforts to promote peace relations across an Iron Curtain in times of the Cold War and détente.” (Suppan & Mueller, 2009, p. 29). *De facto* is, movement within European States has been made easier because of the use of Schengen Visa, but the iron curtains are still there. These iron curtains are put in place in the name of security. Human freedom and the right to freedom of movement are killed and buried in the name of the security of the State. The Russian and Ukraine war shows that European citizens were absorbed by their neighbours while Africans were left in ruins. Many fleeing Africans were denied entry into trains, beaten up by the security agents and left stranded at the border towns. Passengers pushed Africans away and shouted at them “don’t touch me.” According to Masoud Kamali: “European societies, notwithstanding the increasing attention of the European Union to antiracist efforts, consistently exhibit high levels of xenophobia and racism in attitude surveys, a desire to limit immigration and acceptance of refugees, and a

readiness to exclude those defined as ‘foreigners’ from certain social areas and arenas...” (Kamali, 2009, p. 2).

Racial Profiling

At night all cats are grey. According to Tukufu Zuberi and Eduardo Bonilla-silva racial profiling refers to the use of an individual’s race or ethnicity in judging what that person is capable of doing. It classifies all the people from the same race as the same. “In other words, race is conceptualized as a fixed characteristic, rooted in biological or genetic differences between easily distinguishable groups.” (Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008, p. 43). The aphorism is clear. “If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, then, it is duck!” Racial profiling demeans a group of people, treats them as if they are nobodies, tells one-sided stories about them and makes sure that they realize that they are different from “us”. It depersonalizes and criminalizes “the other.” It makes one fear “the other” or makes “the other” an enemy before meeting them. It creates imagery of what “the other” should be like without realizing that they need not fall into the constructed category. Sometimes these mental constructs portray “the other” person as “half-human and half-devil”. “They are not like you, stop going out with them”, “they” are not teachable, “they” are irresponsible, “they” cannot learn anything new”. (Kamali, 2009, p. 3). Those who are not like “us” are poor, never do well, have criminal minds, and are not in any way equal to “us”. That is why Masoud Kamali says, “Racism involves ideas about inferiority, superiority, or essential differences of groups of people based on essentialist elements, but it also involves power ... Racism involves the ability to impose those beliefs or world views as hegemonic, and as a basic denial of rights and equality.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 4).

Under these conditions, one meets “the other” with stereotyped attitude. “The other” will not get a good Job because we do not trust them. “The other” will not come into the party hall because they do not look like us and we are not sure of what “the other” will do. “The other” will have to do a less rewarding job because that is where they belong. “The other” is always aggressive. “The other” must be avoided, “the other” is lazy, etc. Masoud Kamali speaks of “the logic of exclusion.” It is “the separation of ‘Us’ from ‘Them’, and the construction of adversarial frames, requiring a negative identification by which ‘Them’, becomes not only a feared other but an enemy.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 3-4).

The resultant effects of categorization of persons are grave. It is “us against them”, “their gain or our loss”, “either us or them” says Miroslav Volf who gives the following example: “A man who left Sarajevo before the war in 1992 and joined the Serbian army that was shelling the city said in the course of a phone conversation to his best friend, who had remained and whose apartment was destroyed by a shell: ‘There is no choice. Either us or them ... Either we will inhabit this place or they will; either we will destroy them or they will destroy us; no other option is available.’” (Volf, 1996, 99). For peace to reign, “the other” must be eliminated.

Because of fear of “the other” and what is foreign The Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) campaigns with this slogan: We need new security package, that is, the refusal of asylum seekers into our land, which is for the “protection of real Austrians” from Asylum seekers in Vienna. Masoud Kamali gives reasons why it is so: “Particularly acute is the security problem in those areas where the current flow of asylum seekers has turned the whole villages to crisis region ... Above all, the African drug mafia targets Vienna. Drug trafficking is going on almost uninhibitedly on the open street.” (Kamali, 2009, 77). To be an African on the street of Vienna, Austria, in this context is to be a suspect or taken to be a drug dealer.

There were other racial slogans of FPÖ, like “more courage for our Vienna blood, foreigners do not do anyone good and do not bring in anything good.” This placard from the FPÖ caused a lot of reactions. There are other placards showing the then party leader Heinz-Christian Strache cleaning the recreational parks in the city of Vienna of the Turks and the streets of black African drug vendors. These two sets of people are treated as one and the same inferior race in many European countries. Masoud Kamali says,

“The history of the racialization of Africans and indigenous peoples are not separated from that of Muslims and Jews ... For instance, the term Moors at first referred to Arab Muslims, but over time Moors came overwhelmingly to be associated with blackness, as is evident from the ‘blackmoors’. Religious and cultural prejudices against both blackness and Islam, each of which was seen to be the handiwork of the Devil, intensified the connection between them.” (Kamali, 2009, p. 27-28). Curtis A. Keim dates this “Otherization” back to the 1400s. “As Europeans spread across the world from the 1400s onward, they had to make sense of the new people and places they encountered. Over time ... Africa became representative of extreme ‘otherness’ ... The real problem has been that using Africa as a *symbol* of difference has meant that the continent has been treated as an object. As an object, Africa is described and manipulated, but Africans, as objects, cannot speak for themselves, or make comments on who we are.” (Keim, 2009, p. 11). Unfortunately, most people’s impressions of the Africans on the street of Switzerland, Vienna, Holland, etc. are that they are asylum seekers and drug vendors, those who go about poisoning innocent European children with hard drugs. The evil deeds of few Africans speak for the rest of the blacks in Europe.

Evaluation and Conclusion

This work looked at cultures and different concepts that promote the culture of otherization which hinder societal integration as opposed to the culture of inclusion, that promotes humanity. It gave the meaning of concepts such as culture, tribe, xenophobia, belongingness, etc. These served as working tools. The proper understanding of what each stood for will enhance the chances of ones’ better understanding of the work. The work advocates for the need for culture contacts, in the process of which both cultures will undergo changes “in language, behaviour, scripts, customs, ideas, arts, literature, fashions, manners and modes of livings.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 338). This is called acculturation. It outrightly rejects otherization. There is also the need for culture-transfer, which “connotes the structural changes in artifacts, customs and belief that result from cross-cultural interaction.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 339).

This work recommends that efforts should be focused on role models. It is a truism that “representation matters.” All the groups matter. “In Nigeria (Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba, etc.) should refuse to hold desperately to its cultural ethnic sentiments when it concerns national integration and development. But they should take bold steps to inculcate a general national consciousness as against the narrow ethnic or tribe consciousness. The various tribes in Nigerian should promote what brings them together than tribalism and ethnic politics.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 347-348). Therefore, there is need for a model of inclusiveness “by being empathetic and listening to all voices on your team.” (Ezinwa, 2014, p. 348). There is need to diversify the leadership as diversity brings progress and strengthens group interest in building up the common goal. Team spirit is inevitable. When all the ethnic groups see themselves as working for the common good, they will achieve greater success.

Reward and punishments should also be carried out. Those who do well should be rewarded for their excellence while those who do not should be reprimanded. There should be no sacred cows within the group or a particular group made to appear more important than the other. There shall also be no personal and group interest in appointment. Unfortunately, we get the right people into the wrong office and the wrong people in the right office. That is the problem that has marred the wellbeing of the country.

One deadly factor every African in Europe will face is racial profiling and the straightjacketing. You are a *black African* and you must behave like your “other” brothers and sisters who came before you. If they were bad, you may be worse. If they were good, you may not be like them, because they were exceptional to the norm. Most Africans in Europe dream of the day they will be judged by the content of their character and not by the colour of their skin. Based on the principle of ethnophaulism and racial profiling, some Europeans will not see anything good in African immigrants. The African brain drain and the loss of Nigerian cum African best athletes to Europe mean nothing to racial profilers and ethnophaulic.

For such people, Africans are raw materials in the hands of their slave masters, Europe. It recommends the rethinking of European Union principles of Europeans and Others at every point of entry into Europe. There is the need for the equality of all persons.

The work recommends the need to cultivate the culture of inclusion which makes it possible for people to know that there is no justification whatsoever for “asserting that any one race and culture is intellectually superior or inferior to another.” Jennifer Gidley, et al see the fact of inclusion as a biological need of humanity. “Possible areas of inclusion are socio-economic status, culture (including indigenous cultures), linguistic group, religion, geography (rural and remote/isolated), gender, sexual orientation, age (including youth and old age), physical and mental health/ability, and status with regard to unemployment, homelessness and incarceration.” (Gidley, Hampson, Wheeler & Berede-Samuel, 2010, 6). When a country is governed based on the culture of inclusion, she calls everyone in, creates space in the conversation to address our common humanity, builds a bridge that includes groups that would have ordinarily been marginalized. The good thing is that lack of the culture of inclusion is our challenge, but building it is a crucial strategy in national and international development. Progressive minds accept cultural diversity and diversified unity which embrace peace and minimize conflicts. Cultural diversity accepts people the way they are and this leads to progress, which could enhance economic development of the community. It will encourage inter-ethnic marriages whereby Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa/Fulani could freely marriage one another. This is still a dream but if we must live in Nigeria as our country, we cannot stop dreaming. This dream came up in the 1960’s national anthem. “Though tribe and tongue may differ, in brotherhood we stand ... O God of all creation; grant this our one request, help us to build a nation; where no man is oppressed ... This dreamed country can be anywhere in the world. But there is hope that it will be realized.

References

- Boyarin, D. (1994). *A Radical Jew. Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elina, H. (2021). “Pentecostal Theology, and Racialized Xenophobia: Claiming A New Social Order.” *Journal of Religion in Africa*. 1(1), 300-327
https://brill.com/view/journals/jra/50/3-4article-p299_5.xml
- Eruchalu, A. N. & Okafor, Pio-A. (2018). *History of Nigeria and the Wider World Since 1800. For Schools and Colleges*. Awka: Fab Anieh Nig. Ltd.
- Ezinwa, V. C. (2014). *A History of Nigerian Peoples and Cultures. (From Antiquity to Contemporary Times)*. Enugu: Advocate Press.
- Gidley, J., Hampson, G, Wheeler, L., Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). Social Inclusion: Context, Theory and Practice. *The Australasian Journal of University Community Engagement* 5 (1), 6-36).
https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=social+inclusion+theory+pdf&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholar#d=gs_qabs&t1656253706683&u=%23p%3DLt3SRBeLlioJ.
- Kamali, M. (2009). *Racial Discrimination. Institutional Patterns and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Keim, C. A. (2009). *Mistaking Africa Curiosities and Inventions of the American Mind*. Boulder: West View Press.
- Lusane, C. (2009). *Hitler’s Black Victims*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy-O’Connor, J. (1996). *Paul. A Critical Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ogbunkwu, A. & Orji, J. M. (2022). “The Role of Good Conscience in Abating Bad Governance in Nigeria.” *Nigerian Journal of Philosophical Studies (NJPS)*. A publication of Association of Philosophical Professionals of Nigeria (APPON), Vol. 1. NO. 2, 14-29.
- Orji, J. M. (2022). *Religion: A Business?* Abakaliki: Alpha Citizens’ Advocate Press.
- Puskás, T. (2009). “*We Belong to Them*”. *Narrative of Belonging, Homeland and Nationhood in Territorial and Non-territorial Minority Settings*. Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang.

- Suppan, A. & Mueller, W. (2009). *Peaceful Coexistence or "Iron Curtain": Austria, Neutrality and Eastern Europe in the Cold War and Détente, 1955-1989*. Berlin: LIT VERLAG.
- Volf, M. (1996). *Exclusion and Embrace. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Publication.
- Zuberi, T. & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). *White Logic, White Methodology. Racism and Methodology*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publications.