

## CULTURAL IDENTITY AS SECURITY AND A PHILOSOPHY OF DEVELOPMENT FOR AFRICA: REFLECTIONS ON AMILCAR CABRAL

<sup>1)</sup>Philip Ogo Ujomu, <sup>2)</sup>Felix O. Olatunji

<sup>1)</sup>Federal University (Nigeria), <sup>2)</sup>University of Technology (Nigeria)

**Abstract.** The paper looks at the problem of national and human security in many parts of Africa today, seen in the inability of most governments to guarantee the adequate protection, peace and well-being of the citizens due in part to foreign dominating ideas. Cabral in his cultural and political thought offered philosophical insights and applied culture to the analysis of security for modern Africa. His theory of security is build upon the struggle for liberation from the colonial ordinance and his philosophy of identity is based on a combination of theory and praxis in the pursuit of reality. This requires the unearthing of the deep cultural roots and causes of things. This harmonization of interests is not just between men and men, but also between men and nature. The question is; what principles and values can best facilitate the crucial sense of security in most African societies?

**Keywords:** identity; culture; development; Africa; security

### Problem

The problem of national and human security in many parts of Africa is seen mainly in the inability of most governments and the state agencies to consistently and institutionally guarantee the adequate protection, peace and well-being of the citizens. This situation arises from pervasive social injustices and conflicts generating the serious tendency towards fear, chaos and conflicts arising from situations of threats, violence and instability in the postcolonial African state. The urgent task of national integration in many postcolonial African states necessitates an interrogation of the normative and empirical conditions for a culturally sensitive idea of security. Given that some of the more recently embraced paradigms of security analysis and planning that Africans utilize emanate from most parts of the world especially Europe, these ideas face the challenges of blending into the specific cultural nuances and social proclivities of African societies.

The critical question then is; what principles and values can best facilitate the crucial sense of social belonging and cherished capacity for human contribution that can enhance security at all levels in most African societies? This is interesting because

it connects to the kinds of things that people like Cabral, Nkrumah and others were trying to conceptualize for the Africans. So many other scholars have also tried to show the differences in the way Africans view the world and even more importantly, the significance of these facts for their interests and development. The above compels us to seek a proper approach to national security, national integration, peace and stability. The deficits in clearly defined rules for harmonizing the diverse interests and needs in view of achieving the urgent task national development have triggered social mistrust and mismanagement of many parts of Africa. A survey of the history of the discourse will show the perennial tracks of security activities and designs.

We can agree with Latham who says that “security is an object of every group organization if security is understood only in its elemental sense of the survival of the group itself in order to carry forward its mission” (Latham, 1956: 236). But what then happens when security is construed in a wider sense that embraces cosmology, progress, etc. The need to broaden the interpretative capacity of thematic concerns and methodological convergence in security theorizing is also appreciated by Nielsen who has rightly put it that we must be interested not in mere survival but also the quality or character of that survival (Nielsen, 1973: 24).

To put it practically we need to be interested in the extent to which a group’s beliefs and actions foster peace, stability, and compromise both within it and in relation to other groups. This is important when we seek to translate ontologically the transition from the colonial to the postcolonial. The postcolonial state has mainly carried on the repressive tradition of the colonial state. The net effect of this state violence is alienation, resentment, inefficiency and corruption” (CENCOD, 2004: 63 – 65). These points are crucial when we take a panoramic view of the continent and see that perhaps “Africa is the most humiliated and the most dehumanized continent in the world” (Osundare, 1998: 231) which has led to a lot of social disruption, dislocation, apathy and alienation forced on the people by economic deprivation and strangulation. Thus we can safely take the general stance that “Africa cannot be described as a peaceful continent” (Solomon & Mathews, 2002: 1) in so far as political and cultural practices and thought patterns have triggered widespread ‘antipathy, antisocial attitudes and allopsychosis’ (Drever, 1955: 13, 16, 17) leading to violent crimes, conflict, instability and a shortfall in social equity and justice. How may we begin to design a uniquely endogenous cultural view of resolving these problems devoid of importing and imposing alien ideas?

### **Philosophical basis of Cabral’s cultural and political thought**

The concept of security seems to be in need of a more holistic and systematic analysis given the significance of Cabral’s inputs to security theorizing in the history of contemporary Africa. Security in Africa seems to be an area that deserves continuous and deeper philosophical attention especially with a view to revealing its ethical, aesthetical and phenomenological possibilities. This implies what others have described as a re-reading of his work and the attempt to draw parallels (Achieng, 2005: 58). Concerning

Cabral's pedigree, we may note that he is that revolutionary leader of Africa, the founder of the liberation movement of Guine-Bissau and Cabo Verde in Africa (Freire & Gadotti, 1993: 5). His theories deserve attention because as an emblematic figure he stood out among the really genuine thinkers of Africa (Howe, 2004: 2) if not in the whole world.

Some recognized scholars in contemporary Africa have examined his ideas on the issue of nationalism, culture, ethnicity, democracy, etc. But this study focuses on his theory or philosophy of security that can make the difference for Africa. Cabral brought a new lease of life to the African quest for liberation as one of the distinguished leaders of the African continental struggle (Olukoshi, 2004: 28). We should not loose sight of the phenomenological foundations and the ethical character of Cabral's work. He construed the work of emancipation and rectification in Africa from the perspective of its conceivability and feasibility (Adesina, 2002: 15). More than that, the vision of liberation as a critical threshold and strong point of Cabral's theories must be discerned and elicited from his language in so far as this is appropriate for the project of freedom or independence and progress or development (Idahosa, 2002: 3 – 6).

It should be noted that Cabral and his ideas continue to retain relevance given the fact of his historical significance as an outstanding leader of African decolonization project and even as a political thinker and strategist of unusual merits (Rudebeck, 2005: 1). We can easily classify Cabral as a social engineer, a master in the art of transforming social structures for liberation and transformation. He was also an agronomy engineer who had a close grasp of the interconnections between the human and natural forces operating within his society. It is for this reason that we can even refer to him as a cosmologist and phenomenologist; a man interested in the scientific and philosophical engagement with nature, the nexus between men and nature, and above all, a man who is interested in altering the old or hitherto prevailing traditions.

According to Cabral we face the problem of choice "which may be called the dilemma of cultural resistance" (Cabral, 1998: 260). This resistance is however targeted at something. To this end, Cabral pushes for a national liberation that will pitch itself against "the principal characteristic, common to every kind of imperialistic domination, the negation of the historical process of the dominated people by means of violently usurping the free operation of the process of development of the productive forces" (Cabral, 1998: 261). In short freedom for the African peoples is an imperative of their security at the material and ideological levels.

It was an expression of a struggle against denial- denial of humanity, denial of respect and dignity, denial of the Africanness of the African" (Shivji, 2003: 3). Also when especially, we place the pragmatic and prospective strategies of Cabral within the framework of education, construed in its widest possible sense we see that he rejected Africa as "a victim of a western epistemological export" (Nyamnjoh, 2004: 1). Cabral's quest to create the processes that can bring about change pushed him to highlight the role of culture. Cabral discusses the influence

of a strong cultural identity as a factor of resistance against domination. He also viewed resistance as a process in the service of reclamation of a cultural identity, which must be consolidated and pitched as a negation of a foreign dominating culture (Wereta, 2007: 5). This concept of culture at the level of the theorizing of security encapsulates the totality of the human, social and natural environment of the peoples. An understanding, adaptation and control of these realms form the basis of security for a people.

### **Cabral's reconstruction of the theory of identity and security through the lens of culture and resistance**

Cabral situates his theory of security against the backdrop of the necessary rejection of imperialism as an invidious rule and insidious domination of the African peoples. This rule in his view triggers a plethora of inimical consequences, which include the colonial and neocolonial pillaging, criminality, and destruction of human and cultural values of the Africans. This dastardly exercise was the collusive conspiratorial project of selected Europeans and Africans. He repudiates the conspiratorial accumulation of capital by the metropolitans through the despicable acts of piracy, manipulation and deceptive brigandage for the ultimate end of the confiscation of the properties of the Africans. While decrying the adverse circumstances in which the Africans have found themselves, Cabral lashes out at the specter of ruthless exploitation, profligate monopolization of the peripheries and the force of sheer bondage of the satellites and annexes. In this generation the annexation of Africa is done terrestrially and celestially from the outer space using electronic surveillance.

Cabral sees culture as that instrument that will pave the way for a new Africa. This is so because according to him “culture, the fruit of history, reflects at every moment the material and spiritual reality of society” (Cabral, 1998: 261). Anti-colonialism or even de-colonization must be seen as a cultural task that translates culture into an instrument for the resistance of a foreign dominating culture. He condemns domination of any kind especially material and intellectual aspects of it and he insists on an organized response to an organized repression of the cultural life of the Africans. Cabral argues further that the Africans must fight against the two dominant types of domination, these are the repudiation of the physical liquidation of the dominated peoples via human and cultural genocide as well as the infusion of the instruments of political and economic domination into the body fabric of the cultural personality of the oppressed population. This besieging effect and the occluding repercussions arising thereof necessarily implies a clarion call to deny all inimical metropolitan constructs and values (Cabral, 1998: 260).

Cabral therefore calls for a new way of looking at culture as an instrument of cultural resistance especially where culture has a vital and effervescent ideological content and value which is represented by the dissatisfaction and rebellion that drives the physical and historical reality of the dominated society. The key term

arising thereof in the reenactment of culture is the idea of struggle. The rule or ordinance of struggle must be encapsulated with the trope of a people's history, in order to lead to the evolution of the relationships between men and between men and the environment. More specifically, Cabral calls for the entrenchment of a systematic review of the economic, political and social aspects of the evolution of the society. Thus he sees change as a major value in the quest for security. Therefore, he calls for a new idea of national liberation that must be based on nothing other than the profound and pervasive expression of culture. This cultural expression must be directed at the irrevocable and unapologetic pursuit of freedom understood as the decisive upward path of one's own culture and its values.

The most substantial part of his theory upon which we can build a conception of security is the emphasis that he laid on production. He argued that the mode of production is actually the true motive force of history (Adesina, 2006: 11). We can surmise from this that the historical factor is crucial to the security of a people, to the extent that it allows a fuller engagement with the spiritual and material dialectics of their existence. The Senegalese writer C.A. Diop also held a similar view about the importance of history, language and the psychological in the life of a people. In any case, it must be stated that for Cabral "the quintessence of nationalism was, and is, anti imperialism. It was a demand and struggle against, rather than for, something.

Given this scenario, he defines the ultimate task of an African conception of security as the unyielding reply to the forces of cultural oppression otherwise known as imperialism. In Cabral's view, it is imperialism that has altered the landscapes of the occupied territories, redefined the colonial holdings and created new ways by which men can express their selfishness. Thus the security of the African can only come via a relentless pursuit of freedom from the hands of the colonialism and its many accretions (Cabral, 1998: 260). In any case, the progression of culture will be construed within the ambits of the funnel of using the environment to the advantage of human and national liberation and transformation while at the same time resisting all manners of subjection.

Cabral in his theorizing did realize that colonialism in this generation must have its internal and external dimensions, hence the readiness to use the tested and enduring tools of resistance and rectification as a means of liberating the oppressed peoples, some of whose worst enemies are neither the oppressors nor the nonchalant, but those from within the ranks of the oppressed who have teamed up with the oppressors to perpetuate thrallodom. Cabral argues that the end of all cultural struggles, which must involve the creative and advantageous use of men and the environment, must be the annihilation of all attempts to perpetuate exploitation and repress the lives of the colonized. The attempt by any metropolitan to provoke cultural alienation must be challenged by a proactive strategy of conceptual and physical disruption that overrides the challenged mentalities of the colonized and colonizers.

### **Cabral's concept of identity and security through the lens of experience and the unity of thought and action**

Specifically, Cabral is clear on the fact the security demands of a particular society must be based on its experience. Experience involves the interpretation of reality and the appropriation of unity of thought and action. In most of Africa there is a shortfall in technological power, lack of modern ideas and a general disposition of suffering (Cabral 1980: ix). This cannot bring about the kind of security that we need in Africa. In talking about national liberation he emphasizes the roles of ideas and morality in the formation of security principles. Only a leadership that is committed, large hearted and focused on the national progress can promote security. Cabral was clear that only hard work and hard thought can bring about security for the African peoples especially his own people that were even more greatly marginalized (Cabral, 1980: xi). He argued that ideas must combine with reality to give us security. Reality is not the ideas that we have in our heads alone.

Rather there must be a combination of the ideas in our heads with the spiritual and material conditions on the ground. According to him, “your ideas may be good, even excellent, but they will be useless they spring from and interweave with the reality you live in” (Cabral, 1980: xi). He insisted on the thorough and principle study of reality, a stock taking of the gamut of material and immaterial dimensions of reality of a people before we can talk about the definition and propagation of security. According to him it is the here and now that matters.

He argued further that it is the environment that matters. The environment is ‘formative of culture’ (Cabral, 1980: xi-xii) and that there must be a dialectical interplay of culture and environment. For him there are two dimensions to the security issue, the internal and external. There must be an interface between the two dimensions of security. To have security there must be an engagement with the grassroots, an intimate knowledge with the social and cultural realities of the people. This implies the pursuit of the acquisition of the unique knowledge of your country, using scientific and ontological approaches, however, this must not be done at the detriment of the knowledge of the external world or the world beyond your shores. Given this interface, Cabral insists that security creation and sustenance is an on-going task. The quest for security is based on the task of trial and error, the learning from successes and mistakes (Cabral, 1980: xv).

The guarantee of security must come from the use of power that is calibrated and crafted within a political programme and strategy. Therefore Cabral is clear on the fact that “any African development must require a steady advance towards new and organic unities of thought and action” (Cabral, 1980: xvii). Security is based on the drawing out of individuals and groups into modes of participation and social action that are based on solidarity, and social change. In the case of the African security can only come from the development of solidarity in thought and action that can facilitate social and cultural change. We add again that action and thought do not come easy. There is a place for virtues such as courage, integrity and honour in the formation of thought and pursuit

of action. There is also a place for concrete interfacing with the material realities in order to fashion a means of creative and adaptive control of the cosmological elements understood in the broadest possible sense.

### **Critical issues in establishing an endogenous idea of security in Africa**

Given that some of the more recently embraced paradigms of security analysis and planning that Africans utilize emanate from most parts of the world especially Europe, these ideas face the challenges of blending into the specific cultural nuances and social proclivities of African societies. If “cosmology includes a way of acting, thinking and creating a world” (Feuchtwang, 2006: 85), then we need to examine the critical weaknesses of existing strategies that had limited the critical potential for an urgently needed institutional efficiency and ethical citizenship in most of Africa. In fact, writers such as Bakut in his work *“Understanding And Explaining Security: An Africentric View”* have been credited with arguing like many others that the African idea of security is tripartite in nature. It focuses in freedom from threat and is approached from a three dimensional view: psychological, physical and spiritual (Jifri, 1997: 674).

We know from history that human associations have been the core sources of security problems. For example, there is the problem of tyranny and man’s inhumanity to man, as seen in the internal operations of human actions in a society. There is the wider social insecurity generated by human intercultural conflicts among human associations. All of these problems can be predicated upon the personal and social manifestations of human nature and human actions. The clearly psychological, cultural and economic motivations of human nature are further highlighted in the problems of human finitude and limitations, seen as our ethical and metaphysical imperfections. We also confront the restrictive limitations of our peculiar human natures as individual men. And all of these taken together pose a stumbling block to our search for perfect human relations. Given the reality of conflicts and prejudices, Brown (1989: 3) says that ethnic conflicts can be explained using the natural tendency towards ethnocentrism: people seem to trust and prefer those of their own cultural group, while being distant and distrusting of others. How can a stable and viable idea of security be developed from such a limited idea of the world?

What are the cultural and existential foundations of security? Security has always been a matter or outcome of the extent to which men have adapted or conquered their environments understood in the broadest possible sense of the word. In the earliest ages, the challenge of security was highlighted via the “survival interaction between human beings and their surroundings, when they began to develop techniques to cope with the harsh realities of nature” (Perlman, 1995: 25). From the earliest times man was interested in security to the extent that he or she needed to migrate and navigate in search of food, shelter and protection. At this stage man sought protection from the vagaries of nature, earthquakes, hurricanes, drought, flood, dangerous animals, cold, heat, etc. Mackenzie (1963: 35) observes that “the dangers that have to be guarded against are sometimes

heat, sometimes cold, sometimes drought, sometimes flood, sometimes wild beasts or other men.” The interest in security and development arises out of the reality of crisis in these areas. Thus many peoples or communities resorted to using the natural forces of nature for self-preservation. Thus many employed security strategies such as living in valleys, mountains, islands and other inaccessible geo-territories or regions. Also others sought to place formidable fortifications or obstacles such as gorges, waterfalls, canyons, mountains, rocks, rivers, etc, between themselves and their aggressors. Later on with the increase in human population, man sought protection from his fellow men as individuals. At a later time, man would seek protection from and within the context of human organization. Thus at the heart of the human struggle for security is the attempt to confront nature or the natural environment, human nature and human action and human social organizations.

Even though it is true that “some human needs such as those for love, and communication can only be satisfied fully by interaction with other humans” (Bell, 1994: 19) yet, the mere fact of the increase in human population, and the competition arising thereof, caused men to become sources of insecurity to one another. Thus man sought protection from his fellow men, who in turn had become threats owing to the difficulties of living together in an atmosphere where resources were scarce, civic values were not developed under elaborate social systems, and laws were not available or clearly defined and enforced.

In this generation culture and security are dynamic social realities which involve a lot of continuity and change because their adequate conceptualization must come to terms with their inevitable connection with all aspects of the social values and cultural existence of a people and their praxis (Gbadegesin, 1991: 173). Culture and security cannot be discussed outside of cultural values. Ackermann (1981: 447, 450) insists that cultural values are “ways of ordering and evaluating objects, experiences and behaviour manifesting themselves in all situations of choice. Cultural values are seen as a determining factor in the choice and impact of technology; on the other hand, technology is conceived as potentially transforming cultural values.” Ackermann (1981: 451) draws the vital conclusion that “it is important to realize that cultural values and beliefs have historically acquired force to some extent independent of the current social structure. As a result, they will be embodied in the beliefs and projects of individuals and groups, contribute to the ordering of their priorities, and affect their strategies to achieve whatever goals they have set themselves”.

At the moment Africa is susceptible to environmental change and insecurities linked to the degradation of the environment (understood socially and naturally) and especially, sub Saharan Africa “is relatively more vulnerable because of its biophysical, sociocultural and economic conditions” (Nsiah-Gyabaah, 2002: 227). Some of the reasons for this situation can be traced to the crisis and contexts of the colonial and postcolonial situation. The postcolonial state has mainly carried on the repressive tradition of the colonial state. The net effect of this is alienation, resentment,

inefficiency, degradation and disunity. It has been suggested that over the years, different governments, individuals and institutions have systematically entrenched a culture of marginalization within the social order. This has led to the reproduction of widespread violence, arbitrary hierarchies and avoidable deprivation along historical and economic trajectories. It is interesting to note that the security problem and the conflicts arising thereof, in most parts of Africa, symbolize basically a field of contending philosophies of life or ideas about the way things ought to be done. If this is true then we are faced with the basic axiological problem of the character of values and value systems in so far as these impose a primacy on things as important, needed, desirable or interesting.

We can engage the idea of cosmological security by tracing the meaning of the idea of cosmology. It has been said that cosmology is arguably the oldest corpus of knowledge that pursues an understanding of the universe (Garcia-Bellido, 2000: 1). If this is true then we need to establish the reasons for the continuous epistemological and phenomenological appeal of cosmology in terms of its subject, method or relevance. In any case, if cosmology is seen as the study of the universe, then we need to clarify the meaning of this idea. From one point of view, the meaning of the universe herein is “the totality of physical things” (McMullin, 1981: 177). However some questions do arise, for instance, what is the task of a cosmological examination? How does this differ from other approaches to examining things? What are the instruments or tools used in a cosmological study? How do the different conceptions of cosmology affect the type of knowledge that we can get?

Given the above, we need to redefine the tasks and instruments of cosmology. It should be stated that in establishing the character of cosmology we are faced with the task or challenge of “pushing observation to the very limit of technological capacity and sometimes beyond that” (Longair, 2004: 1). It seems that the question that is central to cosmology has two parts, a scientific and methodological one. The extent to which these two dimensions can be separated is debatable. In any case, the central concern of cosmology is to ask for an explanation of the origins and process of things. If this is true, then this desire or imperative derives from a deeper motivation to understand and direct the rules and mechanisms within reality, for the purpose of control and prediction. Thus according to Lyth (1993: 3) we know things from the cosmological perspective by designing and utilizing a ‘model’. A model is a statement about the nature of physical reality. It is also an attempt to combine that statement about the nature of reality, with a theory that is defined in terms of an equation or formula. This principle aims at showing us what is true or not under specific circumstances (Lyth, 1993: 3).

More over, the methodological question focuses on the extent to which we can determine the ‘scientific’ in the study of cosmology. Beyond this there is the issue of the value of distinct vocations in the quest for the understanding of the cosmological. This is where the philosopher becomes relevant (McMullin, 1981: 179 – 181). More significantly, we argue that there is a need to redefine cosmology from a broader perspective that engages the wider social and natural realities embedded in the totality

of the cosmological realms. At an important level, cosmological security is the province of political philosophy. Haines (1967: 46) says that “cosmology is about the nature of human society [it] includes a way of acting, thinking and creating a world” (Feuchtwang, 2006: 85). Some cosmologies are however traditional or antiquated. The idea of tradition “makes us mindful of the prolonged apparently interminable succession of the generations. The individual who, at birth seems at one and the same time, to emerge from and enter into the universe, receives therein, and is received into, a definite place and a definite home” (Kaye, 1932: 68). This view of tradition reinforces the entrenchment of human dispositions, attitudes and ways of viewing reality. The divergences in such conceptions may lead to a crisis of human interaction.

### **Values and the crisis of security**

The hitherto restrictive analysis of the nature of national security reinforces the need for a re-conceptualization of the political community in terms of axiological and aesthetic correlates. Human security seems impossible to attain outside a new reinterpretation of the concept according to cosmological proclivities. What is human security? According to Bellamy and McDonald (2002: 373) “human security marks a much needed departure from the statist and militarist approach to security that dominated the field of international relations. The approach should prioritize the security of the individual and that security is achieved only when basic material needs are met and meaningful participation in the life of the community and human dignity are realized.” In the views of Hoogensen and Rottem (2004: 157) “human security embodies a positive image of security.” This image of human security is embodied in what Suhrke (1999: 269) refers to as “part of a vision for a ‘people-oriented’ economic development”. Human security means “safety for people from both violent and non-violent threats”. What are the normative and empirical conditions for a re-conceptualization of the political community required by a particular country confronted by diverse postcolonial socio-cultural challenges? Otite (1990: 123) has insisted that we should “problematisate our national security and social stability.” In doing so, we must “raise penetrating questions about the foundations and effects of the political regime, i.e. human nature and its implications for society” (Sigelman, 1986: 233).

As Silber (1968: 23) has rightly noted “none of us wishes to be so insensitive to moral values that he becomes indifferent to what happens in the world around him.” This evidently calls for a deeper and more systematic analysis of the core problems facing our society today that seem to arise from externally and internally triggered “behavioral and attitudinal incompatibilities” (Opotow, 2000: 476). This is the more significant when we realize that “the peace, safety, and public good of the people are ends of political society where the well being of the people shall be the supreme law” (Diggs, 1973: 283). In this modern era, the modern African society is challenged tensions and contradictions between modernity and tradition. This is seen expressly in the crisis of politics and power besetting these societies and also in the consequential decline of

the machineries of social responsibility, human compassion and welfare commensurate with the concrete needs of the members of the society. This is a difficult situation that has unleashed “other social factors to produce a discontented and disgruntled citizenry, especially among the youth” (ASUU, 2002: 26). The fact is that the real context of the problems of marginality, the plight of the less privileged, the pains of the excluded and minorities all across Africa, have not been fully resolved in the context of a continent that is urgently and grossly in need of the rule of law and social justice for national and human security.

Security in a developing society now increasingly depends on style or taste understood as “the manner with which situations and issues are dealt with” (O’Connell, 1993: 162). To ensure progress at all levels we must take a “deliberate interest in human taste” (Saw & Osbourne, 1961: 10). As such if taste can be deliberately cultivated or constructed, then we must conclude that some ways of doing things are just incompatible with ease, success and effectiveness. This implies that the human being must think in order to alter his existential situation. It has been noted that “man makes himself. And before he makes, man thinks. It seems also that man very often, and crucially perhaps, thinks in order to control his world, and that his world is a social world” (Virden, 1972: 175 – 176). This is why the aesthetic factor, as an underpinning of human thought processes, is an imperative of human and national security in a developing society. It is so because of the far reaching consequences of the “social implications” (Racy, 1969: 346) of aesthetics, which trigger a regime of human artistic recreations of social values, institutions and systems. At the level of aesthetics we are interested in the constituents of the culture of a society: ideas, aesthetic forms and values. Indeed, “the values of a culture are formed by the interaction between ideas and aesthetic norms of conduct” (Odhiambo, 2002: 5). Obstacles to the sustenance of aesthetical security can be connected to what is known as agency. Hogendorn (1996: 64) says that “an important negative factor on the human side is that the social and cultural value-systems, including attitudes towards thrift, profits, risks, education, and even the view of work may present obstacles.”

According to Harrison (2000) cultures influence progress, and certain positive cultural values are absolutely important for security and progress. These values are “progressive cultures emphasize the future, work is central to the good life in progressive cultures, diligence, creativity, and achievement are rewarded not only financially but also with satisfaction and self respect, frugality is the mother of investment, education is the key to progress, merit is central to advancement, the radius of identification and trust extends beyond the family to the broader society, justice and fair play are universal impersonal expectations” (Harrison, 2000: 299 – 300). If the above is the case, then the task of security is to cultivate a society of people who must generally appreciate that nothing enduring can come from a poor sense of appreciation of the value of things and institutions, a desire to pursue power and position without responsibility and accountability, a tendency to surrender to traditions without critical reflections and creativity to adapt to then changing times.

So also, people must move away from human action without a sense of moral commitment, institutional ceremonialism without optimal effectiveness, the acquisition and use of superfluous titles without having the corresponding skills and expertise to command control and lastly, the desire to coerce respect out of others, without really earning it or desiring to reciprocate such. We can pursue a change in the order described above by recourse to the idea of social welfare as a value. One important realm that can yield solutions to the problem of security is the extremely important aspect of values. Smah (2000: 123) has noted that “the development of human societies hinges squarely on their values, norms, laws. The question is; by what moral and philosophical guidelines can we judge individuals or groups in a community or society?” (Smah, 2000: 126). By what means can we judge entire classes or ethnic groups? Values come in here. Values are understood in terms of features such as “human needs, instincts, powers to act, the natural environment, and the surrounding peoples and cultures” (McInerney, 1992: 154). Munker (1998: 87) adds that the core values of social responsibility, caring for others are other dominant values that can make a difference in the human search fro a better existential situation.

Haines (1967: 40) insists that “men have to formulate policies and makes decisions. They will go on interpreting social realities in terms of values.” For Macbeth (1955: 110) “our chief difficulties today seem to arise from discrepancies in our values.” We must also confront the youth and institutional misuse of insecurity as a cover for individual and sectional interests. Goulet (1983: 174 – 175) is right to say that social changes cannot occur in absence of vigorous leaders to guide their communities, who use their superior education, access to information, to serve the people better and to make greater contribution to the general welfare. Values of improved quality of life or authentic development often conflicts with traditional values. Dzobo (1992: 224) holds that the study of values is an inescapable imperative for rational and meaningful national development.

### **Conclusion: towards a philosophy of security and social order**

The good society aims at its own notion of the common good through the provision of greater opportunities for participation and responsibility among citizens. The concept of social order here becomes particularly instructive for evolving the systems and rules for security and social control in society. Social order understood simply, is a set of arrangements put in place by man in order to attain certain important ends of all in a social system (Ujomu, 2001: 247, Ujomu, 2004: 12). Central to the operation of social order is the idea of social roles allocated to each member and group of the society. The protection of lives and property is the central goal of social order because; society cannot survive for long in any meaningful sense if the safety of life and property is not maintained (Ujomu, 2004: 26). Social order aims at achieving certain important ends, mainly, security, protection and preservation of the lives and properties of people in a society. To ensure individual and collective security, the social order ensures that every

person or group has some stake or interest in, and commitment to the society. Security can be most effectively established and sustained through an idea of society, which upholds the values of increased human participation, responsibility and wider input to social well-being. This view of society promotes security, by recognizing that values such as cooperation, consolidation and continuity are themselves usually uppermost in the minds of people when they form, or participate in commonwealths.

Evidently, if our quest for a philosophy of security understood as a philosophical foundation of life is to be able to serve our purpose in this essay, it must seek to engage human culture on a more consistent and culturally sensitive basis. To achieve this end, we must re-engage the practical task of the establishment and sustenance of the conceptual and institutional frameworks for enhancing the critical creative mind, advancing the work of human reason and conscience, destruction of prejudices and ancient hatreds and above all, the cultivation of a deep sense of tolerance and open mindedness towards other ideas, persons and environments. This is the urgent task of human social reconstruction that goes with the theorizing of security. This task must reckon with the way that different vocations and peoples view the world and also how social institutions must contribute to the continuous task of the holistic development of the human person in society.

Finally, we have argued that the problem of national and human security in many parts of Africa today is continuously seen in the inability of most governments and the state agencies to consistently and institutionally guarantee the adequate protection, peace and well-being of the citizens. This has been seen to be a predominant experience across Africa that has threatened the implementation of viable and humane social policies for African development. We saw that this problematic situation arises from pervasive social injustices and conflicts arising from situations of threats, violence, discord and instability in the postcolonial African state. Amilcar Cabral framed his theory of security against the struggle for liberation from the colonial ordinance, in such a way that his theory of security based its validity on a combination of theory and praxis in the pursuit of reality. He unearthed the deep roots and fundamental causes of things and he argued for the harmonization of things in reality. He pressed for a systematic linkage between men and men and between men and nature. Cabral insisted that we take the connection between thought and action seriously, if Africans are to achieve security in this contemporary era so as to have a culturally sensitive idea of security.

## REFERENCES

Ackermann, W. (1981). Cultural Values and Social Choice of Technology. *International Social Science Journal*. Vol. XXXIII, No.3. pp. 447 – 465.

Academic Staff Union of Universities ASUU (2002) *The State of The Nation*. Ibadan ASUU National Headquarters. March.

Achieng, R. (2005). Codename Conflict: An Antithesis to Its Transformative Potential, *Codesria Bulletin* nos.3 & 4. p. 58.

Adesina, Olujimi O. (2002). NEPAD And The Challenges Of Africa's Development: Towards a Political Economy of a Discourse, a Paper Prepared For The 10<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Codesria in Africa 8<sup>th</sup> to 12 December 2002 Kampala, Uganda. pp.1 – 21.

Adesina, Olujimi O. (2006) *Sociological Endogeneity And The Challenge Of Transformation*. An Inaugural Lecture, Wednesday 16 August Rhodes University Grahamstown, South Africa, pp.1 – 21.

Bell, W. (1994). The world as a Moral Community. *Society*. July/August. pp.17 – 22.

Bellamy, A. J. & McDonald, M. (2002). The Utility of Human Security: Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas and Tow. *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 33. No. 3. pp. 373 – 377.

Brown, D. (1989). Ethnic Revival: perspectives on state and society. *Third World Quarterly*. vol. 11. No.4. pp. 1 – 17.

Cabral, A. (1980). *Amilcar Cabral: Unity And Struggle*. London: Heinemann.

Cabral, A. (1998). National Liberation and Culture (return to the Source). In Chukwudi Eze edited. *African Philosophy: An Anthology*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, pp. 260 – 265.

Centre for Constitutionalism and Demilitarisation [CENCOD] (2004). Memorandum Submitted To the Presidential Committee On Control Of Violent Crimes And Illegal Weapons. *The Constitution*. Vol.4. no.2. (June), pp. 63 – 76.

Committee for the Defence of Human Rights [CDHR]. (2000). *1999 Annual Report on the Human Rights Situation In Nigeria*. Lagos: CDHR.

Diggs, B. J. (1973). The Common Good as Reason for Political Action. *Ethics*. Vol. 83. pp. 283 – 293.

Drever, J. (1955). *A Dictionary Of Psychology*. London: Penguin.

Dzobo, N. K. (1992). The Image of Man In Africa. In Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye (ed) *Person and Community: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies 1*: Washington D.C.: The Council For Research In Africa, pp. 123 – 132.

Feuchtwang, S. (2006). Between Civilizations: One Side of a Dialogue. *Social Identities*. Vol.12. no. 1. January, pp. 79 – 94.

Freire, P. & Gadotti, M. (1993). We can reinvent the world, translated by Rudolf Wiedemann. Reprinted from *Nova Escola*. ANO VIII. No. 71. Novembro. pp. 8 – 13. pp. 1 – 7.

Garcia-Bellido, J. (2000). Astrophysics and Cosmology. Paper presented at the CERN-JINR European School of High Energy Physics. pp. 1 – 78.

Gbadegesin, S. (1991). *African Philosophy, Traditional Yoruba Philosophy and Contemporary African Realities*. New York: Peter Lang.

Haines, N. (1967). Philosophy as social philosophy. *Philosophy*. Vol. xlii. no.159.

Harrison, L. E. (2000). Promoting Progressive cultural change. In Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (edited) *Culture Matters*. New York: Basic books, pp. 296 – 307.

Hoogensen, G. & Rotten, S. V. (2004). Gender Identity and the Subject of Security. *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 2. pp. 155 – 171.

Howe, S. (2004). The Death Of Arafat And The End Of National Liberation. *Open Democracy Free Thinking For The World*, pp. 1 – 5.

Idahosa, P. L. E. (2002). Going To The People: Amilcar Cabral's Materialist Theory And Practice Of Culture And Ethnicity. *Lusotopie*. 2002/2. pp. 29 – 58, pp. 1 – 30.

Jifri, F. (1997). Security and Development. *West Africa*. No. 4147. 28 April – 4 May, pp. 673 – 675.

Kaye, M. (1932). Tradition. *Philosophy*. Vol. VII. No.25. pp. 68 – 75.

Latham, E. (1956). The Group Basis of Politics: Notes for a Theory. In Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, Morris Janowitz (edited) *Political Behaviour: A Reader in Theory and Research*. Illinois: The Free press. pp. 232 – 245.

Longair, M. (2004). A Brief History of Cosmology. Carnegie Observatories Astrophysics Series Vol.2. in W. L. Freedman edited *Measuring and Modelling the Universe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1 – 18.

Lyth, D. H. (1993). Introduction to Cosmology. LANC-TH 9319, astro-ph 9312022, Lectures given at the Summer School in High Energy Physics and Cosmology ICTP (Trieste) pp. 1 – 53.

Macbeath, A. (1955). The need for a social philosophy. *Philosophy*. Vol. xxx. no. 113. pp. 99 – 111.

Mackenzie, J. S. (1963). *Outlines of Social Philosophy*, London: George Allen & Unwin

Mc Inerney, P. (1992). *Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Harper Collins.

McMullin, E. (1981). Is philosophy relevant to cosmology?. *American Philosophical Quarterly*. Vol. 18. no. 3. July. pp.177 – 189.

Moore, J. N. (1973). Law and National Security. *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 51, no. 2. (January). pp. 408 – 422.

Nielsen, K. (1973). Alienation and Self-realization. *Philosophy*. Vol. 48. pp. 21 – 33.

Nsiah-Gyabaah, K. (2002). Human security and the environment in Sub Saharan Africa: the challenge of the new millennium, in Edward

Page and Michael Redcliff edited. *Human Security and Environment*. Massachusetts: Edward Taylor. pp. 224 – 243.

Nwala, U. T. (1985). *Igbo Philosophy*. Lagos: Literamed Publications, pp. 27 – 30.

Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2004). A Relevant Education For African Development – Some Epistemological Considerations” *Africa Development*. Vol. xxix. No.1. pp. 161 – 184.

O’Connell, J. (1993). The Sources Of Morality: Function, Conformity and aesthetics, *The Heythrop Journal*. Vol. xxxiv. no. 2. pp. 160 – 170.

Odhiambo, E. S. A. (2002). The Cultural Dimensions of Development in Africa, *African Studies Review*. vol. 45, no. 3 (December). pp. 1 – 16.

Olukoshi, A. (2004). Africa And The Process Of Undevelopment: Neoliberal Globalisation And Its Social Consequences. *Pambazuka news. African voices on development and social justice*. 165, 15 July. pp. 1– 31.

Opotow, S. (2000). Denial and the Process of Moral Exclusion in Environmental Conflict, *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol.56. no.3. pp. 475 – 490.

Osundare, N. (1998). Squaring up to Africa’s Future: a Writer’s Reflection on the Predicaments of a Continent, in Olusegun Oladipo (edited) *Remaking Africa. Challenges of the Twenty-first Century*. Ibadan: Hope. pp. 228 – 235.

Omite, O. (1990) *Ethnic Pluralism and ethnicity in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Shaneson.

Perlman, J. S. (1995). *Science Without Limits*. New York: Prometheus books.

Racy R. F. (1969). The Aesthetic Experience. *The British Journal of Aesthetics*. Vol. 9. no.4.October. pp. 345 – 352.

Rudebeck, L. (2005). *Reading Cabral On Democracy*. A Paper Presented at The 11<sup>th</sup> General Assembly Of Codesria In Africa 6<sup>th</sup> To 10<sup>th</sup> December 2005, Maputo, Mozambique. pp. 1 – 12.

Saw, R. & Osbourne, H. (1961). Aesthetics as a branch of Philosophy. *The British Journal of Aesthetics*. Vol. 1. no.3. June. pp. 8 – 20.

Shivji, I. G. (2003). The Rise, The Fall And The Insurrection Of Nationalism In Africa. A Paper From A Keynote Address To The CODESRIA East African Regional Conference Held In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, October 29 – 31. pp. 1 – 14.

Sigelman, L. (1986). Politics and the Social Order in the Work of John O’Hara. *Journal of American Studies*. Vol.20. no.2. pp. 232 – 257.

Silber, J. R. (1968). Soul Politics and Political Morality. *Ethics*. Vol.79. no.1. pp. 14 – 24.

Smah, S. (2000). Social deviance on a Nigerian campus: the University of Jos Nigeria, in Yann Lebeau and Mobolaji Ogunsanya (edited) *The dilemma of postcolonial universities*. Ibadan: IFRA. pp. 123 – 143.

Solomon, H. & Mathews, S. (2002). *Civil Society, The State and Conflicts in Africa*. Addis Ababa: Development Policy Management Forum. DPMF.

Suhrke, A. (1999). Human Security and the Interests of State. *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 30. No3. pp. 265 – 276.

Wereta, S. (2007). Engaging With Maori Art And Identity: A Conversation With Maori Artists In Otepeti. MAI Review 1. Intern Research Report 9. pp. 1 – 21.

Ujomu, P. O. (2001). National Security, Social Order And The Quest For Human Dignity In Nigeria: Some Ethical Considerations. *Nordic Journal Of African Studies* Vol. 10, No.2. (November). pp. 245 – 264.

Ujomu, P. O. (2004). Citizenship and Social Order: Reflections on Plato. *Democracy and Development Journal of West African Affairs*. Volume 4. Number 1 Rain Edition pp. 11 – 30.

Virden, P. (1972). The Social Determinants of Aesthetic Styles. *The British Journal of Aesthetic Styles*. Vol.12. no.2. Spring. pp. 175 – 185.

 **Dr. Philip Ogo Ujomu**

Department of Philosophy and Religions  
Faculty of Arts  
Federal University  
Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria  
E-mail: pujomu@yahoo.com

 **Dr. Felix O. Olatunji**

Department of General Studies (Philosophy Unit)  
Ladoke Akintola  
University of Technology  
Ogbomoso, Nigeria  
E-mail: felixolatunji28@gmail.com