

**INTEGRATIVE HUMANISM AND COMPLEMENTARY REFLECTION:  
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

**By**

**Godfrey O. Ozumba  
Professor of Philosophy  
Department of Philosophy  
University of Calabar  
Nigeria  
Email: goddyozumba@yahoo.com**

**1. Introduction**

This essay has become necessary since after the presentation of Professor Asouzu's inaugural lecture titled *Ibuanyidanda: and The Philosophy of Essence*. A number of students graduate and undergraduate have accosted me to differentiate between my philosophy of integrative humanism and Asouzu's. Initially I felt there was no point embarking on such a venture because it looked trivial, inconsequential and rather accusational and instigative. I asked myself do they want to know whether I plagiarized Asouzu or is it a genuine interest to understand the dynamics of our individual thoughts.

Again, I said to myself if there is a comparison to make, it should not be me who should make it to avoid the burden of prejudice and inobjectivity. An independent scholar I thought should dispassionately examine the two positions to know the extent of similarities and dissimilarities. But on a more reflective thought, I considered that there is need for a ground clearing comparative analysis from one of the protagonists of the theories at least to provide the authorial perspective on my perception of Asouzu's theory vis a vis my philosophical position. I thought this could throw more light to prevent a blind or misconceived rendering of my objectives in the work. This essay therefore, is to provide a second mirror aside my book *The Philosophy and Method of Integrative Humanism* in piercing the soul of the author to grasp his own understanding of himself.

I must say that there are many possible interpretations or picture

that could emerge as far as this comparative analysis is concerned. The shortness of time and my inability to peruse the entire gamut of Asouzu's works may affect what I have attempted in this work. This work should therefore be seen as a ground breaker which opens the door for other comparative scholars to exercise their wits in scrutinizing these two philosophies and providing us with their opinions. What I have written is my opinion and critical judgment of my perception.

We have therefore tried to offer clarification, elucidation and analysis of the two philosophical positions. Because of the urgent and sincere desire of our students and interested public, it has become important to delineate the landscape and contours of these schools of thought in order to afford the students and inquirers the opportunity of clear thought on these positions to avoid confusion, muddling, mystification and outright misunderstanding of the aims, intentions, structure and objectives of these two theories.

To do justice to this work it is only germane that we introduce us to the reason for my theory of integrative humanism.

**2. Background to the Philosophy of Integrative Humanism**

It must be noted that philosophy is not just a casual search after knowledge or facts but a deep, consuming and passionate search after wisdom. This is what the Greeks meant by *philosophia*, that is, deep love and search after wisdom. My wandering all these years in the wilderness and outskirts of the horizon of knowledge has left my mind in deep dissatisfaction about learning by rote which characterize the learning and doing of philosophy especially in Africa. Our concerns have been how to know reality, deep things about life, about earthly existence, eternal existence and our relationship to other existent things and our environment and the planets. The question arises, what should be the relationship between man and all his inventions, discoveries and creations of science? How do things come to be? Is it mere fortuitous happenstance of the work or an intelligence nay a purposeful designer. These are some of the questions, the attempt at unraveling provided the insight of integrative humanism. Integrative humanism is therefore, the outcome of a deep, reflective brooding on the above questions and issues. Integrative humanism happens to be my own way of making meaning out of the morass of intricate and criss-crossing mass of amorphous reality with which we have to deal as philosophers.

Integrative Humanism does not deny the possibility of other equally consistent and coherent views about reality but indeed belies this truth and seeks for ways of integrating and harmonizing them with the aim of achieving higher, deeper, more profound and more comprehensive picture of reality.

For instance, it is possible to have a consistent, coherent atheistic world view about reality but the truth is that this consistency is only limited to the physical world. It does not take the cautious and wise preemptive and proactive posture of giving eternal existence the benefit of the doubt. This makes the atheistic view to err on the side of 'caution'. If eternity happens to be a reality, it leads its adherents to a grievous loss through unpreparedness. But on the other hand if at the end of the day there is no eternity, the adherents of eternal life have nothing to lose.

Using Socrates dialectical method of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, we have been able to carry out a sustained reflection on the ultimate questions of life which has led us to a deeper understanding of life and the effect of personal transformation (Stump f and Abel 4). Taking a cue from the wise sayings of the Holy writ we discover that any man who goes through life without a tincture of the life bearing messages of the scriptures will pass through this life imprisoned by his prejudices and at the end becomes a fool.

Integrativism is a cautious philosophical position that holds that it is better to err on the side of caution. We may be committing philosophical blunders if we keep relegating spiritual dimension of reality to the back of the drawers. Integrative Humanism as a philosophy was instigated by the need to debunk the view that philosophy should be concerned about the mundane and not the metaphysical, the spiritual or religious dimensions of reality. This fight was vigorously fought by the logical positivists of the 20th Century. The embers of that fight are still being stoked by some earth-bound philosophers. Be that as it may, it must be put in proper perspective that philosophy started as the search for the urstoff of all things which falls properly within the ambit of metaphysics. The basic roots are mythological and speculative. We have transcended the mythological but the scientific-rational speculative inquiry into reality still remains apposite. Philosophy is therefore a systematic inquiry into the horizons of reality with the view to fathoming its many sided dimensions. It smacks of demonism for some philosophers to decry what they call the *theologization and religionizing*

of philosophy. This is nothing but an exclusivist tendency at a prejudiced and premature barricade or partitioning of reality. The philosopher by his calling should not be selective on what aspect of reality to investigate and those not to investigate. Our mandate is the entire landscape of reality. Any attempt at limiting the philosopher's areas of concern should be straight forwardly confronted as Philistine, narrow-minded, parochial and ideologically propagandist. It is betrayal not to give philosophy and philosophers the full leverage to fulfill the mandate which it/they has/have. Integrative Humanism recognizes that reality is not only multifaceted but deep and high. Every ladder and equipment that will aid us to climb out of ignorance or what Asouzu calls "the phenomenon of Concealment" and which the Holy writ aptly captures when it says "my people are destroyed for lack of knowledge" should be fully utilized.

### **3. The Logical Foundation of Integrative Humanism**

Over the years, Western thought system has remained the dominant framework for the interpretation of theories in philosophy. By this I mean the Aristotelian paradigm of two-valued logic in which there are two shades of understanding in any rigorously constructed theory. These value assignments of truth and falsehood have come to dictate the interpretation given to any signature in Western academic circle. In reading Karl Popper, there is one fundamental condition that any hypothesis or system of hypotheses must satisfy if it is to be granted the status of a scientific law or theory that is, it must be falsifiable. An hypothesis is falsifiable if there exists a logically possible observation statement or set of observation statements that are inconsistent with it, that is, which if established as true, would falsify the hypothesis. Hence, if an hypothesis is falsifiable then it is a true scientific theory otherwise, it is not. The same Aristotelian framework goes for confirmationism. If an hypothesis fails an observational or experimental test then it is falsified but if it passes, it is said to be confirmed (a true scientific theory). The same standard applies to Lakatos' research programs and Kuhn's research paradigms. In philosophy, it is the framework of interpretation for theories in all branches but this is not the case in African Philosophy which is rooted in African thought system. According to Okeke (Forthcoming) in the treatment of his theory of ontological quadrant, African thought system is definitive of African

Logic; the later being three-valued. It is upon the foundation of African thought system rather than the western system, that my theory of integrative humanism is rested. And as such, the African three-valued logic becomes the logic of integrative humanism. It has become imperative for me to make this clarification in order to guide the reader and especially the non-African reader in interpreting the theory of integrative humanism.

In this way, Integrative Humanism maintains the following:

- i. Every theory has something to offer
- ii. No theory is rejected
- iii. All theories must not be applied simultaneously
- iv. Each theory is applied where it fits.
- v. A theory which fails in one context has another context where it passes.

The above conditions show that there is no discrimination among theories and also the primacy of African three-valued logic. Condition (v) in particular shows how context dependent truth is in African interpretation framework (see Okeke's forthcoming *Outline of African Logic*). It is in this regard that integrative humanism differs from many theories in philosophy, for it does not reject or discriminate among theories. Every theory has something to offer and every theory has a context where it works. What integrative humanism does with other theories therefore, is to, at each point, fix a round peg in a round hole and a square peg in a square hole.

In African science which rests on African thought system and operates through the instrumentality of African logic (see Okeke's forthcoming *Systems of African Science and Outline of African Logic* for detailed discussions on the nature of African science and logic) for an hypothesis to be adjudged a law or a theory of science, it must comply with the following conditions:

- i. It must be deniable which means there exists a logically possible observation statement or set of observation statements that are inconsistent with it, that is, which, if established as true, would deny the hypothesis within a given observation context.
- ii. It must be confirmed which means an hypothesis has to pass the observational or experimental test.
- iii. It must be custom-made. A given hypothesis must be true at

least in one observational or experimental context and false in another. This is the attribute of context dependence which justifies the place of the third value in African logic.

Therefore, integrative humanism in line with African three-valued logic states that in philosophy, some position statements are true (which qualify as theories) others which do not qualify as theories are false. It has to be noted that what qualify as theories of philosophy according to the standards of integrative humanism are only position statements which work at least in one organized humanist society. Position statements like "kill to get what you want" does not work in any organized humanist society so it cannot qualify for example as a theory of philosophy. But beyond this, and among the theories, each is true in some contexts where it works and false in some others where it does not work. Thus every position statement in philosophy which qualifies as a theory has something to offer and cannot be out-rightly rejected. The logical foundation of Integrative humanism does not follow the Aristotelian typology of two valued logic of either true or false but a three valued logic where the third value is undecided. It is undecided because it is the context that decides the value of the variables involved. It is important to note that Jeremy Bentham in his "A Fragment of Ontology" talks about contextual definitions but did not assign true values to them. Contextual true value is therefore unique as it admits of truth in an integrative ontology that is ever increasing in its ambience of knowledge through new revelations and discoveries. It is also important to remark that the concept of three-value which characterize African thought system is slightly different from that which has been developed in the writings of Lukasiewicz down to the present day in the history of western thought (see Okeke as above for a fuller articulation of African logical system). One common feature of the two systems is the partial falsification of the principle of non-contradiction. In western thought this has led to the development of systems as para-consistent and relevance logics while in African system, three-valued logic is the basic framework for interpreting reality and the relation existing among realities. The attitude of contradicting or rejecting one another's theories among philosophers which developed out of Aristotelian two-valued system backed by the principle of non-contradiction was what landed philosophy in a post-modern impasse

where theoretic anarchism thrives. I am of the opinion that philosophy cannot end this way, integrative humanism therefore becomes leverage out of the dead lock.

#### **4. Comparative Analysis of Integrative Humanism and Complementary Ontology**

It is germane to state here that the picture we get is dependent on the angle from where we are looking. A given position may present us with a wholly incompatible picture but from some other positions we may see more similarities than dissimilarities. Let us first look at some very obvious similarities:

##### **Similarities**

It is easy to spot the following similarities even at a cursory examination of the two theories. It is obvious that both views are concerned with some moral question. That is, how do we tackle the problem of self interest, self centeredness, ambivalence of human interest and the achievement of the common good. Again, both theories seek to achieve a more comprehensive view of reality through complementation and integration. Both integrative Humanism and complementary ontology are against the view of Stegmuller (Asouzu inaugural, 20) that metaphysics is the grand mother of all obscurities causing trouble in the house of science. Both acquiesce to the importance of metaphysics in inducing scientific progress. Both complementary reflection and integrative humanism are theories seeking transcendence of knowledge, that is, to say that future knowledge must aspire to transcend present knowledge in scope and quality. There is also the likelihood that their Igbo background is partly responsible for this close formal affinity. The African ontology tries to see things as part of the integrated organic whole.

It is argued that the similarity we see in the 'formal' component of both theories is symptomatic of African ontological perspective. The primordial perception of reality by the African is derived from the ontological constitution of all things in an integrated mesh of Mundanity and spirituality. The African chief priest for instance was both a religious leader and a medical practitioner. Sickness is seen as the consequence of a breach of either the laws of the gods (spiritual) or the laws of Hygiene (physical) or both. The African saw man as a tripartite being that carries

the physical, psychological and spiritual components of reality. We may say that somehow Asouzu's complementary ontology, Ozumba's integrative humanism, Tempel's Vital force as expressed in Bantu-Rwandaise philosophy and Mbiti's perception of the African as being through and through religious and the apothegm that "I am" because "we are" (the individual finds significance within the community) are all variants of resources drawn from Africa's rich culture which is anchored on communalism. If we pursue the background, we have this picture.

In the traditional Igbo society the people kept the laws, ordinances, sacred rules, customs and traditions of the people designated as "Nso Ana". Nso Ana constitutes the totality of dos and don'ts that regulate human behaviour and actions as they relate to the land. Land is the symbol of life, power, link with the gods and the Almighty God. Land is the harbinger of fertility for fruitfulness in terms of production of offsprings and productive fruitfulness of crops and fruit bearing trees. When the crops fail to yield then something must have gone wrong between man and the god(s) responsible for fertility. This means that there will be need to appease the gods.

Though in the African reality scheme, they did not understand the full complexity of the human person. However, they knew that man was tripartite and this necessitated healing through appeasing the gods (spiritual). Healing through folk tales, jokes, festivals, music, dances, ceremonies, hilarities and conversations that excite laughter – jesters are valued (because they understood that laughter is the medicine of the soul). These provide psychological healing, then we have the physical healing which may still be a consequence of an evil done or transgression of the law of the land. The bone menders, the herbalists, the witch doctors all play their role in physical healing of patients.

Many wonder why things have changed so substantially today. The truth remains that, in God's dispensationalism, He has restructured reality to suit the redemptive role of Jesus Christ. We now have options of serving God through Christ or serving the elemental spirits that populate the earth. When one gives his life through repentance, God takes care of his spiritual ailments as he/she prays and lives in accordance with the word of God. This is a more ennobling path because it charts a course of greater certainty through the word of God. But the continuing disobedience of man and his reveling in pervasion of all natural order has given rise to a second order of God's dealing with man. This has

necessitated the need for the medical and Para-medical professions to take care of man's health needs. God only intervenes today within the limits of His prerogative of mercy and discretion. Those who want to function within the province of God's perfect will need to live their lives in accordance to His divine laws. Those who want to dwell and operate within the purview of his permissive will also have a corresponding treatment from God. God considers us depending on how we esteem Him. Those who esteem Him highly, He also holds in high esteem. Those who despise Him, He also despises. An integrative posture is the most suitable in understanding reality from the angles of God, man and nature.

### **Dissimilarities**

Permit me to say that the similarities highlighted in the foregoing are more formal than substantial. Integrative humanism differs from complementary ontology in being biblio-centric, ratio-spirito-centric; in seeing man as a being unto eternity, seeks man's earthly and eternal good and is concerned with aggregating the best in being in order to ensure man's earthly and eternal bliss. Also, it looks at man as a tripartite being and insists that he should be studied as such and all things should be studied in relation to how they conduce or detract from man's eternal good, it is opposed to a one-dimensional approach to reality. It accepts the existence of absolute truth and the view that integrated circuitry of all knowledge holds the secret to achieving the mundane and eternal good of man. It holds that all methods in philosophy are potential integrals in the achievement of progressive philosophical holism. The good should be threshed out in a given context and made to harmonize with the momentary holism of discourse. The bad in one integrated holism may be useful in another. Nothing is discarded with finality. Integrative humanism is a philosophy consciously articulated to transcend (but not obliterate the gains of) postmodernism. It cannot be said that complementary reflection is concerned about the issues raised above.

Philosophy is all about articulating reality from different conceptual schemes according to Donald Davidson. Integrative Humanism is a secular cum spiritual conceptual scheme which harps on the richness of compulsory integration of the secular and the spiritual in all our philosophical endeavours.

### **5. Conceptual Differences Between Complementary Ontology and Integrative Humanism**

Basic concepts and phrases in complimentary ontology include:

Human interest, self interest, Human ambivalent situations, ontological legitimacy, Ibuanyidanda, Transcendent complementary unity of consciousness, Joy of being, the idea of missing link, the common good, mutual complementarity, complementarism, complementation, relationship of parts to the whole, multidimensionality, harmonious complementarity, ibuaru, (philosophical, burden), 'Ima-onwe-onye' (being in control), the phenomenon of unintended ethnocentric commitment, the phenomenon of concealment (Ihe mkpuchi anya), ethnocentric mind set, Ikwa ogwe (bridge building), complementary rationality, false consciousness, heuristic principle of African ethics, confidence building, world immanentism, Ethnocentric reduction and impositions, triadic forgetfulness, noetic propaedeutic, the unity of the subject matter of philosophy, being as complementary mediated immediacy, super maxim, etc.

Whereas in Ozumba's integrative humanism, the following concepts and phrases are important in understanding what his philosophy is all about namely: To humanize, secular humanism, new humanism, integration, Micro circuit, integrated circuit, integers, integrands, integrator, philosophical holism, ontological relativity, background theory, cultural integration, Evolutionism, creationism, transcendentalism, immanentism, eschatology, revelation, pragmatism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, postmodernism, existentialism, ratio-spiritocentricism, agglutininism, eclecticism, anatomization of reality, analysis for synthesis, networking of ideas, 'comprehending', bibliocentricism, regeneration, coherentism, etc.

A survey of the concepts that feature in both philosophies will conceptually delineate the navigational ambience of the two inquirers. It is therefore important that the students of integrativism and complementary reflection understand these concepts and their nuances in terms of conception and application. Nothing hinders a cross pollination and fertilization of these ideas like improper understanding of concepts and their contextual meanings. A further project in complementation is not ruled out but it is important that we keep the objectives of these theories in focus as we employ them in our search for greener philosophical pastures. Further comparative studies are enjoined to compare the use

and meaning of the concepts in the different philosophical frameworks. These methods and approaches should be used to enrich our study of African philosophy. In the spirit of integrative humanism, I advocated in my article entitled “The Spirit of Contemporary African Philosophy: An Integrative Humanist Approach” that African philosophy should be based on the following World Communalism, objective globalization, extended family and brotherhood. It is hoped that when this is done, the world will become a better place for all and sundry and pave way for our eventual transition from a glorious earthly existence to a more glorious heavenly existence.

#### **6. On the Concepts of Being and Missing Links**

As Asouzu has rightly pointed out in his book *Ibuanyidanda New Complementary Ontology*. Beyond World Immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and Imposition, that the conceptualization of being is an important starting point of every philosophy that is worth the name. As he says “all matters of ontology begin with providing the enabling horizon within which the idea of being can be creditably articulated (10). For the new complementary ontology, to be, is the capacity to be in mutual complementary relationship with all things that exist. The idea of being is captured as the moment of mutual intrinsic complementary relationship in service of all existent realities. It is an attempt to transcend the idea of trying to bifurcate being into being and non being or seeing being as indefinable. Being becomes a continuous conceptualization of what momentarily is and all other things that may not be immediately seen but which serve as a missing link for all things that exist. For Asouzu, non-being will mean to be alone and to be, is to be in complementary relationship with others (*kaso mu adina*) – Hence, leads to the position that anything that exists serves a missing link of reality (10-11).

This analysis does not take care of the things that do not exist now but can come into existence in future or those things whose existence are only a potentiality. Do they also serve as missing links? Ozumba on the other hand in his conception of being articulates being from three levels; absolute, relative-pragmatic, potential-revelational. Absolute being is conceived in two ways – The absolute Being God which encapsulates all things in one sense, Immanent and transcendent in

another sense and wholly independent in another sense depending on the motif behind the conceptualization. The second level is being understood from the point of view of human based knowledge, that is, relativism and pragmatism. These will include linguistic being, ideational being, abstract conceptualized being, scientific being and experimental (conjectural being) ideas in the mind of the conjecturer which are necessary for the articulation of a relative but progressive truth. The final conception of being is called revelational or potential being. The Bible says that secret things belong to God but revealed things belong to man. There are truths that are hidden in the scriptures which can be revealed to us as we study the word of God. Introducing Asouzu's phenomenon of concealment (*Ihe mkpu chi anya*) is germane here. At times sin covers our eyes from seeing and knowing the truth but through salvation, the scales fall from our eyes and we begin to see. There are, also dispensational revelation which God gives us at appropriate times. The truth of the rapture of the saints was not revealed until the advent of Paul the Apostle on the evangelical scene. The mystery of the catching away and sudden change of the saints at the rapture was revealed to him (see 1 Thessalonians 4: 13-17; 1 Cor. 15: 51-53). This new revelation provides us with a new ambience of ontology (being and existence).

In Integrative Humanism therefore we explore the above three dimensions of being in articulating reality and in prospecting for insights that will enrich our knowledge so as to increase our horizons of possibilities and further distance us from myopism and conventionalism. Metaphysics via ontology sets the frame work and the scope of inquiry. It cannot therefore be true that Asouzu and Ozumba are saying exactly the same thing, their undeniable similarities notwithstanding.

For Asouzu, the concept of missing link of reality entails his concept of being. He uses the expression anything that has head and tail-end that is, (*Ihe di, nwere isi na odu*). This means for him that everything that exists is not only a missing link but serves a missing link in the sense of complementarity. For me, this is understood as meaning that every discrete existent being, is incomplete in itself and for-itself but stands in need of complementation by others or stands as what others need to complete themselves or the whole.

Asouzu is a bit ambiguous in his use of 'whole' as it applies to being and 'individual' as it applies to being. In one stretch, it seems that the individual thing – (*ka som di*) to be alone, does not constitute being

but only individual in complementary relationship with other individuals can constitute being (ka som adina). If this is Asouzu's meaning, then, it is at variance with my position as it relates to being and missing link. In integrative humanism we hold that individual things constitute being, of and by themselves. But we stress that there is a larger comprehensive view of reality in view of which the individuals become missing links. Apart from the above we also talk of reality from the point of view of holisms, that is, complete disparate micro-systems. Since we may never arrive at the complete and full picture of reality or may not know when we reach the full picture, a pragmatic landscaping of reality in micro-holism may end up in utilizing our electronic insight of micro-processors and arranging our transistors, resistors and capacitors on the ontological substrate with a view to achieving an integrated ontological circuitry that provides a more comprehensive view of reality. Missing links are, therefore, in hierarchies – individuals, holistic systems and other possible conjectures that may be known in future. The appeal of integrative Humanism is that man being at the centre of God's creation should always be the focal point in every research. For example, the Environmental Sciences, the Engineering Sciences, Astronomical Sciences, all must be done to enhance and improve on man's chances of enjoying a blissful earthly existence that will enhance (through knowledge) his chances of continuing his blissful existence in the hereafter.

There is no doubt that when both integrative humanism and complementary reflection are understood, then, they will be seen as throwing light on each other to afford better understanding. As we integrate both theories, we appreciate the better, the beauty of complementary reflection and the need for integrative humanism (That is, the need to go beyond complementary reflection to integrative humanism. Both theories are therefore mutually illuminating, complementary, bridge-building and cross fertilizing. They appear to stem from the same recesses of worry and fears about the future of man and philosophy as twin subject matters that are at the verge of being endangered; man has become wolf to man, and to himself. Integrative Humanism and complementary reflection are set on a rescue mission to salvage these twin concerns of our age.

Integrative Humanism attempts the integration of Udo Etuk's New Humanism with secular Humanism on one hand while on the other

hand prospecting for a rigorous and more systematic transcendence from post-modernism to the era of integrative humanism. Asouzu and Ozumba's perception of reality are different bridges into the wide expanse of reality which the philosopher is called to explore. In the words of Asouzu, "Ikwa Ogwe" means building a bridge and when a thinker or a scientist embarks on such a strenuous exercise as to craft a unique bridge through which he seeks to embrace reality; we say of such a person "ona akwa ogwe". That means that such a person is embarking on the art of providing a system and a method as bridge needed to connect thinking subjects to reality. This insight is important because it highlights the necessity of noting that no two persons can see reality exactly the same way for the following reasons (1) Reality is massive (2) All of reality is not open to public inspection (3) Human beings are different spiritually, ideologically, morally, culturally, by education, in preferences, research interest and scholarship. Biographical and authorial differences and all these impinge and determine author's or a scholar's perception. There may be similarities and meeting points but at the long run and in terms of emphasis, style, scope, depth and priority, the authors may not share sameness in all things. It is not a crime though to have two scholars exercise their thoughts on the same subject matter. We had the case of Bertrand Russell and Gottfried Leibniz who each worked on the infinitesimal calculus without any intercommunication at different periods and locations. Though Asouzu's complementary reflection was unveiled in 2004 in his book *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection: In and beyond African Philosophy*, I had not had time to read the contents of his works until a few days to the delivery of his inaugural lecture in 2011. My theory of integrative humanism was hatched and matured in the University of Cape Coast where I spent my 2008/2009 Sabbatical leave. Those who have read my book have come to me pointing out that my integrative humanism and Asouzu's complementary reflection constitute one and the same theory, it is this revelation that set me into this research of establishing through comparative analysis the extent to which the assertion is true. Were the assertion true that will be another case to prove the mutual telepathic congruence of human thinking as was seen in the case of Russell and Leibniz. There is no doubt that the research has unraveled many areas of similarities and differences but the differences are somewhat strategic, that, it will be wrong to see them as one and the same theory.

However, we can achieve a wider intellectual horizon by harmonizing the two theories which share in the main the objective of prescribing ways of overcoming the existential predicaments that confront man in his existence. Though the routes taken by both theories may be different, the import of transculturalism, complementation, integrativism, transcendence can be harnessed to achieve a richer philosophical ambience.

Apart from the above, Asouzu in his inaugural lecture states that “complementary reflection is a philosophical theory geared towards mutual and harmonious coexistence of entities and systems, captured in the concept of 'Ibuanidanda'". This he says answers the ontic-ontological question of how man can attain “the joy of being”. Integrative Humanism contrary to Asouzu's position contends that there can be no 'joy of being' without:

- (1) Understanding the nature of man
- (2) The real purpose for his creation
- (3) The ultimate destiny and destination of man and
- (4) The modus operandi of achieving a blissful ultimate purpose.

Integrative Humanism sees man as a being in existential motion transiting from earth to eternity. Asouzu's complementary reflection creates the burden (Ibuanidanda) of dropping off man (Dasein) at a juncture still far away from his real destination while thinking that that will conduce to man's 'joy of being'. Integrative Humanism is therefore a reflective reflection on the heavy burden with which the deceived man is left at the inconvenient corner of the roadside. Integrative Humanism is like a public spirited cab driver who lifts the abandoned wayfarer from his entangled thicket to the real destination of the “Joy of Life” which is eternal bliss.

We can say that integrative Humanism may be seen as providing a bridge for the perfection of Asouzu's complementary reflection. Asouzu's Ibuanidanda is a wholly communitarian, mundane and metaphysical, construct which promises joyful existence through collective effort in harnessing human interests for the common human good. It however lacks the divine impetus to drive the engine of joyful existence. Man without the touch of the grace of God is incapable of collective upliftment and even when it does, is incapable of sustaining it. The spiritocentric dimension of integrativism is what is needed to consummate Asouzu's ingenious thought experiment.

The high point of the distinction between Integrative Humanism and Complementary ontology can be found in the definitional meaning of the key component words namely: 'Integrative' and 'complementary'. The word integrative implies intimate unification of two or more elements in harmonious symmetricism on the other hand 'complementary' connotes support and cooperation with or without symmetricism but in the harmony of component units. The difference is that in integration the integrating units shelve and melt their boundaries in order to be assimilated into each other. While in complementarity, the boundaries need not be robbed off, all that is needed is identification with complementing units for the purpose of performing a task or fulfilling a function. 'Integration' is like marriage, there is sifting and blending. In complementarity there is coming together with each retaining its uniqueness, while contributing to the efficiency of the whole.

To integrate is to fit parts together to form a whole – in the social sphere it means to end racial segregation. While integration is opposed to differentiation, complementarity is not. We are talking about definite indefinite integration, this means integrated micro holism in an ongoing indefinite integrated holism stretching out into a macro-holism. (Chambers Encyclopedic English Dictionary, 647). To complement means to complete or perfect. It means to provide needed balance or contrast. It implies a participation in an effort to overcome obstacles.

## **7. Methodological Differences**

Methodological differences abound in the procedural approach adopted by both theories. The methodological procedure for integrative humanism entails the assimilation of other relevant methods of philosophy in its bid to achieve the desired goal of enhancement of knowledge and better solution to a problem at hand. Integrative humanism is against cleaving or partitioning of theories. It strives to do away with the divisiveness that have characterized the growth of philosophy. This is why it adopts the method of analysis for synthesis. It analysis problems/issues and then discerns the methodological arsenals which need to be synthesized (integrated) for the achievement of the desired result. It is not very clear to me how the method of complementary ontology is to be applied. I guess it has to do with adhoc enlisting of other theories to gain strength in tackling a given problem without our attempt to assimilate those other theories for an ongoing

deeper and wider understanding of the depths and heights of reality.

This methodological differences are expressed in the linguistic differences as indicated earlier. The linguistic appurtenance/repertoire determines the range and scope of what the theories do.

Integrative Humanism Is a philosophy of essence. It seeks to reach the core of any existential issue from the humanistic, scientific and revelational stand points. What is considered real and true are seen only from the point of view of an integrative outcome of the analysis of ideas from the humanistic, scientific and revelational insights. The real essence is the overbearing purpose in relation to earthly and eternal goodness. Anything that does not serve earthly and/or eternal purpose has no essence.

Professor Asouzu in his own uses the expression philosophy of essence in a broader sense to designate any attempt to understand and relate to reality after the mindset of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. It is the attempt to relate to the world in a disjointed, disharmonious, exclusivist, polarizing mode as to negate the mutual complementary interrelatedness between all existent realities.

This makes Asouzu to see "philosophy of essence" as given in extreme forms of existentialism, idealism, realism, positivism, relativism, absolutism, Afrocentricism, Eurocentricism, rationalism, empiricism, etc. He believes that each of these taken alone will be guilty of what he calls "unintended ethnocentric commitment". His philosophy of essence therefore is in contradistinction with Aristotle's idea of essence which carries with it the import of the superior against inferior, substance against attribute/accident. Both substance and accident serve as missing links in complementary ontology (16-17).

For integrative humanism the essence is the product of an integrative analysis threshed out on the altar of bibliocentricism to ensure man's ultimate bliss. Like Paul the Apostle, we aver that if it is only in this life we have hope in Jesus Christ, we are of all men most miserable (1 Cor 15:19). There is nothing wrong with each researcher viewing the world from their vantage position. All will be wrong if such a researcher resists integrating his views, findings with other views that may lend more insight into the truth which he professes to seek. A hundred flowers can bloom but after that there must be synthesis to harness the kernel of these views into an integrative truth that available insight can yield. This "truest integrative truth" becomes the

consensual-absolute truth which should guide our perception of reality. This means that integrative humanism does not disregard (debunk) Aristotle's philosophy of essence, but redefines it to fit into the integrative framework. Both integrative humanism and complementary reflection will view as irrationalism any philosophy of essence that pays undue attention to only one aspect of reality. We have laboured assiduously in this work to avoid any rancorous comparative analysis. Analysis should be done with the view to exposing the strengths and weaknesses of theories, provide support to the weaknesses in order to strengthen them. This is why I see integrative humanism as a "complementarity of complementarities". And must be properly aligned to explore and harness the strength of complementary ontology to fortify itself.

As Asouzu says in his *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection*, as a meta-theoretical approach to reality, complementary reflection serves as a critique of science, ideology, any world view of philosophy that seeks to make valid statements about the conditions for the attainment of human happiness, about reality in general and human action in society in particular (270).

African philosophy in a complementary perspective is the systematic ambient methodological reflection about reality with the aim of explaining and understanding reality authentically in a way that portray the totality of the factors and actors that influence the thinking of the philosopher involved (276).

The question is, how do we get all the actors and factors constitutive of being towards the emergence of the true and authentic nature of reality, that is if being is seen as the unifying foundation of all existent realities outside of which nothing can be thought (272). It aims at the resolution of conflicts of interests to achieve joy to human action. To seek to reach being as independent of the disparate individual beings will be difficult to achieve. Except he refers as I do to the final unification of all beings in the eternal essence of all beings, in the Being of beings.

Asouzu's Ibuanyidanda is immersed in sociology, metaphysics, African philosophy and morality while Ozumba's integrative Humanism is coming from principles in electronics, mathematics, sociology, metaphysics, epistemology, morality, religion and science.

**8. Conclusion**

From the survey and comparative analysis we have carried out, it is clear that Asouzu's complementary reflection and Ozumba's integrative humanism are different bridges crafted for the purpose of articulating reality from their different perspectival background language. Discerned similarities are contiguous to the socio-political and economic situations in which they both operate and the African indigenous perspective from which they draw. But clear differences from the ideological, spiritual, methodological, linguistic, intellectual and systemic trajectory are discernible and obvious. It should be commended that both scholars have offered their sincere contribution to the growth of philosophy in general and African philosophy in particular.

**Works Cited**

- Allen, Robert. Chambers Encyclopedic English Dictionary. Edinburgh: Chamber Publishers, 1994
- Asouzu, Innocent I. Ibaru. The Heavy Burden of philosophy, Beyond African Philosophy. New Brunswick: Transaction publishers, 2007.
- . . . The method and Principles of Complementary Reflection In and beyond African Philosophy. Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2009.
- . . . Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of Human Interest. The Nigerian Paradox in a complementary perspective. Calabar: Calabar University Press, 2004.
- . . . Ibunyanidanda: New complementary Ontology; Beyond world-Immanentism, Ethnocentric Reduction and impositions. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers 2007.
- . . . IKWA OGWE: Essential Readings in Complementary Reflection: A Systematic Methodological Approach. Calabar: Saesprint Publishers, 2007

Bentham, J. "A Fragment of Ontology" in The Works of Jeremy Bentham, New York: Russell Pub Inc. 1962.

Burr, John R. and Goldinger Milton. Philosophy and Contemporary issues. New Delh: Prentice Hall of India, 2008.

Mistchell, Helen Buss. Roots of Wisdom: A Tapestry of philosophical Traditions. Boston: Wadsworth Publishers, 2011 (edition)

Okeke, Jonathan. Outline of African Logic and Numeric System Forthcoming

. . . Systems of African Science Forthcoming

Ozumba, Godfrey O. "The Spirit of contemporary African Philosophy" in Colloquium on African Philosophy Vol. I Calabar: Pyramid publishers, 2003.

. . . Philosophy and Method of Integrative Humanism. Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers, 2010.