

Re-thinking shaming Practices in African [Igbo] Traditional Society as a Viable Option for Maintaining Justice, Social Integration and Moral Development in Modern Africa

Dr. Kingsley Okoro

Department of Philosophy and Religion
Ebonyi State University
Abakaliki-Nigeria

Abstract

The history of crime dates back to historical antiquity and this is an outgrowth of human capriciousness and avarice, which made everyone an atom and a law unto himself in the social order. This situation hinders human mutuality and cooperation which is needed for human survival, development and progress. Guided by reason, man had to notch out norms/ laws that will guide human relationship and maintain social justice. These rules have been notched with their consequences. The technical name for the consequences is “Shaming” Shaming practices vary according to the degree of offence and in relations to time and context. While some shaming practices involve capital punishment others involve reprimanding, which may include the incarceration of the offender in prison and subsequent parole. However, the overall aim of shaming is social cleansing of the society that has been desecrated by the criminal act. Nevertheless, this paper notes that the present shaming model is alien to African [Igbo] culture and as such have failed to achieve its purpose. Therefore, it begins a re-thinking of an indigenous shaming model that allies with African culture as to bring about the positive social effect of shaming ideality in the society and this is the resocialization and reintegration of the offender into the society after a period of shaming ritual. Using the socio-anthropological method, this paper underscores the if African [Igbo] indigenous shaming model is adopted as a means of adjudicating social justice in the modern era our dream of crime free African society shall soon be realized.

INTRODUCTION

The ideal state is a crime-free-world. This is a world or social system that promotes common humanity, where no one is victimized or discriminated against. It is a state or social system in which social justice is maintained and human rights honoured. However, this state of nature in which everyone seeks the interest of the other and maintains common brotherhood has been an illusion or a mere day dreaming from history. Thus selfishness, competition, avarice and crime have become the defining paradigm of human relationship in the modern era. This gave vent to Hobbes description of the state of nature in modern literature thus, “Life in the state of nature is solitary, nasty, and short....It is a state of war of all against all” [Okoro an Osunwokeh 2014: 3045-3067 see also Leviathan Chapter XIII-XIV] George and Thomas [1973] expanded on this Hobbesian ideality when they note that such condition, so long as there is no civil power to regulate their behaviours is a war of everyman against everyman and such condition is inconsistent with any kind of civilization. In this state, there is no industry, navigation, cultivation of soil, building, art or letter....Equally there is no wrong or right, justice or injustice, since the rule of life is only that to be everyman’s that he can get and for so long he can keep it [429].

Then in order to check this irksome state of man in nature and institute a humane society, different societies and cultures developed norms, rules and laws that defined their vision of an ordered society and stipulates penalties for any breach of such social norms. The basic notion that informed the stipulations of social norms or laws in any given society is that people are more likely to commit crime or behave defiantly at any slightest opportunity. Braithwaite [1989] justified this assumption when he avers that, "Individuals are naturally drawn to commit criminal act for personal gains and hedonistic pleasure" [42]. Therefore, the need to introduce checking mechanism and this resulted to laws/rules and or norms and their consequences. It is the consequences of violating the rules, laws and or norm that became known as shaming practice in history.

In this regard, Chad, Brain and Emily [2015] enunciate that the issue of public shaming as a moral and integrative practice among various cultures of the world dates back into pre-historical period though their methods vary from culture to culture [1-8]. Making particular reference to shaming culture in the United States of America, they note thus:

The issue of public shaming is not new to the society. In history of the United States, the government has publicly punished criminals by stoning, public hanging and witch trials. Centuries ago, women, who committed adultery in the Puritan communities were forced to wear red letter "A" as a symbol of their infidelity. Similarly, during the world war 11, the Jews were forced to wear gold star [1-8].

Okoro [2014] also observes that in Thomas Moore Utopian Island that there is the practice of public shaming. He thus enunciates that in the Utopian state, slavery is allowed and every household is permitted by law to have two slaves, while the slaves were either Utopian criminals or foreigners. Here the Utopian criminal were weighed down with chains of gold, gold being part of the state wealth and faltering criminals with it gives the citizens a grave dislike for it. It also makes it difficult to be stolen since it is always in the public view [332-344].

With these examples, it therefore became evident that shaming practices began in the dateless past, thus it was and is still part of the social emotion. Hence, Scheff [2015] relating shaming practice to social emotions underscores that emotions has long been recognized in the field of sociology and perhaps anthropology as crucially important in the development of the moral values of any society. In his own words:

Many sociological theorists have at least implied that emotions are a powerful force in the structure and change in the societies. Although Webber did not refer to emotions directly, his emphasis on values as the foundation of social structure implies it, since values are emotionally charged belief. Durkheim was explicit about the roles of emotions...he strongly implicated emotions and collective sentiment in the creation of solidarity through moral community [1-18].

Accepting that shame and shaming is an essential part of social emotion, Julien, Raffaele and Fabrice [2012] opine, "social conception of shame' makes shame an essentially social emotion requiring the actual or imagined pressure of others in order to occur" [268].

However, it is important that we observe that shaming practice has taken different dimensions with the passage of time and evolution of culture/human history. The reforms that the practice have undergone within the centuries may have been informed by several factors, which may

include but not limited to time and social context. The changes may not be clearly defined with one single category, hence we note that in some modern cases the shaming practice may even be more stringent than in the past century and at time it may be more relaxed than in the former period. Massaro [2008] made an apt observation of these dynamism in the administration of shaming practice within certain historical epoch as he writes:

On October 26, 1989, a Rhode Island Superior court Judge ordered Stephen J Germershausen to place the following 4.6 inches ad with his picture in the providence Journal-Bulletin, "I am Stephen Germershausen. I am 29 years... I was convicted of child molestation...if you are a child molester, get professional help immediately, or you may find your picture and name in the paper and your life under the control of the state" [1-9]

Massaro further notes the changing nature of shaming practice by observing that Stephen of our example above would have suffered more grievous punishment in the early period of human history, like capital punishment. He also notes that within the late middle age, Stephen would have been nailed by both ears to a pillory and then whipped about twenty times or alternatively, he would have been placed on a stock and forced to apologize and also pay financial restitution or even face banishment of exiled from the United States [1-9].

Notably, Stephen's public sentence was part of the modest trend in the criminal justice system. Following from this recent trends, several Judges in the United States have required deviants to apologize publicly to their victims or wear signs listing their offences [see Massaro 2008:1-9]. Actually, these new trends of shame and shaming practices are noted to be throwback on the pre-colonial type of punishments, more especially in African and most indigenous cultures of the world. Thus the import of re-visiting this old method for the modern Africans is an outgrowth of the general experience that the modern or conventional method of prison and parole is becoming increasing frustrating as they do not achieve their targeted result of reforming the deviant persons. Against this backdrop Massaro [2008] writes, "Prison overcrowding, as well as recurring doubts about the appropriateness and the effectiveness of incarceration, make imprisonment seem infeasible, unduly harsh or otherwise unacceptable in some cases" [1-9].

Therefore against the background of the inefficient/ineffectiveness of the conventional system of shaming practice-prison method-of handling deviant behaviours in modern African, which is also alien to the people and their culture, we propose a return to the traditional method. The traditional African [Igbo] method of shaming practice is a major factor in handling criminal justice in Igbo traditional society. Notably, Igbo traditional shaming method is sensational, most effective and inexpensive in the adjudication of criminal law system even in the modern times. This system exploits in a dramatic and explicit form the link between people's sense of shame and their tendency to observe legal norms [Massaro 2008:1-9]]. Therefore, we suggest that if the African [Igbo] traditional shaming practice is adopted as a means of handling deviant cases that the dream of making our modern African society a crime free world will soon be achieved.

SHAME, SHAMING AND COGNATE CONCEPTS IN PERSPECTIVE

Shame and shaming practices are tied to the concept of crime in modern literature. Here crime and criminal acts are weighed against the backdrop of moral contents of any given society. What is considered a crime or criminal is not as such criminal because it is illegal rather

because it violates the shared values/norms of a particular society. Actions therefore are considered criminal on the basis of its acceptability or rejection in any cultural milieu/society. On the basis of this epistemology, criminal activities have taken their bearing and definitions in relation to shame and shaming practices Thus Barnard [1996] defines shame as a powerful emotions [1-14] and Karp [2015] avers that shame is a powerful tool in ensuring normative compliance as it has become so central in the theories of restorative justice and informal control [1-26]. In the same vein, Tangney, Tuewig and Hafex [2012] consider shame as being more painful and disruptive emotions as its central concern is one's self not one's action [1-20]

Taking his cue from a psychological insight, Braithwaite [1989] maintains that shame is the ultimate deterrence against the violation of societal norms, for those who have an interest in the community and community living. On this note, Braithwaite goes on to make a clear distinction between two forms of shame and shaming practice in history. His differentiation model took the lines of stigmatization and reintegration as the centre point of shaming practices. He maintains that any shaming practice in history whether ancient or modern must be located within the ambience of any of the two models. According to him, the re-integrative shaming model is anchored on ceremonies by which the deviant is offered the opportunity to denounce the deviant behaviours or the crime he/she had committed. In this model of shaming, the community as a whole are offered the opportunity also to express their disapproval of the crime [100-101]. Here shaming practice is followed up by an effort to re-socialize the deviant back to the community of law abiding/respectable citizens through the manifest practice of forgiveness [see Braithwaite, 1989 100-101]. Through this ceremonial rites/rituals, the offender is purified and as such seen no longer as a criminal as the ritual offers him/her the opportunity of taking a symbolic rebirth and as such accepted in the community not as a forgiven criminal but as though he never committed any crime in the first instance [see Braithwaite 1989:100-101]. However, Braithwaite [1989] further underscores that describing shaming practice as integrative does not denote that it is 'soft' and 'easy' on the deviant rather it is the overall aim that makes it integrative rather than disjunctive. Here integrative shaming is done in love and in caring, though it could still be degrading, cruel and punishing. Hence the difference between integrative and disintegrative shaming practices is not based on the quality of the shaming practice but on the aim and in the process. While the disjunctive shaming emphasizes the evil of the deviant, the integrative shaming practice acknowledges the act as evil done by a person who is not inherently evil/bad. Hence the ideality of reconciliation as the centre point of integrative shaming in most cultures and societies [see Braithwaite 1989:100-101].

According to the same author, stigmatizing model of shaming takes very strong rebuttal rejection on the offender. In his own words:

Shaming that is disintegrative or stigmatizing occurs when the act and the actor are denounced as unworthy of the community. There is no effort to re-integrate the offender and he/she is rejected by the community. This model is exemplified in the traditional [modern] criminal justice system by the court and sentencing process. Here the offender is stigmatized by his/her conviction and literally as well as the symbolically, sent away from community to prison [Braithwaite 1994:139-171]

It therefore suffices that under the disintegrative model of shaming, the criminal/deviant is ostracized, isolated and humiliated. The goal of this model is to punish the person by instilling feelings similar to what would be considered shame [see Tangney, Tuewing and Hafex 2012:706-723]. Overtly, disintegrative shaming are practices and policies that focus on the

individual. Here there is no consideration for the bestowal of forgiveness. Its main goal is to punish the person without regard to the socio-psychological effects on the individual and his/her family members. Disintegrative shaming does not have a human face in all its process and adjudication.

Against this backdrop, Bear, Uribe-Zerain, Maiming and Shiomi [2009] observe a direct link between shame and the tendencies to externalize blame, anger and consequently maintain that both the dispositional and the state levels among individuals of all ages the proneness to shame is related to anger, hostility, and the propensity to blame others [229-238]. In the direction, Sandrine and Martin [2010] opine that both formal and informal ritual/ceremonies that shame a person, degrade his/her status or expel him/her from group membership is a universal practice whether in subsistence or industrial culture [97-110]. Hence shaming serves as a deterrence against the violation of social/societal norms.

Therefore, Baker [2003] generally describes shame as painful emotions caused by consciousness of guilt, short coming or impropriety [1-7]. Accordingly, Scheff [1998] asserts that shame is the most important emotion that pervades all social encounter. In his own words, 'A deference-emotion system in which conformity to exterior norms is rewarded by deference and feeling of pride and nonconformity is punished by lack of deference and feeling of shame' [405]. Karp [2015] explicates more on the social dimensions of shame and shaming practices when he opines that the self is inherently social and this social identity is reinforced as, 'knowledge of the individual or rather the consciousness of a person that he belongs to certain social group together with the same emotions and value significance of this group membership[1-26]. The implication of Karp's assumption above is that human beings are gregarious as result of their being social creatures. Consequently, they regard their sense of belongingness or community living as very important and their parameter of social acceptability. Therefore, any threat of rejection by others within the same community is essentially a threat to their identity and self-worth. This ideology is occasioned by the fact that social recognition reinforces one's sense of humanity [belongingness] and one's sense of pride.

On the scores of the foregoing discussion Karp [2015] states that it is a faulty thinking to believe that people obey the social norms/laws primarily because they agree with the intent of the norms/law and perhaps may not wish to violate it because to do so would tantamount to the violation of their conscience [1-26]. He however notes further that people do not break laws/rules because they believe their action to be wrong and would feel guilty if they did. Noting that conscience is fallible, he situates that no society that pursue order, social control and the regulation of criminal activities will depend on individual conscience to achieve it. Here the society most often depends on the scheme that creates the social conscience for the maintenance of order in the social system and this scheme is technically known as shame.

Relating shame to guilt as a cognate concept, Kahan [1996] maintains that guilt is an emotional expression following the violation of internalized moral codes [593]. In this direction Jennifer [2015] asserts that guilt is a valuable emotions, though only felt by individuals and as such motivates only individual. On the one hand, guilt is triggered by an existing value within an individual, thus if there is no existing value there will be no guilt and there will be no action. On the other hand, shame occurs after an individual fails to cooperate with the group. Shame therefore regulates social group behaviours and also serves as a forewarning of punishment in any social setting. While guilt is simply evoked by individual standards, shame depends much on group standards, hence unlike guilt, shame is felt in the context of the community [1-16].

Accordingly, guilt prevails only in a situation of social dilemma, while shame is considered by psychologists as a more painful and disruptive emotion. This description is an outgrowth of a careful observation that one's personality-the self is the primary object of judgment and not simply the behaviour as in guilt. Accordingly, guilt is considered a less disruptive and most adaptive social phenomenon. Here it could be noted that though guilt may be less painful but it is often most overwhelming. This is because the issues involved are specific behaviours, which is somewhat separate from the self [see Tangney, Tuewing, and Hafex 2012:1-16].

The implication of the above assumption is that people, who have a sense of guilt are likely to easily reconsider their behaviour and its consequence rather than feel compelled to defend the self. Thus the feeling of remorse and regrets are essential part of the sense of guilt. In consequence therefore Ruth Benedict [2015], made further observations on both the relationship and difference between shame and guilt as she underscores:

Shame is the violation of cultural or social values, while guilt is feeling arising from the violation of one's internal values. Shame arise from when one's defects are exposed to others and result from negative evaluation[whether real or imagined] of others, guilt on the other hand comes from one's own negative evaluation of one's self, when one acts contrary to one's own values or ideas of one's own self [1-12].

Taking insight from the field of psychiatrics, Lewis [1971] argued that shame is directly about the self, which is the focus of evaluation, while in guilt, the self is not the centre of negative evaluation but rather the focus is the action taken [21]. Against this background, Fossum and Marson [1986] consider guilt as a painful feeling of regrets and responsibility for one's action, while shame is a painful feeling about one's self as a person [4]. In his own contribution from the same psychiatric perspective, Kaufman [1992], developed an Affect-theory which underscores that shame is merely instinctual, short-duration physiological reactions to stimulation. This theory situates that guilt is a learned behaviour consisting of self-directed blame or contempt [24]. The basic difference between shame and guilt from the study so far is that people feel guilty for what they do, shame result from whom we are. However, shame is often much stronger and more profound emotion than guilt. Shame is the outcome of one's feeling of disappointment about one's basic nature [Norman bales, 2015: 17]

However, both guilt and shame are important social factor and could be useful social model to creating moral values and stable social order. This is owing to the fact that both shame and guilt are connected to the social system. Thus our ideas about shame and guilt are influenced by the social situations in any given society. Therefore our educational system, family upbringing, culture, friends, work and social network are important paradigm in the definition of our shame and guilt [what is wrong and what is right]. Through these social institutions we create our self-worth borne out of our moral development. However, in practice, shaming has come under severe attack in the modern period as having negative effect on the society. Therefore the next section of this work is dedicated to considering the debate on the practice of shaming in modern literature.

SHAME AND SHAMING DEBATE IN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

The validity or rather efficacy of shame and shaming practices in effectuating social control, personality reforms and maintaining an equitable social order has attracted heated argument and debate. Therefore some scholars with socio-psychological bent sustain the fact that shame and shaming rituals could be effective in a more traditional society but argued that its effectiveness in the modern period has been attenuated due mainly to the fact that community

life and living have been vitiated on and secondly to the nature of modern criminal and judicial system. In justification of the above postulation, Karp [2015] notes, 'naturally, shame becomes less powerful when individual's relationship to other people becomes more distant' [1-26]. Karp thereto avers that the use of shame in the modern society as a means of sanctioning has been wholly unacceptable as it lacks the potency of human socialization but results in regression. In his own words, shaming scares the offenders with humiliation, depression and anger, all of which will lead them further down the path of criminality and violence' [see Scheff 1988:405].

Differentiating the traditional society from the modern society in the social relation and socialization processes and their consequences, Okoro and Njoku [2012] maintain that the traditional social group composed of larger number of identical, self-contained social unit like villages or tribes, while the modern societies are larger number of special group that permit membership and identities. The traditional society have fewer opportunities for weak ties among the subjects that make them up and pass on the information, innovation and human resources less easily [50-64, see also Fukuyama 2001: 7-20]. On the one hand, the modern society is noted to lack all the essentialities and intrinsic values and extrinsic trappings of the traditional society such as the value for solidarity, propriety and common community living, which are the basic character of the traditional society. On the other hand, the modern society nurture mankind that are equal and free but weak in their equality, since they are born with no conventional attachment. Overly, the modern society has created and inadvertently promoted excessive individualism that is preoccupied with private life and family, who also is quite unwilling to engage in public affairs[see Okoro and Njoku 2012:50-64].

It is against this backdrop that shame and shaming practice is considered as a negative social phenomenon. Adding pep to the above discourse, Braithwaite and Munford [1994] assert that shame and shaming practice instead of bringing about social reforms on the individual [the offender] ostracizes him and places him outside the community [131-171]. They therefore consider shaming simply as merely pushing the offender outside the community or the social group. Hence Karp [2015] was gradually led to conclude thus:

...I think that most people brought before the court suffered some amount of shame. If you go out of your way to shame them further, to me it is pushing them aside, it is ostracizing them. And I don't believe that that's a promising way to reduce future crime and make community safer...shaming is a form of degrading [1-26].

Supporting this ongoing discussion, other shame critics, view shame as a problematic social creation and consequently developed certain taxonomy with which they discuss the phenomenon of shame and shaming in the modern society. As such they consider shame as mere social conception. It was Julien, Raffaele and Fabrice [2012] that promoted this ideality of shame. Here they described shame as social emotion that required actual or imagined presence of other people in order to occur. Therefore they drew their conclusion that shame is not only morally superficial but also irrelevant to the modern society as it depends solely on other's value [268].

The outgrowth of this conception of shame and shaming practice has given birth to three basic assumptions or rather conclusions. These are namely:

- That shame is imposed upon people from the outside as a result of other people's judgment. This is done without regard to our own personal values. This externally

generated judgements are constitutive of shame rather than merely antecedent of it. This notion is labelled, 'Radical heteronomy' as opposed to autonomy of shame. Therefore, this calls the moral status of shame and shaming rituals to question, since the main fulcrum of shaming involves reliance on external values and this creates in us a behavioural pattern that are inconsistent with self-chosen values or autonomous moral agency. This first assumption is inversely represented in the following lines. Here shame is seen as essentially and solely involving an evaluation of person's appearance before an audience. The danger here is not only that people are influenced by foreign values but also that personal values such as a concern for appearance, reputation or privacy are either superficially or scarcely considered.

- The second assumption considers shame as not merely morally neutral or irrelevant but morally bad. This conception of shame links shame with behavioural tendencies that are considered in themselves as immoral or producing immoral behaviours. In this wise shame is connected to anger, anxiety, depression, hiding and withdrawal, lack of empathy, shirking responsibility etc. Against this backdrop shame is contrasted with guilt, which is often looked upon as morally-positive-emotions that can lead to reparation, empathy and pro-social-other-focus and an act-based rather than crushing judgment of the global self.
- The third assumption sees shame as taking a third person perspective on the self. This underscores therefore the problematic nature of shaming rituals in history. The problem emanates from the fact that shame is not driven by first-person assessment of the peoples values and violations, which is a necessary condition for effective shaming process to occur.[see Karp 2015: 1-26].

In order to show the ineffectiveness and moral nature of shame as social phenomenon, critics relate shame to the development of the self in the modern society. They falsely assume that in whatever culture shame is directed on the global self [see Julien, Raffaele and Fabrice 2012:268]. In this regard therefore, they consider shame as very severe judgment practice and as such will never generate positive role in behaviour, moral development or moral reforms of the individual within the society. A distinction is made here on between 'values' and 'norms'. Norms are regarded as acts and are phrased linguistically in the nature of 'all or nothing' deontological prohibitions, while values admit a degree or rather are exemplified in a deeper social trait. Accordingly, the violation of values or rather the instantiating devalue is a property belonging to the self rather than the property of action. Against this background, Julien, Raffaele and Fabrice [2012] maintain that shame is value based [268].

In line with the ongoing thoughts, shame is therefore related to self and ultimately directed to the self as against the others. Shame is targeted or directed on impugning self-respect, dignity, integrity and of course lack of any or all of these threatens the self or the personhood of the individual. In this direction, Tangney, Stuewig, Hafex [2012] enunciate that shame is painful feeling of unworthiness and consequently maintain that shamed people are inclined to defensively 'turn the table' by externalizing blame and anger outward onto a convenient scapegoat [706-723 see also Lewis 1971: 23, Scheff and Retzinger 1991 90-91, Tangney 1990: 102-111]. Accordingly, people who are put on the trauma of shame, using externalization technique, seek to regain some sense of self control and worth and to place their personhood in a superiority balance. Therefore according to this school of thought, shame and shaming practice can be counter-productive. Notably, those who fail to regain the self-image during and after the shaming process have been noted to have suffered acute psychological trauma. These range from low self-esteem, depression, anxiety, eating disorder, post-traumatic stress, suicidal

ideation, and substance dependence [see Tangney, Stuewing, Hafex 2012:279, Ashby, Rice, Martin 2006:148-156, Brewin, Andrew and Rose 2000: 499-509]

Furthermore, Karp [2015] noting that shaming process could result to either labelling, social casting, depression or/ and both, spotlights that shaming practice in the modern atomistic society may likely develop into oppositional culture formation [1-26]. Thus shaming ritual seems to be merely retributive and as such counter-productive as oppositional culture systematizes criminality [see Braithwaite and Munford 1994:1-7]. It is noted by Kahan [2012] that the modern shaming ritual could be likened to the time of ducking, stools, pillories and stock and the chain gang to the historical legacy of racism. He pointed to a stern example, where an offender in domestic violence was made to stand before his ex-wife, while she spits in his face, which he considers absolute dehumanizing [see Brilliant 1991:1365 for detail on this case]. Notably, the aim of shaming being retributive made the quintessential ceremonies of degrading to present no opportunity for the social reintegration of the shamed person. Hence Karp [2015] notes that by seeking penalties that are clearly offensive to the dignity of the person, the moral message of shame becomes one of devaluation, hence the offender no longer worth respect and is forced to lurch in the shamefulness of the offence all through life. Overtly, the retributive nature of shaming ritual blurs the distinction between the moral condemnation of the act and of the actor [see Karp 2015:1-26]. The end point is that such shaming practice will never generate the expected remorse, rather it generates anger and the externalization of shame by enabling the deviant to shunt his/her self-concept from victimizer to victim.

Weathering the odds of the above arguments against the efficacy of shame and shaming practice, another school emerge and promoted the inviolability of the phenomenon of shame in maintaining social control and stable social system. Coming from the flank of socio-cultural and anthropological field, Massaro [1999] situates that shaming practices have been and will still be one of most effective and meaningful method of social control even in the modern times [1-7]. He underscores the need to revert to community shaming practices as a result of the failure of the modern criminal and judicial system. He justified his assumption in the following lines:

...the revival of shaming springs from profound and widespread dissatisfaction with existing methods of punishment. In particular, many people including judges doubt the effectiveness and humanity of prison. Yet the main alternative to prison-parole-is equally unattractive, both because the community fear the often unmonitored return of the offender to its neighbourhood and because not many people believe that criminals should go unpunished [1-7]

With the above assumption, Massaro [1991] therefore concludes that both modern prison and parole methods are not only effective but mainly also lopsided. The twin modern system is bedevilled with great neglect of the individual persons in the crime-the sufferer or the victim. He notes that in the modern system crime is considered as offence against the state, hence the victim is not given a proper consideration in the modern judicial arrangements. He made clear explication of this argument in the following idea.

Modern law construes crime as an offence against the state. As such the harm to be redressed is the injury to the society and is measured through its eyes. The damage to the victim is relevant only to the extent that she/he is part of the larger society [1-7].

Karp [2015] having given serious consideration to the contemporary shaming rites came to conclusion that the contemporary society is a shameless society. This epithet for the modern

society, accordingly is evidenced in her reaction towards shaming practice. Thus he notes that part of the failure of the modern society that defines it as a shameless society is its promotion of absolute individualism of persons within the community. He further describes the modern society in relation to its actions and reaction to the phenomenon of shame thus:

It may be odd to raise the concept of shame in the midst of what seems a highly shameless society. A cursory look at daytime talk shows attests to bizarre and quite common willingness to flaunt the harm people cause without remorse. Why even consider shame when so many people seem impervious to the moral disapproval of others....Indeed vast majority of us, only sociopaths excluded, are deeply concerned with how we are viewed by others. Social acceptance and fear of rejection, even in our highly individualistic society is an enormous motivation for most of us [1-26].

However, Karp [2015] amidst all the burgeoning controversies still maintains that shame and shaming practices remain most fundamental principle in any society, be it modern or traditional. In his own words, '...shame is a powerful sanction and its application can alleviate much of the current pressure on our criminal justice system' [1-26]. This understanding receives surf by the fact that in the communitarian social structures, individual behaviours are deeply influenced by the 'moral voice' of the community. This idealty counters the libertarian idealty, which maintains that individuals are largely free agents, who select courses of action purely on the basis of individual preferences and tastes [see Karp 2015:1-26]. On the contrary, individual persons are overly or inadvertently controlled by the social framework of informal control, which directs and limits individual person's actions. Karp avers further, using his socio-psychological tool and expertise that the 'moral voice' is a sociological counterpart to the superego, which is a centrepiece for acceptance and abiding by the normative standards prescribed by the community. This ideality is not simply a suggestion by a strong moral demand for accountability [1-26]. Hence in the communitarian structure shame perspective is grounded in a socio-psychological concept of the self, which places emphasis on the role other people play in the notching of our corporate identity. This perspective rejects the idea of the selves as island or atoms, living wholly in isolation from other people, an autonomous individual. In describing this communitarian perspective on the social system, Karp [2015] adopts Charles Horton metaphor as his own benchmark. In his own words:

We see our faces and dress in the glass and we are interested in that because they are ours and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be, so in imagination, we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims deeds, character, friends and so on. A self-idea of this sort seems to have basic principle elements: as-The imagination of our appearance to others person. The imagination of this judgment of that appearance of that and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride and mortification [see Charles Horton 1992:184]

On the scores of the ongoing discourse, Scheff [1988] describes shame as an important emotions that looms in every social encounter [405]. Therefore he enunciates that shame and shaming practice is part and parcel of deference-social-emotion system in which conformity to exterior norms is rewarded by deference and feeling of pride and non-conformity is punished by lack of deference and feeling of shame. Here social control is interlocked with the bio-social system, which functions silently, continuously and remains virtually invisible and occurs within and between members of any society [Scheff 1988:406]. It therefore becomes normative with a communitarian society to see the self as inherently social and as such the

social identity props the individual's knowledge that he belongs to a certain social group, together with emotional and value significant to him as a member of this group [see Karp 2015:1-26].

In communitarian perspective therefore, the individual persons are considered as social creatures, who value their sense of belonging in the community. Thus any threat of rejection by others tantamount to a threat to the individual self-identity. Thus social recognition reinforces the sense of belongingness and pride thereto, while disapproval threatens our place in the social order [see Karp 2015: 1-26]. This perspective encourages self-comparison with other selves and this lays out a clear paradigm of evaluating ourselves in the light of other people's opinion. This practice is at the core of social and moral development any healthy society requires. This because as we discover that people around us approve or disapprove our behaviours, we then discover what is right or wrong within our society/community.

That shame and shaming is externally forced on the individual members of the society without consideration to their personal feelings and ideality has been the basis of rejecting shame and shaming practice in the modern times. However, if we relate shame to moral development, we will discover that being social beings or creatures, mankind is not born with internalized moral codes and as such morality is not genetically released at various stages of our physical development. Therefore, morality is acquired and internalized developmentally through the repeated process of experiencing shame for wrongful behaviours and pride for behaving according to social norms [see Karp 2015:1-26]. However, once the internalization of the social norms occurs in the individual through the external factors, then as Mead [1999] points out, it follows naturally that at this point socialization takes place within the individual. Whenever socialization occurs in this manner, social control ceases to rely on external factor, such as shaming or punishment and relies more on inducing the internal process, such as appealing to conscience through the invocation of respect or affection in any relationship.

In this wise, the communitarianists consider shame, criminal and other norm-violating behaviours as dovetailing into the social system and as such must be prevented by shaming practice. This perspective underscores that shame cuts to the bone because we care about how other people perceive us. Thus we conform to social normative standards because we do not want to risk our acceptance in the society and more importantly we have internalized normative standards because we do not wish to violate our conscience.

Here Karp [2015] notes that though shame is a powerful sanction, which has the potency to reorder the social system, yet it has often been neglected by the stakeholders in the modern criminal justice system and also most often criticized as being obnoxious practice [1-26]. He also enunciates that because of inherent potency in effecting social control, shame is vulnerable to abuse and misapplication and as such must be practiced with great caution. In his own words, 'though shame is a powerful sanction, it has not been employed to any significant degree by the criminal justice system. There are three important reasons for this' [1-26]. With these Karp's [2015] three reasons we shall conclude this section. These are:

- Shaming is potent and where there is potency, there is risk. Here misapplication of shaming rites can easily be counter-productive, leading to stigmatization of offenders and symbolic or literal exile the offender from the community.
- The use of shame generally has an individualistic offender-based focus that often fails to take into account the circumstances within which the offence took place.

- Shame grates against the sensibilities of the society deeply influenced by liberal political theory heavily reliant upon formal procedural mechanism of the state [Karp 2015:1-26].

Against this backdrop, this paper devotes the remaining section to doing a critical consideration of shame and shaming practice in African [Igbo] Traditional society. Here the paper discovers that African shaming process and practice are based on certain core values such as empathy, community, integration, propriety and humanity. The work notes how this core traditional values make African shaming process and practice distinct from the modern practice and as such proposed it as a viable alternative of social control for the modern society.

SHAMING PRACTICES IN AFRICAN [IGBO] TRADITIONAL SOCIETY: A VIABLE MODEL FOR SUSTAINING MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL STABILITY IN MODERN AFRICA

The general experience of the mass of African, more especially of Igbo extraction in the 21st century, is a general moral devaluation or failure, resulting to social instability, breach of social justice, miscarriage of justice, with their attendant general systemic collapse. The reason for this awful experience cannot be located in one single indices and as such it seems mystifying. Though several attempts have been made by scholars of diverse fields and orientations to decipher the reason for such general system collapse in African society of the modern period, yet their efforts seem to be yielding no insightful solution to the problem and even the seeming solutions appear impracticable and irrelevant to the irksome moral and social crisis that have bedevilled Modern African society. Therefore, Odey [2005] bemoans the ostensive irreversibility of moral/social crisis of Africa and the apparent hopelessness of a bright future if the trend continues in this direction as he writes in the following lines:

Africa has a genius of extreme, for the beginning and the end. It seems simultaneously connected to the memory of Eden and to some foretaste of apocalypse. Nowhere is the day more vivid or night darker. Nowhere are forests more luxuriant. Nowhere is a continent more miserable. African, Sub-Saharan Africa, at least has begun to look like an immense illustration of chaos theory, although some hope is forming in the margins, much of the continent has turned into battle ground of contending doom. Over population, poverty, starvation, illiteracy, corruption, social break down, vanishing resources, overcrowded cities, war and homelessness of war refugees, Africa has become the basket case of the planet, the third world of the third world, a vast continent in free fall [143]

Though the African moral/social crisis cannot be describe with a single category, however, it could still be observed that the fundamental issue undergirding all other categories is the question of devaluation of the basic African moral culture. In this wise, Tomilison [2003] collaborates the assumption in the following idea.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been in cultural dilemma ever since its forceful integration or rather subjugation by Europeans countries through colonialization and slavery. Ever since their experience with colonialism, African countries have been unable to independently articulate or chart their own history, culture and identity [18].

Tomilison [2003] further enunciates that in the traditional African society, there existed local, autonomous, distant and well-defined vigorous and culturally sustaining connections between geographical places and cultural experiences [178]. Okoro [2009] maintains that this connection constitutes one's and one's communities-cultural identity. Here the African identity value was an undisturbed essential possession, an inheritance, a benefit of traditional dwelling

community with a past identity. It was not just a description of cultural belonging rather a collective treasure of local communities [see Okoro 2009: 26-35]. Accordingly, culture in all its nature and milieu is fragile and needs a careful protection and preservation by its owners so that it will serve its generational purpose. This generational purpose include but not limited to the followings: 1. Defining and giving of identity, 2. Developing the social/moral personality. 3. Charting the course of moral and socio-political development of the community. Notably, no nation will develop beyond her cultural accretions, hence African developmental crisis may partly be attributed to the vitiation done to her cultural heritage by the combined forces of colonialization, assimilation and globalization policies of America and Europe, in their actions, inactions and reactions to African culture.

Some of these African cultural heritage which have suffered undue vitiation by the incidence of African contact with the West are namely, community living and sharing, community social solidarity, brotherhood effects/care, community compassion and Community social justice system to mention just but a few. In an apt summary of the above values, Ejizu [2014] maintains that Africans [Igbo] maintain closeness or shared community life which brought them together not only to themselves but also to the natural environments and this deepens the natural impulse for gregariousness and sense of community within any African community [1-15]. Thus unlike the Western value that maintains and promotes individualism and personal autonomy of persons within the community, African traditional values promotes community living and sharing. Thus living together in mutual support becomes a natural way of living in African [Igbo traditional society. Therefore the network of relationship inherent in African culture suffices on the one hand, a synchronic mutual support such as human relationship in the family and the food chain in the ecosystem [see Okoro 2013:87-112]. Against this backdrop therefore Okoro [2013] subsumes that the African [Igbo] proverbs, which says, Go the way of many, if you go alone, you will have reason to lament, become quite relevant. Hence African idea of security and its values depends solely on personal identification with and within the community of other people [87-112 see also Masahiro 1990:99-105]. Ifemesia [1979] explicates more on this line of thought when he avers

This community also, within the transcendental terms of reference [God-man] becomes the custodian of individual ideas. This is why, beyond the community-clan-for the Africa, there stood the void in strong and ever present contact. Outside this ancestrally charted system, there is no possible life, since a man without lineage is a man without identity and therefore without citizenship, without allies or... a man outside his clan is like a grasshopper which lost its wings. The clan here is, the elan vital, that is living clan [25-29, see Davidson, 1969: 93, Okoro K.N., 2013: 87-112].

The African community ideality also offers Africans a diachronic mutual support in passing from generation from parents to their children. Thus in African traditional society, the community offers it members both physical and ideological ideality [see Okoro 2013:87-112]. Here Africans understand that the community as entity is immortal, while the individual within the community is and remains mortal. On the strength of this notion, Africans are prompted to emphasize the community ideality as the essence of African vision of reality. Therefore, the individual members of the community are nurtured to bear the community cultural accretion as well as identity. In this regard, culture becomes a community property, which must also be protected [see Okoro, 2010: 136-159].

Against the backdrop of African community living philosophy, which gave birth to African social solidarity, African social justice notion takes its definition and understanding. Okoro [2014] lending credence to this assumption defines African notion of social justice as a community or/and indigenous justice system. He explicates further on this justice ideology as he maintains that African justice system is weighted particularly on the ways and manners crime and justice affect the community. It gives preference on how the citizens and community organization unite to adjudicate crime justice with the intent of controlling social disorder and maintaining equitable society [922-933]. Thus the African [Igbo] people developed several taboos and their sanctions as a means of achieving this vision of equitable society by guiding as well as controlling individual actions and behaviours. It is therefore by means of institutional structure that the African [Igbo] people direct the social life of her members. Hence the African [Igbo] people understand laws/norms and traditional mores as manifest instruments of general cohesion rather than an agent for advancing individual or group interest [see Okafor 1992:55, Okoro and Okoli 2014: 922-933, Okafor, 2006: 35-58].

The implications of the foregoing discussion are as follows: 1. In African [Igbo] society justice is devoid of any vindictiveness and 2. There was no notion of retributive or deterrent justices among the traditional people of Africa more especially among the Igbo people of Eastern Nigeria [see Shorter 2013:1-22]. Here, the Igbo people define, interpret and apply their laws on certain basic traditional norms and beliefs, which gave them a paradigm for the definitions of their behaviours within the Igbo social continuum. The basic background of the Igbo social /criminal justices system becomes therefore the Igbo moral stipulations. Hence the Igbo legal system is tied to the Igbo religion and culture. Anyasodo observes this water tight relationship between Igbo legal and Igbo religious systems as he avers, ...'The relationship between the Igbo legal system and Igbo religious institutions and practice is so deep that it profoundly affects all realms of Igbo life and social interactions [see Onyeozili and Ebbe 2012: 29-44]

Based on the Igbo deality of community living and sharing, which forms a synthesis of their social existence into one unified opsis, Iwe [1991], maintains that the practice of justice is to the Igbo People what charity is to the Christians [1-24]. Hence Igbo anthropologists accentuate that Justice is the fulcrum of African [Igbo] morality. Thus Igbo justice practice vied away sharply from vindication and requital ends as in modern practice to reprobation and reintegration method. By this method both the victims of injustice and the social deviants are careful brought back into the living and harmonious community. It is underscored that the main focus of Igbo traditional justice system is community-level out-come, which shifts emphasis from individual incidences to systemic pattern, from individual conscience to social mores and from individual good to the common good of the community [see Okoro and Okoli 2014:922-933].

Against this backdrop, shame and shaming in Igbo traditional society takes a new dimension and considerations different from their modern understanding and practice. Thereto African shaming system conforms to Ruth Benedict's [2015] ontology, as she opines that shame is one major aspects of socialization within any society whether traditional or modern [1-7]. She enunciates further that societies/cultures may be classified as either open or close by their emphasis on the use of either shame or guilt to regulate the social activities of the individuals within the community. Thus the Igbo shaming practice fits into what socio-psychologists describe as restorative justice system. Accordingly, restorative/integrative justice bents towards condemning an action but seeks to recover and reintegrate the wrongdoer back into the community. Igbo restorative/crime preventive justice can be simply defined as integrative shaming. This identifies crime as irresponsible, wrong or bad. Therefore, it is the behaviour

that is condemned, while the person is respected, accepted back into the society and gave a chance to make reparations for his/her criminal act/acts. This practices has been documented by Okoro and Okoli [2014] in one of their experimental studies on social justice among the Igbo People of Eastern Nigeria. Here they examined two serious crimes [murder and Incest], their shaming and integration methods and securing of justice and maintenance of equitable society. The present work will adopt the excerpt/paradigm from this work without modification. We choose the murder incidence as our example here. In case of murder of a kinsman, the ideal practice would be that the murder hangs himself or escape into self-imposed life exile with all members of his family and his property confiscated [see Tangney Stuewig and Hafex 2012: 706-723]. This is because there is no case that can warrants capital punishment in Igbo Traditional justice system. However, the community has also made provisions for propitiatory sacrifice [shaming ritual] in place of grave punishment. The following steps are taking to absolve and purify the murderer through rigorous shaming practice/ritual.

Step 1: On the event of the murder of a kinsman by his fellow, the village square, public places, market places are shut down with fresh palm fronds hung around those places by the village messengers, by the order of the chief priest of Ala [earth goddess] whose abode has been desecrated by the blood of one of her sons/or daughters. This symbolizes general mourning of the deceased by the entire community and general remorse for the crime committed against the mother earth.

Step 2: The town criers are dispatched to announce that every adult male be gathered in the shrine of Ala {Aja Ama Eze/Eke Aja} for the Uburu community of Ebonyi State, at very early in the morning after the general mourning period, which may last for two days. While coming, the invited shall dress in tattered attire, still signifying sorrow/mourning.

Step 3: The meeting shall rise with the sending of strong delegation to the deceased family, with condolence, proper traditional burial fixed, though the family may have conducted adhoc burial for the deceased. Then the community on an appointed date gives the deceased befitting burial rites according to the customs of the land and the rank of the deceased in the social structure of the community.

Step 4: The murderer is sought out and detained in the shrine of the earth goddess so that the blood of the murdered will not drive him into desperation and he begin a general massacre of the people, starting with his immediate family members. While in the shrine, appropriate purifying rituals are applied on him and for him. Within this period of incarceration, no member of the community will have access to him, nay not even his immediate family members. The period will be long, so that many people will begin to forget him and the anger of the family whose relation is murder may have assuaged. This period symbolizes death for the murderer.

Step 5: On the eve of the new year festival, it is usually on Orie day known as Orie Ava/Afa [it should be a period of one year or there about but not less than one year, it could be more but not less] then the murderer is made to appear to the public led by the cultic officials. The first point of call shall be the market place at its full sitting. He shall be lead to the entrance, where he shall be positioned strategically for public sighting. He shall dress in tattered dress, with neither shaving his beard nor barbing his hear for this period. His face, hands and feet shall be besmeared with charcoal. At the entrance of the market, every passerby is permitted by choice to spit on him. He shall be made to hold fresh palm fronds in his two hands, which symbolizes

peace. Here the family members of the deceased will be invited officially, who the elders of the community have gone to see, to give them reasons for forgiveness. At the point of meeting, the murderer on sighting the family members of the deceased will bend on his knees without raising his face. On arrival, it is expected that the deceased family led by the oldest person will raise the murderer to his feet, which signifies forgiveness and both shall weep together for such social misfortune. After that all will move to the place of the murder and a he goat if the deceased is a man or she goat if she is a woman, will be sacrificed at the place of murder. This is with the aim of purifying the land of blood guilt. At this point negotiation begins between the two families.

Step 6: The two families will retire till the end of New Year festival. However, they will reconvene after two days of the end of celebration, usually on Nkwo day, this time at the shrine of Ala. Those who must necessarily be present include the chief priest of Ala [the Earth Goddess], with all cultic officials, the elders of the community, including all titled men [Ozo, Osuji, Onyibe etc], all exogenous daughters of the land [Umuokpu/umuada] and any other interested persons. Here final purification rites are made at certain strategic places in the community. The Umuokpu [Exogenous daughters will perform one of the most prominent ritual, known as ikpo-ntu ochu [cleansing the ashes of murder}. This involves elaborate ritual, some of which are performed in the night by women who have crossed their menopause. By the completion of the rituals which may last for 4 market days, the final step will gradually follow.

Step 7: A marriage arrangement is made between the two families, so that the murdered will have progenitors to bear his name. It is during this marriage rite that the murderer is reintegrated into the community once again and from this point he begins to live a normal life in the community, without discrimination or stigmatization [see Okoro and Okoli, 2014:922-933].

Stating the moral philosophy behind this rigorous system, Okoro and Okoli [2014] write: The philosophy underlying this rigorous system [shaming] or ritual practice in relation to appeasing the breach of social justice is compassion. This is because African [Igbo] People value brotherhood and their core value is brotherhood, which gives rise to the Igbo maxim 'Onye aghala nwanneya' [What affects one affects all, so do not abandon the brotherhood [922-933]

Therefore, the reconciliation and restoration of social harmony were and still the main object the judicial proceedings, which may result to shaming practice but not retribution. On this note Wamala [2014] maintains that every justice in Africa traditional society is justice of fairness [1-9]. Thus being a fair justice system, Igbo traditional jurisprudence incorporates certain features like: 1. the criminal/deviant has the right to be heard as in the modern system. 2. Justice was given by the elders in an extended family and 3. Prompt adjudication is also taken. 4. Justice is administered based on consensus [Okoro and Okoli 2014: 922-933]

Notably, the African [Igbo] conception of life and brotherhood have great influence on the practice of social justice via shaming in the traditional society. The Igbo people consider life as hallowed and as such bequeath it with eternal origin and destiny and conversely sustain that it does not belong solely to the community, in which it is given as a gift but belongs wholly to its creator. Therefore, at no point does the Igbo people consider life worthless or irredeemable by its creator, even that of the most obdurate villain [see Oraegbunam 2014: 1-31].

Thus the Igbo people developed elaborate mechanism/institutions that sustain their social justice ideality. However, the overall aim of the elaborate rituals of shaming practice as noticed in this work is not to isolate or stigmatize the deviant/scoundrel but to bring him back to the community-to reintegrate the scoundrel to the mainstream of the community life after a period of reprobation. Thus Okoro and Okoli [2014] conclude as follows:

The aim of social justice of the Igbo traditional system is the maintenance of social stability borne out of harmonious social relationship. Thus in spite of the mechanism put in place to check the abuse of human rights and breach of justice, it is observed that Igbo traditional justice system is community living based on shared living, honour, and respect for members of the community as its fulcrum [922-933]

The implication of Okoro and Okoli's subsumption above is that the Igbo traditional system is both community and human centred system and not necessarily institutional legal centred system as in the modern period. Thereto, Okoro [2015] observes that African traditional social justice system aims at solving problem, unlike the modern criminal justice system, which David and Todd [2000] define as contest between the state and the accused [323-363]. In this direction, Okoro [2015] notes that in African traditional system, crime is not a contest to be won but a series of problems to be solved, hence African system is focused on how to achieve and maintain public safety and solve the problem of crime in order to improve on community life and living [Okoro 2015: 1-21].

Here African traditional justice system in its practice of shaming, does not concern itself with the individual being shamed as such. This is because Africans [Igbo] people in particular understand that though the deviant and victim may be important in any justice situation but they are simply subservient in relation to the whole community, which the justice system aim at improving [see Okoro 2015: 1-21]. Thus Africans understand that the failure of modern system [judicial system] of the deviant even to the satisfaction of the victims cannot fully assure that justice prevailed in a broader scale [see Bersik and Gransmick 1993:43]. In consequence therefore, Okoro [2015] notes that African shaming system, which is an outgrowth of her traditional moral system accentuates its goal as not only merely to change the circumstance of the villain and the victim but to strengthen the capacity of the community for self-regulation and realization of the collective aim of social welfare [1-21].

Therefore, shaming as a practice in the Igbo traditional society does not only seek to restoring the credibility of the community conception of the moral order by affirming that individuals are accountable for the violation of the community life but more importantly to affirm the community norm for others that have not disobeyed. It is through this method of norm affirmation of the community that the community members are empowered to respond to crime, as they clarify and enforce appropriate standard behaviour [see Okoro 2015: 1-21]. In shaming practice the villain is made to confront his community peers directly and the harmful consequence of his crime are made bear to the community members. Here the community members are given strong voice in the process of setting the normative standard of the community.

Overly, the goal of Igbo Justice system via the shaming system is the restoration of the villain into the community. This goal is averse to the modern justice system which hinges on retribution and pushes the offender out of the community without holding him/her responsible for making amends to the victim and the community. The underlying ideality

informing African traditional justice system, which orbits around restoration is that crime wrought injury to the community and as such needs rectification through restoration rather than reciprocal imposition of more harm [see Okoro 2015:1-21, Iwuagwu 2001: 62]. Thus philosophy of restorative justice through shaming circles on repairing the damage done by the deviant rather than inflicting proportionate harm on the offender. Okoro [2015] explicates more on this African justice principle when he opines that:

Restorative justice typically emphasizes the need of crime victims and the general exclusion from justice process. African traditional justice system does not only prioritize the need of crime victim, it also locates them in the context of communal membership. The African community justice focuses on the need of particular parties to the crime incidence [offenders, victims and onlookers] and attends to their relationship between community and members, which aims at solving damaged social ties [1-21, see ifemesia 1979: 82 and David and Todd 2000: 332-363].

The restoration ideality that governs the African social/criminal justice makes the justice system an all-inclusive and integrative system. The system provides an archetypal model that makes it impossible for neither the victim nor the villain to be perpetually shunned, displaced or exiled from the community. Thus in the system all efforts are geared towards integrating all parties into full community life. In doing so the system provides protection of individual rights as citizens, make claims to their responsibility for pro-social contributions to the collective good and to curb anti-social activities [David and Todd 2000:323-363].

This model is responsive to crime incidents in its focus on reintegrating victims and deviants. Its goal at fostering greater community attachment and democratic participation in the community life. Integration is indicated by the establishment of normative consensus. 1. Do the offender agree that their behaviour was inimical to the victims and the community? 2. Do the various stakeholders agree on the extent of the harm? It on this points of issue that the African traditional shaming practice diverge from the modern system. Therefore we assert that African integrative shaming make social behaviours uncoupled from the self and the aim is to instil emotions akin to guilt, which may result to remorse and reprobation and consequent forgiveness and reacceptance into the community.

CONCLUSION

This paper took a socio-psychological and anthrop-cultural survey of the phenomenon of shame and shaming practices across cultures and epochs and finally zeroed down to Africa, with particular reference to the Igbo Community of Easter Nigeria. The paper made the following assumption as an outgrowth of its survey. 1. The modern practice of shaming is alien to African culture. 2. It does not promote social harmony, stability and cohesion. 3. It is stigmatizing and dehumanizing and as such disjunctive in its aim and approaches. 4. The modern shaming practices as exemplified in modern prison and parole is vindictive as it sees crime as a contest between the society and the deviant and as such seeks reciprocal compensation of harm/ crime committed against the society to the villain. 5. The African traditional shaming practice is built upon social and moral values of the people. 6. The major principles of these social and moral values are community living and sharing, brotherhood, compassion and care, and humanness. 7. The goal of African shaming practices/ritual is the reintegration and re-socialization of both the victim and the villain into one harmonious community. 8. It is community/and people centred rather than legally centred. 9. Therefore it emphasizes the needs of the victim, which is compensation, the need of the deviant, which are forgiveness, re-socialization and reintegration and the need of the community, which are

purifications and social stability. 10. The African traditional shaming practices promotes moral development, social healing, stability and cohesion and fosters equitable society. Therefore the paper concludes that if African [Igbo] traditional shaming method shall be adopted in the modern period as a paradigm of crime/justice practice in modern Africa that moral/ development crisis bedevilling African society would have been eliminated or at least reduced to its barest

References

- Ashby JS, Rice, KG and Martin J.C [2006]. 'Perfectionism, Shame and Depression Symptoms', *Journal of Counselling and Development* 2006:84 [148-156] retrieved from www.shamingpracticesinthemodernworld.edu/org on 23rd April, 2015.
- Baker Phil [2003]. What is Guilt? What is Shame? Beyond Intractability Project. Colorado. The Conflict Information Consortium[1-7] retrieved from www.shameandshamingculture.org/edu. On 27th March, 2015.
- Barnard Jayne W [2015] Re-integrative Shaming in Corporate Sentencing. Restorative Justice Online. Mooball I.T. Centre for Justice and Reconciliation. Retrieved from <http://justicearticle.org/shame.edu> on 12th April, 2015.
- Bear GG, Uribe-Zarain X, Manning MA, Shiomi K [2009]. 'Shame, Guilt, Blaming and Anger: Differences between Children in Japan and the U S'. *Motivations and Emotions*. [2009]:33:229-238. Retrieved from <http://shamingcultureinmodernworld.edu/org>. on 24th of March, 2015.
- Benedict Ruth., [2015] 'Shame' see Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopaedia. www.shamepracticeinancientsocieties.org/edu. Retrieved on March 12, 2015.
- Braithwaite John [1989]. *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://shamingculture.org/edu> on 12th April, 2015.
- Braithwaite John and Mungford B[1994]. 'Conditions of Successful Re-Integrative Ceremonies' *British Journal of Criminology* vol,3 No 2[1994] retrieved from <http://justiceedu/article.org> on 24th March, 2015.
- Brewin, Cr, Andrew, B. Rose, S. [2000]. 'Fear, Helplessness and Horror in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: Investigating DSM-Westevion A2 in Victims of Violent Crime' *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2000:13 [499-509] retrieved from www.shameandmodernculyure,edu/org. on 30th March,2015.
- Chad Cusworth, brain Danniels, Emily Rondi [2015]. *The Ethics of Public Shaming*. Retrieved from www.shamingculture/education.org. on 23rd March, 2015.
- Charles Horton C [1992] *Human Nature and Social Order*. New York: Scribners.
- David Karp and Todd Clear., [2000]. 'Community Justice: A Conceptual Framework: Boundary Change in Criminal Justice Organization' *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Vol.6 No. 4 [2000]. 323-363.
- Davidson. B., [1969]. *The African Genius*. Boston: Navigation Publishing.
- Ejizu, Christopher. I., [2014]. 'African Community Living' see www.africansocialjustice/html/edu.org.127045031725. Retrieved on 23/01/2014.
- Fossum, Merle A and Mason Maily J[1986] *Facing Shame: Families in Recovery*. WW Norton. Retrieved from www.moderncultureandshamingpractice.org/edu. On the 12th April,2015.
- Fukuyama Francis [2001] 'Social Capital, Civil Society and Development'. *Third World Quarterly* Vol 22 No 1 [1-20]
- George H.S and Thomas L. Thorson, [1973]. *A History of Political Theory* [4th edition] New Delhi: Oxford &IBH Publishing.
- Hannem-Kish Stancy, *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Encyclopaedia of Prison and Correctional Faculties ed. Thousand waks. LA. Sage 2004:201.05 reference online web 1 august, 2012. Retrieved from shamingculture.org/edu on 23rd March, 2015.
- Iwe, N.S.S., [1991]. 'Sociological Approach to the Study of African Traditional Religion and Culture' A paper presented at the 6th Annual Conference of National Association of African Religions. May 6, 1991 [1-24].
- Jennifer, Jacquet [2015] *Is Shame Necessary?* Excerpted from *Future Sciences: Essays from the Cutting Edge*. Edited by Max Brozkman NJ. Vintage Books. Retrieved from www.cuttingedge.org on the 23th March, 2015.

Julian A Deonna, Raffaele Rodogno and Fabrice Teroni [2012]. 'In Defence of shame: The Faces of an Emotion' Notre Dame Philosophical Review, College of Arts and Letters. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from www.shameandshamingcultureinmodernstudies. On 12th April, 2015.

Kahan Dan M [1996] What Does Alternative Sanction Mean? *University of Chicago Law Review* 63:593. Retrieved from www.socialjusticemodel/edu.org. on 12th April, 2015.

Karp David R. [2015]. *Shame and Criminal Justice*. Washington DC: Centre for Communitarian Policy Studies George Washington University. Retrieved from <http://criminaljustice.org/article.edu>. On 12th April, 2015.

Kaufman, Gershen [1992], *Shame: The Power of Caring* [3rd edition] Rochester: Schenkman Books

Leviathan Chapter XIII-XIV.

Lewis Helen b [1971] *Shame and Guilt in Neurosis Study*. NY International University Press.

Mashiro, Morioke., [1991]. 'The Concept of 'Inochi': A Philosophical Perspective on the Study of Life' *Japanese Review* Vol.2, 1991 [83-115].

Massaro, Toni M[2008] *Shame Culture and American Criminal Justice Law*. Dayton: University of Dayton. Retrieved from www.justiceeducation.org/edu. On 12th April, 2015.

Mead FS [1999] 'Shaming as a Positive Culture' *Sociological Review* 46 [1999] 102-109. Retrieved from www.shamingcultureinmodernperiod.edu/org. on 24th March, 2015.

Norman Bales [2015] *Coping with Shame and Guilt*. Retrieved from <http://fbg-church.org/article/guilt.htm>

Odey, John O., [2005]. *Africa: The Agony of a Continent: Can Liberation Theology offer any Solution?* [2 edition] Enugu: Snaap Press.

Okafor, F.U., [1992]. *Igbo Philosophy of Law*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension.

Okafor, N., [2006]. 'Relevance of African Traditional Jurisprudence on Control, Justice and Law: A Critique of Igbo Experience' *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*. No. 1, June 2006 [35-58].

Okoro, Kingsley [2014] 'Utopianism and the New World Order: A Critical Consideration' *Open Journal of Philosophy* 2014.4 [332-334] published August, 2014. <http://www.scrip.org/journal/ojpp>.<http://olx.doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2014.43037>.

Okoro, Kingsley and Njoku Donatus [2012] 'Religion, Social Capital and the New World Order: A Reconsideration' *Proceeding of International Conference on Research and Development Held in the University Auditorium, University of Lome. Republic of Togo. May 14-17 [2012] 50-64.*

Okoro, Kingsley and Osunwokeh Clement [2014]. 'Religion and Human Rights Violation in History: The Women and Witch Hunts in Medieval Europe' *Journal of Scientific Research and Report* 3 [24] 3045-3067 [Jsr.2014.24:1102.www.sciencedomain.org](http://www.sciencedomain.org).

Okoro, Kingsley N., [2009]. 'Cultural Globalization the Last Onslaught on African Personality: The Igbo Example'. *International Journal of Philosophy and Religion* Vol 1. No.1. [26-38].

Okoro, Kingsley. N. and Okoli Charles., [2014] 'The Synergy Between Social Justice and Compassion in African [Igbo] Traditional Society: A Reconsideration' *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2014:2 [63] 922-933. Available @ <http://sasjournals.com/sjahss>.

Okoro, Kingsley. N., [2010]. 'African Traditional Education: A viable Alternative for Peace Building Process in Modern Africa'. *Online Journal of Alternative Perspective in Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 1. 2010. [136-159] <http://www.japss.org/editorial/journaljapss>.

Okoro, Kingsley. N., [2013]. 'African Concept of 'Inochi': A New Paradigm for Peace Education in the Contemporary Society'. *Modern Social Science Journal* 2[2013].No.2 -87-112. Available online at <http://www.scik.org>.

Okoro, Kingsley. N., [2015] 'The Theory and Practice of Social Justice in African Traditional Society through Compassion and Community Living' In *Conversation in Compassion* edited by Michelle Brenner. Sydney: University of Sydney Press. [1-21].

Onyeozili and Ebbe., 'Social Control in Pre-Colonial Igbo Land of Nigeria' *African Journal of Criminology and Justice studies*. 2012; 6 [1&2] 29-44.

Oraegbunnam. I., [2014] 'Crime and Punishment in Igbo Customary Law: The Challenge of Nigeria Criminal Jurisprudence' *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol.5, No.8 2014 [1-31].

- Ruth Benedict [2015]. The Culture of Shame' In Wikipedia 'Shame' Free Encyclopaedia retrieved from www.cultureofshameandshaming/modernsociety.org. on 12th April, 2015.
- Sandrine, Theresa and Martin Brain [2010] Shame, Scientist Degradation Ritual in Science. Prometheus Vol.28 No 2 June, 2010 [97-110].
- Scheff Thomas and Retzinger S [1991] Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage Spirals in Interminable Conflict. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Scheff Thomas J [1988] 'Shame and Conformity: Deference of Emotional System' American Sociological Review 35[1988] 405-409. Retrieved from www.shamingcultureinmodernworld.edu.org. on 23rd April, 2015.
- Scheff Thomas J [2015] Shame and Social Bond retrieved from www.shamingcultureorg/edu. On 12th April, 2015.
- Shorter, Alyward., [2013]. 'The Concept of Social Justice in African Traditional Society' see www.africansocialjustice.alyward.edu/org. Retrieved on November 12, 2014 [1-22]
- Tangney J.P [1990] 'Assessing Individual Differences in Proneness to Shame and Guilt: Development of Self Conscious Affect and Attribution inventory' Journal of Personality and Social Psychology [102-111] [Pubmed. Retrieved from www.shameculture.edu/org. on 23rd April,2015.
- Tangney June Price, Stuewing Jelf and Hafex Logain [2012]. Shame, Guilt and Remorse: Implication for Offending Population. J.Forens Psychiatry Psychol. 2011 Sept 1, 22[5] 706-723 doi. 10.1080/14789949.2011.617541.
- Tomlison John., [2003]. Globalization and Cultural Identity. See www.polity.co.uk/pdf/glreaderzetomlisonpdf. Retrieved on August 16, 2009.
- Wamala. E., [2014] 'The Socio-Political Philosophy of Traditional Burgundy Society: Break and Continuity into the Present' see www.justiceinafrica. Retrieved on January 12, 2014.