Leadership: Blight to the Appreciation of Common Humanity of Mankind

Columbus Ogbujah (Ph D)
Institute of Foundation Studied, Rivers State University of Science and Technology, P.O.Box 75, RSUST, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
nogbujah@yahoo.com

Abstract
Leaders are recognized in politics, businesses, education, sports and cultural activities and indeed, in all events that entail human interactions. Some leaders are able to manage the affairs of the public to the desired goals; others are not only unable to do so, but sometimes do oversee processes that out-rightly subvert the attainment of desired objectives of a group / corporate entity. Anyone can be a leader. It does not take a specific title or academic qualification to be a good leader. Rather, there are skills leaders have that make others want to perform at a high level when either working with or for them; skills that create a synergy in the activities of managers and staff (in business outfits), or promote tolerance, cohesion and integration of various components of a heterogeneous society (in political climes); qualities without which an individual who physically occupies a position of leadership is classified a bad leader. In this work, leadership qualities were discussed along with the hindrances to the appreciation of the universal citizenship of mankind. Findings revealed that bad leadership is a major clog on the wheel of integration of humanity into one big family of love.
Keywords: leadership, common humanity, integration, universal citizenship

1. Introduction
Some interesting questions that appear somewhat difficult to answer among philosophers, political scientists, historians, social psychologists, etc, are: what makes one a leader? Are leaders born or made? Are there any antecedents or circumstances rather extraneous to a person's character which propel one towards leadership positions? Or is the answer in-between the person's background and his character? The answers to these would ultimately help to delineate which individuals would eventually make good or bad leaders. Perhaps, they will open up doors for gleaning at the obstacles militating against the quest for the common humanity of mankind.

Leaders are recognized in politics, businesses, education, sports and cultural activities, and indeed in all events that entail human interactions. Some leaders understand all too well the demands of their office and carefully navigate the affairs of the public to the desired goals; others are not only unable to do so, but sometimes superintend processes that out-rightly subvert the attainment of desired objectives of a group / corporate entity entrusted to them. The difference between success and failure of a state as a whole, or a business outfit; between love and hatred amongst people; between appreciation and discrimination of individuals in the wider world; or between belonging to the in-group and out-group within specific cultures, could simply be a matter of leadership. To that extent, leaders can make or mar a nation. In the following paragraphs, we shall attempt to bring to fore what leadership entails, and then see if, and how it is the prime source of conflicts, wars and a host of subterranean activities that fly in the face of appreciating the common humanity of everyone.

2. Leadership and Leaders
Anyone can be a leader. It does not take a specific title or academic qualification to be a good leader. Rather, there are skills leaders have that make others want to perform at a high level when either working with or for them; skills that create a synergy in the activities of managers and staff (in business outfits), or promote tolerance, cohesion and integration of various components of a heterogeneous society (in political climes); qualities without which an individual who physically occupies a position of leadership is classified a bad leader.

Leaders are found in homes, businesses, politics, and in all activities of social engineering. As such, the term and its derivatives are common concepts which everyone, irrespective of educational background, race, creed or nationality is able to appreciate, at least, within the level of their practical usefulness: leaders are people who are in charge of others. So long as any group / institution has a person/persons coordinating its affairs, then such a group or institution has leaders. In this sense, leadership can be defined as the "process of social influence in which a person can enlist the support and aid of others in the accomplishment of a common task"; it is "the action of leading an organization or a group of people" (2014). While the first definition emphasizes on what can happen when an individual is an effective leader, the second is quite innocuous accentuating merely the nomenclature of the position, thus given credence to the point hitherto raised that leadership can move groups or organizations to accomplish tasks, build bridges, promote tolerance / cohesion among diverse peoples or

engender strife and destruction. Thus, leaders are people who direct the affairs of identifiable group / organization to good or bad.

Being a good leader is more than a title. It is about bringing out the best in people by recognizing each individual's potential and skills and building dynamic teams of them. It's all about identifying with those for whom one is responsible; inspiring, empowering and motivating them to want to do their best. The definition of leadership involves connecting to people and building trust and credibility. It is about honesty, forthrightness, having a vision, and translating it into reality for the good of everyone. It is all about possessing outstanding qualities articulated by many researchers which Peter Economy (2014) has effectively couched in his traits that define leadership, viz.:

i. Awareness: Leaders must understand the nature of the difference between management and employees, and allow same to determine their actions. Because people give whatever they say or do weighty interpretations, leaders must be circumspect in their dealings, conducting themselves in ways that permit them to retain an objective perspective on everything that is going on within their organizations or political enclave.

ii. Decisiveness: Making tough decisions is part of the job of leadership. Leaders must realize that in certain conditions, difficult, unilateral and timely decisions, which may not please everyone, must be made in the best interests of the entire organization / body politics. Yet, great leaders know when not to act alone but rather engage in collaborative decision-making.

iii. Accountability: True leaders take responsibility for the team's work, good or bad. Even though different works are assigned to different people according to their competences, a good leader always follows up issues, checking on the performance of employees and monitoring their effectiveness with respect to organizational policies and procedures. True leaders do not take the praise in success, and shift the blame in failure: they take responsibility for the outcome of their team work- good or bad.

iv. Honesty: Tough leaders always follow the golden rule: they treat people how they want to be treated. They are very ethical and believe that uprightness, determination, and reliability form the bases for success. Their integrity is what oftentimes pulls the workforce to be the best they can possibly be.

v. Focus: Outstanding leaders are extremely focused and organized in their dealings. They map out strategies ahead of time, identify and empower key actors and prepare for eventualities by considering possible alternatives. They do not leave things to chance.

vi. Confidence: Confidence is an attitude that comes through knowledge, experience and hard work. Since no good leader could emerge without knowledge, experience and hard work, it means every good leader should be able to exude some high level of confidence. Great leaders are not perturbed by challenges because they know their ideas, opinions and strategies are well-informed. Showing mastery over job descriptions attracts employees to leaders much as honey attracts ants.

vii. Empathy: Amazing leaders show genuine love and concern for the welfare of the led, identifying with them at difficult moments and always searching for constructive solutions to their daunting challenges. Praising employees in public and addressing problems in private is a sure way to enhancing self-efficacy which, in turn engenders productivity.

viii. Optimism: The worst thing that could happen to a person in life, let alone a leader, is to be despondent. Strong leaders are always positive and hopeful. They always seem to have a solution to every problem, avoiding negative thinking and destructive criticisms, and looking for ways to get people work together effectively and efficiently.

ix. Inspiration: Here, Peter believes that whoever emerges with these qualities would be a truly inspiring leader: someone who is able to set standards and empower people to pursue their common ideals; someone who connects openly with people, and in consequence motivates them to give their best at all time.

Such are the qualities which empower great leaders to transform their lands from waste to wealth; from hatred to love; from disunity to unity; and from fragmentation to togetherness that reveal the common humanity of mankind.

3. Bases for the Common Heritage of Mankind

The literary world is trite with speculative ideals which do not give much room for practical human application. While the *New York Times* columnist – Stanley Fish in his piece *Favoritism is Good* has attempted to sketch the familial / sociological motives which underpin the human tendency for preferential treatment, Stephen T. Asma, in his numerous publications has demonstrated that not only is the equal status of strangers and kin in deserving our love an unproven and counterintuitive assumption, it negates the very finite resource of emotional care. Both of them, I would say, would subscribe to the view that even though it sounds nice to feel that the entire human race is our extended family, the practical reality of what it means to be human does not allow this to be far flung. But there are a good number of authors who argue to the contrary.

The notion of *Common Heritage of Mankind* was first mentioned in the preamble to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Later in his 1967 address to the United Nations, the Maltese Ambassador Arvid Pardo used the concept to challenge the 'structural relationship between rich and poor countries' not merely in the law of the sea, but also in international relations (Pardo, 1984). At the end of that convention, it was specifically enunciated as an obligation under international law in the Outer Space Treaty (U.N.T.S., 1967). In point of fact, the aim of this international law in the *common heritage of humanity* principle is to seek to protect, respect and fulfill the interests of all human beings wherever they are living as well as future generations, separately from any politically motivated nation state (Taylor and Stroud, 2013). This was a milestone achievement in international law. One of the main architects of the principle claimed that it was "the most important legal principle achieved by man throughout thousands of years during which law has existed as the regulating element of social exchange" (Cocca, 1982).

Furtherance to this principle and in recognition of the need to safeguard man from the profligacy of genetic engineering, the UNESCO *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights* proclaims in Article one that, "The human genome underlies the fundamental unity of all members of the human family, as well as the recognition of their inherent dignity and diversity. In a symbolic sense, it is the heritage of humanity"; article two notes that "Everyone has a right to respect for their dignity and their rights regardless of their genetic characteristics"; and article four states that, "The human genome in its natural state shall not give rise to financial gains" (UNESCO, 2000). These strongly-worded declarations and the backup sanctions thereof, one would agree, are all aimed at emphasizing on the common humanity of everyone which is based on the Scholastic interpretation of Aristotelian principle that every person, irrespective of colour, nationality or race is a composite of mater (body) and form (soul). Every person partakes of the same nature and must be treated as such without discriminations.

At the heart of the claim to common heritage of humanity is the question of what constitutes personhood. Already Western culture is afloat with philosophies which underpin this relationship. From Augustine to Wojtyla; from Boethius to Buber, depending on which tradition (ontological, psychological, or dialogical) one pitches camp with, human personhood is understood both as an individual substance of a rational nature, and as a being whose meaningfulness is inextricably tied to open communication with others. While Aquinas (no date) sees it as 'a distinct subsistent in a rational nature', Ryle (1949) identifies it with the being that possesses the power of introspection. The positions of Descartes (1968) and Strawson (1959) here constitute what Ryle called a 'batch of category-mistakes' of traditional philosophy which Bernard Williams (1973) claimed to be correcting when he maintained that person is nothing but 'a material body which thinks'.

The reflections of some other authors seem to establish the core of personhood within the ambient of interrelationship of peoples. This is where the opinions of Mounier, Marcel and Buber are very instructive. Mounier (1952) sees person as an entity that exists towards others. He only knows himself in knowing others, and only finds himself in being known by others. "Common opinion notwithstanding", Mounier says, "the fundamental nature of the person is not originality nor self-knowledge nor individual affirmation. It lies not in separation but in communication".

Marcel (1974) located the person within the confines of 'I and thou' relationship. For him, it is in one's relationship with the other that the process of one becoming a person takes place. 'The presence of others is always indispensable to an individual's self-discovery, self-awareness and/or self- differentiation'. Buber has the credit of popularizing this relational concept of the person within the German heritage by his distinction between the *Ich-Es*, (I-It); and the *Ich-Du*, (I-Thou) that characterize human life. For him, in the *Ich-Du* rapport, man lives to respect the worth and dignity of the other because he knows he owes his origin from this relationship. Buber (1947) declares:

> Human persons are essentially directed towards each other. To be man is to be fellow

> man: man becomes only in contact with those who have already become. Only in relation
> with the 'thou' can man become an 'I'.

Thus, as I noted in *The Idea of Personhood*, man essentially is a being of relationship. 'He has always been with the world, with his fellow men, and with his God. The body is given to man as presence in the world; his 'person' is given to him as presence-in-communion'. Without communion in the real sense of the Greek *Koinonia*, the human person is in danger of sliding into oblivion.

If then everyone is a person, and all persons share the same nature whether as a result of the creative act of God or evolution from the same species, and given that the human person cannot subsist in total isolation of others, it means then that everyone has some dignity to be respected, needs to be fulfilled and aspirations to be achieved irrespective of the accidents of history. In this sense, it is only logical to accept that the clamour for the common heritage which springs from the shared humanity of mankind has both biological and social foundations. It is a clamour that is deeply rooted in the core of what it means to be human. Strawson (1959: 112) understood this well when he said that "we act, and act on each other, and act in accordance with a common human nature".

Besides, the quest for common appreciation of all is not merely biological and social, it has an ethical dimension. Peter Singer, for instance, thinks we can overcome factional bias and eventually become one huge 'world-family' since the relative neocortical sophistication of humans allows us to rationally broaden our ethical duty beyond the immediate community to an equal and impartial concern for all human beings. In his *The Expanding Circle*, he argues that,

> If I have seen that from an ethical point of view I am just one person among the many in
> my society, and my interests are no more important, from the point of view of the whole,
> than the similar interests of others within my society, I am ready to see that, from a still
> larger point of view, my society is just one among other societies, and the interests of
> members of my society are no more important, from that larger perspective, than the
> similar interests of members of other societies (2013).

What this means is that if we are to take the impartiality and universality elements in ethical reasoning to their logical conclusions, we would accept that we ought always to have equal regard for all human beings. An individual's needs are not much more important than that of others simply because of the accidents of birth, religious affiliation or race. As members of the same human race, any form of discrimination based on factional bias would task our common resolve and question our competency in bringing about the greatest good for the greatest number.

This utilitarian argument that we can infinitely stretch our domain of care was, for the most part, highlighted by Jeremy Rifkin in his book: *The Empathic Civilization*. Here, Rifkin voices out what appears to be the ethical prerequisite for 'global citizenship': 'we can feel care and empathy for the whole human species if we just try hard enough'. Sketching the progressive evolution of empathy from the blood-based tribalism, to the religion-based tribalism, and then to the nation-state tribalism, Rifkin insists that the time has come for us to empathically embrace all humanity, and even beyond – to other species. For him, we must reach "biosphere consciousness and global empathy in time to avert planetary collapse." And this can only be done when we start feeling as if the entire human race is our extended family. Empathy, he concluded, is the real 'invisible hand' that will lead humankind out of her local and global predicaments.

4. The Common Human Heritage: A Subjective Fact or a Universal Farce?

In his *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Immanuel Kant projected his idea of categorical imperative in this manner: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end" (1972: 110). That is, unlike things that can be pre-empted for our own purposes, persons must not be used merely as means to someone's ends, since they can reason and be reasoned with; they are agents commanding moral values.   In Kant's view, immorality occurs when the categorical imperative is not followed: when a person attempts to set a different standard for themselves than for the rest of humanity. In a sense, this could be adjudged as the root of the modern sociology of boundless affiliation and elimination of factional biases. It became the springboard for affirmative actions that, to a considerable degree, have broken down the barriers of prejudice, stereotype and discriminations that have, for long, plagued humanity.

Elsewhere in the essay "Toward Perpetual Peace" (1999), Kant claimed that the expansion of hospitality with regard to 'use of the right to the earth's surface which belongs to the human race in common' would 'finally bring the human race ever closer to a cosmopolitan constitution'. In this way, Kant did not just ground the

ethical imperative of altruism in the metaphysics of morals, he went further to predict the socio-political outcome of humanity's adherence to such a 'rational' principle, namely – the appearance of a new world order with a broad-based, multiethnic constitution (which is the goal of World Philosophical Forum). This sounds good and indeed very desirable given the spate of conflicts in the world today. But desire itself is not enough to bring a new world order; it needs a wide range of affirmative engagements which must not undermine a repertoire of what it takes to be a person. Perhaps, some further considerations will illumine whether this clamour for equal unbounded love for everyone is not a task in futility.

In everyday interactions, we discover that properties like gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, political party, sports team affiliations, and all of our other group memberships, large and small tend to define us more than being human (Breines, 2013). Not only, as Breines continued, do we often stake our identity and sense of self-worth in these groups, time and again we tend to be more helpful towards those who belong to them, at the expense of those who do not. It is not as if we do not have ethical perspectives, but our individual backgrounds and life situations literally prescribe our reactions to circumstances. Altruists seem to have the conviction that every life is worth just as much as one's own. This is absolutely true given that we are made of the same stuff. But in analyzing the findings of McFarland, Webb, and Brown with the Identification With All Humanity scale (IWAH), Juliana Breines in her article: "Is It Possible to Love All Humanity?" concludes that if individuals were forced to make a direct choice between the lives of family members and strangers, for instance, one might imagine that even the most devout humanitarian would prioritize the lives of those closest to them. We may strive to transcend group boundaries, she says, but when it comes down to hard situations of choice, we are social creatures who flourish on loyalty and belonging. It is hard to imagine a world without any distinctions at all (Breines, 2013).

One might object and rightfully too, that not everyone will succumb to the pressure of filial distinctions or security of one's life. And so the identification with all humanity can still be possible even in the midst of dire circumstances, as it was for the Holocaust rescuers whose own safety was clearly at risk. The single-standard calculus regards ideological/political differences as superficial articles like clothing which one could put on and off; the person is what he is apart from them and it is the person, rather than the accidents of birth or belief or nationality, who merits our respect. As compelling as this argument might be, the comparison of ideological differences to articles of clothing, to state the least, is an oversimplification. Ideologies have shaped the world: built up nations; propagated hateful behaviours that have led to genocides; built loving families, etc. By them men who expend their life savings on their children are called 'loving fathers'; mothers who resist the lures of sexual promiscuity are called 'faithful wives'; and children who do not abandon their aged parents in need are called 'responsible kids'. Since real works in the world are done by real people and not by some 'idealized' entities, it is proper, and sometimes even expedient to prefer fulfilling one's obligations to clinging to some abstract concepts. This is the point Stanley Fish (2013) tried to underscore in his article: "Favoritism is Good" when he wrote:

> Favoritism - giving more than an even break to your own kind - is not a distortion of judgment, but the basis of judgment. And being impartial to those who are a part of you - through blood or creed or association or profession (think of the thin blue line) - is not to be virtuous, but to be ungrateful and disloyal, more concerned with hewing to some abstract principle of respect for all than with discharging the obligations that come along with your most intimate relations. The particularism that in the one vision is an impediment to right action is, in the other, the key to right action.

We are particular individuals, socialized within specific families, schools, cultures and business outfits. The people around us are the people who look out for us, who have our back, who share our history, who stand for the same things we do. Why, as Fish queried, would you not prefer them to strangers? What indeed, do you think will remain of a person after race, gender, ethnicity, education and filial relationships have been discounted?

The hollow of arguments against favoritism is exposed all the more when one likens the clamour for universal respect for everyone to that of 'objectivity' in knowledge. Over the centuries, the maxim that experts have forced down our throats is that while certain knowledge are objective, others are purely subjective. This is often done without proper qualifications; a ploy frequently used to downgrade certain kinds of knowledge. In my quest to trace the springboard for polarized thinking elsewhere in my investigations, I found out that since the 1980s the idea of *situatedness* has gained prominence in research fields. Every individual is born into a situation; grows and lives within specific situations, and functions in line with the provisions of inheritance and society, much like the facticity of *Dasein's* 'thrownness' in Heidegger's ontology. Situatedness refers to specific

conditions under which actions take place. As I noted elsewhere, "since every thought, every action or reaction originates from specific social conditions, every human activity is therefore, situated". Teaching and learning do take place, and have always taken place within embedding social contexts that do not just influence, but fundamentally determine the kinds of knowledge and practices that are constructed (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Perhaps, this explains why feminist epistemologists conceive of knowers as situated in particular relations to what is known, and to other knowers. In other words, the knowers' physical and psychological relations to the world (situatedness) affect what and how they know, and in consequence, their claims to objectivity.

This applies too to the principle of 'blind submission,' – the policy of erasing from submissions for publication all the identifying marks that tell the editors of a journal exactly who has produced the essay they are judging, in order to give 'objective' and 'impartial' evaluation; an evaluation based, as they would claim, on 'intrinsic merits'. Fish had already pointed out the apparent incongruity in such a policy noting that there is no such thing as intrinsic merit, but that merit could be calculated only in relation to those factors the policy of blind submission forbids us from considering. For him, 'pure' judgment 'is never available' not because assessors cannot distance themselves from the prejudices attendant upon their professional histories - predispositions that incline them to value submissions agreeable to their scholarly convictions, much as an employer might value the job application of a relative - but because without those prejudices, 'there would be nothing either to see or to judge' (2013). Hence, it is purely speculative to think of human interactions without much of these preferences.

On the whole, it was the works of Stephen Asma that have presented the most persuasive deconstruction of the argument that humans should show equal preference to all irrespective of family affiliations. Asma critically challenged the inferences of two of the leading liberal social theorists, Jeremy Rifkin and Peter Singer, and subsequently concluded that they were 'different prescriptions for arriving at ethical utopia'. For him, all people can never be equally entitled to one's time, affection, resources or moral duties. For the vast majority of people, 'family members are more entitled than friends, and friends more entitled than acquaintances, and acquaintances more than strangers, and so on'(Asma, January 5, 2013). It is purely conjectural, suspicious and counterintuitive to assume the contrary.

Singer's argument that we should do everything within our power to help strangers meet their basic needs, even if it seriously compromises our kin's happiness, would entail, if one were to be truly impartial to all human beings, reducing one's own family's life to a subsistence level so as to dispense the leftover to needy strangers. Asma was quick to point out not only the impracticality of such redistribution, but its conceptual hollowness. Using the example of a man who bought a fancy pair of shoes for his son, and who had to endlessly stop from giving it out or selling it to give out the money because each time he wanted to, he discovered there was someone else in the world more in need than his prospective beneficiary, he argued that such a practice could lead to an infinite regress.

In response to Rifkin's quixotic view that empathy is an almost limitless reserve, Asma went on to trace the bio-emotional origin of care, situating it within the activities of the limbic brain. Empathy, for him, and I fully admit to this, is not a concept, but a natural biological activity like sprint racing, and is not the kind of thing you can do all the time, otherwise you will literally break the system in short order. If the care system were to be automatically activated each time one perceives someone in need, then the daily news would render one literally exhausted all the time, since the limbic system cannot handle this kind of constant stimulation. Asma (2013) said:

> We can have contagion-like feelings of sympathy when we see other beings suffering, and that's a good thing - but that is a long way from the kinds of active preferential devotions that we marshal for members of our respective tribes. Real tribe members donate organs to you, bring soup when you're sick, watch your kids in an emergency, open professional doors for you, rearrange their schedules and lives for you, protect you, and fight for you - and you return all this hard work. Our tribes of kith and kin are "affective communities" and this unique emotional connection with our favorites entails great generosity and selfless loyalty. There's an upper limit to our tribal emotional expansion, and that limit is a good deal lower than the "biosphere."

It was not surprising then that the research of McFarland, Webb, and Brown discovered that even though people high in *Identification With All Humanity* scale (IWAH) tend to be higher in the personality traits of openness to experience and agreeableness, they are also higher in neuroticism - a trait characterized by anxiety and negativity.

Thus, when we say empathy is a limited resource that cannot stretch indefinitely to cover the massive domain of family and strangers alike, we do not mean that one would be unperturbed in the face of the suffering of strangers. Naturally, our hearts will shudder at people's anguish. But the emotional resource expended when it concerns our kith and kin are never the same.

In the main, I am inclined to say that the common heritage of mankind, as relating to an infinite stretch of our domain of care is more of a subjective fact than a universal reality. Granted, we are all humans and subjects of inalienable rights and care; granted that it is through the 'other' that the 'self' is able to identify its worth and dignity, there is no gainsaying that we cannot love humanity. Rather, we can love only real people: people we encounter every day, beginning from members of our families. Cicero was apt when he averred that "society and human fellowship will be best served if we confer the most kindness on those with whom we are most closely associated" (cf. Asma, January 5, 2013). If everyone were to care for all persons intimately associated with, borrowing Singer's argument, like mathematics, familial empathy will continue its recursive operations infinitely upward, not in terms of everyone caring equally for all, but in terms of all having enough people caring for them.

5. Where lies the problem then?
Concluding in her article - "The Roots of Moral Courage", Kristen R. Monroe affirmed that even though every person has an innate ethical perception, the details are guided by immediate factors, such as the person's background and life situation, much as an innate tendency for language is steered by the specific linguistic context of the country and society into which a person is born and raised (June 23, 2010). This goes on to show that the possession of ethical sense and the tendency to express empathy is a common patrimony, but its expression which, for the most part, determines the texture of relationships between peoples, is often guided by situational factors. The particular context (background situation, societal norms, government policies) under which an individual is groomed will almost always structure his views about life, and his interrelationship with people.

The complex socio-political activities rampant in this modern era, now and again confound the imagination of simple minds. As there are massive actions geared toward the promotion of individual identity and liberty, concurrent activities that enhance cleavages in societies and government control are equally on the rise. Never has man been as knowledgeable with the principles that would create conducive atmosphere for a good life, as our time. Yet, never have governments / leaders been so powerful and their activities so divisive, as our time. It does not take rocket science for one to see that the crisis rocking the modern world is that of leadership. Leaders have created and destroyed empires, caused disaffection among peoples and ignited wars.

As a process of social influence, it is difficult to separate the divisions, stereotypes and discriminations that have compartmentalized the world today from the crisis of leadership. Beginning with the family, to the city, corporate bodies, the state and the nation, various strata of leadership (formal and informal) structure the behaviour of people. Even though government policies have a greater tendency to affect family leadership style than the other way round, a fluff at each level resonates all around the chain. As we noted earlier, great leaders are focused, honest, accountable, decisive, visionary, confident, empathetic and above all inspirational. Such qualities empower them to 'transform their lands from waste to wealth; from hatred to love; from disunity to unity; and from fragmentation to togetherness that reveal the common humanity of mankind'. But when people who lack what it takes to be leaders occupy positions of leadership, the reverse is always the case – strife and destruction within the body politics.

From the first to the second world war, from the Rwandan genocide to the Kosovo massacre, from the Biafran war of attrition to the more recent Gulf wars, from the Trans-Atlantic slave trade to Stalin's repressive communism, history is awash with the moral bankruptcy of wars and brutal acts of discrimination. Unimaginable number of families has been destroyed, cities have been wiped out, and entire nations have been emasculated often as a result of leadership struggle. What could explain the extermination of about six million Jews at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Chelmno and other concentration camps except the hateful ideology of the German leader – Adolf Hitler? What can account for the attacks and reprisals between the Hutus and Tutsis that led to the death of over a million people in Rwanda? Have we forgotten that it was Saddam Hussein's annexation of Kuwait, - a smaller neighbouring country that gave rise to the first Gulf war? Was it not the sit-tight syndrome of Middle-east leaders that instigated the Arab Spring? Ever after, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria have all been in turmoil. Iraq has imploded with the ISIS's brutal and indiscriminate murder of anyone perceived to be in difference with their religious ideology, and the Al-Qaida and Taliban have for long, unleashed terror on their own people of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

In Africa, we have the El Shabab in Somalia, the Boko Haram and political turmoil in Nigeria, the fundamentalists' attacks in Kenya and Mali; the emasculation of the people of Zimbabwe by Robert Mugabe; the massacre of thousands of people following elections in Ivory Coast, etc. Europe is now at the brink of war following the Russian annexation of Crimea and her tacit support to the Pro-Russian fighters at eastern Ukraine. Coloured people are targets of hateful crimes everywhere, and in America, are not given equal 'benefit of doubt' especially by those who supposedly are to enforce the laws. People of Hong Kong are demonstrating for freedom and more liberty from repressive leaders, etc. There is turmoil everywhere in the world because of failure of leadership. Unless and until leaders get it right, the idea of people appreciating the common humanity of everyone will remain a mirage.

6. Conclusion

A 1948 draft World Constitution stipulated that the Earth and its resources were to be the common property of mankind, managed for the good of all. This came at the heels of World War II – a war in which an estimated over sixty million people perished, making it the deadliest war in world history in absolute terms of total dead. This was a war remotely caused by the rise of Italian fascism in the 1920s, Japanese invasions of China in the 1930s, and proximately by the takeover of Germany in 1933 by Adolf Hitler and his Nazis. Thanks then to a highly militaristic and aggressive national ideology prevailing in Germany, Japan and Italy (Coppieters and Fotion, 2008), and championed by their leaders, the world today reels at the memory of this massacre of epic proportion.

In the light of what is happening in the world today, the clamour for the Common Heritage of Mankind (CHM) should be understood as an ethical clamour central to a new world order, based on new forms of cooperation, economic theory and philosophy. It is a call for leaders in governments and business executives to develop comprehensive policies and promulgate inclusive principles that would properly guide the innately possessed tendency for familial empathy to wider horizons. The immediate solution to lack of appreciation of the common humanity of mankind may not lie in seeing everyone as an "idealized equal" and drawing ethical conclusions from such a metaphysical assumption. This may have been the imperative of a philosophical line stretching from Kant to Rawls, but it is not an imperative that fixes the problems of the world today. The solution lies in understanding that practical works are done, as Asma has insisted, by locally situated persons who act not out of a concern for all humanity but out of a concern for that portion of humanity with which they identify. Charity, they say, begins at home. When leaders become responsible to that portion of humanity with which they are identified, then the prospect for 'biosphere consciousness' and an 'empathic embrace of all humanity' would be brighter.

References

A Definition of Leadership'. Retrieved on 22/8/2014 from: http://definitionofleadership.org/

Aquinas, T. (1265-73). *Summa Theologiae*. 1, q 29, a.3 ; see N. Kretzmann and E. Stump (Eds). (1993). *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asma, S. T. January 5, 2013. "The Myth of Universal Love", in *The New York Times.* Accessed on 28/8/2014 from: http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/05/the-myth-of- universal love/?php=true&type=blogs&_r=0

Breines, J. 2013. "Is It Possible to Love All Humanity?". Accessed 28/8/2014. from: http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/is_it_possible_to_love_all_humanity

Buber, M. (2002) [1947]. *Between Man and Man*. Oxford: Routledge, 250–51

Cicero. Cited by Stephen T. Asma. January 5, 2013. "The Myth of Universal Love", in *The New York Times.* Accessed on 28/8/2014 from: http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/05/the- myth-of-universal love/?php=true&type=blogs&_r=0

Cocca A. (1982). *Introduction to the Study of the Legal Framework for Economic Activity in Space*. Cordoba, p. 159 cited in Danilenko, G.M. (1988). "The Concept of the 'Common Heritage of Mankind' in International Law". *Annals of Air and Space Law* XIII: 247–63 at p 250.

'Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict'. (The Hague 14 May 1954). Accessed 3 August 2012, from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13637&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html .

Coppieters, B., and Fotion, N. 2008. *Moral Constraints on War Principles and Cases*. Lanham MD.: Lexington Books, 6.

Descartes, R. 1968. *Discourse On Method And Meditations*. (London: Penguin Books Ltd. p. 54. Through his *cogito ego sum* principle, Descartes understood person as 'mind who has a body'.

Economy, P. (2014). 'The 9 Traits that Define Great Leadership'. Retrieved on 22/8/2014 from:

http://www.inc.com/peter-economy/the-9-traits-that-define-great-leadership.html

Fish, S. January 7, 2013. "Favoritism Is Good", in *The New york Times*.   Accessed on 28/8/14 from: http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/07/favoritism-is-good/)

Kant, I. Cited by Danto, A.C. 1972. "Persons" in Edwards, P., et al. (Eds.). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Vol. 4.* New York: Macmillan Pub. Co. & The Free Press, 110; Cf. also "Categorical Imperative", accessed on 08/09/2014 from: http://hercules.gcsu.edu/~hedmonds/lecture%20notes/kant%20lecture%20notes.htm

Kant, I. 'Toward Perpetual Peace', in Gregor MJ (trans.). 1999. *Practical Philosophy- Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 329

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcel, G. in F. J. Lescoe. 1974. *Existentialism: With or Without God*. New York: Alba House, 101.

Monroe, K. R. June 23, 2010. "The Roots of Moral Courage". Accessed on 09/09/2014 from: http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/roots_of_moral_courage

Mounier, E. 1952. *Personalism*. Indiana: University Of Notre Dame Press, 17

Pardo, A. (1984). "Ocean, Space and Mankind", in *Third World Quarterly* 6 (3): 559–69. doi:10.1080/01436598408419785

Ryle, G. (1949). *The Concept Of Mind*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 164

Singer, P. "The Expanding Circle". Cited by Stephen T. Asma. "The Myth of Universal Love", in *The New York Times*. January 5, 2013. accessed on 28/8/2014 from: http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/01/05/the-myth-ofuniversallove/?_php=true&type =blogs&_r=0

 Strawson, P, F. 1959. *Individuals*. London: Routledge. p. 104. Strawson conceives the person as 'an unanalyzable subject of mind-predicates and body-predicates'.

Taylor, P. & Stroud, L. (2013). *Common Heritage of Mankind: A Bibliography of Legal Writing*. Malta: Fondation de Malte. ISBN 9781291577259

Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. (Jan. 27, 1967). 18 U.S.T. 2410, 610 U.N.T.S. 205

UNESCO. (2000). *The Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights: From Theory to Practice.* Accessed on 04/09/2014 from: ; http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001229/122990eo.pdf

 Williams, B. 1973. *Problems of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar