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CHAPTER ONE
FOUNDATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY AND HUMAN EXISTENCE

Philosophy is a rendering of the Greek concept- 'Philosophia' which means love of or search for wisdom or knowledge. It is a result of a derivative from two Greek words Philos (love) and Sophia (wisdom). Sophomore, derived from Greek 'Sophia and moron' also equally gives another insight to the meaning of philosophy- "the love of wisdom". In the 4th century B.C Socrates [469-399B.C.] called himself a lover of wisdom-a philosopher. Plato [427-347B.C.], a devoted friend and disciple of Socrates who wrote down most teachings of Socrates also largely, shared this contention. Since then the term assumed prominence and especially in the 5th century B.C the term was in popular usage by great philosophers like Heraclites [535-475B.C.], Herodotus and Thucydides. Pythagoras (C.580-570B.C), accordingly concretely conceived philosophers as those who contemplates and seeks the truth. He emphasized on the dialectical and dynamic activity of constant disposition and seeking of wisdom as well as the wisdom that is sought as a philosophical process.

Aristotle (384-322BC) in his own way defined philosophy by reflecting explicitly that; there is a certain kind of science which belongs to being in itself. This science is not the same as any of those that are called special sciences, for none of the latter introspect being in general as being, but separate off some part of it and contemplates it's attributes, as the mathematical sciences do.

From this concrete conceptual clarification
philosophy is thus, distinguished as been more general than the sciences for while the sciences study portions of being, philosophy studies being as a whole. Philosophy thus, according to Odey, concerns itself with both an inclusive and the comprehensive view (the concrete, as well as, the abstract) of man's experiences; it is the thinking that seeks to discover connected truth about all available experiences. Basically, it is in this sense that philosophy also professes empirical experiences as well as constitutes an enterprise of search and discovery. For, a philosopher need the facts (empirical evidence) their connection and their concreteness of experience, as far as reasoning would allow, which when put together may be good, bad, indifferent, conscious or unconscious, ideal or immaterial material.

Paradoxically, philosophy is the theory or logical analysis of principles underlying conduct, thought, laws, and an enquiry into the nature of the universe, primarily concerned with what there is in the world and with what we ought to do about it. Philosophy uses rational thought or logical method in all it seeks to do. It uses logic and propositions. Logic on one hand is the basic branch of philosophy regarded as the science of implication and inference, where facts must be observed and related to laws and confused streams of thought and knowledge or experience broken down into analytic parts such that conclusions bear relevance to premises and procedures. Propositions on the other hand, simply implies true or false in philosophical discourse.

Odey advanced an explanation that a combination of observation and reasoning was the earliest philosophical method used for inquiry. However by 640-546 B.C the methods proved to be rather crude forms of
animism and spiritism and that even when they took the form of magic and elementary religion they still proved unsatisfactory, thus making reasoning assume more significance. For example Thales of Milatus observed many forms of water-as, ice, snow, rain, cloud, fog, mist found in many or all organisms. Heraclites went further in his observation of fire to note that everything is stamped with change and decay except the Logos or law of change. Parmenides of Elena (5th C.B.C) allowed reasoning to carry him further beyond facts of observation. In a complicated argument he said that motion and change are unreal and that the only one, unmoving and changeless is true being. Being is, and it is, its 'isness'. Being can be known only by reason. Here facts show change in their complex variety, observation fades, and pure reason rules. Philosophy prominently promises also a deeper understanding capable of indefinite expansion, as Heraclites[535-475B.C.S] clearly put it, "Philosophy is like a soul you will not find the boundaries of the soul by traversing in any direction, so deep is the measure of it".

Bertrand Russell related that philosophy is to be studied not for the sake of any definite answered to its questions. For no definite answers can as a rule be known to be true, but rather for the sake of the questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our conception of what is possible enrich our intellectual imagination and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculations but above all, because through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates; the mind also is rendered great and becomes capable of all that union with the universe which constitutes the highest goal all philosophers strivers for; to attaining real life and really what is.
However, strictly speaking the philosophical foundations of human existence and the nature of philosophy can best be understood in concrete historical perspectives. Feuerbach attempted to do this by reflecting that philosophy is all about the study of nature and man, whom he however, erroneously saw as a product of the protracted development of nature. Hegel too used the historical laws of dialectics in analyzing the philosophical past but could not however, concretely apply these to the future. His dialectics was abundantly one of a consciousness beyond man and the universe. Originally all scientific subjects were regarded as philosophy. Philosophy of matter now encompassed what is physics and chemistry; while philosophy of mind encompassed psychology and other behavioral sciences. Thus accordingly, philosophy by nature was seen as too broad to cover any field of theoretical inquiry. In other words, any subject matter with a generalized explanatory theory was regarded as a branch of philosophy. Odey related that when generalized theory becomes dominated by a major theoretical framework with standardized methods of criticism or confirmation it was capable of staying on its own from the mother country of philosophy. For example, the philosophical problem converted to a scientific one was that of the nature of life. Initially life was considered to be an entity that entered the body at birth and departed at death. But long afterwards, the natures of life become known as biochemistry.

Thus, the nature of philosophy is such that, once argumentation and disputation brings up a theory accompanied by a methodology, this leads to the independence and autonomy of another discipline. And this came to form the basis of historical and scientific nature of philosophy.
2. A Survey of the main Branches of Philosophy

Philosophy by nature is a very vast and widely covered field of human Endeavour. Its scope includes everything, since it aims at discovering connected truths about experience. But since the philosopher cannot deal with everything simultaneously, according to Odey he approaches the big avalanche that is philosophy in any of the following field or branches of philosophical study. These include the following:

Methodology: In applying a methodology philosophers ask, what methods do we use? "And which ever method is used must be rational and logical and possess the science of implication and inference. The significance of this is that, this partly shows how all philosophical branches or fields' overlaps and unify in concrete specificities attesting to its multi-faceted, diversified but holistic nature.

Methodology synthesizes conflicting hopes and aspirations and concretizes its place in historical development of society, assuring it of a glorious and successful future. The force of methodology, of course, lay in its ability to bring together diverse grievances, hopes, and aspirations, to give its moral and empirical criticisms contemporary relevance and bit and above all, to point to a seemingly simple way out. It is in this way that classical Marxism has become for many thinkers the paradigm of an ideology- a general critique of existing society and existing conditions; a proclamation of moral and human values in terms of which these conditions are to be judged; and a mechanism, an historical, empirical, description of the way in which the transition from the debased present to the glorious and moral future would be achieved. Through the application of methodology when facts are observed
and related to laws, it is ensured that parts must be analyzed and must be seen as wholes to which they belong. This requires especially, the synoptic and even a little of other approaches to philosophical discourse.

**Epistemology:** The term epistemology is a derivation from two Greek Words-'Episteme' meaning (knowledge) and 'logos' meaning (theory). Thus, James Frederick Ferrier (1808-1864), a Scotch idealist was the first to coin out this term in the 19th century to mean theory of knowledge. Epistemology is regarded as that branch of philosophy which has developed around answers to perennial questions concerning knowledge. Epistemology existed before the nomenclature itself, this is traceable to John Locke's an 'Essay concerning Human Understanding' in which fundamental methods and distinctive grounds of knowledge were formulated. Fundamental questions are raised in epistemology about knowledge in both forms and application such as, what is knowledge? What are the sources of knowledge, Is it possible to really know? How can we determine true knowledge, How is knowledge in both forms and application? It is possible to really know? How is knowledge of what is not present, possible? What is the nature of present knowledge? Etc, etc,

In the field of Epistemology, there exists also another branch of knowledge known as phenomenology which examines a given data of knowledge and experience such as, death, guilt, belief, despair etc which are either covered by interpretations or are hidden from ordinary observations. This branch of epistemology aims at accurate descriptions through disciplined efforts of such hidden truths. Philosophers therefore, impart different types of knowledge depending on what knowledge they have commanded, its reliability and significance.
Metaphysics: This is a branch of philosophy which studies the nature of reality, the nature of man and the nature of things governing the universe. It is an attempt to find a true account of reality or an attempt to describe all types of reality in their systematic relations and differences. Metaphysics entails knowledge about something or an object. Such factual knowledge are called reality which can be expressed in degrees as physical, mental, ideal, particular, universal and so on. Indeed, one of the fundamental problems of philosophy pertain the one of giving a general description of the universe particularly, the essence, existence, creation, reality of God, supernatural, cosmos among other entities. In the field of metaphysics there is however a sharp contrast of idealism compared with communist dialectical materialism; idealism (that reality is of the nature of mind consciousness), monism (i.e. the theory that one principle or being will explain the plurality in the world and qualitative metaphysical monism believes that the universe is one individual entity etc), pluralism (the theory that reality is many, either is quantity of quality), to portray life as it is with idealization. There are several other meanings of realism like epistemic realism which is the doctrine that knowledge of an object does not depend on its being known, which in turn may be monistic or dualistic etc. all these terms refer to systems of metaphysics. The subfield of metaphysical philosophy has been historically subdivided into; Ontology: [which is devoted into the investigation of the nature of being in general]; Cosmology: [which is definition of nature]; Rational psychology [which deals with philosophy of the mind]; and Rational theology: [which pertains what can be known about God beside revelations].
Axiology: This is a branch of philosophy which professes values in life. Axiology therefore, is referred to as a theory of value. This branch of philosophy comprise of ethics---a theory of good conduct, aesthetics---a theory of beauty and logic---the study of correct reasoning. In aesthetics it is such areas as Arts, Music, Poetry and Drama which had received premises. Orient and occident philosophers from the earliest time devoted much thinking to the value of life and life of value. They were concerned about what goals in life were really worth striving for, what is their nature and if they really exist, what is their value? Some of these value experiences include moral goodness, beauty, and religious worship. Logic and philosophy, Ethics and esthetics dealing with these values is called normative sciences, while the whole field of value investigation is known as axiology; the Greek theory of the valuable, which appear to be another branch of metaphysics. Logic on another plane is what gives 'teeth' of order and systemic concreteness as well as disciplinarily defense and justification in philosophical discourse.

History of Philosophy: This field of philosophical discourse pertain ramifications of investigations of the development of thought in all branches of philosophy. In this area of study the earliest philosophical accounts were documented in ancient times by Aristotle in the first book of his metaphysics and later by Diogenes Laertius in the 3rd century A. D.

Aristotle (384-322 B. C) the pupil of Plato and Socrates were the greatest philosophers of their time. Aristotle taught philosophical development from pure matter toward pure form. He introduced the former logic, numerous sciences and many branches of
philosophy. He is regarded as a believer in God, and was mainly seen as a critic of his predecessors rather than an expansionist on their ideas.

Up to the time of Hegel whose lectures were published by his students posthumously, there was practically no systematic or critical treatment of the development of philosophical ideas, until the emergence of Karl Marx who revolutionised the existing trend of philosophical discourse as well as the Hegelian Dialectics and introduced in its place the Marxian philosophy which shows the interconnection among the main categories of philosophical dialectics in their mutual convertibility. This was perhaps because right from the period of Diogenes' philosophy was nothing more than gossip, padded bibliographies mixed with some nuggets of truth in narration without any logical order. With the emergence of Hegel and later on Karl Marx and other critical philosophers, the development of philosophy assumed litmus contest. Finally due to the necessity of relating methods and fields of philosophy to broader perspectives, there emerged basic philosophical branches like; philosophy of science, philosophy of law, philosophy of history, philosophy of matter, of social sciences, of education etc. and other subject matter, no matter how limited or broad, became investigated from a philosophical point of view.

3. Nature of Philosophical Problems, Prominence in Philosophical Scholarship and emergence of philosophy in higher educational Institutions.

Life in Europe during the middle Ages was dominated by the Catholic Church which commanded monopoly over land and authority over vast estates. The church manipulated, conditioned and at times dictated
the roles of secular governments; it was as Odey put it, a sort of monarchical state within a state. The church lived by its own canon law which in 1142 was even codified by the British Government in its Decretum. The Church also had its own law courts to try those who had "benefit of clergy" or cases arising over conflicts involving wills, sworn contracts, marriage, blasphemy, sorcery, among other cases; Indeed it was primary guide to moral life. It adjudged that wealth was a great temptation to sinning and that people must have to accept their status in life as trials of their virtue.

According to Bowie and others philosophy in the Dark Ages (5th-9th C.) witnessed Christianity as a force shaping the direction of things especially in the realms of thought and indeed, it played fundamental role even in the decline of Greco-Roman civilization. Odey vividly explained that the Church attacks upon "paganism" involved not only the physical destruction of the works of the classical masters, but also and most importantly a transformation of their modes of thinking into Christian forms. Christianity was determined that the orientation of thought should be turned to the other world of the supernatural, the miraculous, the revealed and the authoritative aspects of knowledge, where rational modes of thought or direct observation of phenomena could serve these aims. Thus, the fundamental groundwork of medieval thought was faith, faith in what was revealed. The general belief was that all happening was part of a divine plan moving in the direction of the last judgment and that reason, when properly used, could find some of the purposes of this divine plan as they affected man and his institutions.

During this period, philosophy produced no
master work equal to that of St. Augustine and although the period was uncreative, it was not entirely unproductive. Grammars were written, translations were made of the works of Aristotle and Porphyry, and encyclopedias of information (even though filled with many errors) were complied. There was also establishment by Martianus Cappell and Cassiodorus of a curriculum of study, "Seven Liberal Arts" were established and then divided into a trivium (grammar, rhetoric and logic) and a quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music). There was also, the works of Boethius (D.524) who was the first to fuse the philosophy of Aristotle with Christian theology as well as a Latin vocabulary. His work, 'the consolidation of philosophy', was seen as neo-platonic and Stoic rather than Christian.

Scholastic philosophy began with the Carolingian Renaissance as a philosophical rebirth. Charles has founded palace and cloister schools and had brought Alouin from York who introduced the trivium and Quadrivium in the schools. The schools spread rapidly into urban centers in England, France, Germany and Italy. Teachers at these schools were called "Schoolmen" and their approach to the subjects in the trivium and Quadrivium was known as scholastic. As this approach grew into a philosophy, it became known as scholasticism. However, scholasticism never became one philosophy, based on one method; it included a number of philosophies and a number of methods each depending on initial premises, and many arriving at different conclusions. Debate often violent, was also featured in scholastic thought during the middle Ages, yet scholastic philosophy is distinguished from non-
scholastic philosophy by a number of criteria. It was the philosophy of a Christian society and as such was based upon accepted authority in the forms of tradition and revealed religion. Tradition bound the scholastics to the systems of Aristotle and Plato as adopted to Christian thought. The problems to which the scholastic thinkers applied themselves were controlled by theology; rational interests were never permitted to push religious pre-occupations aside. Put in other words, philosophy was subordinated to theology.

Scholastic methods were based on Greek logic; concern was with deduction, systematisation and formal logic. To Greek logic scholastics added unique pedagogical device which involved eight distinct steps of; stating the question or proposition; giving a succinct listing of the negative arguments; making a brief statement of the affirmative and giving a citation of authority; stating the principal difficulties and doubts which inhere in the preposition; then giving a detailed preventative of the negative, following with a detailed presentation of the affirmative and which include refutation of the negative; advancing an explanation to solve the inherent doubts; and giving a summary by disposing of the negative.

The scholastics made considerable use of the “Tree of Porphyry”. Right from Aristotle onwards, philosophers had sought to arrange all knowledge into a hierarchy of "forms". Odey explained clearly that this tree enabled one to determine quickly that any human individual is a rational, sensitive, animate, corporeal substance. In other words, it provided philosophers with their initial premises on which to build a syllogism, for from the tree of porphyry people were expected to secure the major
premise. For example, Man is a rational animal. This leads to the minor premises- Plato is a man. From these two premises the conclusion follows- Ergo:- Plato is a rational animal.

In the medieval mind the major premises were provided by fixed and unalterable belief derived from faith in revelation and authority; hence the main concern of thinkers was with minor premises and conclusions. One could not safely question the validity of the major premises until the church lost its power to punish free thought. At the time men arose to test, observe, weigh, and challenge the major premises of the scholastics, the scientific thinking was really in the making and scholastic philosophy began to make tremendous strides, forged in the heat of debate. In the ninth century an original and daring thinker, John Scotuss Erigena (Duns Scotus), had produced a work which raised reason above revelation and authority and which dissolved all of nature into a pantheistic reality. Substance, bodies, living things, animals and men were all emanations from a single source, God, and in essence were indistinguishable. A little later, Berenger of Tours had raised many a question about the "reality" of transubstantiation. This problem of the "reality" of that which was not given directly to the senses became the so-called "problem of universals," which is central in the history of medieval thought. On the problem of universals: Plato and Aristotle differ here. Human beings perceive many particular objects these trees, and all rocks these terms being simply "tree" and "rock" without reference to a particular object. For Plato the idea or form of the rock or tree had more reality both in logic and in being than any particular specimen Aristotle insisted that the mind gets the idea of any particular from
the visible object itself. For Aristotle the universal was a classification made by the mind: for Plato it was the true reality.

Belief in the one or the other of these propositions converted medieval scholastic into "Realities" (those who agree with Plato) and "Nominalists" (those who reduce universals to the names of things). St. Anselm headed the former and Rosecellinus (c. 1050), the latter.

This was no pointless quibble. Nominalists said there was no transmutations in the Eucharist since bread and wine remained visibly unchanged; there was church universal apart from separate and individual church groups; there was no unity in any trinity, etc. In other words, nominalists challenged any concept for which visible evidence was but a short distance from heresy. Roscellinus was, in fact, convicted of heresy in the matter of the trinity and he was forced to resent his views.

Peter Abelard (1070-1142) produced his doctrine of conceptualism. His compromise was based on the fact that a universal has no objective existence as such exists as a concept in the mind. The mental concept, however, is derived from observation of particular things and from taking note of the similarities or identities in their qualities. From these real identities the concept is made. In this sense, it has objective reality.

Abelard was typical of the new man that was typical of the new man that was arising in the middle Ages. He was a troubadour poet, a bold lover (his love for Heloise is famous as one of the world's great love stories), a fearless brilliant scholar, a ruthless debater and logician, a free inquiring spirit. Abelard came into conflict with Bernard who was his complete opposite-ascetic, completely on faith, distrusting reason. Against Ber
Abelard argued that thought must begin in doubt for doubt leads to inquiry and inquiry to the truth. For his own satisfaction Abelard composed the Sic et None, a book which proposed 158 questions concerning faith and reason. About these questions, Abelard collected arguments for (sic) and against (None). He attempted no reconciliation of the opposites, but others did (Peter Lombard in the sentences; Thomas Aquinas in the summa). The significance of Abelard's work was that following him there could be no reliance any more on faith alone but reason.

The Revival of Aristotelianism. Abelard's insistence on logical rigor gave an impetus to the study of Aristotle. The time was ripe, for from Moslem lands the works of Aristotle were being imported into Europe and translated into Latin. Once acquainted with Aristotle's writings, Alexander of Hales, John of Fidenza and Albertus Magnus began the task of fusing his teachings with Christian theology and philosophy. St Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was a pupil of Albertus Magnus and set himself to the task of creating a synthesis or summa of all knowledge rational and revealed. In his monumental Summa Theologia, Aquinas made the major summary of the Christian synthesis. Indeed, he represents the greatest of the medieval thinkers. The work 'The Thomistic System' was one of the greatest works in philosophy. St Thomas was a theologian and his work in philosophy must be regarded in the light of its relation to theology. His problem was to introduce philosophy into religion without corrupting the essence and nature of theology. Theology was to be treated as one of the revealed, and the revelation must remain intact. But some truths in theology like for instance, (God's existence) can be ascertained without revelation.
Thomism or Thomistic system is regarded as essentially realistic and concrete. Paradoxically while Metaphysics studies the nature of being; Thomas studied it as existent being. He started with the existing world and asked what its being is, how it exists, what is the condition of its existence, etc. at the time, he concentrated upon supreme existence, on being that is its own cause. By placing his emphasis upon existence Thomas advanced philosophy beyond Plato and Aristotle who emphasized essence rather than existence. God, of course, was both essence and existence; any other existence was a creation by God. Concentration upon existence made Thomas begin with sense-experience from the visible world. Even in his proofs of the existence of God, Thomas begins with the visible world. The theologian accepts God as creator as an unquestioned assumption; the philosopher argues or reasons his way up to God the creator. One proceeds from a revealed premise, the other from a reasoned conclusion. Thomas produced five famous proofs for the existence of God: proof from motion; whatever is moved has a mover, but motion must have begun with a first mover that was it self unmoved. This cause of initial motion was God; the unmoved mover. Concerning proof from causation, he reasoned similarly that there must have been a first cause for all efficient causes. This first cause is God. On concerning proof from contingent being, he in sighted that Beings depend upon one another ad infinitum. There must therefore be one being that does not depend on any but itself. This self dependent being is God. Concerning proof from the stages of perfection, he maintained that in the world, things are arranged in more and more perfect series and the most perfect is God. About proof from teleology, he advanced that the universe exhibits purpose and design.
Purpose and design imply a directing will, that is the will of God. By such reasoning Thomas sought to prove that God is eternal, pure act, without matter, identical with His own essence, absolutely perfect, the highest good, complete unity; an intelligent being, a being with will a loving being, etc.

He reasoned the human intellect cannot apprehend God directly it comes to knowledge through the senses. Outside are corporeal objects that act on the senses and produce particulars then the particular proceeds to the intellect which has the capacity to make an abstraction and derive a universal. According to him there are no innate ideas in the mind; all knowledge begins with sense perception. The human mind cannot therefore, in this life, attain knowledge of immaterial substances that are not the object of the senses. But sense impressions can suggest, by analogy and logic, what immaterial substances may be like.

Everything seeks to fulfill its potentialities; such fulfillment is perfection. Evil is relative to good and is the failure of a thing to reach its proper form. Since all things come from God they are actual or potentially good; evil is negative, a deficiency in being, an incomplete realization of its potential. Evil exists but it is not real since it is not a part of but the absence of being.

The basic explanation is that God created man in His own image but men direct themselves through free-will to their appointed ends. Man and angel alone are capable of sin. Man and angel have definite places in a universal hierarchy, the chain of being. Man's happiness does not consist of bodily pleasure, honors gained, glory, wealth- these are mean to moral ends. Man's greatest happiness is in understanding God and attaining to virtue.
The ultimate point therefore is that the universe is evidently governed by natural law, human and divine. The laws of nature are the laws of God at the level of inanimate nature; the laws of reason in personal and social morality are the laws of God at the human level; the divine law is revelation of the laws of God at the spiritual level.

The Decline of scholasticism came as a result of some radical forces which swept through right at the tail end of the 13th century. Fundamentally attacks on the Thomistic synthesis came from within the ranks of the scholastics. Duns Scotus (1270-1398) found flaws in Thomistic logic and suggested that major premises needed some other form of examination. William of Occam (1280-1349) drove a sharp wedge between faith and reason, revived Nominalism and brought European thought close to the experimental method of investigation. The reasoning of post-Aquinas scholastics became so tortuous that men were repelled by philosophy in general and began to seek other means of acquiring knowledge. By the 14th century scholasticism was clearly outmoded; it was far too static for the dynamic forces that have been released by the first winds of the renaissance, the Commercial and Scientific Revolutions and the Reformation.

**Medieval Universities**

Odey related that Universities begin to form in the twelfth century and that at its inception a university stood for a kind of guild or cooperation; later it became particularized as a guild of learners and teachers. In this form, universities began to receive charters from royal and ecclesiastical authorities giving them special rights or immunities. Bologna was an early university center. Students flocked to that town to study civil law. At first the university at Bologna was controlled completely by the
students. It was they who organized living quarters, qualifications for teaching, standards of teaching, performance, courses of study, etc. The masters, however, were permitted to decide in the matter of granting degrees. To Paris came students who wished to study theology. Before long, however, the universities there have been divided into separate faculties of arts, canon law, medicine and theology. Customary degrees granted were Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Doctor of Laws, Doctor of Theology and Doctor of Medicine. The standard undergraduate curriculum was the trivium and quadrivium. Slowly graduate schools began to specialize. Paris remained the center of theology and Bologna for law; for medicine however, one went to Salerno or Padua in Italy, or Montpellier in France. These developments and several others revealed to some great extent the nature of the development of philosophy and philosophical problems in their processes of historical change and led to the philosophical evolution of various human institutions as we have came to experience them today.
CHAPTER TWO

PHILOSOPHY AND THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN INSTITUTIONS

A. SCIENCE:
Science evolved from several stages, right from the period of Antiquity which involves speculation about the nature of the universe and man; then in the Ancient period which involves what was called mystical idealism, which made philosophers seek hidden realities, as evident with the Greeks (25000BC) ago. This was followed later by the medieval period, when idealism and materialism became the motive force of science centered on God; Then further to the modern period when profound scientific thinking which commenced with the renaissance assumed growing proportions; And finally, the contemporary period which featured close cycle theories (Laws of universe) and therapist modernism (metaphysical research) in science.

1. In Antiquity, impetus into speculation of the universe began with the ancients such as the Egyptians, Babylonians, Cretans, Indians, Japanese, and Chinese. These civilizations were great achievement in the areas of crafts, arts, architecture, law, agriculture, religion, statesmanship and rudimentary science. Much of the knowledge of the universe was learned from the animistic helpers. It is to the animistic helpers that the command went through the rulers of the forces of the elements in creation to fashion the world of matter (subsequent creation) from which man of the earth belongs. The animistic beings fashioned both the Ethereal as well as the Gross material world in all the gradations that have become the field of activity for the development of
humans. To these animistic helpers of the various elements (water, air, earth and fire) were the so-called elemental beings. These elementals at some time in the prehistoric period were mistakenly looked upon as gods, such as the giants. They featured greatly in the times of Ephesus (Jaffder), the Atlantis, Lemura and other lost kingdoms of Antiquity.

2. The Ancient Period: This period featured strongly the Greeks (2500BC) and mystics of life were vigorously sought. Speculations became bolder with advent of early philosophers who sought to seek and expose hidden realities. They therefore sought for the substratum as the fundamental elements for the universe. Their material interpretation of the universe was known as hylozoism (nature philosophers). They made attempts of an explanation of the laws of the cosmos and the interconnected existence of things based on the unifying elements or principles, and that is why the early Greek philosophers were also called cosmologists.

Science for instance, was seen as an investigation of the ontological wonder, and the basic way to investigate this wonder was to raise questions and attempt answers. For example, in unraveling what constitute existence, to Thales: “all is water,” but for Anaximander: what is, is void or peiron”, while for Anaximenes: “All is air”. Empedocles and Anaxagoras located the fundamental stuff in the four elements: water, air, fire and earth. Parmenides saw “Pythagoras what is” as being, to him not-being” and becoming” do not exists Being is one, indivisible, unchangeable and permanent entity. The way of being to him is “reason” while the way of “not-being” and “becoming” is the senses or illusion. Herodotus on the other hand held that “what is,” is “change” or “flux” and
Fire is the acid-test which everything must go through and as they do so, their forms are altered. However, fire is guided by a principle of intelligibility known as Logos. Pythagoras on his part thought that things are made up of innumerable numbers or dots with number four as the base number.

To Democritus, everything is made up of atoms which are the smallest individual particles. While to Plato, the innumerable but perfect numbers depicts the perfect essences of things which can only be found in the world of forms.

Aristotle developed his theory of matter and form, or potency and act otherwise known as the theory of hylomorphism. He applied this theory to explain the physical structure of the world in physics. In Biology, he studied 500 species of animals and classifies them into sub-groups known as “genus” and “species”.

In logic and chemistry, his theory of hylomorphism to today is corroborated by the theory of morphogenetism. In the last days of Greeks were featured great scientists like Euclid the mathematician and physicist who discovered the law of density. Hippocrates was the father of Medicine; while Hipparchus, was the astronomer. The Greek civilization was dated 330 to 325 B.C. The Romans too featured in Military, administration, engineering, Architecture and arts.

3. Medieval Period: Two dominant schools idealism Vs materialism dominantly existed in the medieval period. Materialism supports a this- worldly point of view, while idealism supports an other- worldly point of view. It was one philosophy that assert that reality is material, and encourages material development more than the one that asserts that reality is spiritual. In Medieval Greek what
 existed was mystical idealism while in Europe; idealism supports another worldly point of view. So idealism became dominant in medieval Europe. Indeed, what existed in ancient Greek was mystical idealism while in Europe, idealism adopted religion as a theological perspective whose “ultimate knowledge” was God. It is premised that human understanding could not know anything except through the illumination of God. That scientific knowledge if it is possible is only by divine grace; this means, man had no direct access to nature except through God. Therefore the age of faith as opposed to reason was more fundamental. Other non-European civilizations share the same attitude for example, in Arabia, India and Japan the worldly philosophy thrived.

4. Modern Period: The modern period began with the renaissance (13th -14th C A.D. as the foundation of contemporary science. Philosophical enterprise through the theory of knowledge was overwhelmed by scientific superiority thus Epistemology overthrows metaphysics. Philosophers like Francis Bacon, David Hume, Rene Des Cartes and Immanuel Kant; found methods of geometry, physics, mathematics and psychology. Scientists like Kepler, Capenicius, Galileo, Ernst Mach, Heinrich Hetz, Henri Pincase, Max Planck, Pierre Duhem and up to Albert Einstein (between 15th and 20th centuries), sought to establish metaphysical orientations for their scientific researches. These nature philosophers realized the pitfalls of Euclidean geometry and Newtonian science. Thus, one common feature of the modern period is that it was an age when reciprocal relationship existed between the sciences and philosophy. Others are Isaac Newton, Leibnitz, Broglic, schrodinge, Wener Heisenberg, David Bohm, Dalton, Edison among others.
5. Contemporary Period: The contemporary period is otherwise known as the "postmodern age" or "postmodernism" because its immediate roots lie in the modern era. Three philosophical strands, neo humanism, neo-cartesianism and the particle or quantum physics theory in science, further gave rise to other sub-theories of relativism, indeterminacy or uncertainty and hollow movements.

The discoveries of science in the contemporary era are buildups from the insights of classical science and philosophy. Analyzed differently, scientific progress has been the result of certain principles or theories known as the Closed Circle Theories which have their roots in antiquity and modernism. These series of theories are philosophico-scientific explanation of the operational laws of the cosmos or the universe. The discovery of these theories has sparked off great revolutions in the areas of mathematics, geometry, physics, chemistry biology, mechanics, genetic engineering, space exploration, optics, the resolution of the space, time, motion problems etc. these theoretical and philosophico-scientific examples of the explanation of the cosmos include the following: Geocentricism, Heliocentricism, Classical Newtonian Physics, Quantum Physics or Quantum Mechanics, The Relativity Theory or Relativism, The Theory of indeterminacy or Uncertainty, and the Hollow Movement Theory.

In the millennium, a new theory has been conspicuously added with so much revolutionary vigor and break through—the Gagus theory expounded by Professor Oyibo which again, revolutionised scientific world of contemporary period, making science to undergo yet another stage of evolution of human institution.
PHILOSOPHY AND THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN INSTITUTIONS

B. Religion

Religion deals with man's attempt to exercise devotion. That is man's relationship with the superior powers and his search for final peace in or beyond his cosmos. It is a quest to acknowledge the unknown superior power above man and to relate accordingly with him. In this wise, it's also the work of enlightenment.

Uppermost in the religious attitudes are, the essence of obligation; That is, in Islam it entails a collective devotion, while in Christian faith it entails individual and personal devotion to the superior power.

In prehistoric times, the forces of the elementals, that is, the nature beings predominated in material creation manifesting themselves helpfully in uplifting the world of matter. This period marked the era of animistic forces or animism which presented a plethora of animating activities which are miraculous and far above human capabilities, for they work in the power of the whole. This was evident in the times of the Atlantis and Lemura, as well as other lost kingdoms or worlds.

The animistic taught man almost everything man needed in the world of matter and all the natural laws operating in material creation. These laws of nature include; the law of like or homogeneity, the law of sowing and reaping, the law of balance (give and take) and the law of gravity.

Human beings saw the immense activity of these elementals during this time and began to relate with them and regard them as "gods" and sought to explain life as
being mediated by them (elementals). Some of these elementals were the mighty field forces of nature like the giants and other elementals like the elves, salamanders, nixies, gnomes, dryads, fauns and water-sprites, among others.

The Bible gave a pictorial view of two millions of years in the preparation of the earth as evidenced by the work of the elementals associated with different spheres. Some were associated with flowers, plants and the meadows. Others water, others the air and also, with fire; through these they related with mankind. Apart from these helpers there were also other helpers sent to mankind at different points in time to lead humanity to the Godhead. In prehistoric times Jalfder was sent and later on Buanan was also sent particularly, to the heart of Africa and later Moses to the Israelites.

Later in ancient times the totemistic era featured prominently in form of belief in objects or idol worship; even animals were worshiped and sacrificed. “It was believed that “God” always wanted the blood of bulls and goats to smell as a sweet savour in his nostrils”. They even preferred to believe in the possibility of the Deity's having nostril.

Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, Romans among others, have shared this period. Mercury for instance, was recognized as the Lord of the elementals, what ancient Greece knew as Hermes, the Greeks and even the Danes spoke of Odin. The belief in idols and idol worship became as strong as men began to find and worship these elementals and even common animals Some even worshipped engraved idols and believe in them as gods.

Buanan for instance, had to gradually begin t
teach man the belief in one God (Anu) in Africa. Moses through severe suffering with the Israelites, had to gradually form in them believe in one supreme God, whose commandments he also gave as God's will. Other forerunners who also taught the various human beings a crystallized believe in one God and a clarification that the elementals were only God's servants and not God in themselves were; Buddha (in India) Lao-tse (in China) Zoroaster (in Persia, Iran) and Mohammed (in Arabia). The work of enlightenment pertaining God extended to a stage that the Lord Christ Himself came through Jerusalem and brought more enlightenment about God's will or his laws. Man however, introduces many wrongs about his message after him and 600 years after him Mohammed came in Arabia and above all reintroduce the knowledge of Christ; that God's love can not be separated from His justice. He enlightened people on the justice and love of God Almighty - the creator of all, requesting man to give total submission to God's will: hence Islam. Mohammed advised on the need for constant re-unification to God through prayers. Parsifal too was sent to undertake the tour of the seven world communities to enlighten and share God's love. In Ephesus, which is our earth, however, had to call forth the judgment into being.

In the medieval periods down to the modern times man's persistent ignorance created thought forms of dark nature through persistence indulgence in wickedness and concomitant production of dark activities of hell, witches, wizards, magic, witchcraft and other cultic activities which became predominated in societies. The predominance of these practices led to many religious wars which took a lengthy period of time in the history of
humanity, Wars that could have been avoided if humanity but could have listened, but which however; saw the collapse of great religions and nations. Many writers and poets of divine spirited minds were exterminated in the Wanton destruction that characterized these religious wars. The persecution and wars of religions even affected envoys of God and their messages became reduced into rigid forms of religion. In contemporary times philosophers have observed deeply the development of religion overtime. Karl Marx's view of religion on one hand is based on the basic premise that the economic forces are dominant in society and as such, everything else is secondary. He saw religion as "false consciousness”. It is the “opiates” of the peoples, because it offers them a “pie in the sky” to divert them from class struggle and prolong their exploitation. Marx expressed this view because he saw the abuse and use of religion by the ruling and dominating classes in his times.

Auguste Comte on the other hand, advocated for religious secularism as an evolutionary stage of religion in contemporary times. According to him, religion was once important but became obsolete by modernization as a result; the sacred which was the domain of religion has been replaced by the secular, or that which is removed from the super natural. That is, to say; religious belief systems have been displaced by scientific knowledge while the healing, educational and social service work of the Church has been taken over either by government or by non-religious private groups. Comte (1855) wrote of three stages of human thought: the theological (religious metaphysical (philosophical) and the scientific (positive). The last stage constitutes the only valid one Comte. According to him if, religion survived at all
would only be a "religion of humanity based upon science. A great philosopher of all times, Abd-Ru-Shin, clarified that the various divine teachings of mankind were willed by God and are supposed to have formed lungs of a single adder for the ascension of mankind. He related that we have abused and misused religion and have turned every divine message of God into a religion for our own convenience! Thereby, placing religion upon a pedestal far removed from everyday life and by doing so we have removed God's will from our daily life or separated ourselves from God's will; instead of uniting with it and making it the centre of our daily life activity, thus, becoming one with it. For every divine message was granted to us so that it should become an integral part of us! We worried that today; religion and daily life have always remained for us, two separate things; and it is not supposed to be so.

PHILOSOPHY AND THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN INSTITUTIONS:

C. Morality:

In prehistoric times up to the ancient, the search for purity of heart and decency of life constitute the moral question. A Greek philosopher, Aristotle in Ancient times, maintained that a human being has a capacity of a rational behavior and rational behavior is the basis of ethics while morality is its object. The Latin word for Ethos is roughly Mos, which has been translated in English language as "Mores". Mos acquired the meanings of custom, character, behavior, inner nature, law, regulations, fashion and style of clothing; Relying on the Greek precedence and making a direct reference to Aristotle; Cicero formed
the adjective moralis ("moral") from the word Mos. Later in the 4th century BC, the Romans coined the noun moralitas. Both Greek ethics and the Roman's moralitas did not originate from the people's popular consciousness; each of the two terms was an artificial term, which was created to give a name to a certain academic field, that is, ethics.

In Medieval up to modern times the term "ethics and "morality" gained currency throughout Europe. It was dominantly implied as a religious charge and quest for chastity. While the term ethics obtained its original meaning and has become an academic discipline, it also implies the term matter which ethics studies. But the terms "ethics" and "morality" are still very used interchangeably. For instance, the current phrases: "professional ethics" "scientific ethics" and "ethical norms" are meant to designate "moral phenomena". But clearly envisaged these phrases should actually be written as "professional morality", scientific morality" and "moral norms".

Furthermore "theory" and "moral philosophy" are also, used to mean ethical concepts, while they should in profound factual terms, be written as "ethical theory" and ethical philosophy" which actually gives more meaning to ethical concepts. However the common origin of "ethics" and "morality" is only partially responsible for the confusion of using them interchangeably, the approach we have adopted in this work purviews that in the concept of morality, there is an inherent principle of justification, "Justification" connotes or means substantiation of one claims, statement, charge, arguments, assertion, standard action; and since ethics is not restricted to a passionate theoretical analysis of morality, but rather also provid
recommendations on a choice of a particular standard of a particular pattern of behaviors it all the more, informed more concretely on this appropriate and relevant conceptual charge. This means that ethics has a normative character and this similarity to the normative character, is inherent in every day social consciousness. Strictly speaking, ethics is a discipline while morality is its object. Discipline is basically concerned with the training of the mind, body or the moral faculties to be able to judiciously subject our minds and body to authority and self-control. Discipline embodies many ideas such as self-respect, self control, obedience, loyalty, humility, patience, fairness, justice, sincerity and commitment. It covers a wide range of moral values and attitudes.

According to Plato, in order to discover morality or good life, men must first acquire certain kinds of knowledge; such knowledge can be arrived at if these men are carefully trained in various disciplines. On the basis of this sort of reasoning, Plato went on to advocate the necessary censorship on what he called an ideal society. Plato felt that is was necessary to prevent young people from being exposed to certain sorts of experience, if they were to develop virtuous habits and thus, lead the good life. Secondly, it is necessary for some especially gifted men to develop their mental powers and subsequently to undergo rigorous intellectual training, which will do more for them than develop virtuous habits. This is thought so because; these exceptional men must finally be the rulers of the ideal society. Plato was thus, arguing for the objectivity of moral principles as opposed to philosophies, which maintain that morality is merely a matter of preference.

Philosophers have attempted to answer the
question: "what is the good life for man and "how ought men to behave "in various ways. Aristotle has also, provided his own answers. In answer to the first question he says that the good life for man is the life of happiness. For the second question the answer is equally direct; Men ought to behave so as to achieve happiness. But if we should ask, how should we behave to active happiness? Aristotle's answer to the question is to be found in the doctrine of the mean. This he has explained by providing an analogy of eating.

Being happy for Aristotle is like being well fed. But again, what quantity of food does a man requires eating to be well fed? Aristotle's contention is that there is no general answer to the question in the sense of fixing a specific amount like two loaves of bread a day. It depends, on a lot of other factors, like the size of the man, the kind of job he does, his health condition and so on. It is likely that a man who works on digging ditches will need more food than the one sitting and signing things in cooled environment. Just like a huge man may need more food than a small man, the proper amount of food for any one to eat and be well fed can be ascertained only by trail. If we eat certain amount of food and still feel hungry, we should eat more. If we eat the same amount and feel uncomfortable, then we should eat less. The correct amount is the mean between eating too much and eating too little. So with happiness, the proper way for man to behave in the moral sphere is in accordance with the mean. In order to achieve happiness, men must act moderately; they must act so as to be striving for mean between two extremes.

The ethical philosophy of Epicurus pertaining morality, however maintains that morality consists mainl
of advice for living moderately but at the same time pleasurably. That is, to live pleasantly without suffering from any of the undesirable effects, of such living; while cynicism proposes perpetual denial of pleasurable living. According to this philosophy, all the fruits of civilization like slavery, luxury, are all artificial pleasure of the senses. If moral grounds or salvation is to be found, it is to be found in a rejection of society and return to the simple life, to a life of ascetic living. Surprisingly, even the church and other religious institutions were not able to stand the grounds of morality in medieval times!

The early cynics like Diagones, prescribe frugal and miserable living to such an extent that they were likened to animals in their modes of life. Diagones is supposed to have lived in a rejected all refinements of dress, food, personal cleanliness and so on. The cynics believed that the world was fundamentally evil, and in order to live in a morally proper way, a man must withdraw from participating in it. Man must dispense all external wealth private or public. If a man is to be found morally sound in the world, first he must find morality within himself. Utilitarianist view on the other hand, propounds that an action is right morally in so far as it tends to produce the greatest happiness for the greatest number. The point of this view is that, the consequences of a given action determines its moral grounds, its rightness or wrongness, not the motive from which it is done. This is so because someone may act from the best of intentions, yet his action would produce the most horrible consequences. For example, Adolf Hitler may have acted from a well formed desire, that of improving Germany by killing of the Jews, yet his act led to torture, pain and genocide and in the long run, the destruction of Germany itself, and the moral
intention boomerang altogether. Proponents of utilitarianism include, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. In modern times, there emerged a class dimension of morality. To start with, there should be no need arguing that there is a strong class bias in the way normal and deviant conducts are being defined; with each class trying to make its own conduct, its own moral- or immoral conduct to represent the "norm" and to make the conduct of other classes "abnormal." Thus for example, the people who are classified as deviants, criminals or lunatics in the Russian society for instance, are often the type of people whom the American system holds up as society's heroes and heroines. To a considerable extent also, those the American system condemns as abnormal "Cranks" finds acceptance in the Russian system, the only people who would fall foul of both systems being political anarchists or terrorists. As for moral anarchists, such as sodomites and lesbians; while the Russians would take a serious view of their deviance and moral collapse, they have found on the other hand, an acceptance in the American system, an acceptance in fact tinged with admiration for daring to be different, an admiration stemming from the fact that this kind of deviance finds little acceptance in the generation of society and hence, far from being a threat to the system, help to sustain it by administering occasional shock to society. It is for this purpose that the activities of "gay" societies and the "escapades" and foibles of the rich, of actors and of actresses are given wide and incessant publicity; Publishing such activities being one of the methods the system uses to shock and to hypnotize the general public and thereby divert attention from serious political issues and moral concern.

Further, in capitalist societies the moral question is
far worse in the evolution of the social Institutions of capitalist societies including Nigeria, the breach of the moral “norm” is variously categorized depending on the class position of those involved. Thus for example here in Nigeria and on the basis of the English language, there is one stock of words for abnormal moral behavior when it involves the lower classes. Thus for an identical conduct, “poor man is accused of “stealing” while a member of the elite is chided with “embezzling” or “misappropriating”. A girl from the lower class is branded as “shameless” while girls from upper classes are described as “sophisticated”; Girls from poor background are charged of engaging in” prostitution”; While girls from bourgeois background are charged as merely “having good times”. The poor commits adultery, the rich have “affairs”. Poor women give birth to “bastards” and illegitimate “children, “high society” women give birth to children out of wedlock”. The poor patronize “prostitutes”; the rich keep “mistresses”, “sweetheart” and “girlfriends. In short, so to speak, Morality has become a qualification for the rich, while immorality for the poor, and we are constantly called upon to expose and condemn the “immorality” of the lower classes, but advised not to poke our nose into the private affairs of the rich. And if on account of the fact that the “private affairs” of the rich or the upper classes are refused to be accommodated by the “private” affairs of the poor, they stand charged with “jealousy,” the most arrogant defense the bourgeoisie had invented for its anti-social privileges and foibles.

So clearly, morality in modern times has become a class tool for domination and subjugation of the less privileged of the society. Even religious institutions have seemed not to have recognized this fact or are all together,
have closed their eyes against a tough battle of restoring morality to its position of purity and dignity in life.

In contemporary times, the call for morality once again is on the mettle as an indispensable concept in life as recognized by various institutions social, economic, political, religious and otherwise.

Accordingly, a philosopher of all times Abd-Ru-Shin in our contemporary times has this to say; Look around you! Observed what people read, how they dance, how they dress! By tearing down all barriers between the two sexes; the present time is more than ever anxious systematically to obscure the purity of the infinitive perception and ultimately smother it. People speak today of the emergence of a free independent humanity, of a development of inner stability, of physical culture, the beauty of the nude, ennobled sports and of education etc, without consent to morality!

He related that what is being preached today under the fine guise of "moral" progress is nothing but a veiled encouragement of utter shamelessness, the poisoning of every higher intuitive perception in man. It is the greatest pestilence that ever befalls humanity; and strange, it seems as if so many had only been waiting for a plausible excuse. But he who knows the spiritual laws operating in the Universe will turn away in disgust from today’s pursuits. Let us take just one of the “most harmless” pleasures; “mixed bathing”. Let us assume that of the thirty persons of both sexes, twenty-nine are really pure in every respect; stimulated by what he sees, although his outward behaviour maybe absolutely irreproachable. These thoughts are immediately embodied ethereally in living thoughts forms, which move towards and attach themselves to the object of his glances. This is defilement.
whether or not it leads to any remark of improprieties! The person thus, contaminated will carry about this dirt, which is capable of attracting similar straying thoughts forms. Thereby, the thoughts become denser, ever denser around the person, and may finally confuse and poison the victim, as a parasitic creeper often destroys the healthiest tree. Such are the ethereal happenings in so-called “harmless” mixed bathing, at party games, dances, most religious retreats or the like and at other sporting and schooling forums like excursions, picnics, etc.

Morality today has become a sham as if it has no supreme price! In contemporary times we must again first, restore Morality in its true form, know it, practice it, and the first to stand up to this responsibility must be women, who should by this great hanging responsibility exert with full force the backing of men to recon to the demands of this serious challenge.

PHILOSOPHY AND EVOLUTION OF HUMAN INSTITUTIONS

I. Politics

The definition of politics is highly, perhaps essentially contested. There is considerable disagreement on which aspects of social life are to be considered “political”. According to Bernard Crick the phenomenon of politics is very limited in time and space to certain kinds of relatively liberal, pluralistic societies which allow relatively open debate.

The traditional definition of politics, which implies “the art and science of government”, offers no constraint on its application since there has never been a
consensus on which activities count as government. Is government confined to the state? Does it not also take place in church, guild, estate, and family? There are two fundamental test questions we can apply to the concept of politics. First, do creatures other than human beings have politics? Second, can there be societies without politics? From classical times onward there have been some writers who thought that other creatures did have politics; in the mid-seventeenth century Purchas referred to bees as the "political flying-insects". Equally there have been attempts before and since to properly conceptualized phenomena. More coined the term- to posit "Utopian" Societies with no politics. The implication is usually that such a society is conceivable, but not practically possible. Politics occurs where people disagree about the distribution of reasons and have at least some procedures for the resolution of such disagreements. Thus, an activity as intrigues and struggle for succession in the places of the decision-making process in societies is characterized as politics. In ancient Greece, Athens had a different type of politics than in neighboring Sparta. In Athens all free adult citizens participated in politics in a similar way a politicians do today. They met in one place, debated issues and took decisions together. This wide spread involvement of people in political life motivated Aristotle; a Greek Philosopher of the time to argue that man is a political animal. To the Athenian citizen, politics seemed like natural activity. It was part and parcel of everyday life. What Aristotle did not consider was the Athenian slave who constituted a significant proportion of the population were not involved in political life. They were not involved indeed, not allowed to be involved. Politics as practiced that time was not a natural aspect of their existence. Wh
Aristotle really meant, therefore, was that the Athenian citizen was a political animal.

In neighboring Sparta things were quite different. The overwhelming proportions of the population were the object, rather than the subject of politics. Only a very small part of the population took part in politics. In fact, historically this has been more the rule than and practice.

The central problem of political philosophy is how to deploy or limit public power so as to maintain the survival and enhance the quality of human life. Like all aspects of human experience, conditioned by environmental and by the scope and limitations of mind; the answers given by successive political philosophers to peculiar problems reflect the knowledge and the assumptions of their times. The central purposes is to represent influential political process from Greco-Roman antiquity through the middle Age, early modern times, and the 19th and early 20th centuries to contemporary times.

Evolution of Politics in Antiquity:

There were great civilizations as in Egypt and Mesopotamia in the Indus Valley, and in China. There was little speculation about the problems of political philosophy as formulated in the West and since predominant. The laws of Hammurabi of Babylon (C. 1750 BC) are rules propounded by the monarch as a representative of God on Earth and are mainly concerned with order, trade, and irrigation. The Admonitions of the Egyptian Vizier Ptahhotep (C.2300BC) are shrewd advice on how to prosper in bureaucracy; and the Arthasastra of Autilya, grand Vizier to the Indian Candragupta Maurya in the late 4th century B.C. are precepts on how to survive under an arbitrary power. Others are Indian Buddhist
concept of dharma in the 3rd century B.C; The Confucian teachings in the 6th century B.C. (codes to stabilize society).

In Ancient Times

Plato's Republic (C. 378 B.C) tries to find remedies for prevalent political injustice and decline. It constitute first attempt to moralize political life. The Republic is a criticism of Hellenic politics. Plato is thus, indirectly the pioneer of modern beliefs that only party organization inspired by correct and "scientific" doctrines, formulated by the written word and interpreted by authority, can rightly guide the state.

In the laws, purporting to be a discussion of how best to found a polis in Crete; He presented a detailed program in which a state with some five thousand [5,000] citizens was ruled by thirty seven [37] curators of laws and a council of three hundred and sixty (360).

Aristotle, who was a pupil in the academy of Plato remarked that "all the writings" of Plato are original; they show ingenuity, novelty of view and a spirit of enquiry. His politics (C.335-322 BC), written while he was teaching the Lyceum at Athens, is a part of an encyclopedic account of nature and society, in which he analyzes society seen as political behaviour as a branch of biology, as well as ethics. Hence his famous definition of man as "a political animal," distinguished from the other animals by his gift of speech and power of moral judgment. "Man when perfected," he writes; Is the best of animals, but when separated from law and justice he is the worst of all, since armed injustice is the most dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with the array of intelligence and wit, moral qualities which he may use for the worst ends.
Aristotle attacks oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny. On democracy, he argues, demagogues attain power by bribing the electorate and waste accumulated wealth. On tyranny he most detests the arbitrary power of an individual above the law, who is “responsible to no-one and who govern all alike with a view of his own advantage and not of his subjects, and therefore against their will. He was vehement that no free man can endure such a government.

Apart from Aristotle, Cicero (and the stoics) too lived in a time of political confusion during which the old institutions of the republic were breaking down before military dictators. His De re Publica and laws are both dialogues and reflect classical sense of purpose: “to make human life better by our thought and effort”. Cicero defined the res publica (common Wealth) as association held together by law. In St. Augustine's view the role of government and indeed of society itself must become subordinated into a “secular arm”, to keep order in a world intrinsically evil.

THE MIDDLE AGES:

The decline of ancient civilization in the west was ever: institutes were established to define a condensed Roman law. The Byzantine Basileus were codes of making elaborate state, “a colony”. Hellenic and Christian political philosophy were transmitted in rudimentary encyclopedias.

The Politicratieus of John of Salisbury (C. 1159) the folk of man experienced in politics who become Bishop Chartres emerged. St. Thomas Aquinas 12th Century mise on politics too emerged. His views were expressed the summa theologia. He was the first to pioneer the story of constitutional government. His political views in
motion and that the predominant human impulses were fear and, among those above the poverty level, pride and vanity. Men, Hobbes argued, are strictly conditioned and limited by these laws, and he tried to create a science of politics that would reflect them. "The skill of making, and maintaining common-wealth's"; which rules, neither poor men have the leisure, nor men that have had the leisure, have hitherto had the curiosity, or the method to find out". The Leviathan, points Hobbes conclusions to utilitarian ends. Benedict De Spinoza a Dutch Philosopher and Scientific humanist in the 17th century accordingly, justified political power solely by its usefulness. According to him; if state power breaks down and can no longer protect one or if it turns against him, frustrates, or ruins his life, then any man is justified in resisting it, since it no longer fulfills its purpose. It has no intrinsic divine or metaphysical authority. De Spinoza is a pioneer of a scientific humanist view of government and of the neutrality of the state in matters of belief. There is also Richard Hooker, an Anglican who adopted Thomism and wrote "the laws of Ecclesiasticall Polin." Hooker related that society itself is the fulfillment of natural law, of which human and positive law are reflections, adopted to society. And that public power is not something personal, for it derives from the community under law. Other prominent modern political philosophers include, Locke, Barke, Vico, and Montesquieu, Rousseau to mention but these. In contemporary Times; marking the 19th-century onwards, Utilitarianism and utilitarian theorists such as Tocqueville, T H Green, as well as Liberal nationalism, Anarchism and Utopianism all featured prominently. The most profound and according to significance among these great political philosophers was Saint Simon and Comte, Hegel, Marx
[1818-1883] and Engels [1820-1895]. In the 20th century, political philosophy witnessed abundantly political pragmatism, religious and Existentialist approaches and vibrant revolutionary doctrines dominated by Lenin, Mao-Tse-Tung and other Marxist approaches who located the central problem of political philosophy in terms of how to deploy or limit public power so as to avoid anarchy and dictatorship so as to maintain the stability of the state and enhance the quality of human life. This is to be achieved through a regulation of class exploitation and excessive accumulation of wealth of the state or the public, for the collective benefit of all. The most recent and dominant political theory which is having a field day and is ideologically more sympathetic in world politics is the American Constitutionalism, strongly pioneered by today's democratization and globalization politics.
CHAPTER THREE
TYPES, SOURCES AND FOUNDATIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

Conceptual Clarification

From its foundations of implication knowledge has to do with experience. Indeed in our daily life we encounter objects of knowledge by way of perception, which translate to means that knowledge is thereby acquired by cognition. As we experience knowledge by cognition this, graphically represents the synthesis of all of our sensations and perceptions.

Thus, it is really only beings with consciousness that can know or have knowledge. Knowledge can therefore be attained by identification of objects, discovery of facts, acquisition of skills (know how) and by acquaintance. As the philosopher looks back at himself and the world around him and attempts to make progress from wonder to explanation and understanding, he has only one way to move forward he has to employ rational analysis of facts and experiences in understanding the problem of knowledge and its inherent difficulties.

Basic schools of thought have developed in attempt to variously contemplate on knowledge and these have come to form basic foundations, types and sources of knowledge which they have variously expressed as knowledge by the fore-runners of mankind. RATIONAL KNOWLEDGE; One fundamental expression of knowledge is pioneered by the rationalists. The Greek term ratio, expressing rationalism is one of
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such conception or epistemological thought which believes that reason alone can lead to knowledge or reality of things. Thus, it mistrusted the senses and adheres to reason in search of knowledge. Prominent proponents of this source of knowledge include Parmenides, Plato and Rene Descartes. Others include St Augustine, Plotinus, Spinoza and Leibniz among others.

EMPIRICAL KNOWLEDGE; Another exposition pertaining knowledge is expressed by the empiricists who believe that knowledge is attained by means of sense perception which to the exponents is the only ultimate source or type of knowledge. According to them this sort of knowledge is one that has passed the test of experience, observation and experimentation. By contending so, adherent of empiricism uprightly deny the reality of innate ideas or the substance of mind upheld by the rationalists. Empiricism has it origin traceable to the Greek hylozoists who conceptualize reality in terms of material or concrete forms. Prominent among them include Aristotle, Francis Bacon, John Locke, George Berkeley, David Hume among other philosophers.

Bacon's account of knowledge advocated knowledge by sense perception which he visualized as a thoroughly examined knowledge; That is, knowledge without prejudices or preconceived opinion or idols--knowledge that has advanced nature and not one that anticipates it. To Bacon empirical method is the best in acquiring knowledge just as empirical knowledge is really the only true knowledge.

SKEPTICAL KNOWLEDGE; another exposition on knowledge is advanced by skepticism. The skeptics doubt if the human mind can know anything for sure. Advocates of this thought are many and prominent among
these great thinkers are Protagoras who is famous for his 'Homo mensura dictum'- man is the measure of all things— he believes that the human mind can in truth only perceive appearance. Others like Gorgias Clearly asserted that no one could really know reality since reality does not exist; Thus, it do follows that if we cannot know reality, we cannot say anything about it. One other prominent philosopher among skeptics is Pyrrho- The father of sophism and skeptics are also known as Pyrrhonians. Skeptics' significance lay in the fact that they acknowledge that there is a limit to our knowledge of reality in explaining human knowledge.

A priori knowledge
This conception of knowledge is taken from Latin meaning; "for from what is before". The phrase "a-priori reasoning" was used from the sixteenth century to describe reasoning from causes to effects deductively. It acquired in the 19th century the meaning of knowledge or concepts not derived from sensory experience: knowledge that we have before the facts. For example, to count three [3] men you need to know that 1+1+1=3 you cannot find this out from looking at the men. You need to know it a prior (before). A priori knowledge is therefore knowledge from reason. The person who coined this terminology was Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher. Kant reasoned that there must be an innate power (not the same as innate ideas) for knowledge, which in the first place, allows for sensation, perception and cognition of things.

A posteriori knowledge;
This conceptual expression is taken from Latin meaning; "for from what comes after". Used, from the early seventeenth century for reasoning from effects to causes, inductively or empirically; Thought of as the opposite
process to a-priori reasoning. In the Mills and Macaulay and the battle apriori, Kant divided the claims we make about the world into:

Analytic propositions: In these the truth is a logical property of what is said. For example “this cat is an animal” is true because we classify cats as animals. Analytic prepositions do not add to our knowledge of the world except in as far as they tell us how things are classified by our culture.

Synthetic proposition: A synthetic proposition contains extra knowledge. “This cat is black” tells us something that is not a necessary property of being a cat. It is a synthetic proposition because we combine (synthesise) our thinking with an empirical observation. “This cat is black” is an a-posteriori synthetic proposition. It is after the fact. Establishing its truth depends on our looking at the cat. “1+1+1+=3 is an a-priori synthetic proposition. It is not based on observation, but it tells us something about the world. It is knowledge that we derive from reason. It is knowledge by experience or the empirical knowledge of things. These two concepts of Analytic versus Synthetic expression are very common with Kant's epistemology.

The Necessary and the contingent knowledge

These are expression of knowledge at the level of propositions. A proposition is said to be necessary if it holds under all possible circumstance or conditions. On the other hand, a proposition is contingent if it holds only in some but not in all circumstance. The latter is used to ascertain the truth or falsity of claim in epistemology.

DE DUCTIVE REASONING OR KNOWLEDGE; in a deductive knowledge conclusions must logically follow from the premises. If the premises are true the conclusion must also be true. See example A.
[A.] All lecturers mark examinations [B.] Paul is a lecturer. Therefore, Paul marks examinations. This is a valid argument because the conclusion follows from the premises. Let us consider example B. All lecturers mark examinations; Paul marks examinations; Paul is a lecturer. This is a valid argument for the same reason. However, a valid argument is not necessarily a true argument. It may be true that all lecturers' marks examination but not all who mark examinations are lecturers. Let us consider example C. All Tiv people are hospitable; Terwase is a Tiv man, Kalu is hospitable. This is not a valid argument because the conclusion does not follow from the premises. An argument may contain false premises and still be valid. For example, All Ibos are Christians. Musa is an Ibo, Musa is a Christian. This argument is valid even though the premises are false.

A Good argument or knowledge is one that is valid and has true premises. To say that an argument or knowledge is sound is to say that the conclusion is true following from true premises. However, it is important to note that deductive logic or knowledge is the study of validity, not of truth.

INDUCTIVE REASONING OR KNOWLEDGE; this is knowledge based on establishment of general truths. It is based on prevalence of parallel cases or circumstances in nature. It is established that what happens once will under a sufficient degree of similarity of circumstances happen again as often as circumstances occur. Consider for example, Mr. A's first son became sick on first January, 2005, Mr. A's second son became sick on first January 2007, Mr. A's third son became sick on first January 2009, Mr. A's first daughter became sick on first January 2010. Therefore; All Mr. A's children are
potentially unhealthy. The conclusion in this case is based on a number of observations. It is possible to find one or more exceptional cases of Mr. A's children who may not be victim to these family stigma. Therefore, the conclusion is based on probability'.

AUTHORITATIVE KNOWLEDGE; This type of knowledge is based on higher disciplinarily attainments. For example, a Professor of law has authority to inform in issues of law; while that of Medicine commands authority in medical discourse. Similarly, Historians and philosophers command knowledge of historical and philosophical discourse, respectively. We often refer to an authority when we are asked to substantiate our claim to knowledge.

INTUITIVE KNOWLEDGE; This is a certain type of knowledge that is hardly doubted but then is not easily described. Intuition is when you know something but do not know where it came from. It refers to ones' becoming aware of something without consciously remembering, or reasoning. It involves a kind of leap-straight from seeing a problem to knowing its solution. It is a case whereby we suddenly know an answer or apprehend a solution to a problem. It comes upon us without methodical step-by-step reasoning. Intuition can be coloured by emotions. Angough citing a psychologist, Evelyn Vaughan maintain that; Anger, fear, envy and hate while are not intuitions themselves can influence and even contaminate our intuitions.

KNOWLEDGE BY REVELATION; This concept implies the exposition of what hitherto was concealed. People often demand questioningly pertaining who revealed the secret, this translate to mean that something has been hidden but brought to light. Some People often
claim to have gotten their revelations in dreams, while others from God and others such as Christians, Muslims and other religious bodies, in sacred books.

Knowledge and Belief

Knowledge entails belief but beliefs do not however entail knowledge. There is belief that is founded in knowledge and there is one not founded on knowledge or even reason. Belief is often based on ignorance or emotions, while knowledge is not. To have knowledge of a thing is to be sure of it or proof of it or evidence for it. Hence it is always better to investigate or have knowledge of things or situations before we have believed in them.

Plato, Hamlyn and Pierce hold a view that belief stems from ignorance, that quite often belief is just merely a matter of habit. Knowledge however is what is, it is being a testimony to truth or reality of things.

True knowledge is spiritual knowledge, which embraces the knowledge of God and His Laws, and their effects in the visible and invisible Creation.

He who wishes to gain knowledge about the mysteries of life must adjust himself to the Will of God in His Laws, and carry them out. Since the Creator is Eternal Perfection, and hence also His Will, which is anchored in the Laws of Creation, any knowledge which man acquires on the basis of the Laws of Creation will also be right. Wherever it is applied it will release harmony, allowing neither gaps nor doubts to arise, because it has a natural healthy soil on which it can flower and thrive gloriously, even in the possession of earthly mankind.

A man who bears within him spiritual knowledge, the knowledge of the wonderful Laws of God in Creation,
to which the Laws of Nature also belong, the knowledge of their absolute incorruptibility and strict justice, of the love and grace that work hidden within them, of guilt and atonement, which these Laws mediate to men such a man will find it impossible to hide this knowledge from the outside world; he must live it himself, and be an example to his fellow-men.

Such a man can spread around him only peace and up buildings thoughts, contentment and happy confidence, the striving for joyful compliance with the Will of God; he will be a faithful helper and a furthering influence in every respect to his neighbour as well as to his people.

If we consider the knowledge of present-day humanity from this point of view, not much is left of the true knowledge. But in its place man has created a knowledge of his own, which he formed according to his will, without at the same time taking into account the Will of God. Today we are experiencing with absolute clarity the collapse of this human self-knowledge.

However for the seriously seeking human there is nothing left but to make his own the knowledge of Creation that is once more offered to him as true knowledge from out of the Light of Truth, so that he can attain to that level of maturity which he must now occupy at the great Cosmic Turning-point.

Truth, Belief and Opinion

Truth is reality revealed. That is what is! It is eternal unchangeable! It never changes in its form, but remains. It is therefore, can never be subjected to any development. Truth is real, it is “being”!, only being is true life. The entire universe is “supported” by Truth! It therefore follows that only that which issues from the
Truth is really living; everything else is subject to transformation through death. Only that which issues from the Truth will alone continue to exist, and all else will perish. Things thought out by the human mind and recognized by the human spirit can never bear real life within them. They remained theories and recognitions, which lack the power of Living Truth. Only the Word of the Lord - God which issues from the Light and from the Truth brought by envoys of God, who themselves stand in the Light and the Truth, who are thus, really living within themselves, represents Truth.

Belief is what one thinks he trusted in or what one minds, regards and accepts as true. It is a lower stage of conviction, in which one's state of thrust real or imaginary, is informed and expressed out of one's inner experiences or outward teachings of trusted associates whom one has faith in their abilities. In religious circles, belief is mostly merely made out of habits as is customally related, believing to be based on Trust and mostly one's opinion is often based on his belief, religious and otherwise.

Opinion is maintained to be what one thinks or believes. It is one's expression of a viewpoint or position based on some things or people. And just as belief, opinion is supposed to be one's expression of his inner quality and state of mind. Many a time one's beliefs are moulded by opinions and vice versa, in attempts at ascertaining truth, or reality of things. However, not all belief and opinions are truthful, for them to appropriately understand or comprehend truth, they must attain conviction. It is only then that they could become unshakable pillars of faith bearing truth.

Thus, these concepts are interrelated and sometimes interchangeably used depending on real
implied situation.
Appearance and Reality
Bertrand Russell (1872-1870) was one of the greatest philosophers of this century. He wrote an enormous number of philosophical books and articles, from principia Mathematical (with Alfred North Whitehead) to some notorious polemics in favor of "free love" and atheism. Like Hume, he was too controversial for most universities, and a famous court case prevented him from teaching at City College of New York. He did, however, win the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1950. At the age of eighty-nine, was jailed for protesting against nuclear arms.

According to Russell's transcript, in daily life, we assume as certain many things which, on a closer scrutiny, are found to be so full of apparent contradictions that only a great amount of thought enables us to know what it is that we really may believe. In the search for certainty, it is natural to begin with our present experiences, and in some sense; no doubt, knowledge is to be derived from them. But any statement as to what it is that our immediate experiences make us know is very likely to be wrong. It seems to me that I am now sitting in a chair, at a table of a certain shape on which I see sheets of paper with writing or print. By turning my head I see out of the window buildings and clouds and the sun. I believe that the sun is about ninety-three million miles from the earth; that it is a hot globe many times bigger than the earth; that, owing to the earth's rotation. It rises every morning, and will continue to do so for an indefinite time in the future. I believe that, if any other normal person comes into my room he will see the same chairs and tables and books and papers as I see, and that the table which I see is the same as the table which I feel pressing against my arm. All this
seems to be so evident as to be hardly worth stating, except in answer to a man who doubts whether I know anything. Yet all this may be reasonably doubted, and all of it requires much careful discussion before we can be sure that we have stated it in a form that is wholly true.

To make our difficulties plain, let us concentrate attention on the table. To the eye it is oblong, brown and shiny, to the touch it is smooth and cool and hard; when I tap it, it gives out a wooden sound. Any one else who sees and feels and hears the table will agree with this description, so that it might seem as if no difficulty would arise; but as soon as we try to be more precise our troubles begin. Although I believe that the table is 'really' of the same colour all over, the parts that reflect the light look much brighter than the other parts, and some parts look white because of reflected light. I know that, if I move, the parts that reflect the light will be different, so that the apparent distribution of colours on the table will change. It follows that if several people are looking at the table at the same moment, no two of them will see exactly the same distribution of colours, because no two can see it from exactly the same point of view, and any change in the point of view makes some change in the way the light is reflected.

For most practical purposes these differences are unimportant, but to the painter they are all-important: the painter has to unlearn the habit of thinking that things seem to have the colour which common sense says they 'really' have, and to learn the habit of seeing things as they appear. Here we have already the beginning of one of the distinctions that cause most trouble in philosophy the distinction between 'appearance' and 'really', between what things seem to be and what they are. The painter
wants to know what they things seem to be, the practical
man and the philosopher want to know what they are; but
the philosopher's wish to know this is stronger than the
practical man's, and is more troubled by knowledge as to
the difficulties of answering the question.

To return to the table, it is evident from what we
have found, that there is no colour which preeminently
appears to be the colour of the table, or even of any one
particular part of the table, it appears to be of different
colours from different points of view, and there is no
reason for regarding some of these as more really its colour
than others. And we know that even from a given point of
view the colour will seem different by artificial light, or to
a colour-blind man, or to a man wearing blue spectacles,
while in the dark there will be no colour at all, though to
touch and hearing the table will be unchanged. This colour
is not something which is inherent in the table, but
something depending upon the table and the spectator and
the way the light falls on the table. When, in ordinary life,
we speak of the colour of the table, we only mean the sort
of colour which it will seem to have to a normal spectator
from an ordinary point of view under usual conditions of
light. But the other colours which appear under other
conditions have just as good a right to be considered real
and therefore, to avoid favoritism, we are compelled to
deny that, in itself, the table has any one particular colour.

The same thing applies to the texture. With the
naked eye one can see the grain, but otherwise the table
looks smooth and even. If we look at it through a
microscope, we should see roughnesses and hills and
valleys. And all sorts of differences that are imperceptible
to the naked eye. Which of these is the 'real' table? We are
naturally tempted to say that what we see through the
microscope is more real, but that in turn would be changed by a still more powerful microscope. If, then, we cannot trust what we see with the naked eye, why should we trust what we see through a microscope? Thus, again, the confidence in our sense with which we began deserts us.

The shape of the table is no better. We are all in the habit of judging as to the 'real' shapes of things, and we do this so unreflecting that we come to think we actually see the real shapes. But, in fact, as we all have to learn if we try to draw, a given thing looks different in shape from every different point of view. If our table is 'really' rectangular, it will look, from almost all points of view, as if it had two acute angles and two obtuse angles. If opposite sides are parallel, they will look as if they converged to a point away from the spectator; if they are of equal length, they will look as if the nearer side were longer. All these things are not commonly noticed in looking at a table, because experience has taught us to construct the 'real' shape from the apparent shape, and the real, shape is what interests us as practical men. But the 'real' shape is not what we see; it is something inferred from what we see. And what we see is constantly changing in shape as we move about the room, so that here again the senses seem not to give us the truth about the table itself, but only about the appearance of the table.

Similar difficulties arise when we consider the sense of touch. It is true that the table always gives us a sensation of hardness, and we feel that it resists pressure. But the sensation we obtain depends upon how hard we press the table and also upon what part of the body we press with; thus the various sensations due to various pressures or various parts of the body cannot be supposed to reveal to reveal directly any definite property of the
table, but at most to be signs of some property which perhaps causes all the sensations, but is not actually apparent in any of them. And the same applies still more obviously to the sounds which can be elicited by rapping the table.

Thus it becomes evident that the real table, if there is one, is not the same as what we immediately experienced by sight or touch or hearing. The real table, if there is one, is not immediately known to us at all, but must be inferred from what is immediately known. Hence, two very difficult questions at once arise: namely (1) Is there a real table at all? (2) If so, what sort of object can it be?
CHAPTER FOUR

BASIC NOTIONS IN SOCIAL POLITICAL
PHILOSOPHY: BASIC TERMINOLOGIES

(A) Authority:

This is the right or the capacity, or both, to have proposals or prescriptions or instructions accepted without recourse to persuasion, bargaining, or force. It includes a system of rules, legal and traditional, which typically entitle particular office bearers to make decisions or issue instructions: such office-bearers have authority conferred on them by the rules and the practices which constitute the relevant activity. Law enforcement officers are authorized to issue instruction, but they also receive the right to behave in ways which would not be acceptable in absence of authorization: for example, to search persons or premises.

To have authority in these ways is to be the bearer of an office and to be able to point to the relation between that office and set of rules. In itself, this says nothing about the capacity, in fact of such an office-holder to have proposals and so forth accepted without introducing persuasion, bargaining, or force. A referee, for example, may possess authority under the rules of the game, but in fact be challenged or ignored by the players.

A distinction is therefore drawn between dejure authority in which a right to behave in particular ways may be appealed to and defacto authority in which there is practical success. A different distinction is drawn between a person who is in authority as an office-bearer and a person who is an authority on a subject. The later typically has special knowledge or special access to information not available to those who accept the person's status as an
authority. Sometimes the two forms are found together: for example, the speaker of the House of Assembly possesses authority (to regulate the business of the House, under its rules of procedure), and is also an authority (on its rules of procedure). These focus primarily on the "internal" relationship between the authority-holder and the authority subject, the process of recognition of the status involved, and on the Willingness of the authority-subject to adopt the judgment of the authority-holders. God is almighty above all commands all authority.

(B) Power:

Power is the ability to make people (or things) do what they would not otherwise have done. The purpose of the modern concept of power was recognized as early as 1748, with the publication of Hume's Essay, "of the original contract". 'Almost all of the governments, which exist at present, says Hume, "......have been founded originally, either on usurpation or conquest or both, without any pretence of a fair consent, or voluntary subjection of the people". Describing the process of political change- Hume demands, rhetorically, is there anything discoverable in all events of such change, by force and violence? Hume's comments offers one of the first clear versions of the assumptions of a modern approach which seeks to study politics positively, eschewing theological justifications and moral evaluations in favor of a causal assessment of how the political world works.

Reality. Politics is seen to be about might rather than right, indeed, in Hume, as in much social science, might is seen as creating right de facto because the seizure of power leads to the establishment of authority and the successive incultation of belief. Power is the appropriate central concept for this world view because, in its modern form
is concerned with which groups or persons dominate, get their own way or are best able to pursue their own interests in societies.

James March in his Essay (1966), "The power of power", "stressed that the concept conveyed simultaneously overtones of the cynicism of Real politik, the glories of classical mechanics, the realism of 'elite sociology, and the comforts of anthropocentric theology"; in other words, The 'Power' world-view offers the would-be social scientist an immunity from moral evolution and theoretical speculation, and the possibility of emulating the explanatory achievements of the physicist.

Bertrand Russell defined power as "the production of intended effects", but this serves well as an indication of what we want to mean when we talk about power than as a working definition. Problems with the definitions of power include issues of intentionality comparability and quantifiability, time and causation. Power is often classified into five principal forms: force, persuasion, authority, coercion, and manipulation. However, only coercion and manipulation are uncontroversial forms of power. Power is issued from being. It is what is.

(C) Equality:
It is factual and/or normative assertion of the equal capacity or equal standing of persons, generating claims about distributive justice. The quasi-empirical equality of individuals may refer to apparently physical characteristics-as in Hobbies view of man's equal natural insecurity- or to mental characteristics like rationality or the capacity for morality. Claims about the capacity for rational or morality may be made as transcendental
arguments. The normative claim involves four main “applications” which are not wholly separable: 1 Equal consideration within a scheme of (moral) decision-making. In this sense, the claim to equal treatment taken equally into account, as in the utilitarian concern that each count for one in the aggregation procedure; 2 Even-handed treatment; Here the claim to equal treatment is the claim that like cases be treated alike. This only contingently leads to equal outcomes. 3. Equality in distribution, the claim that equal treatment requires that each person receive an equal amount of a good or treatment; such claims seem most plausible when there is a lack of information about the circumstances of the persons involved. 4. Equality in outcome; the claim that equal treatment requires that persons should end up in the same conditions, taking account of their situation before distribution and adjusting the amount to be distributed to each accordingly.

Human equality is best conceived in the very fact that all human beings are accorded access to life and are afforded the gift of free will to be what they desire or want.

(D) Freedom:
The concept freedom on simplistic but factual terms implies absence of interference or impediment. The concept in philosophical terms however, is highly controversial and problematic. Gerald Mac Callum is of the view that all statements about freedom can be cast in the same form- A is free from B to P (P stands for any verb of action) - and that, disputes about freedom are disputes about the three terms involved, referring to the agent, the obstacle and the action or state to
be achieved.

Sir Isaiah Berlin proposed in a famous lecture that two accounts of liberty should be distinguished: negative liberty; focusing on the absence of interference by others and positive liberty; focusing on an agent's capacity to P. Berlin particularly emphasized the connection between the positive conception and a willingness to accept an intrapersonal notion of freedom. Three problems exist. Attempts have been made to distinguish freedom from ability. In most social contexts the concern is with interference or impediments which are the responsibility of other persons. This is the first one. In Hillel Steiner's conception of freedom, a person is un free if and only if his action is prevented by another person. Thus, he sees freedom solely in interpersonal terms. The second major problem arises specifically from the comparison of interpersonal and intrapersonal cases. Some impediments or obstacles with which a person may be faced include those which arise from "internal" characteristics or dispositions. Suppose someone is unlucky enough to suffer from agoraphobia. No one else is responsible for the person's condition- it has not been imposed on the person by others, even if they might be able to help the person overcome it. So freedom can be intrapersonal also. The third problem is the relation between freedom and resources to be able to achieve some objectives, or even to do particular actions; persons require access to the components of action- most fundamentally space and, often, funds. A similar point is tenable about rights. So the freedom persons care about is substantive and attempts to adjudicate between them have raised the charge of ideological preference or philosophical discrimination. But more factually and logically according to natural laws,
a person who has overcome darkness is truly free from it and all forms of injustice; dross and gross material trappings, for he must have attains luminous heights even if such a person is still existing in this material creation and is therefore truly freedom bound.

Justice

Justice is the existence of a proper balance. In Law, it illustrates applications of the notion of a proper balance a fair trail, which among other things, achieves a proper balance between the ability of the defendant to establish innocence and the ability of the prosecution to establish guilt', a just sentence which balances the precedent wrong with a present right response.

In political theory however, justice concerned both the terms of membership of a social group [social justice] and the distribution of burdens and benefits within this group (distributive justice). In a legal context, distribution is sometimes contrasted with compensation, with restoring the proper balance which existed before a wrong and this view informs some theories of punishment. Plato's "Republic" depicted a just society as one in which various social functions were properly fulfilled and balanced, tending to assimilate the virtue of justice with the pursuit of the common good. This assimilation makes justice the cardinal virtue of political order, but is resisted by those, for example, who might wish to consider how justice as a society is as only one of a number of guides to the desirability of a life within it. The theory of the state in "Republic" culminates in the conception of justice, wh
is, the bond which holds a society together, a harmonious union of individuals each of whom has found his life work in accordance with his natural fitness and his training. It is thus, both a public and a private virtue because the highest good both of the state and of its members is thereby conserved. Plato's elaboration of the prima facie definition of justice is "giving to every man his due." For what is due to him is that he should be treated as what he is, in the light of his capacity and his training, while what is due from him is the honest performance of those tasks which the place accorded him requires.

According to the Leviathan, justice arises as part of the "social contract," which creates society. That what so every-you require that others should do to you, that do ye to them and that do not do to others what you do not want them to do to you. By this law of nature, we are obliged to transfer to another, such rights, as being retained which could in no way, hinder the peace of Mankind, for this law of nature, consists the fountain and original justice.

A utilitarian theory of justice as pioneered by John Stuart Mill insists that justice is part and parcel of ethical view called, "utilitarianism" which calls for" the greatest good for the greatest number"; For it would be unjust to deprive anyone of his personal liberty, his property, or any other thing which belongs to him by law. Thus, the matter of justice is one of the oldest problems in philosophy. It is the question that dominated not only Plato's Republic, but was seriously contemplated by the ancient Sumerians and Babylonians. Discussions of justice often begin with the question of criminal or retributive justice- the question of how and why those who violate the law are to be punished. The more common and familiar question, however, are rather those of distributive justice- the fair and equitable
distribution of benefits and obligations to everyone in society. Both sets of questions come down to a single common question: what do we deserve? The answer we would all like to hear, of course, is that we deserve what we want and do not deserve to be punished. But what people want is often more than the resources of a society can provide, and their behaviour, even if not criminal, is too often detrimental to others around them. Justice thus concerns the basic workings of the society, that is, the organization of its institutions so that goods are fairly distributed and obligations and duties are fairly assigned. It concerns the punishment of the guilty but also the reward of the meritorious, fair pay for good work, and appropriate power in determining how things are done.

One ancient recipe for retributive justice was “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth”. One modern prescription for distributive justice is “one should get what one earns”. But we now consider that ancient prescription brutal and inhumane, and we are also realizing that the question of what one earns is more difficult than we once believed. By what standards of justice does a broker doing deals on the phone in a air conditioned office earns more than a day laborer building a stone wall on a hot summer day? We are also concerned not just with the distribution of money and goods but with the distribution of power and privileges. We say that everyone is equal, but we discriminate in a thousand ways. How can such discriminations be made fairly? These are all questions of justice and still as much matters of great controversy as they were in the ancient world. Thus the questions and dimensions of justice are many. It is because of this that John Stuart Mills defended his “utilitarian” theory of justice on the premise that "everyone counts for one and no more than one."
Rawls presents a brief version of his influential recent theory of Justice as "fairness" and Robert Nozick supplies a sharp rejoinder. More practically is Joel Feinberg's "economic income and distributive justice". Amartya Sen accordingly clarified on understanding "world poverty on terms of basic human rights". While Maliccolm X Threw substantial light on the "difference between human rights and civil rights" in properly understanding justice; And Marjorie Speigel, in her quest to explaining justice extended it appropriately by defending "animals rights and deplored our treatment of animals as slaves."

Justice above all, according to a Philosopher of contemporary times Abd-Ru-Shin; "Lies in the self-acting Laws of creation that bear the will of God, which at the same time is his love".
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