

The Place of Aristotelianism in Africa's Political Development: A Critical Evaluation

Elijah Okon John, Ph.D* & Umezurike John Ezugwu

Department of Philosophy, University of Uyo, PMB 1017, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Abstract

Aristotle is one man who has contributed immeasurably in various areas of life and in history of ideas. His efforts cannot be underestimated in Africa's political development. His political thesis can go a long way to make possible the full realization of the dreams and aspirations of the African continental body. African Union (AU), formerly called Organization of African Unity (OAU). The nitty-gritty of his thesis can as well help African leaders to embrace their cultural heritage, bearing in mind that failure to do so will automatically pave way for eternal condemnation and abdication of their cultural values. A critical method of evaluation was employed in this paper, to holistically ascertain the place of Aristotelianism in Africa's political development, and to show the shortcomings and inconsistencies of Aristotle's political thesis. In this paper, we shall attempt to discourage Aristotle's capitalist mentality, bifurcatory and dichotomized mindset, which he demonstrated on women, slaves and war. We shall argue for the enthronement of mutual understanding, interdependence and interrelatedness that ought to exist between men and women in the states. This paper canvases for equity and fairness, equality and justice, enhancement and realization of political stability in the states. The position of this work, therefore, is that Aristotle's political philosophy, in spite of its weaknesses, can architecturally, redesign the political thoughts of the African leaders, and assist in cultural coalition than the parochial tribe and self aggrandized national interest that Africa has been facing for a quite number of decades now.

Keywords: Aristotelianism, African Politics, Political Development, Human Nature, Theory of the State.

Introduction

The relevance of Aristotelianism in Africa's political development is something that cannot be swept under the carpet or be hidden for any reason. His political philosophy can assist the African leaders to re-examine their minds, and do the proper thing that ought to be done in the state. More importantly, Aristotle's notion that a state should not be too big or too small, has a great impact, and can go a long way to reshaping the way we look at reality in Africa. A good number of countries in Africa are highly populated while to some, there is no need for a large population. Aristotle's notion here will go a long way in guiding African leaders to understand that if a state is too big, the state may suffer, meaning that, the state may not have enough resources to take care of her citizens. In fact, there is bound to be unemployment and hunger which will breed other vices in such state, because everybody will be struggling to survive at all cost. Again, his idea that a state should not be too small is equally a wonderful concept that can help African states to grow strong and defend themselves against external aggressions. This would imply that since certain states are not big enough to be independent in an exclusive sense of the word, and cannot be merged together with existing ones, then the idea of political, economic, scientific and military coalitions, integrations or cooperation becomes very necessary (John, 200:158). African leaders must see the need to promote the solidarity of all African nation states. Aristotle's political philosophy can be helpful in securing African culture; where coalition of culture for national growth will be paramount than the parochial interest that leads to ethnicity.

The African political society should thrive and compete favorably with political environments of other continents (Barongo, 1987:225). This expectation can become a reality if African leaders will take seriously the political philosophy of Aristotle and find ways of adopting some of his useful recommendations to take Africa to a new platform. However, we shall expose Aristotle's bifurcatory mindset about women, especially his claim that women are more or less property owned by men or husbands; thus, women are seen as slaves while men are lords that must dictate for the women. This paper may not accept in totality Aristotle's view on women as his view on them can lead to discrimination, patriarchy, marginalization of women in politics and disenfranchisement of women's rights. More so, this paper observes that Aristotle unwittingly introduces ethnicity into his philosophy even though he tries unsuccessfully to avoid it. The private ownership of goods in the state, which was seen by Aristotle as the best form of life, is capitalistic in nature, and can bring about inequality in the state. His justification of slavery and war can go a long way in the destruction of peace and stability in the state. In spite of all these shortcomings in Aristotle's political thesis, it would be observing that Aristotle's political philosophy, particularly his idea that there is need for manageable size of a given state is commendable and can be helpful in Africa's political development and its stability.

Historical Background of Aristotle

Aristotle (384 – 322 BC) was born in a small Greek colony, in Thrace called Stagira. His father's name was Nicomachus, a court physician to the Macedonian royal family. He was trained first in medicine, and then in 367 BC, he was sent to Athens, to study philosophy with Plato (<http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/history/aristotle.html>). He was Plato's prized student, though he disagreed with him on many points. Plato notwithstanding saw him as intelligence per excellence (Durant, 1961:41). His dynamism was insightful before Plato and he was duly recognized. John (2009:149) observes that he remained in Plato's Academy for about twenty years, until the death of Plato in 347 B.C. After Plato's death, Aristotle together with his colleague, Xenocrates left Athens and settled at Aterneus on an invitation from king Hermias of Atarneus. He served as the teacher of a thirteen year old Alexander, son of Philip of Macedon. His writings alone form a library; they run into about four hundred volumes. The scope of his writings can be classified into logical, scientific, aesthetic and philosophical works (John, 2009:147). The import of his writings that cut across all facets of life, distinguishes him from other philosophers ever existed. We then see him as a philosopher "*quatele*", which can be translated in Igbo aphorism as *ogburugburu*, that is, a man of all angles. In fact, in recognition of his courageous achievements, Ozumba (2000:2) maintains that Aristotle was great for many reasons and conquests.

However, in 334 BC, he returned to Athens and established his school of philosophy, in a set of building called the Lyceum. This originated from a name for Apollo, "the shepherd" and was located at North East end of Athens. According to Ozumba and Uka (2014:88), Aristotle was here for about twelve years. But after the death of Alexander the Great, there arose a wave of Macedonian feeling bothering on hate. Aristotle escaped, saying he will not allow the Athenians to commit the second crime against philosophy, the murder of Socrates being the first. He was clever enough to have discovered on time that since he was charged like Socrates for impiety by the Athenians, what happened to Socrates may happen to him; he then ran away and settled in Chalcis, where he stayed till he died in 322 B.C.

Aristotle's Idea of the Human Nature

It is germane to discuss briefly on Aristotle's concept of human nature as his philosophy on politics, ethics, aesthetic, logic sprang up from there. In his notion of human nature, Aristotle noted that man is a composite of two substances, soul and body. The soul for him is the principle of life. It is the soul that illuminates the body and propels it into action. (http://en.wikipedia.org/Aristotelian_ethics). Everything, for Aristotle, has soul including plants. Irrespective of the fact that everything has soul, the plant for him, possess a lower kind of soul that enables it to perform certain functions.

Regardless of the fact that man is a composite of soul and body, Aristotle places more importance on the soul, since for him, it is the soul that controls the body. In line with this argument, Omoregbe (1991:58) avers that "the soul is the act which actualizes the potency of the body". By implication, it is very clear here that for Aristotle, the soul is the form while the body is matter, and it is the soul that gives life to the body, without which the body is meaningless. Unlike Plato who maintains that the soul is only accidentally united with the body, Aristotle opines that the human soul forms one inseparable substance as matter and form. For Aristotle then, neither the soul nor the body can exist independently. For them to exist and make meaning to life, they must be united in one inseparable relationship.

Looking at the soul as the main part of the living things, Aristotle divided the soul into three parts; vegetative, sensitive and rational souls. These various divisions of the soul explain how the body can function. According to him, the vegetative part is primarily found in plants. This plant-soul is only capable of nutrition and growth. In other words, it exercises the functions of nutrition and growth in plants (*Politics*, 1964:59). The second kind of soul is the sensitive. This kind of soul is possessed by animals. The animal soul has in addition to his activities, of locomotion and sensation than that of the plants, which are growth and nutrition. The animal soul is higher than that of the plant because it can perform both its own activities and those of plants. It is with sensation that animals can decipher between a prey and an enemy. Copleston commenting on Aristotle avers thus: "Just as Aristotle has pointed out the necessity of nutrition for the preservation of life at all times, so he shows the necessity of touch in order that an animal should be able to distinguish food, at least when it is in contact with it; whereby that which is food attracts the animal and what is not food repels it, this is also necessary" (2014:70).

It, therefore, means that it is with sensation that animals can identify its food and its enemy respectively. The soul of man is the highest kind of soul. It possesses supremacy over all other souls. The rational soul is peculiar only to man. The human soul combines in itself, all the lower forms of souls: the vegetative and sensitive, and has in addition to these the rational soul (Stumpf, 1971:89). The rational soul according to Aristotle possesses the

power of rational thought. It also has the power of deliberation. The mind here does not only discover what truth is, in the nature of things, it also initiates etiquette for human behaviour.

Furthermore, Aristotle stated that the rational soul has two kinds of reasoning; the first is theoretical and second, practical. The theoretical, gives us knowledge of principles or what is called philosophical wisdom, and the second gives us a rational guide to our actions under the particular circumstance, in which we find ourselves. It is this rational element in man that enables man to make choices. Rationality helps him to decipher between good and evil and make moral judgments. The rational soul is superior to the irrational soul. Rationality in Aristotle's sense implies bringing out the potentialities in man, by making him know what to do and what to choose. It implies responsibility. In this sense, Aristotle means that the rational soul controls, checks and guides the irrational part of the soul. The rational part of the soul is that which thinks, deliberates and make choices in man. Stumpf (1971:100), in assessing Aristotle, states that "The origin of moral choice is desire; its efficient, not its final cause-choice, and the origin of choice is desire and reasoning with a view to an end". Here, Aristotle argues that without reason, we cannot make choices. It is the rational soul that enables man to choose between evil and good.

There are two kinds of virtues; intellectual and moral, corresponding to the two parts of the soul. Intellectual virtue results from teaching, and moral virtue from habit. It is the business of the legislator to make the citizens good by habits. We become just by performing just acts and similarly as regards other virtues. By being compelled to acquire good habits, we shall in time, Aristotle thinks, come to find pleasure, in performing good actions. Deliberating on virtue as a mean, Aristotle insists that every virtue is a mean between two extremes, each of which is a vice (Russell, 1946:186). Courage is a mean between cowardice and rashness; liberality between frugality and meanness; proper pride between vanity and humility etc. It is the rational part of the soul that is responsible for the control of the passions and guiding of man's actions. Aristotle's idea of human nature informs his theory of the state which we shall consider in the subsequent section.

Aristotle's Theory of the State

Aristotle's politics begins by pointing out the importance of the state. According to him, it is the highest kind of community, and aims at the highest good (Russell, 1946:197). The state was necessary because it provided a framework, for the satisfaction of basic wants and also ensured a means to secure and realize good life, in a uniquely human sense. For Aristotle, the state is prior to the individual, since it provides opportunities for the achievement of full humanity. Subrata and Sushila quoting Aristotle in their joint-book: *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*, state that "All associations are in the nature of parts of the political association. Men journey together with a view to some particular advantage, and by way of providing some particular thing needed for the purpose of life; and similarly the political association seems to have come together originally and to continue in existence, for the sake of the general advantages which it brings" (2014:105).

The state was the means through which man can actualize his potentialities; since man is by nature a political animal and the state exist naturally prior to an individual. For Aristotle, the state evolved from lower associations. The family, he emphasized, is the fundamental society, established according to the laws of nature, with the responsibility of providing man's daily needs. Since man's needs are not limited to the daily needs that the family provided, village came up as a result of the clustering of households, with the intention of satisfying beyond man's daily wants. Man, in spite of the creation of the village, was not still satisfied with what the village could provide, hence sought for a better alternative. This gave rise to what we call state today. That is, a combination of villages. Aristotle holds that the family is the beginning or the bedrock of the state. Following this view, he then criticized his mentor Plato, for his total abolishment of the family in the republic.

Aristotle in his theory of the state, made a demarcation between classes of citizens. He believed and emphasized that the qualification for citizenship, was a person's ability to share in ruling and being ruled in return (Stumpf, 1971:96). For him, women, children and slaves are not qualified to be citizens. Aristotle clearly captures this demarcation thus: "For some hold that mastery is a kind of science and that managing the household, mastery and expertise in political and kingly rules, are the same as we said in the beginning. Others hold that exercising mastery is against nature, for it is by law that one person is a slave and another free, there being no difference by nature, and hence it is not just, since it rest on force" (1964:123-124).

Aristotle believes that some people naturally were made free and some were to be slaves. The masters are the free citizens whereas, the slaves were properties owned by the masters. Again, there is no degeneration or graduation to another's status. This implies that there is no room for a slave graduating to a free man or a citizen degenerating to a slave. A slave always will remain a slave and a free man, free forever. With this in mind,

Russell avers: "Slavery is expedient and right, but the slave should be naturally inferior to the master. From birth, some are marked out for subjection, others for rule; the man who is by nature not his own but another man's own is by nature a slave. Slaves should not be Greeks, but of an inferior race with less spirit" (1946:197).

Therefore, in a natural state, slaves are not counted as citizens because they belong to the citizens, and only the citizens have right over them. A slave imbibed moral and intellectual excellence from his master, which if left to him, would have been difficult. Aristotle, according to Subrata and Sushila (2014:113), justified slavery on the grounds of triumph of reason and virtue, the master representing reason and virtue, and the slave absence of reason, and non-virtue or less virtue". A slave cannot govern himself for he lacks the reason to do so. Aristotle also emphasizes in the *Politics* that women, children and slaves should be excluded from the polity since they are only capably of a different kind of virtue, the irrational virtue of cowardice and licentiousness (<http://www.constitution.org/art/politics/htm/>). To this end, he states that the slave is wholly lacking the deliberative element; the female has it but it lacks authority; the child has it but it is incomplete (*Politics*, 1964:127). Aristotle pointed out that a ruler must possess full and perfect moral virtue. Though moral goodness may be found in all persons, temperance, fortitude and justice are not in the same degree in women as they are in men. As a matter of fact, a woman's rightful place was her house, particularly, her kitchen because of her social abilities as a wife, mother and householder. The woman though free was like a slave, for she lacked reason, this was why she should submit to the superior wisdom of the man. While a slave helped in the orderly functioning of a household, a woman manage her family and home (Subrata and Sushila, 2014:116-117).

Aristotle argues that only citizens were free because they can partake in the leadership of the state. This implies that they can rule and be ruled. On the other hand, the slave, children and woman, were not counted as citizens because they were the properties of the citizens. For Aristotle, woman and the family belonged to the private realm which was the world of particular rather than the universal. He went further to describe the woman as an infertile male, an incomplete male. The male for him, was the active partner and the female passive, required only for sexual reproduction. The activities of women are to be checked by men while women are irrational and naturally incapacitated, to do the same, in the activities of men. Now, it is germane for us to establish what we have aforementioned somewhere in this paper. That is, to show the relationship between Aristotle's idea of human nature and his theory of the state.

The Nexus between Aristotle's Idea of Human Nature and his Theory of the State

It is crystal clear, from what we have discussed so far, that there is a nexus between Aristotle's idea of human nature and his theory of the state. In fact, it is from his idea of human nature that he derived his theory of the state. Hence, he applied the same procedure he used in explaining the human nature on the state. Aristotle in his idea of human nature divided the soul into parts; the rational and the irrational, with the rational having absolute control over the irrational. The irrational consisted of the vegetative and the sensitive soul. Here, the irrational is under the authority and directives of the rational. Aristotle applied the idea of human nature directly on his theory of the state thus; he divided people into citizens and non citizens in the state, which correspond to the rational and irrational souls respectively in the human nature. For him, it is only the citizens that have the authority to rule over the non citizens.

The non citizens consisted of slaves, women and children. Just as the rational soul controls the irrational soul, so also does the citizens control and direct the activities of the slaves, women and children. The slaves, children and women represent the sensitive and vegetative parts of the soul, which depends on the commands of the rational soul. It is the citizens that control and own the non citizens. It is only the citizen alone that is intelligible and endowed the required power by nature to rule and be ruled. The citizens, just like the rational soul, take part in deliberations and decisions making. Just as men or citizens take control over the slaves, women and children, so does the rational control the irrational soul. When one juxtaposes Aristotle's idea of human nature and his theory of the state, it becomes obvious that both are of the same current that flow in the same direction and maintain the same circuit of reality.

Aristotle's Justification of Slavery and War

Here, Aristotle raises the question of whether slavery is natural or conventional. He asserts that the former is the case. In other words, Aristotle's notion of slavery points that some people are innately or naturally slaves and others are naturally masters. John (2009:152) observes that for Aristotle, certain men from birth have been destined for dominion, while others were ordained for slavery. Aristotle's bifurcatory mindset can as well be seen in his idea of the essence and the accident. For him, the essence can exist without the accident but the later cannot. His notion of slavery equally showed itself in his concept of citizenship in the state. He was of the view

that there are citizens and there are non citizens. Citizens are likened to men and non citizens or slaves to women.

Moreover, as Aristotle was interested in slavery, he was also interested in the issue of war. Aristotle in his *Politics* argues that the art of war is a natural art of acquisition. By implication, war can be justified, if its end is the acquisition of natural slaves. Aristotle justified war, especially, when waged against men who were divinely decreed to be governed and will not willingly submit (John, 2009:152). Thus, it is very wise to make slaves of the conquered. Generally, from Aristotle's arguments on slavery and war, one can deduce that slavery is a natural thing that can never be warped or thrown away easily. And that some men are born slaves, but should they die in slavery? This is a serious question because every government is set in place to amidst men to become good and amiable citizens. This is where Aristotle has failed in his sweeping statement about slavery. Yes war may be justified and also be used as determinant parameter in finding slaves, but can it be adopted in the 21st century and beyond as a good attitude?. (<http://movementrepost.blogspot.com>). In other words, war enhances the state to be hierarchically structured, for the betterment of its citizens, but not at all times.

Aristotelianism: A *Sine Qua Non* for Africa's Political Development.

Before we show how significant Aristotle's philosophy is for Africa's political development, it is of utmost importance to define the word Aristotelianism, which is the key word in this paper. Aristotelianism refers to the philosophy of Aristotle in politics, aesthetics, ethics, metaphysics, religion and his entire philosophical works. Aristotle's philosophy from all indications can be of good help in Africa's political development. His notion that a state must not be too small or too big, but should rather have a manageable size, is very important, if considered adequately in Africa's political affairs. Many Africa states are too small to be on their own while a quite number of them too, are too big to be emerged together. Following Aristotle's idea of state, there is need for those countries that are too small to emerge, while those that are too big to be divided. This is to enhance economic growth, social and mutual development in the state.

Africa leaders must work towards a continent-wide socio-political thesis. This will make possible the full realization and utilization of the African continental body: African Union (AU) formerly called Organization of African Unity (OAU) (John, 2009:158). It is when the African leaders understand the nitty gritty of cooperation, integration, complementation and unity that the best form of states can be actualized in Africa. Again, there is need for the (AU) to summon courage politically, to bring out things that will stop Africa's dependence on the Western way of life. This will help us to appreciate ourselves and retain our cultural heritage. If African leaders follow this Aristotle's political thesis, there will be no room for external aggression or mismanagement of public funds, which is the order of the day in most of African countries today. The problem of ethnicity which has eaten deep, into the fabric of our continent, precisely Nigeria, is because of the poor understanding of this Aristotle's political stand point.

If Aristotle is to be well understood in African continent, for instance, there will be no room for what Ozumba and Chimakonam (2014:75), observe as the seed of polarization and fragmentations of human society into antagonistic factions that has led to several wars, alliances, migrations, miscegenations and pockets of human societies, each seeking autonomy, identity, national personality, which made us to be talking of races, nations, countries, continents, unions, federations, republic etc. Asouzu notes that the tendency to act from the background of ethnocentrism usually leads one to cling to those nearest to him, and one's mind seeks to protect his interest, against what he perceives as the external or others (*The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and Beyond African Philosophy*, 2004:69). Asouzu elaborates further as he states thus: "Since we tend to act under this impulse of our primitive instinct of self preservation always and often unintentionally, one can say that in most multicultural and multiethnic contexts, there is often the tendency for the mind to act in an unintended ethnocentric fashion, in view of securing certain interests and privileges it defines as very important for the inner circle" (*Ibanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology*, 2007:130).

It is obvious that the instinct of self preservation, which implies so that I may be alone, is the major cause of ethnocentric commitment, and the core reason we often secure ourselves at the detriment of others (Ezugwu, 2014:44). This shows that the need for one to secure oneself first is the reason for the dichotomy and ethnocentrism that have eaten this continent deep, particularly our country Nigeria. It is worth concluding here that understanding and practicing of Aristotle's political philosophy can go a long way, to curb the problem of ethnicity that has crippled our land today. Aristotle has made it very clear in his *Politics* that if the state is too big that it may lead to ethnicity, hence, the state might not be buoyant enough nor has the required resources to cater for its citizens. This may lead to stealing, gangsterism, cultism, boko-haramism, sickness and high level of illiteracy in the state. Again, if it is too small, it is still a problem because the state may be attacked and be taken

for granted. The available individuals in the state might find it difficult to control the resources of the given state, thereby, creating avenue for external bodies' intervention into the state's resources, which could be harmful to the future growth of the given state.

Moreover, just as we have aforementioned somewhere in this paper, Aristotle's political philosophy enlightens us more on how to depend on ourselves and cherish our cultural heritage. Rather than depending solely on the western thoughts and ideas. One could deduce, following these emphases, that Aristotle's political philosophy has the capacity of helping the African thinkers or philosophers, to adjust in their former way of thinking, which is full of the western pattern of thinking, to African way of doing things or looking at realities. No wonder why, Today, we have what we call "African philosophy" that is been cherished in most of the African universities. African philosophy or worldview is part and parcel of our educational curriculum today. Asouzu (2014:3), in his Acceptance Speech on the Occasion of his Award of Honorary Life Membership of the Nigeria Philosophical Association, observes that doing African philosophy well and promoting it is sacred vocation we can hardly abdicate. Where we attend to it lukewarmly, our colleagues elsewhere will hardly take us seriously.

Asouzu is of the opinion that African's must be serious over what they have, so that they can always and ever time, represent them well in the world. This will equally put fear in the minds of those external aggressors or attackers, who may be coming to attack the state. What we are talking about here is originality, and its phobia creation on the minds of the hoodlums. If there is unity in the state, the probability of external attackers taking over, is infinitesimal negligible. In other words, African leaders are encouraged to hold their culture and philosophy of life at high esteem hence; it will revitalize their mentality, political ambition and objectives, and bring about development in the state.

Evaluation

It is of great importance to evaluate a work of this nature, before a conclusion is drawn. This is because the man Aristotle in question contributed a lot in the history of ideas, but seemed to have derailed or committed a lot of contradictions, in a view of making his contributions. Though in this work, we are pre occupied with his political ideologies, and the import of these ideologies to Africa's political development. As we emphasize on his political philosophy, we should also not forget that his indelible foot prints can equally be seen in biology, physics, chemistry and so many other disciplines of studies. Upon all these areas that Aristotle claimed to have been delved into, scholars of different specialization that supposed to appreciate him for the beautiful ladder he provided for them, improvement and initiation of their thoughts, many a times, grumble, whenever his name is mentioned. The major reason for their grumbling is the numbers of books accredited to Aristotle alone and his inability to cite or acknowledge his mentors. This is the reason for their doubting and provocation over Aristotle's efficacy. The several books that he cannot account for made scholars like John, (2009:148) in his *Man and the State* and James (1954:3) in his book *The Stolen Legacy*, to conclude that most of his books were stolen from the Royal Libraries and Temples of Egypt. As a matter of fact, Aristotle was busy writing his name on people's books. This sound valid since the number of books claimed to have been written by him are much, without a clear link or connectivity of ideas in his volumes of books and on how he wrote or acquire them.

Be that as it may, our major challenge in his philosophy is not whether he stole ideas or not, our problem here is the bifurcatory mindset he introduced in the history of western philosophy. He adopted a polarized and dichotomized mindset in pursuing his philosophy of life (Ezugwu, 2014:42). He captures the relationship between metaphysics and other sciences, with the imagery of the relationship between the master worker and the mechanic, the wise and the unwise, the essential and the accidental. He notes that "The master workers in each craft are honourable and know in a truer sense and are wiser than the manual workers, because they know the causes of the things that are done ... (Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 1926:72).

Aristotle brought this mentality into his political philosophy. He was of the view that slaves must serve their masters forever and that women are subhuman beings. In fact, for him, men are citizens while women are non citizens. The African leaders should be careful here hence, his philosophy about women can bring about colonialism, imperialism, fatalism and determinism and elimination of women's rights, which is part and parcel of the human rights. That a woman cannot produce semen does not make a man paramount, since a man cannot equally produce ovum, which is the required combination under normal circumstance, to have foetus, that is not just a mere tissue, as held by the pro-abnormities, but unborn baby, that will at the end of its term be born and mature to its adulthood, if not tempered with.

Again, in his political philosophy one could conclude that Aristotle prays for war than peace. Though, he claimed that the supremacy of the state is to defend its citizens in time of war. The question remains: what about

in time of peace? Will a state not defend its citizens in time of peace? If this is the case, one will not be indicted if he concludes that Aristotle preaches war than peace. More so, his ideology brings about ethnicity even though, he was trying to run away from it. Ethnicity can be seen boldly in his interest to protect men and abandon women, for the reasons best known to him. Aristotle's notion of reality introduced ethnicity, which brings about discrimination, marginalization, deprivation, neglect and other perceived negative treatments (Ikegbu, 2012:211). African leaders should kick against and discard this kind of mindset about reality, since it can be horrible if explored in dealing with women, slaves and the manual workers in the society. Hence, it deprives one sense of belonging in the society, thereby, propelling one to do nasty things, just to survive within the state.

Conclusion

Having delved thus far on Aristotle's political ideas *vis-a-vis* his relevance to African political development, it therefore behooves one to say that Aristotle deserves to be applauded. His contributions in the field of politics can be very enticing, in the development and restructuring of African leaders' mentality and training their minds, to know that there is a missing link of reality between them and the people they govern. In his aphorism, "medium stands virtue", he notes that a state should not be too small or too big, in order to achieve a certain goal, morality and for the overflow of happiness in the state. With his conception of reality here, one can vehemently say that Aristotle can really help through his political philosophy, in the Africa's political development, in spite of the inconsistencies and impracticability of his philosophies. African leaders and the entire citizens of the state can therefore, through Aristotle's political thesis, turn back to corruption, disagreement, nepotism and self aggrandized interests that have remained preeminence in the inner most part of our continent today. Truly, Aristotle has set the ball rolling for the African leaders to play and be guided in their actions.

References

- Aristotle (2011), *The Politics*. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. <http://www.constitution.org/arit/polit.htm/>. Retrieved on 6 November 2011.
- Aristotle (1926), *Metaphysica*. Trans. W.D. Ross. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Aristotle (1964), *The Politics*. Trans. Corners Lord. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Asouzu, Innocent (2014), *Acceptance Speech*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- Asouzu, Innocent (2007), *Ibuaru: The Heavy Burden of Philosophy Beyond African Philosophy*. Berlin: Litverlag GmbH & KG Wien.
- Asouzu, Innocent (2007), *Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology*. Berlin: Litverlag GmbH & Co.KG Wien.
- Asouzu, Innocent (2004), *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection in and Beyond African Philosophy*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- Barongo, Y (1987), *Ethnic Pluralism and Stability: The Basis of Conflict and Consensus in Democratic Experiment in Nigeria*. Benin: Omega Publishers.
- Copleston, Frederick (2014), *Aristotle's Physics and Psychology*. http://www.csudh.edu/phenom_studies/greekphil/greek13.htm. Retrieved on 9th November.
- Durant, Will (1961), *The Story of Philosophy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ezugwu, Umezurike (2014), "Ethnocentric Bias in African Philosophy Vis-Avis Asouzu's Ibuanyidanda Ontology" in *Filo Sofia Theoretical Journal of African Philosophy, Culture and Religious* 3.1.41-44. <http://en.wikipedia.org/Aristostelian-ethics>. Retrieved on November 01, 2014.
- <http://movementnresponse.blogspot.com>. Retrieved on November 01, 2014.
- <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/histroy/Aristostle.html>. Retrieved 2nd November 2014.
- Ikegbu, Ephraim, "African Political Philosophy" in Godfrey Ozumba and Elijah Okon John (Eds) (2012), *African Political Philosophy*. Uyo: El-johns Publishers.
- James, George (1954), *The Stolen Legacy*. New York: Julian Richardson Publishers.
- John, Elijah Okon (2009), *Man and the State: Issues in Socio-political Philosophy*. Uyo: Afahaide Publishers.
- Omogbe, Joseph (1991), *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy*. Ikeja: Joja Press.
- Ozumba, Godfrey and Chimakonam, Jonathan (2014), *Njikoka Amaka: Further Discussions on the Philosophy of Integrative Humanism*. London: 3rd Logic Option.
- Ozumba, Godfrey (2000), *The Great Philosophers*. Vol.3. Awka: R and K Publishers.
- Ozumba, Godfrey and Uka, Michael (2014), *A Handbook of Ancient Western Philosophy*. London: 3rd Logic Option Publishers.
- Russell, B (1946), *History of Western Philosophy*. London: George Allen & Uwin.
- Stumpf, Samuel (1971), *Philosophy: History and Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Subrata, Mukherjee and Sushila, Ramaswamy (2014), *A History of Political Thoughts: Plato to Marx*. <http://www.google.com/m?q>. Retrieved on 9 November 2014.