

KANT'S CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE AS A BASE FOR PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL STUDIES MORAL EDUCATION IN NIGERIA

IMO M. OBOT (Ph.D)
FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR, CALABAR
drimoobot@gmail.com

Abstract

Kant's philosophy has in it some bases of moral actions which he outlines as categorical imperatives. This philosophical base advocates for moral duties for duty sake and not for exterior motives. Many moral problems have been identified in Nigerian society as ensuing from actions or behaviours arising from exterior motives as the bases for actions. Testing Kant's moral principle against the moral requirements in the context of Social Studies Education, it has been found out that Kant's moral imperative if adopted in Social Studies Education as a philosophical base will enhance effectiveness of Social Studies as a discipline aimed at producing morally positive citizens in the multicultural and multidimensional actions that can be found in Nigeria. From the above study, some recommendations were made.

Introduction

Kant's moral philosophy is based on his *metaphysics*. Kant draws heavily on his observations and ideas about human nature to formulate his normative ethics. He makes explicit that the supreme moral principle itself must be discovered a priori, through a method of pure moral philosophy (G 4:387–92). Such must be inherent in and revealed through the operations of reason. This is contrary to empirical moral philosophy grounded in a posteriori principles inferred through observation or experience since they can tell us how people do act and cannot tell us how we ought to act. Kant then favors moral principles that are the most fundamental, authoritative and normative rather than descriptive. According to Kant (1952) then moral commands are unconditional. For him, we should not confuse conditional truths, such as what is prudentially good for certain individuals or species, with unconditional truths about fundamental moral requirements (G 4:389–90).

Kant's notion of autonomy is one of the most central, distinctive, and influential aspects of his moral philosophy. Kant (1952) defines autonomy principally as the property of the will by which it is a law to itself being independent of any property of the objects of volition since it both gives itself the moral law (it is self-legislating) and can constrain or motivate itself to follow the law (it is self-constraining or self-motivating) (G 4:440). In this case then the source of the moral law is not in the agent's feelings, natural impulses or inclinations, but in her pure, rational will or noumenal self, which Kant identifies as the proper self (G 4:461). This is contrary to heteronomous wills governed by nature through their instincts, impulses, and empirical desires (G 4:444, CPrR 5:61).

Kant (1952) conceives of the human agent as having both noumenal and phenomenal aspect being members of both the intelligible world and the sensible world. As members of the intellectual world we are free. As members of both intellectual and sensible world we are both free and determined. (G 4:451–52, 454; CPrR 5:43).

Consequently, Kant (1952) then believes that morality presents itself to human agents as a categorical imperative and our all specific moral duties are derived from it. It is a categorical imperative because it commands and constrains us absolutely, with ultimate authority and without regard to our preferences or empirical features or circumstances. Contrary to this is the hypothetical imperative which can only express a command of reason, but only in relation to an end already set by the agent in form of objects of inclinations (G 4:413–20). Perhaps the two best known formulations of Kant's categorical imperatives are (1) act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law (G 4:421), (2) So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means (G 4:429) (Kant:1952). It is from these that he believes the highest good can be obtained. Kant believes that morality gives rise to a notion of the highest good.

Although the end that Kant's ethics most closely concerns is rational in nature (the "end in itself" which grounds moral duties), Kant's ethics also contains a different sort of ultimate end: the complete object of practical reason, which we can think of all moral action as pointing toward. The highest good consists in a world of universal, maximal virtue, guaranteeing universal and maximal happiness (CPrR 5:10–111). One reason that makes Kant's account of the highest good important is that it emphasizes that virtue is unconditionally good, whereas happiness is conditionally good; happiness is good when and only when it is pursued and enjoyed virtuously. These two components of the highest good are heterogeneous. No amount of happiness can make up for a deficit of virtue, and no amount of virtue, despite its unconditional goodness, can make up for a deficit of happiness. The highest good requires both. Another reason why Kant's account of the highest good is important is that Kant often portrays the highest good as a social good for us to strive for collectively and which history may be viewed as leading towards. This presents Kant's ethics to be less abstract and individualistic and more concerned with social and political progress than some of his more foundational writings suggest it is. A final reason why Kant's account of the highest good is important is that it is through his account of the highest good that Kant argues for the rationality of belief in God and immortality. For example in the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant argues that because reason sets forth the idea of happiness conditioned by virtue as

the ultimate culmination of our moral strivings, we must believe this end to be realizable; for if we do not believe it can be realized, we must admit that morality directs us to an empty ideal, and hence is itself fraudulent. But since this end does not seem possible only through human agency in the natural world, we must, if we are to believe it is possible, postulate the existence of God, who mediates between the realms of nature and freedom, allowing morally good intentions to be expressed through actions in the natural world, and making possible a causal relation between virtue and happiness (CPrR 5:124–26). This argument does not give us knowledge of God's existence, but rather practical warrant for belief in God. Moreover, it depends on the impossibility of proving that God does not exist; for this practical warrant would not hold in the face of theoretical proof of God's nonexistence. But Kant believes that speculative arguments can prove neither God's existence nor God's nonexistence. Thus, Kant's account of the highest good shows how, for Kant, moral commitment leads to religious belief. Kant also argues that we must postulate the immortality of the soul, since otherwise it seems impossible for us to bring our dispositions into complete compliance with the moral law (CPrR 5:122–24).

Like all other moral theories, Kant's categorical imperative sought to evolve what could be judged as morally acceptable acts. In addition, it suggests the means of it. It cannot be justifiably denied that a greater percentage of the problems of the Nigerian society is the result of the actions of men in the society.

Thus, it can be said that, if the bad actions of people in the Nigerian society can be corrected, most of her moral problems would be solved. Be this as it may, the questions are: Can adherence to Kant's categorical imperative help to solve morally based problems in the Nigerian society? Can it correct human actions? Can it solve all the problems? These are some of the questions this study would battle to provide answers within its scope and limitations.

Kant's Categorical Imperative

Kant (1952) holds that the fundamental principle of our moral duties is a categorical imperative. It is an imperative because it is a command which commands us to exercise our wills in a particular way or not to perform some action or other. It is categorical since it applies to us unconditionally and simply because we possess it as a rational will without reference to any antecedent end or goal for ourselves. The categorical imperative is the true moral imperative.

According to Kant (1952), the categorical imperative would be that which represent an action as necessary in itself without reference to another end, i.e., as objectively necessary.

This categorical imperative applies to all men and commands actions as necessary of itself without reference to another end, that is, as objectively necessary. It commands certain conduct immediately, without having any other purpose as a condition.

The categorical imperative commands action that are good in themselves and not action as means to another good. It shows and directs the human person to actions that are objectively necessary and thus it becomes valid as an apodictic principle. Knitting all these ideas together, it can be said that, It concerns not the mother of the action, or its intended result, but its form and the principle of which it is itself a result; and what is essentially good in it consists in the mental disposition, let the consequence be what it may. This imperative may be called that of morality. According to stumpf (1977), this imperative is categorical because of its instant application to all rational beings, and it is imperative again because it gives the principles on which all human actions ought to be based.

For Kant (1952), not all imperatives are connected with morality or the universality moral commands. There are imperatives such as technical and prudential imperative which command the performance of technical or self estimable actions respectively. Kant calls these hypothetical imperatives which is the opposite of categorical imperative that command binding actions. Hypothetical imperative is a command that also applies to us in virtue of our having a rational will, but not simply in virtue of this. It requires us to exercise our wills in a certain way given we have antecedently willed an end. A hypothetical imperative is thus a command in a conditional form. In this case, he describes the will as operating on the basis of subjective volitional principles he calls 'maxims'. Hence, morality and other rational requirements are demands that apply to the maxims that motivate our actions. Being that hypothetical principle states only what some agent wills, it is subjective. A principle for any rational will would be an objective principle of volition, which Kant refers to as a practical law. We must understand the concepts of a 'good will', 'obligation', and 'duty' and so on, as well as their logical relationships to one another, before we can determine whether our use of these concepts is justified.

Given that the analysis of concepts is an a priori matter, to the degree that ethics consists of such an analysis, ethics is a priori as a well. What *is* a duty? What kinds of duties are there? What *is* the good? What kinds of goods are there? These appear to be metaphysical questions. Any principle used to provide such categorizations appears to be a principle of metaphysics. Kant (1952) argued, no experience can tell us whether any will, including our own, conforms to the Categorical imperative either. "What counts", regarding such conformity, is not the actions one sees, but their inner principles, which one does not see (4:407).

Kant's analysis of commonsense ideas begins with the thought that the only thing good without qualification is a 'good will'. While the phrases 'he's good hearted', 'she's good natured' and 'she means well' are common, 'the good will' as Kant thinks of it is not the same as any of these ordinary notions. The basic idea is that what makes a good person good is his possession of a will that is in a certain way 'determined' by, or makes its decisions on the basis of, the moral demands or moral law as a priori principle of action.

Human beings view this Law as a constraint on their desires. It is the will which motivates actions based on the Moral Law by the thought of duty. So in analyzing unqualified goodness as it occurs in imperfectly rational creatures such as ourselves, we are investigating the idea of being motivated by the thought that we are constrained to act in certain ways that we might not want to, or the thought that we have moral duties.

Kant's views in this regard have understandably been the subject of much controversy. Yet Kant's defenders have argued that his point is not that we do not admire or praise motivating concerns other than duty, only that from the point of view of someone deliberating about what to do, these concerns are not decisive in the way that considerations of moral duty are. What is crucial in actions that express a good will is that the motivational structure of the agent be arranged so as to give considerations of duty priority over all other interests. It does not require or even recommend a rule-bound character devoid of the warmth of human emotion. According to Kant (1952), what is singular about motivation by duty is that it consists of bare respect for lawfulness.

It can further be argued that duties are created by rules or laws of some sort. For instance, the bylaws of a club lay down duties for its officers. City and state laws establish the duties of citizens. Thus, if we do anything because it is our 'civic' duty, or our duty 'as a boy scout' or 'a good Nigerian', our motivation is respect for the code that makes it our duty. Thinking we are duty bound is simply respecting certain laws pertaining to us.

However intuitive, this cannot be all of Kant's meaning. For instance for a bad law such as the Nuremberg laws of Nazi Germany out of duty may be morally despicable. Respect for such laws could hardly be thought valuable. We should know that the motive of conforming our actions to civic and other laws is never unconditional. We also have eyes toward doing our part in maintaining civil or social order, toward punishments or loss of standing and reputation in violating such laws, and other outcomes of lawful behavior. In that case for Kant we respect these laws to the degree that they do not violate values, laws or principles we hold dearer. Yet Kant thinks in acting from duty that we are not at all motivated by a prospective outcome or some other extrinsic feature of our conduct. We are motivated by the mere conformity of our will to law as such.

Kant(1952) argued, we are motivated by the thought that, insofar as we are rational beings, we must act only as this fundamental law of (practical) reason prescribes, a law that would prescribe how any rational being in our circumstances should act. Whatever else such a law might be, it is, in virtue of being a principle of reason, true of all rational agents. My respect for such a law is thus not qualified: my respect for the laws of my state, constitution or religion guides me in practical affairs only insofar as they do not require me to violate laws laid down by my own practical reason, but my respect for the deliverances of my own reason does not depend on whether it requires me to violate the former sorts of laws. In this case, it is respect for (rational) lawfulness as such that guides me.

The forgoing line of argument reveals a distinctive aspect of Kant's approach: his account of the content of moral requirements and the nature of moral reasoning based on his analysis of the unique force moral considerations have as reasons to act. The force of moral requirements as reasons is that we cannot ignore them no matter how circumstances might conspire against any other consideration. Since they retain their reason-giving force under any circumstance, they have universal validity being that the laws of reason are universal. So, whatever else may be said of moral requirements, their content is universal. Only a universal law could be the content of a requirement that has the reason-giving force of morality.

For Kant (1952), the objective matter of moral philosophy is nothing but the discovery of the possibility of arriving at principles of behaviour that are universally binding on all rational beings. In the words of Stumpf (1977) on Kant's morality, the qualities of universality and necessity are the marks of a priori judgments, and this further confirms Kant's view that the principles of behaviour are derived by the practical reason a priori. Instead of searching for the quality of "goodness" in the effects of our actions, Kant focuses upon the rational aspect of our behaviour. He believes that though man is a rational being, he is not always disposed to perform rational actions. It needs to be guided. The will which orders actions is often influenced by instincts and other personal desires. Reasons must be assisted. According to him, reason is not competent to guide the will with certainty in regard to its objects and the satisfaction of all our wants. Reason is imparted to us as a practical faculty, i.e. as one which is admitting that nature generally in the distinction of her capacities has adapted the means to the end; its true destination must be to produce a will, not merely good as a means to something else, but good in itself.

It is the good will that engenders actions for their sake without attachment to end, cause or what it can accomplish. It is with the good will that actions are performed just for the sake of duty with the total exclusion of the influence of inclinations. Writing on this, Stumpf (1977) says, duty implies that we are under some kind of obligation, a moral law. As rational beings we are aware of this obligation as it comes to us in the form of an imperative. Duty helps us to recognize some obligations towards certain actions or moral laws. It comes to us in the form of imperatives. It is the necessity of acting according to the law. Rational nature exist as an end in itself. All men everywhere want to be considered persons instead of things or animals for the same reason. Reason orders that they act accordingly.

The above leads Kant to the second formulation of the categorical imperative: So act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other in every case as an end withal, never as means only. He understands this to be a supreme principle in relation to the human will. It is the universal law. Every rational being regards his existence in the same way as others. Thus, this principle of practical action is more or less an objective principle. Thus, in attempting to commit suicide for example, one would ask, is my action consistent with the rational being that I am?

Kant (1952) formulates the third categorical imperative which is very similar to the ones already shown. However, this third formulation is more explicit: Always so act that the will could regard itself at the same time as making universal law through its own maxim. Kant means that a rational being, morality consists in self legislation through which the subjective will is made objective based on the common rationality. Though we are all free, we are able to subject ourselves to a common moral law. This morality is based on conviction with action performed just for the sake of the end not influenced by passions desires and inordinate inclinations. As stumpf (1977) puts it, Here Kant speaks of the autonomy of the will, that each person through his own action legislates as a moral law. Thus, a heteronymous will is influenced or even determined by desires or inclinations. An autonomous will, on the other hand, is free and independent, and as such is the supreme principle of morality. Central to the concept of the autonomy of the will is the idea of freedom. Kant affirmed the “will” as the cause of free and independent actions among rational beings contrary to that of irrational beings determined by physical necessities. How do we now relate Kant’s categorical imperative to our multidimensional and multicultural challenges? Let us start by looking at related concepts.

Nigeria as a Multinational State

Etymologically culture is a derivative of the latin word colere which means to nurse, to cultivate, to care for. In the field of social science, culture came to be understood as a common way of life of a people. This includes their beliefs, knowledge, customs, traditions, technology, skills, perception and actions. According to Onuigbo (1998), culture touches every aspect of human life such as technology, economics, social system and structure, education, politics, language, and religion. While these things help to create culture, culture in turn creates them. Culture then is a distinctive make of a people.

This relates culture to ethnic groupings and ethnicity. Ethnic groups are social formations which according to Nnoli (1997) are distinguished by communal factors such as language or culture or both. This is where ethnicity is associated with the nature of social interactions among people of different ethnic groups by Nnoli (1997). There is no doubt then that culture, social interaction and social morality are related. There are various cultures in Nigeria such as Annang, Hausa, Boki, Igbo, Ijaw, and Yoruba cultures as there are various ethnic groups.

Historical Sketch of the Multicultural Nature of Nigeria

The multiplicity of culture in Nigeria is indicated in the nature of historical distributions of ethnic origins in Nigeria. Three main historical stocks can be found in Nigeria(1) West coast Negro _ These are predominantly found in the South East forest belt and forms the main stock of various groups in the south region of Nigeria.(2) The Fulanis _ These are found Predominantly in The Northern part of Nigeria Except for the “cow Fulanis”.(3) The Shuwa Araps. These are found in the lake chad area of Bornu province. With these groups are other groups with the features of Mongoloid, Cansesoid and Semitic.

Nigeria Multicultural Nature and the Nature of Ethno-cultural Relationship

Although Nigeria has this multicultural background, it is said to be a federal state. This has variously been described as an artificial entity accessioned by the administrative initiative of amalgamation by Lord Lugard In 1914. According to Ekeh(2001), Two centuries after the amalgamation of Nigeria many cultural and traditional discords still remain unresolved. This is indicative of a conflictual nature of Nigerian ethno-cultural relationship as a multicultural state.

Typology of Intercultural Conflicts in Nigeria

There is the need to understand the typology of intercultural conflict in Nigeria in order to make an appropriate relation to Kant’s categorical imperative. Three major types of intercultural conflicts have been distinguished in Nigeria: 1. Inter Communal Conflict 2. Minority rebellion. 3. Conflicts aimed at ethnic discrimination.

Theories of Intercultural Conflicts

Three major causes of intercultural conflicts have been identified. These include: 1. Primordialist Position 2. Instrumentalist Position 3. Moderate Instrumentalist Position .

THE PRIMODIALIST POSITION

According To This School Of Thought, cultural pluralism is the bases for many conflicts in the Nigeria society. This is a position shared by Nsongola- Ntalojo(2001) in his article “The National Question In Comparative African Perspective”. It is very difficult to detach from ones cultural values.

INSTRUMENTALIST POSITION

For the instrumentalists, cultural multiplicity is not the sole cause of social conflicts. Social conflicts are more as a result of tribalism and ethnicity which ensues from manipulations of multicultural context of Nigeria (Nzongola-Ntalojo:2001).

Moderate Instrumentalist Position

In addition to the position of the instrumentalists, the moderate instrumentlists hold that social conflicts in the Nigerian society are caused also by the perspective of historical constructions of the different cultural origin. (Nzongola- Ntalojo:2001). For him, as far as social antagonism is concerned, it is traceable to and related to issues of cultural identity, racial, religious, economic and political hermeneutics of ones cultural history and the struggle for superiority (1991). For him, individual values represent both the ideal and real dimension of our feelings as individuals and as a culture. Every value of the individual is a mirror of his culture as a whole and by its history.

The Implications of Nigeria Multicultural Nature for Positive Actions and Morality: The reality of Moral Problems

There is no doubt that the multicultural nature of Nigeria has impacted variously and enormously on the moral dimensions of our social lives. These includes issues of religious intolerance, insecurity, inequality in the distribution of the nation's wealth, offices, rights and privileges, unequal distribution of developmental projects, unequal distribution of opportunities, living in mutual suspicion of one another. To make a better assessment of Kant's categorical imperative in the Nigerian socio-moral environment, it may be necessary to take a brief and sketchy look at Nigeria's related problems. Chinua Achebe in his book "The Trouble with Nigeria", has a good list of Nigerian problems. However, this is not to say that there is nothing positive about the Nigerian society.

CORRUPTION

Achebe in his book "The Trouble with Nigeria" testifies to the reality of corruption in the Nigerian systems. He writes, Corruption in Nigeria has passed the alarming situation and entered the fatal stage, and Nigeria will die if we keep pretending that she is only slightly indisposed. This corruption ranges from bribery, frauds, and forgeries to obtaining by tricks. Obtaining by trick as the name implies involves deprivation through the use of moral force. It causes the infliction of emotional and even physical pains including the inconveniences that the deprivation will bring.

Asking for and giving bribes have almost become common features of contemporary social life. Asking for and giving bribe hinders the proper usage of the will and freedom of decisions. Again, it divides attention in the performance of duty. Without this freedom of judgment, decisions and actions, a lot of people are continuously deprives of their rights and innocent people are vulnerable and victimized.

VIOLENCE

Violence is one of the characteristics of the Nigerian society today. A confirmation of this can be seen in the nature of her arts. Drama, concerts, songs and films shows dramatize the violence in the Nigerian society. This violence ranges from violence on persons to violence on personal property. There is no doubt, these violence are mated out with reasons including cultural bias which sometime make it structural. Thus, it constitutes a moral problem in the Nigeria society. It is difficult and depressing to admit it, but Nigeria is fast assuming the character and attributes of a troubled state. Nigeria is becoming increasingly filled with history and stories of violence as all kinds of alienated social groups perpetuate violence of all kinds. A recent example is the Jos crisis(2012). Because of this it appears it can be said to be unable to protect its own citizens and enforce its own laws in most respects. The primary duty of a state is to offer its citizens protection and safety from violence and insecurity of lives. When a state is no longer able to fulfill this basic duty to its citizens and foreigners here on legitimate business then it is deemed to have failed in the discharge of its basic responsibility. Although he does not limit the cause of this violence to cultural differences, it is said to be a major cause which arises from alienation, humiliation, deprivation and unhealthy competition based on cultural differences and suspicion.

GOVERNANCE

Good governance is supposed to be a rule for the sake of the people. On the contrary, governance in Nigeria has been carried out for the sake of the rulers themselves. Apart from the lootings during the military era, this act seems to continue till today. This is inflicting injury on the nation.

EDUCATION

There is no doubt about the breakdown of the educational sector of the nation. Many factors come into play in this. This ranges from the parents of the students to the policy formators including the management sector and the teachers. There is no doubt that some of the actions by stake holders in the education sector are morally depraved.

ECONOMY

The economic sector of the Nigerian has been flooded with substandard goods. Such goods include even medicines that have to do with human life. Adulteration of these is a clear case of selfishness and moral insensitivity to the good of others.

INJUSTICE

Injustice goes with the deprivation of one of what by right belongs to that person. This deprivation may be physical or moral. It is true that no one ever desires to be deprived of what belongs to him. To practice injustice is to do to someone what one may not want done to him.

The summary of the above is the selfish and self-centredness that has infiltrated into the Nigerian society which in most cases is attributable to cultural bias.

MULTICULTURALISM AND NATIONAL INTERGRATION

We have seen issues on conflicts and social immorality as related to the multicultural nature of Nigeria. There is no doubt then that, like other nations with many cultures, national integration has remained a very big challenge (Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh (2001). According to Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh (2001), National integration has never been an easy thing for any nation to achieve as a result of cultural differences.

The word integration means bringing every person irrespective of cultural dissimilarities into common and equal membership in a particular nation (Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh, 2001). As given by Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh (2001) National Integration then involves:

1. Members of the nation regard themselves as sharing common and equal citizenship.
2. Every citizen enjoys equal rights and responsibility to the nation.
3. Every citizen can live work and own property anywhere in the country regardless of state of Origin.
4. Every citizen believes and knows that he has equality before the law of the country wherever he may be.
5. Every section of the nation believes and knows that he has equal access to the resources of the nation.
6. Most individuals and sections of the nation maintain loyalty to the nation.

From the above, more implications of Nigerian multiculturalism can be inferred. Ethnocentrism and nepotism are functions of the problems of national integration Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh (2001). For them ethnocentrism, nepotism and lack of national intergration form the bases of public actions by public functionaries based on kinship and other forms of cultural affinities. These in turn encourage among other things bribery and corruption (Akpabio, Udokpong and Eboh, 2001) and selfishness in behaviours and social actions.

The Demands of Moral Character Formation

Having seen Kant's categorical imperatives and the Nigerian situation in relation to its some of the social implications of its cultural pluralism, it is important to briefly look at some principles of morally good character formation in order to properly test the efficiency of Kant's position for the desired purpose through the use of Social Studies Education.

Character is observable in ones conduct. This implies that a change in conduct also indicates a change in character. According to Oyelade (2008), morality in the society involves human principles of right and wrong, how humans treat themselves with the aim of promoting mutual welfare, growth and meaning in their strive for what is good over what is bad and what is right over what is wrong. Conditions for good moral character as behavioral pattern include:

- 1 Moral responsibility, sound ethical and moral rules and values
- 2 Capacity for discipline
- 3 A moral and ethical sense of the values, goals and processes of a free society
4. Positive moral standards of personal character and ideas

To assess the capacity of Kant's categorical imperative to solve Nigerian multicultural problem is to match it with the principles above with particular attention to the Nigerian situation.

Kant's Categorical Imperative and Moral Education in the Nigerian Multicultural Situation

Our previous studies have been able to expose the basis of Kant's categorical imperative as a moral principle and the Nigerian situation in terms of morality. As a competent philosophy for solving the consequent problems through Social Studies Education, the categorical imperative will be hypothesized as being capable or not capable based on the four requirements of Huitt (2004) for a moral principle.

1. Moral responsibility and sound ethical and moral behavior:

Kant's categorical imperative is based on an a priori metaphysics. As an a priori principle, Kant (1952) sees every man as naturally capable of moral responsibilities with the capacity for sound ethical and moral behavior. Thus Kant goes beyond descriptive morality and places his morality on a normative pedestal as naturally binding. Morality for Kant is not a matter of option but a natural responsibility as a "duty for the sake of duty".

2. Capacities for Discipline

In Kant's Teaching on morality, he recognizes the weakness of human nature capable of errors and defects. Consequent on this, Kant's categorical imperative contends principles of discipline on the human will and desires. The will and human desires are inordinate in nature and should be guided by reason.

3. A Moral and Ethical Sense of Values, Goals and Processes of a Free Society

Kant recognizes good moral values, goals their means as the bases for integral social living. He recognizes "the other" in the society as an important aspect of the society. This is a principle that directly bears on tolerance and accommodation which is an imperative for moral rectifications in the contemporary Nigerian multicultural situation.

4. Standard Of Personal Character and Ideas

As a standard principle, Kant alludes to the disciple of the will, rational actions and duty for duty sake as principles of social morality. Be this as it may, Kant's categorical imperative is a principle and standard for personal character, ideas, being law abiding and contributing positively to the Nigerian society.

Conclusion

This brief study looked at Kant's categorical imperative and went further to look at the Nigerian situation. Looking at the propensity of Kant's categorical imperative to salvage the moral ills of Nigerian society, it can be concluded that Kant has much capacity to do this. This is based on the fact that no one desires injurious acts for himself. Knowing that universalization of injurious act would eventually make him a victim; he would not desire its universalization. Desiring the good for himself, in universalization, he would always perform commendable actions which he expects from others. Thus, Kant's principle of universalization has the propensity to evoke good actions and socially commendable actions from all and at all levels.

However, it must be clearly noted that this study does not claim that Kant's categorical imperative can solve all of the Nigerian societal problems. Even Kant (1952) acknowledged that though rationality belongs to all, not all are always capable of rational actions. At the same time, it is a veritable philosophical tool for moral education in social studies in Nigeria.

Recommendations

- 1 Kant's categorical imperative should be integrated among other related ones as a philosophical base for moral and character education in Nigeria.
2. Formulators of moral education curriculum on social studies should adopt Kant's categorical imperative into it as a guide in their curriculum formulation.
3. Evaluation on social studies moral education should pay more attention to acquisition of good behavioral skill than merely cognitive competence to enhance positive attitude and practical actions towards good social behaviours.

References

- Akpabio, A.J., Udoukpong, B.E. and Eboh, S.(2001). *Social Studies For Junior Secondary Schools and Colleges Book 1*. PAICO Press, Calabar.
- Ellis, A. K. (1977) *Teaching And Learning Elementary Social Studies*.Massachusetts: Allyn And Bacon.
- Ekeh, P. P. (2001) "Nigerian Political History And The Foundations Of Nigerian Federalism". In E. E. Oseghae And E. Onwudiwe (eds). *The Management Of The National Question In Nigeria*. Enugu: The Lord's Creation.
- Immanuel Kant (1952). *The Critique of Practical Reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ikporukpo, C.(2001) "The Myths And Realities Of Majority Groups In Nigeria". In E. E. Oseghae And E. Onwudiwe (eds). *The Management Of The National Question In Nigeria*. Enugu: The Lord's Creation.
- Kavanagh, D. (1972) *.Political Culture*. London: The Macmillan Press.Nnoli, O. (1997). *Ethnic Policies In Nigeria*. Ibadan: LCP Press.
- Nzongola-Ntalojo, G.(2001) "The National Question In Comparative African Perspective". In E. E. Oseghae And E. Onwudiwe (eds). *The Management Of The National Question In Nigeria*. Enugu: The Lord's Creation.
- Onuigbo, S. (1998) "Cultural Heritage: Any Future For Africa If..." In J. O. Oguejiofor (ed). *African Philosophy And Public Affairs*. Enugu: Bigard Memorial Seminary.
- Stumpf, S.E. (1977). *History and Problems Of Philosophy*. New York: McGraw Hill Books.