



THE PLACE OF MORALSPHERE THEORY IN INTERSUBJECTIVITY OF HILARY KANE

By

Abubakar Yakubu Emeje, PhD

Department of Philosophy

Prince Abubakar Audu University Anyigba

emejeyakubuabubakar@gmail.com

&

Oguche, Peter Unekwu, Ph.D

Department of Philosophy

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

oguchepeterune@gmail.com

&

Olubisi, Oluwagbenga Stephen

Department of Philosophy,

Prince Abubakar Audu University Anyigba

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17080446>

ABSTRACT

When an individual, as a being has a good relationship with the other, life is maintained and harmonious living orchestrated. Robert Kane's inter-subjectivity emphasis among other things good inter-personal relationship. Kane further treats "moral rightness" in the Moral Sphere Theory. He argues that it resides in striving to lead a good life that is objectively worthy of being lived and striving thereby to realize goods by virtue of the living of such a life that are objectively worthy of being realized. Endeavouring to live such a life, in other words, moral rightness entails fundamentally, not treating others as mere means (not breaking the moral sphere) and then doing what one can to maintain (restore and preserve) the moral sphere when it has broken down, while moral wrongness is doing otherwise. Consequently, an attitude of "openness" or tolerance toward other points of view is vital. Openness to other points of view, he sustains, would thus become a way of reaching that point of commonality. The problem then that warrants this study is that although Kane's idea of Openness appears to be a solution to sustain commonality and objectivity, he creates back the problem which he set out to resolve by not giving a stand on the truth; hence, the intersubjectivity of subjectivism. The main objective of this research is to explore an exhaustive

idea of Robert Kane's discourse on intersubjectivity based on openness and to evaluate the claims therein. This research adopted a qualitative design. Materials were sourced from books, journals, periodicals, conference papers and dissertations. This research thus sustains that Kane's idea of Openness appears to be a solution to sustain commonality of living; however, he creates back the problem which he set out to resolve by not giving a stand on 'the truth'; hence, the intersubjectivity of subjectivism.

Key Words: Intersubjectivity, Openness, Moral Sphere, Subjectivism, Objectivism

Introduction

In the month of August 2024, the youths in different parts of Nigeria took to the streets for a protest against the government. With the tag: "END BAD GOVERNMENT", the youths lamented the problems of killings, bad government and many other socio-economic issues in Nigeria. This protest degenerated into some kind of killings, injuries, breaking of jails etc. Some of the people were injured in the process as a result of gun shots by the military, while some as a result of the struggle. This incident opened up several thoughts among Nigerians regarding the sense of insensitivity and corruption among the Nigerian politicians. Corruption has become the order of the day when corrupt leaders usurp the resources and foodstuffs meant for the good of the people, thereby reducing other subjects as mere objects- as means only.

In the wake of this thought, and while I was reading the work of Robert Hilary Kane, I discovered his idea in his Moral Theory, called Moral Sphere Theory, that was propelled by his idea of Ends principle, as a way to proffer some solutions to the issue and curb some social mischiefs. Kane (2005) firstly defines the moral sphere as a sphere in which all persons can be treated with openness by all others in the sense of being allowed to pursue and realize their desired ends or purposes, and hence to pursue their ways of life, without interference (without being prevented from doing so by the pursuits of others). He then writes that the "Ends Principle" implies that you treat all persons as ends in every situation, and no one as means only (or as mere means). Hence, our fundamental worth is to conquer the world, not by subjecting the other of our kinds to mere puppets to be used, but to make them a part of us in reality. It then means that the realization of oneself is predicated upon the freedom to project oneself into possibilities opened in everyday life, but with the full break of not harming another. To harm another implies the breakdown of moral sphere, which for Kane should be sought to be resolved when broken-down. Simply put, the domain of freedom reaches the idea of self/community development, made feasible by mutual interaction, but not to harm nor use the other as a puppet. The relationship of the "I" and the "Other" should be based on the possibility of realizing a collective whole. The projecting of ourselves into possibilities is a kind of way to justify the one sense of freedom, for the making of oneself. In this light, Robert Kane establishes that the doing of this would necessary require the ethical principle about right actions and in this interpretation, right and good freedom worth exercising, a kind of pursuit for wisdom. Since we are limited, the other can supply us with some other materials that we do not have, but are necessary for our being and for our realization as well; for no one is self-sufficient.

For Kane (2005), the points of view of persons are defined by their beliefs (factual, evaluative and normative) along with their desires, intentions, emotions, feelings, preferences and

other psychological attitudes that together tell us how the persons experience the world, what they believe about it and what their “values” are. While their values, he writes, include what they care about, what they regard as good and bad, what purposes or ends they regard as worth pursuing or avoiding, what activities, accomplishments, and other things they regard as worthy of admiration or condemnation, and how, in general, they think persons ought to act and live their lives. Consequently, an attitude of “openness” or tolerance toward other points of view is vital. Openness to other points of view, he sustains, would thus become a way of reaching that point of commonality.

Similarly, we live in a world of conflicting opinions, philosophies, religions, ways of life and points of view about fundamental matters, including good and evil, right and wrong. These complexities would be better synthesized by the idea of “Openness” to the idea of others; and treating them as ends. It is therefore important to see freedom here as that which all possess in the first order of freedom, that is, to pursue our ends; to strive to know, and to become the best we can be, in so far as this striving does not affect another person negatively.

The Basis of Robert Kane’s Intersubjectivity

We live in a world marked with pluralities and uncertainties. Consequently, there are different individuals acting at the same time within a society, with person’s belief; this then means that humans should try by every means possible see to it that there is the possibility of having objective ethical standards; a new search for fairness about values and ethics. This fairness will be grounded in the human interactions which is the thrust for a complete society free of violence. There is then the need for an objective moral standard, and this quest made Kane to propose that ethical principles about right action and the good life emerge from the philosophical quest for wisdom. There should be the good worth striving for and value worth pursuing. Accordingly, as awareness of facts about the natural world and human beings would tell us what was good and valuable, so theoretic investigation into the nature of things (theoria) would answer practical questions about how to live; and to know what purpose each person should pursue in actions, there should be an explanation of why anything in a society behaves as it does. Conflicts of idea, opinion, and pursuits could bring about some moments of fights if not approached with wisdom. Hence, a quest for wisdom would charge for the pursuit of objective moral standard about what is right and what amounts to a good life. This search further led him to propose a concept called the “End Principle,” the idea that you treat someone as an end in every situation, treating a person with openness and valuing the person’s moral sphere; this further led to his “Moral Sphere Theory” of right action.

Since all persons are free, and there exists this idea of responsibility in freedom, there is then the need to highlight how Kane would solve the problem of individual relationship in a society and the way to curb excesses in terms of any kind of exercise of freedom. Notably, the whole of the idea of Kane to be discussed is how he addresses the social interrelation among humans and their way of coming to a mutual agreement, thus the idea of intersubjectivity. Note that Kane’s emphasis in his early works have been on the deep sense of freedom, concretely sealed in the notion of URC (Ultimate Responsibility Criterion), but the need arises that no man is an island; hence, humans of freewill/freedom must necessarily come in contact with one another, and how they do this thus matters. As understood, Intersubjectivity is the reciprocal structure of social correlation/connection. Human can come to an unanimity about knowledge or about their experience in this life as a working agreement. It is a relationship that exists between two separate

and conscious minds. It is the common sense shared meanings constructed by humans in their interactions (sharing their experiential contents like emotional states, points of view, sensitivities) with one another and used as a way of interpreting the import of fundamentals of socio-cultural life. As it were, it is the mutual engagement and participation amidst independent subjects which conditions their particular experience about the world. Apparently, the human mind is primarily a shared mind, thus, intersubjectivity (as relationships models) is at the centre of that which make us humans. Hence, the fact that each person as rational being with mind, is differently working out his own purpose and exercising his freedom, there exists the other who would definitely interact with the subject I, and this interaction calls for a working principle.

The Cause of Conflict among Men: Pluralism and Uncertainty

In the views of Kane (2005), there are five conditions of modernity. These are (1) fact from value, (2) theoretical from practical inquiry, (3) explanation of fact from purpose, together with a greater recognition of (4) pluralism and (5) uncertainty in matters of value. They block certain traditional paths of inquiry into the nature of the objective good. However, he explicates that plurality and uncertainty have played a more pivotal role in raising doubts about the possibility of objective values and ethical standards in the minds of ordinary persons and in the human sciences and philosophy. By pluralism, Kane means the fact that we live in a world of conflicting opinions, philosophies, religions, ways of life and points of view about fundamental matters, including good and evil, right and wrong.³ In the lens of some philosophers, pluralism about values is the doctrine that more than one view concerning the good, or the good life, is true. But Kane is of the opinion that this kind of doctrine is controversial and thus lacks the idea of what he meant. Hence, pluralism Kane (2011) submits is something less controversial “the obvious fact that in our modern cultural environments we are daily faced with conflicting points of view about good and evil, right and wrong; a fact that leads us to wonder which view may be true, and whether our own is true.”

He explicates that such pluralism is made more insistent by two pervasive features of the modern world. The first feature is the global village created by modern information technology and the second is the spread of democratic and pluralist societies. This first one, he avers, puts people in daily contact with views and values different from their own. The second allows and encourages differences of point of view within individual societies. He gives an analogy of a global city in which different cultures and ways of life mingle and are forced to confront one another. Hence, by knowing other ways of life and entertaining doubts about our own, we learn something about the complexities of good and evil. He noted that the loss of moral innocence (the secure feeling that the rights and wrongs learned in childhood are the only correct or true ones, unchallengeable and unambiguous) is not experienced at all in the modern era. Hence, many persons still live never doubting that their own views are absolutely right and unchallengeable.

On the issue of uncertainty, Kane (2005) submits that the new “knowledge of good and evil” that tempts and confuses us is the awareness of different and competing ways of life and views of good and evil. The mere existence of diversity and disagreement, no matter how pervasive, does not rule out the possibility that one view is right and others wrong. Consequently, realizing in the abstract that diversity and disagreement do not rule out the possibility that one view is right does not mitigate fears of pluralism, if we are also uncertain about how to show which of the competing views is right. In the real sense of it, Kane (2011) argues, the source of lost moral innocence in the modern world is not pluralism alone, but pluralism plus an uncertainty about how to resolve fundamental disagreements between conflicting points of view, values and ways of life.

He furthers that the uncertainty that conspires with pluralism to raise doubts about how to resolve such disagreements has its source in a deeper philosophical problem. To explain this problem, he spoke of conflicting “points of view”, “values” and “ways or forms of life.” For him, the points of view of persons are defined by their beliefs (factual, evaluative and normative) along with their desires, intentions, emotions, feelings, preferences and other psychological attitudes that together tell us how the persons experience the world, what they believe about it and what their “values” are. And their values include what they care about, what they regard as good and bad, what purposes or ends they regard as worth pursuing or avoiding, what activities, accomplishments, and other things they regard as worthy of admiration or condemnation, and how, in general, they think persons ought to act and live their lives. Furthermore, their Ways (or forms) of life are then plans of living implied by different points of view, so defined.

It is worth noting that what is meant by values of persons or group of persons is what they hold or regard or believe to be good or bad, right or wrong, which may or may not be what really is good or bad, right or wrong. For Kane (2005), to show that one point of view is right and other competing views wrong, you must present an evidence. But the evidence will be gathered and interpreted from your own point of view. If the dispute is about values, he contends, some of the evidence will include beliefs about what is good or bad, right and wrong, that are not going to be accepted by those who have fundamental disagreements with your values in the first place. Your evaluative beliefs must be defended by appealing to other more fundamental evaluative and other beliefs that are also yours.

Kane’s Idea of Openness and How to arrive at Objectivity: The Retreatants

To drive home the nature of philosophical inquiry, (that will lead one to arrive at objective good and truth) Kane uses the analogy of ‘Retreatants’. By the idea Retreatants, Kane (2005) means those who stayed behind to continue the search after others had left. They decide to take an attitude of respect in the sense of openness towards all points of view and forms of life. This openness attitude calls to mind the idea of intercultural Philosophy. It is worth noting that it seems Kane had an idea of intercultural philosophy (an approach towards philosophy) in the discourse of his philosophical ideas. According to Agbakoba J. C. (2014), “Intercultural philosophy started as an attempt by some European, mainly German, philosophers to break out of the confines of Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism has many aspects, however in the area of scholarship and education, it can be taken as the notion that Europeans – particularly, Western Europeans – and Westerners generally possess superior knowledge, values, and methodologies in all spheres in relation to other societies. And stressing too the part of openness in the Philosophy, (with which Kane is claimed to have used to drive home his idea) Ucheaga D.N. (2018), holds that; Intercultural philosophy gives one the impression that philosophy can be done in an open fashion that is committed to the concerns of philosophies besides Western philosophy. The intercultural philosopher views “dialogue and polylog as means of reaching out to other cultures apart from one’s own in an attempt to understand or benefit from the other.”¹⁷ From these ideas about intercultural philosophy, and putting into consideration Kane’s retreatants and their openness attitude, one can say that Kane understands the reasonableness of dialogue and openness in arriving at a holistic knowledge.

Kane (2005) furthers that the Openness attitude of the retreatants is a way of limiting narrowness of vision, expanding their minds beyond their own limited points of view. The retreatants in Kane’s explanation would not claim that these other points of view are wrong. To claim that would mean to undercut the assumptions of pluralism and uncertainty with which they

initiated their request for information/inquiries. It is their belief that they are still searching for the truth, not that they have already found it; and this motivates their position of openness even to all who disagree with them. The reasoning of the retreatants who do not demonstrate that other competing views are wrong shows that “while the retreatants’ ethical conclusions would not be arrived at by anyone from any point of view (or form of life), their conclusions would be arrived at by anyone from any point of view (or in any form of life) who was willing to start with an attitude of openness to all other points of view and forms of life. Thus, the ethical conclusions which the retreatants reached will be arrived at by anyone who in the interests of limiting narrowness of vision, chooses initially to respect every other points of view and way of life in the sense of openness, and doggedly strive to maintain this ideal in the face of obstacles and conflicts. Openness is the stance one must choose to take. The retreatants or anyone must take the attitude of openness in the hope of finding out what is right and wrong.

The stance of openness Kane says is grounded and motivated by two primary attitudes. These primary attitudes are: “(i) the belief or recognition that we are finite beings who must see the world from limited points of view, which is the source of pluralism and uncertainty; and (ii) an aspiration to wisdom in an ancient philosophical sense. To explain aspiration, Kane (2011) argues that aspiration is a longing to find what is true and worth striving for in the nature of things. It is also the willingness to make efforts to search for such truth and worth under finite condition. To choose openness and stay at the retreat as did the retreatants, one holds one’s traditional religious, cultural, political and personal beliefs. Openness does not even accord their views any kind of superiority. Hence, to opt for openness, “requires that they disown certain kinds of privilege or superiority, that of claiming absolute certainty for their points of view or the right to impose their points of view on others except as a last resort in order to restore the moral sphere. Openness is not the final view in an imperfect world; it is a defeasible good. Openness is a path not a goal. As a retreatant, one does not possess the final truth about the good, but you are searching for it. Hence, Kane (2011) argues that the ethical truth that would be possible to be possessed by some persons in principle could only be a truth, not the truth.²¹ In other words, a person could possess an ethical truth, not the ethical truth. By and large, Kane sees openness of mind as an initial attitude in search of wisdom and in resolving conflict, but “relativism of indifference” need not be the final attitude. By its “goal”, openness is not the final truth about what is good or valuable, but a guide (an attitude) in search for truth.

Moral Sphere Theory and the Idea of End Principle: The Dialectics of Intersubjectivity in

Robert Kane

Our fundamental worth is to conquer the world, not by subjecting the other of our kinds to mere puppets to be used, but to make them a part of us in reality. It then means that the realization of oneself is predicated upon the freedom to project oneself into possibilities opened in everyday life, but with the full break of not harming another. Simply put, the domain of freedom reaches the idea of self/community development, made feasible by mutual interaction, but not to harm another. The relationship of the “I” and the “Other” should be based on the possibility of realizing a collective whole. The projecting of ourselves into possibilities is a kind of way to justify the one sense of freedom, for the making of oneself. In this light, Robert Kane establishes that the doing of this would necessary require the ethical principle about right actions and in this interpretation, right and good freedom worth exercising, a kind of pursuit for wisdom. Since we are limited then, the

other can supply us with some other materials that we do not have, but are necessary for our being and for our realization as well; for no one is self-sufficient. This then will make us treat others as ourselves too. He here explains that the natural world furnishes us with the way to live and the daily experience gives us the clue on way to relate and in turn exercise our freedom. It is therefore important to see freedom here as that which all possess in the first order of freedom, that is, to pursue our ends; to strive to know, and to become the best we can be, in so far as this striving does not affect another person negatively.

The Moral Sphere Theory

For Kane (2010), the goods realized by enslaving others (in the form of pleasure for the slave masters) are “Ill Gotten Goods”, (IGG), which should be restricted. It follows that Kane sees the Moral Sphere Theory (MST) as the theory that offers an appealing way of arriving at the necessary/required moral content, the theory of right action, between the “I” and the “Thou”. He goes ahead to give the Moral Sphere formula as: “Strive to lead a good life that is objectively worthy of being lived and strive thereby to realize goods by virtue of the living of such a life that are objectively worthy of being realized”. (Kane, 2010) With this formula in view, one would want to know the ethical theory this idea falls into, whether the Deontological or Consequentialist (Teleological) Ethical Theories. It is noteworthy to explain the two. The distinction between the two is strictly on the way of understanding the relative priority given to the good and the right. The Consequentialist ethical theories, (Teleological in Rawl’s sense) Kane explains, give priority to the good over the right, defining the rightness of actions (principles, motives, etc.) in terms of their promotion of the good. While the Deontological theories, by contrast, give priority to the right over the good, defining right actions (principles, motives, etc.) independently of their promotion of the good.⁵ At the first sight, one would think that Kane’s theory is that of the Consequentialist/Teleological theory in that it lays emphasis on the good, but his theory, as he argues is basically a Deontological Theory. Kane (2010) observes that the Teleological Theory promotes the good of a kind, but in Moral Sphere Theory, an ultimate good or value, that is, the objective worth or the fourth dimensional value (‘Value’ as worth that should be recognized by everyone from every point of view, not relative but universal).is promoted; and right action is a precondition for promoting this kind of good. Consequently, the Moral Sphere Theory stipulates that universality and impartiality are derived from the requirement that the kind of good to be promoted by right actions must be worthy of being recognized as good from all points of view. De jure de facto, goods that came through moral sphere-breaking plans of action and ways of life, are not objectively worthy of being realized in the required sense (fourth dimensional good/value). Kane in this way will not favour the idea of slavery in that it involves treating some individuals as mere means to the ends of others and therefore involves a moral sphere breaking way of life, an ill-gotten good.

The Idea of the Ends Principle in Connection with the Moral Sphere Theory

Kane treats the matter of moral sphere breakdown as that point where an individual could interfere in the matters that concerns another (when an assailant moves to main another). He firstly defines the moral sphere as a sphere in which all persons can be treated with openness by all others in the sense of being allowed to pursue and realize their desired ends or purposes, and hence to pursue their ways of life, without interference (without being prevented from doing so by the pursuits of others). To break the moral sphere theory means making it impossible for other persons

to treat us with openness, and all others with openness as well. The intent in imposing one's will on another is to use his victims as a means to promote his own ends, regardless of the desires or interests of his victims. Kane sustains that the means by which agents may "impose their wills on others," or "make others do or undergo what they want" can take many forms. Physical force and intimidation are two of the most common ways of imposing one's will on others, but manipulation and deception are others. Those who engage in moral sphere-breaking treat some other persons as mere means to their own ends, as does an assailant to his victim. This language of persons treating others "as mere means to their own ends" is also common in everyday life, as far as the "I" and the "Other" is concerned.

It is to tackle the above dilemma that Kane (2010) submits that, the foundation of the unpretentious quest for wisdom concerning value is an ethical principle that he terms the 'Ends Principle'. This principle when looked at closely is a resemblance of Kant's humanity formula, the Categorical imperative. Kant's Categorical Imperative states thus: "Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always at the same time as an end and never as a means only. It is from this idea that Kane (2010) develops his Ends principle which states thus: "Treat all persons as ends in every situation, and no one as means only (or as mere means). The Ends Principle provides an account of what it is to treat someone as an end in themselves (and to treat someone merely as a means) in terms of treating them with openness and respecting their moral sphere. One important difference between Kant's Formula of Humanity and Kane's Ends Principle is that the Ends Principle is a hypothetical imperative, which holds that if you are embarked on the quest for wisdom, then you are committed to Moral Sphere Theory. To differentiate from Kant, Kane holds that Kant's idea is that you treat all persons, at all times with respect. However, for Kane (2010), it is not possible so, because, doing so would allow for Moral Sphere Breakdown. Hence, to treat with respect at all times is done provisionally, and under certain condition that there is no braking of the moral sphere. Kane emphasizes that Moral Sphere Theory and the Ends Principle are justified by the quest for wisdom and they are not requirements of rationality or reason. As it were, "the Ends Principle" of Kane, is a description of the need to at all times, if possible, to handle someone else as an end in that someone's self, treating with openness and valuing the person's own moral sphere. The Ends Principle (EP) which states that treat all persons as ends in every situation and no one as means only led to Kane's Moral Sphere Theory (MST), of the right action.

Evaluation

Kane's position is commendable, but there exist some inconsistencies in his postulations. He writes that the points of view of persons are defined by their beliefs (factual, evaluative and normative) along with their desires, intentions, emotions, feelings, preferences and other psychological attitudes that together tell us how the persons experience the world, what they believe about it and what their "values" are. While their values, he writes, include what they care about, what they regard as good and bad, what purposes or ends they regard as worth pursuing or avoiding, what activities, accomplishments, and other things they regard as worthy of admiration or condemnation, and how, in general, they think persons ought to act and live their lives. He then argues that what one thinks good, one strives for it, and is consequently what he values. This might sound as a kind of contradiction. If what one thinks good, he strives for it; does it imply that even those who feel that killing others who do not belong to the same faith with them are right, since they feel that is good? By extension, there is the problem of how to show which of the competing

views is right? This is a kind of dilemma. In this connection, because we all are finite beings, any claim of one point of view being superior than another is not feasible, and none is the ultimate. Kane would respond that an attitude of “openness” or tolerance toward other points of view is vital. Openness to other points of view, he sustains, would thus become a way of searching for the objective truth about what is good or valuable under conditions of pluralism and uncertainty rather than a denial of that objective truth. Critically, he fails to establish a point of objectivity still, leading us back to uncertainty and the point of “the truth, or the right”. The question still stands and as Pilate (John 18:38) will ask: what is “the truth”? Kane himself agrees to this point when he submits that the ethical truth that would be possible to be possessed by some persons in principle could only be a truth, not the truth.⁸ Since there is no view that is allegedly better than another, one might say that openness hides some level of subjectivism.

Critically, this idea of Kane about the absolute is quite problematic. He seems to have made us day-dreamers and constant strugglers on the journey to the ideally value, so absolute. It then means that what one struggles to get at cannot be reached. Suffice it to say that this idea could be misleading, as it presents a scenario where you told a child that he would see his mum on a very long journey of years, only to tell him at the end that his mum cannot be seen (say dead), but he can only view her picture, (which is something that only represent her, and not her per se). This in my view sets a limit to his quest, which this research, on the ground of the above articulation, could dismiss as an objective relativism (so to say; a way to hide the idea of relativism to a new kind of it). This to a minor extent bring us to G.E. Moore who says that good cannot be defined; however, this is the issue with philosophy as a discipline itself.

Furthermore, Kane posits that what is good for some kind of beings and from their perspective is not relatively good for them, but is worthy of being recognized as objectively good by everyone, whether others in fact recognize it or not. This though is problematic. If what one sees as good should also be seen as good by others, then to reconcile this point is quite strong. This is because if Mr. A, sees suicide as good, does it mean that others should see it as good too? This is what Kane could face here as a problem, though he might reply with the idea that suicide is a kind of breaking of the moral sphere, but in response; one who commits suicide, does not punish others directly. Hence, when one commits suicide, he has only inflicted pains of death on oneself and not on another; even though we know that the family bears the burden of the person’s burial. Even at this point that the person’s death came to them suddenly, all must someday die, and there exists the unchanging duty to bury the dead by those alive. In the connection already stated, Kane’s point is that worthiness for glory from all points of view depends upon the worthiness for care or concern from all points of view. For you to earn my respect for your point of view, you have to respect my point of view too, and this dependence is indirect for Kane. Kane goes further to prove that openness is an attitude, and that attitude is a choice, and that choice is the choice to stay at the retreat, a place of openness; and to keep searching for the right and the good from every point of view despite conditions of pluralism and uncertainty. Note that in his books; *The Significance of Freewill*, one of Kane’s understanding of choice is “that which terminates the process of deliberation, but this is a place of choice where Kane seem not to suggest that, but as the ordinary sense of it, that signifies settlements of the conditions of doubt and uncertainty about what an individual will do. Unlike the discourse of freedom, Kane offers an alternative criterion, where one is free to change one’s course of action (like the SFAs, Self-forming Actions), but here, Kane sees no way, but implies that openness is the deal, in so far as one wants to get to the ideal, and to come to the sense of objectivity he pursues.

Conclusion

Truly so, the natural world furnishes us with the way to live and the daily experiences gives us the clue on way to relate and in turn exercise our freedom. Everyone pursues an end, and that marks for pluralism. By implication, “we live in a world of conflicting opinions, philosophies, religions, ways of life and points of view about fundamental matters, including good and evil, right and wrong.”¹⁷ Kane’s move is to find the point and how these complexities would be better synthesized; hence, the best path to the ideal, and mutual living. Consequent upon the pluralistic nature in life, one has to project oneself into freedom, bracketing one’s own view, in order to know and appreciate that of another; one comes to the knowledge of the complexities of good and evil. In the bracketing of one’s view, (freedom to project into possibilities) one would not lose one’s own freedom, but will acknowledge the freedom of others and then understand the need for the being of another. It is therefore important to see freedom here as that which all possess in the first order of freedom, that is, to pursue our ends; to strive to know, and to become the best we can be, in so far as this striving does not affect another person negatively. This marks for a healthy interaction between the “I” and the “Other”. One thing striking about the postulations of Kane is the logic of his thoughts and the idea he conveyed, namely: that man is a being in relation to another. As a result, to get that which is good, give it also to others; and to be happy, make others happy. This is why Kane insists that desiring one’s own happiness is compatible with desiring the happiness of others; thus, one should not exploit another.

REFERENCES

- Agbakoba, Joseph C. A. (2014), “Intercultural Philosophy and the question of African identity: an ‘Afroconstructivist’ perspective” in William Sweet (ed), *What is Intercultural Philosophy? Journal of Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change Series I.Culture and Values, Volume 44*, George F. McLean (Ed.General). USA: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication.
- Aja, Egbeke. (2015), *What is Philosophy: An African inquiry*, 2nd edition. Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press.
- Bergson, Henry (2001), *Time and Free will: An Essay on the immediate data of consciousness*, translated by F.I. Pogson, M.A., NY: Dover Pub, Inc.
- Buber, Martin.(2011), *I and Thou*, Trans. R. J. Smith. Edimburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Carlson, N. (2011), *Foundations of behavioral neuroscience 8th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Double, Richard. (1991) *The Non-Reality of Free Will* , Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Honderich, Ted. (1988) *A Theory of Determinism: The Mind, Neuroscience, and Life-Hope.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. (1949) *Foundational Principles of Metaphysics of Morality*, Trans. Abbot Thomas.
New York: Indiana Bobs-Meril Comp.
- Neil, Levy. (2011) *Hard Luck: How Luck Undermines Free Will and Moral Responsibility.* Oxford University Press.



Njoku, O. C Francis. (2010) *Studies in Philosophy of Mind*, (Owerri: Claretian Institute of Philosophy.

Nozick, Robert. (1978) *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.

Kane, Robert Hilary. (1985) *Free Will and Values*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

.....,(1998)*The Significance of Free Will*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

....., (1999) Robert Kane, “Responsibility, Luck, and Chance: Reflections on Free Will and Indeterminism” in *The Journal of Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

....., (2002)*The Oxford Handbook of Free Will*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

....., (2003) *Free Will*. (editor) New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

....., (2005) *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*. Oxford Fundamentals of Philosophy Series. Oxford University Press.

Kane, Robert,et al, (2007) *Four Views on Free Will*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

....., (2010) *Ethics and the Quest for Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kane, Robert. (2011) “Rethinking Free Will: New Perspectives on an Ancient Problem.” in *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will 2nd edition*. Ed. Robert Kane. New York: Oxford University Press.

Strawson, Galen. *Freedom and Belief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Weber, Max. (1947),*The theory of Social and economic Organisation*, Translated by Henderson and co., Talcott Parson (Ed.). NY: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Bernard. (1963) *Freedom and the Will*, ed. D.F Pears. New York: St. Martin’s Press Inc.

Zlatev, Jordan. Racine Timothy P. Sinha, Chris. Itkonen, Esa. Eds. (2008) *The Shared Mind: Perspectives of Intersubjectivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.