

CULTURAL RELATIVISM: SOME COMMENTS

Nkeonye Otakpor

Introduction

Since the publication of Richard Rorty's "Philosophy and The Mirror of Nature"¹ a lot of academic water has passed under the bridge of scholarship. Rorty's principal thesis, indeed, generated a lot of heated controversy and the spate of pro and anti Rortyan arguments are far from diminishing. The present effort is neither to support nor critically assail Rorty. I believe that some of his ardent critics have not demonstrated enough sincerity of purpose. By which is meant that it is not sufficient to attack Rorty's position without attempting to see beyond his "Mirror of Nature", and indeed without sufficiently explaining whether or not philosophy is on any grounds the Mirror behind the mirror. I do not intend to concern myself with any detailed exegetical exploration or reconstruction of the positions taken by Rorty on one hand and those of his critics on the other since these positions are well known and already received enormous and extensive publicity in learned journals. Rather I intend to refer to a different outcome in terms of the arguments for and against cultural relativism.²

What is cultural relativism?

To attempt an answer to this question it is important as a first step to proffer definitions of the two key concepts: culture and relativism.

Culture: Culture in its broadest sense refers to that part of the total repertoire of human action (and its products), which is socially as opposed to genetically transmitted.³ In other words, "culture" or civilization is that

complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, philosophy, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.”⁴ Its essential core consists of traditional — historically derived and selected ideas, and especially their attached values and shared understandings, all converging and resulting from the desire to respond to human needs. Culture is essentially a type of an adaptive mechanism, making possible the satisfaction of human needs both biological and social. It is not merely a set of stereotyped traditional reactions but a form of instrumental function which satisfies human needs. Culture is thus essentially a boundary marker which not only separates man from mere animality but also sets groups apart from one another. Evidence from both history and experience support the view that human beings are many and vary in customs, beliefs and outlook. Such experience may have influenced the account of the Tower of Babel in the Bible (Genesis, 11:10). The Biblical story has deep cultural implications. The tower represents the primordial unity of the human family and could be taken as the cradle of culture. It represents developments in culture since the emergence of languages led to the failure of the project. Individuals who could no longer understand themselves constituted new units of culture. In this sense, the tower stands for cultural unity as well as the diversity of cultures. In other words, the tower stands for a plurality of belief systems, art, morals, laws, habits, customs, traits, myths, stories, philosophies, truth, knowledge, objectivity, etc., both national and transnational. It stands for the universal as well as the particular, or more philosophical speaking, for the ONE and the MANY. Hence the universal aspects of culture may be subdivided into (a) the special (particular) aspects, and (b) the general aspects: according to how far they correspond with specific types of human activity and how far they are more general and pervade every field of human life.

Special Aspect

1. Economic
2. Political
3. Legal
4. Educational:
 - Knowledge and technique
 - Sentiments and Morals
5. Religion

General Aspects

1. Geographical environment, human ecology and demography
2. Material substratum
3. Knowledge and belief
4. Normative System
5. Language

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6. Art, recreation and ceremonial | 6. Social Organisation |
| 7. Philosophy | 7. Life-Cycle of the individual |

It must be emphasised however that the distinction between these two aspects of culture is a relative one and the categories are not mutually exclusive. They do overlap.

Although we do speak of culture in the sense of that which is a property of the human race (Human culture), this cannot be transposed into a single homogeneous culture, that is, one culture embracing and encompassing the peculiarities and nuances of all the ethnically federated cultural units in the world. In other words, the possibility of a "cultural universal" is remote because culture can only be in the particular and can be understood, if at all, only in that frame work. There cannot be a culture universal because that negates the idea of a culture area, that is, the geographical area in which there is a high degree and consistency of traits and custom in substantial difference from other areas or regions. There is no one single way of life common to the entire human race, though there is only one known human race. No single set of moral standards can be applied to all human populations. And in the absence of such a single way of life or a single set of moral standards, culture can only be relative and meaningful within the confines of a geographical space. Yet acceptance of this does not run counter to the ethical unity of the human species.

Relativism: There are many sorts of relativism as they are many senses of it. All are at best reducible to the Aristotelian theses: "Fire burns both in Hellas and in Persia, but mens ideas of right and wrong vary from place to place."⁵

This Aristotelian theses is further and fully exemplified in the popular maxim: when in Rome do as the Romans. This maxim expresses not unbridled particularism "but a specific and categorical universal standard."⁶ The relativist takes due cognizance of the following: (a) the social and environmental conditioning of knowledge and belief in terms of what is, what is not, and what ought to be the case; (b) that there is no universal standard of good and bad, right and wrong; and finally (c) maintains that there is nothing like "objective knowledge of realities independent of the knower."⁷ One difficulty, and a serious one for that matter, with relativism is the unconscious but easy slide into subjectivism. If anything

such subjectivism is an intelligent one. Intelligent because the experiences and world view of “the subject are not mere emotions but proper to the person’s intellectual life.”⁸

Cultural Relativism: In the light of the discussion of the these two key concepts, what emerges from the conflation of the salient points in this: Cultural relativism is the notion or idea that “a culture can only be understood in its own terms, and that standards from other cultures cannot be applied to it. It also stresses the idea that culture moulds personality, and that the ideas of normality and deviance, for examples, are relative to particular cultures.”⁹

For those interested in issues concerning culture universals or the universal categories of culture, the whole idea or question of cultural relativism does not make sense because of the alleged commensurabilities between and among cultures. What is usually unaddressed in this quest for commensurabilities is whether or not the commensurables are indeed possibly the case without grounding in particulars. In other words is it not the case that the quest for sameness in terms of the standards of measurement presupposes variation and plurality? The quest for sameness can make sense only by acknowledging the existence, importance and primacy of variance and plurality, because the primal background to this quest is the fact that there is the *MANY*. W.L. Butler has well advised and warned Africans and other marginalised groups in the world not to concern themselves with the vague concepts of a “Civilization of the Universal” and universal humanity etc., “until all other races and nationalities have reached that level of awareness.”¹⁰

A Minimalistic Defence of Cultural Relativism

I regard this defence as minimalist in the sense that I do recognise and acknowledge the existence and prevalence of certain invariant ethical norms, certain invariant rules of good conduct common to the entire human family. For example, all cultures may differ in their respective visions of life, after life, death and salvation; they may differ and perhaps disagree about what is a good life or a bad life but none permits wantom killing, cheating, lying or the abuse of other persons. Prohibitions against any or all of these can be found in all cultures in one form or the other. Yet this is not to say that the reasons behind the prohibitions are univer-

salisable. It is not to say that there is a "reason universal" behind the prohibitions. If anything, the reasons are largely informed by particular customs and traditions. In other words, the reasons are culturally based and determined. How we think and reason is sentiment relevant and what we think and reason about is temporally grounded. Yet these substantive and procedural fundamentals are fused in the dynamy of culture.

Mackenzie has suggested that "culture is the lens without which one cannot see at all",¹¹ that is, make sense and meaning in and out of our immediate environment. This lens is thus needed by all to make their particular worlds more habitable, more comfortable and more meaningful. The universe if it is rational at all, is made more meaningful and perhaps intelligible with the aid of this lens. Without it our own particular world would, perhaps, not be senseful. We probably would not be properly and adequately located in it. Our own world might then become a "season of anomy". Hence even if "problems of life are universally human and stem from the necessity to respond to the needs of our own particular world"¹², this lens is necessarily required in terms of attempts at articulating the answers to these problems. And although common to all human beings and the necessity for resolving them equally common, the answers differ greatly to the extent that the lenses are in total disaggregation. So while these problems and the need for their resolution are universally aggregated, the answers are totally disaggregated. They are relative to culture.

Cultural Pluralism and Relativism

The incontrovertible fact of cultural pluralism grounds relativism and this constitutes the historical background for the exercise of human reasoning both in the past and in our present condition. Against this background a culture universal like a reason universal is on this score homeless, that is, without a base. To be home this base need be only relative and subjective. There is nothing like a completely neutral universal culture just as there is nothing like a neutral universal philosophy. A culture or philosophy that is not relative is by definition not one. Just as there is no neutral universal culture or philosophy, so there is no single story, myth, etc. that is not relativistic. The recognition of the incidence and existence of culture areas largely entail the plurality of philosophies, stories, myths,

and cultures. Reck has pointed out that “humans are story creating and story telling animals. We live by stories, we remember and dream by stories. In a very real sense we domesticate”¹³ our different worlds by narrative.

In other words there are innumerable ways of specifying the correspondence between the human mind and the world particular to it. This correspondence is not only particular but privileged. To this extent Jackson’s argument “that the question of verifying any given correspondence relation as the correct mirror of nature remains as unanswered as ever”,¹⁴ misses its intended target if that target is the invalidation of a correspondence relation that is culturally determined. The important but unanswered question by Putnam, Jackson and others is not, indeed, the question of verifying the correctness or any given correspondence relation but essentially that of specifying whether or not any such correspondence relation can be taken or regarded as culturally indeterminate. This is prior to the quest for correctness and in fact largely informs the decision concerning correctness or incorrectness.

A major consequence of the position adopted here is the problem posed by truth and objectivity. Three important reminders are relevant in this regard: (a) that knowledge, truth and objectivity are, in essence, prisoners of systems of thought of which they are unaware, that truth *per se* is the product of a system of exclusions, a net work, or episteme, that defines what can and cannot be said; (b) that knowledge is knowledge for some purpose. The validity and usefulness of knowledge depends on the validity of the purpose: (c) that truth and objectivity are not the exclusive preserves of a calculative, deductive, logical and analytic temperament.

The logico-deductive model is not the only path way to truth and objectivity, or even knowledge. The plurality of truth is much broader, hence the royal road does not exist. To this extent, it is plain that all cultures do not have the same regime of truth and objectivity. The Greeks and Romans had their own, the Arabs have another, the Indians, Chinese, Africans yet another. It is then the problem of the different cultures having equally different attitudes to truth and objectivity.

The calculative, deductive, logical and analytic model does not embody the holographic cultural matrix of the entire human family. Furthermore, this model does not, cannot, embrace or embody the holographic cultural matrix of the west essentially because that matrix (like in other cultures) is phronetic.

“Of all things the measure is man ...” (Protagoras), is true only to the extent that man is interpreted plurally. In this sense just as there are many individuals and cultures, so there are many measures, truths, world-views, stories and philosophies. Hence for Aquinas “in our understanding truth is diversified in two ways: in one way because of a diversity of knowers from whom it has diverse conceptions which lead to diverse truths; in another way from a diverse manner of understanding.”¹⁵ This diverse manner of understanding coupled with the diversity of knowers are grounded in particular cultures. If there are many ways of specifying the correspondence between mind and the world particular to it, it follows that there can never be one truth, one true story, one philosophy, one version or conception of reality or one version or conception of objectivity. In effect Western truth of any sort is just one kind of truth. The Western truths about God, Hell, Heaven, Limbo, after life, etc. for examples, constitute an only infinitesimal aspect of the truth on such matters because there are other truths concerning them. And if these truths work for the West and all those who share the Western version of reality, the truth concerning such matters in an Indian or Nigerian village which are conditioned by and rooted in their respective traditions definitely works for those Indians and Nigerians. In other words, reality is socio-culturally constructed, and “if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences”. However, the prospects for revision as a result of worthwhile encounters with nature and other human kins is not remote. But such revisions are never radical in the sense of an absolute or a complete rupture between the old and the new. Yet such revisions are significant in terms of the displacement and transformation of thinking, the changing of received values and all the work that has been done to think otherwise, to do something else, to become something other than what one is.

When we open our eyes on our world, according to Paul Veyne, “We do not observe a methodical doubt (unrelated) to the myths and norms of our tribe, in expectation of more rational proof. We do not adopt, while waiting, a provisory moral (and epistemological) code by which we would eternally conform our attitudes and beliefs to local customs. Not at all, we believe at the outset, firm as steel, in local beliefs and norms, we defend them, are profoundly imbued with them, we take them as the natural way to behave.”¹⁶ It is thus plain that no individual can stand fully outside the form of life of which he is a part. That form

of life of which the individual is a part is a continuum: from the remote and immediate past to the present. What is our present? What is the present field of possible experiences? According to Foucault "this is not an analysis of truth (or of objectivity), it will concern what might be called an ontology of the present, an ontology of ourselves. It seems to me that the philosophical choice confronting us today is this: one may opt for a critical philosophy that will present itself as an analytic philosophy of truth, or one may opt for a critical thought that will take the form of an ontology of ourselves, an ontology of the present. That ontology of the present and of ourselves based on a genealogical analysis and applied to any object will reveal that such object is only the configuration of multiple or plural wills to power, to truth and objectivity."¹⁷

Our Common Ground

Our common ground is, in the main, the fact of our humanity. It is generally accepted that the hominids comprise one family only, reduced to the single genus: Homo. It is indeed "one family with the same surname but with different first names."¹⁸ The subdivisions of the three great groups of mankind: Negroid, Mongoloid and Europoid are based much more upon community of language, religion and morals than on physical characteristics. And even within each community there are still more divisions based on the sense indices: language, religion and morals and if I may add history. Historicism thus has a pluralistic foundation. Therefore this common ground does not entail the existence of eternal essences of any sort. We artificially unite under the guise of this commonness which is largely made up of a succession of heterogeneous phenomena. Hence for Nietzsche "all concepts have become. There are no eternal concepts (truths), so that philosophy is historiography."¹⁹ Rorty is not decidedly against this communality. He insists that "abandoning the notion of a common ground leaves us in a Hobbesian state of nature where force and not persuasion is the motor of change."²⁰ If we take into account the structural properties of experience and action, and of diversity in terms of knowing and understanding, we can understand and appreciate observed differences without abandoning the concept of human nature.

Rorty versus Putnam and others

Against the background of the interesting controversy between Rorty on one hand, Putnam and others on the other, the question is: what is the point at issue? In other words, what is the bone of contention? As I see it, it revolves around the notion of objectivity. The other issues are peripheral and mere embellishments of the issue at stake.

Admittedly, relativism is committed to the local character of epistemic standards. This means that one's ability to evaluate a culture cannot exceed one's contact and understanding of it. Putnam takes this to be antirealism while Rorty does not, on the grounds that no matter how vigorously we protest we are all realists, one way or the other.

Rorty rejects the notion of objectivity because of its underlying ideology: "it treats other persons just as it does things as objects for us, rather than seeing others as one of us."²¹ This ideology is one of subordinating one culture to another. It is one of domination, subjugation and cultural imperialism because there is neither the desire nor the will to see others as "one of us." This ideology is no more than rationalizing and justifying behaviour which convinces no one but the already convinced, and amuses or bores the others. It is unimportant whether or not Rorty denies being a cultural relativist or denies that no one has really held the view that one opinion is as good as another.

What is important, of value and interest is his attempt at deconstruction: unveiling the ideological mask under which cultural imperialism has been practised by the West. We are culturally imperialistic once we refuse to see others as "one of us" or when we treat others as we treat objects. It is this unravelling by Rorty that irks Putnam, Jackson and others. The other issue is Rorty's assertion that epistemological inquiry should be within familiar discourse where it would serve to develop and draw out deductive consequences latent in the vocabulary of a culture. Against this background it should be noted that rational inquiry emerges from, is continuous with, and is affected by, the subcognitive conditions of human survival manifested within the contingent horizon of a culture. Yet it does not follow that such inquiry is grossly antithetical to the search for universal regularities (Universal aspects of culture?). It Does not follow that such an inquiry conducted within familiar discourse does any violence to the common ground of our humanity. It probably means that given our temporality and the short historical interval within which

there is some considerable leeway for such an epistemological inquiry, different conceptual frameworks, schemes and tools are possible, and this permits us to entertain equally different view points. To this extent, our knowledge of the world is tied to what we take to be pertinent evidence available to us, yet in affirming that much we are not precluded from the supposition that there may, indeed, be truths about the world that we do not know and may never actually know.

The refusal or reluctance on ideological grounds to see others as "one of us" serves a political end-state. The activities of a society possesses an important dimension, namely the political dimension insofar as it deals with the issues of a group, give expression to the hopes, fears and frustrations of the group in such a way as to bring about the desired change. The political activities take place, essentially, on the canvas of the cultural background of the society in question. What may then be termed political values may not be understood outside the consideration of cultural values *per se*. The nature of political values acceptable to a society depend, to a large extent, upon what kind of cultural values are accepted by that society. Hence politics can be taken as a sub-system of culture. If culture is a system of values in general, politics is specifically concerned with those values related to power and authority. Science and technology are in themselves harmless but may have become institutionalised power in Europe and North America and when allied with politics, as is often the case, has become heedless, reckless and dangerous instruments for manipulation, domination and subjugation of others who are not "one of us." Hence for examples the reluctance of the West to share some of the important fruits of its science and technology with the rest of the human family. And hence the restriction on the possession of Nuclear facilities and Chemical weapons. This reluctance and refusal can, at best, only be understood, properly appreciated and situated against the background of a culture that places premium on the superiority of one culture over others, of one philosophy, religion, knowledge, truth, etc. over all others. Yet there is nothing like a sovereign truth, knowledge, philosophy or culture. There is nothing like a Sovereign culture in existence. But it should be noted that centuries old stereotypes cannot be brushed aside or wished away in a decade especially when reinforced by deep-seated exclusiveness, insularity and an intellectual apparatus that has no place, even if fragile, for interdependence, coexistence, cultural pluralism and mutuality.

Rorty's call and request that we endeavour to see and treat others as "one of us" is perfectly in order. Doubtless, we live in a federated universe, yet it is essential that it be remembered that there is only one human family. Scholars of Western orientation, both old and new, have long taken the position and do enjoy the privilege of "announcing a future which will be disagreeable to me,"²² that is, to the rest of the human family. That future is one in which truth, fact, knowledge, religion, philosophy, science, objectivity, etc., as defined by the imperatives and requirements of Western culture and its ethos will be predominantly dominant.

For Rorty the question that arises is, perhaps, whether it is possible, in the light of the foregoing, to arrive at a horizontal philosophy of tolerance to replace the old vertical philosophy of domination and exploitation. Against this background it is obviously the case that a naturalised epistemology is not necessarily more harmful than a future that has already been determined by and solely hinged on Western interests alone. What is required to make this future robust, possible and beneficial to "all of us" is not a cultural shift towards the Western version of reality; it is neither the abandonment of the common ground of our humanity nor the repudiation of a naturalised epistemology. Rather that future is assured only on the basis of dialogue and empathy, on the understanding and appreciation of the peculiarities and nuances of all cultures, on the recognition that reason and intuition are necessarily apposite, that reason is not necessarily better or superior to intuition. Rather that it is a matter of two different but complementary ways of perceiving reality, each with its own strengths and weaknesses, each with its own meaning structures, each with its own purposes, but both united in terms of service and response to human needs. Against this background Rorty would, perhaps, want "all of us" to remember and take due cognizance of the fact that no culture has a sacred claim to a messianic civilizing mission in a universe as diverse and federated as our own.

Conclusion

There is a serious objection to these comments. They will be assaulted immediately by mainstream philosophers, sociologists and political scientists, whether foundationalist or not, as nihilistic. Such a charge is most

telling only from the perspective of those who accept certain categories of abstract fact, knowledge and objectivity. All such scholars (Putnam, Jackson, etc.) have one thing in common: their subtle but polite disinclination to recognise the influence of Freud and Marx. Yet in our "post-Freudian and post-Marxist world, have we not learned too well that our perception of issues and problems is coloured by our background, our experiences and our interests? Can we really expect people to assume the point of view of others."²³ It is plain, therefore, that there is no vantage point or position from which we can escape our beliefs and language to find correspondence between judgment and uncontaminated truth. On this vein, we prize community as relevant and necessary if we are to attain the only kind of truth, knowledge, art, science, philosophy, etc., available to us — that founded on concrete human interaction, experience and dialogue which privileges neither agreement nor disagreement from outside, and therefore abrogates appeal to universalism. On another vein, Putnam, Jackson, and others seem not to believe that there are patterns of order existing between words and things which cement the two together. This order has no meaning outside a given convention and culture. Broekman emphasises that "this order can only be perceived through the grid of a point of view, or of a language. Order is seldom apparent. On the other hand, the fundamental codes of a culture determines the way in which man enters this empirical order — the way in which he will live and work, speak and think, and achieve self-realization".²⁴

This approach relies on ongoing human interaction in sociocultural and historical contexts. To this extent, no attempt would then be made to silence the plurality and diversity of discourse and experience distinctive of human beings. Rather experience, intuition, conviction, not only cold analysis, logic and deduction, are primal as well as being significant. On this basis a metaview that is overtly implicit emerges:

"(a) meaning and classification are socio-cultural products, they are socio-culturally created and conditioned; (b) Socio-culturally created representation systems are necessary and inevitable - there is a world outside consciousness but we cannot grasp it independently of our culturally created representation systems; (c) mental classifications and categories are not pure reflections of or compelled by uncontaminated facts of nature."²⁵ Yet while conceding the relevance of this metaview there is need for caution based on two grounds: that cultural pluralism, the harbinger of cultural relativism, does not and need not, entail nor-

mative disorder. This is important because the essential tactic of reason both theoretical and practical is to discover the consistently universalizable within empirical multiplicity. And second, our shared biology, it would appear, is more determinative than historical and sociological variations of what we can find and define as valuable.

Yet, these remarks do not vitiate the attractiveness and defensibility of cultural relativism. Cultural relativism is attractive and fashionable, and is, doubtless, a robustly defensible proposition. Its attractiveness and defence may be due partly to its moral and political appeal. It seems, according to Green, "to be a fair alternative to the kind of moral arrogance and cultural imperialism that has often characterised Western Civilization"²⁶ since its contact with the rest of the human family. It is a fair alternative to the moral violence, political subjugation and humiliation, and economic exploitation of other human kins not regarded as "one of us." It is in the light of these that Rorty's Call "for dialogue without a historical conclusions, participation in the enduring conversation of humans, edification rather than objective judgments, the exclusion of no voice in the name of some substantive value system that denounces what is different as not being human"²⁷ is germane in terms of determining who we are, what we are and why we are the way we are. Doubtless, socio-cultural practices are, in the main, radically particular and contingent. Yet history and context are always shaping and reshaping what we are in the unceasing process of becoming.

To finally conclude these comments the words of Aime Cesaire are insightful as well as poignant: "for it is not true at all that the work of man is finished, that we have nothing more to do, that it is enough that we should set ourselves in the steps of the world, ... but the work of man is only just beginning and it remains for man to conquer every immobilised prohibition at the corners of his zeal, ... and no race (culture) possesses the monopoly of beauty, force, intelligence, (knowledge, truth, reason, emotion, objectivity, etc.) and there is room for *all of us* at the rendezvous of victory."²⁸

NOTES

1. Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, (Princeton: University Press, 1979).

2. a. Hilary Putnam, *Reason, Truth and History*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- b. Hilary Putnam, *Realism and Reason*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- c. Ronald Lee Jackson, "Cultural Imperialism or Benign Relativism? A Putnam — Rorty Debate", *International Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. xxviii, 4, 1988, pp. 383-392.
3. G. Duncan Mitchell, ed., *A New Dictionary of Sociology*, (London: Routledge, 1979), p. 45.
4. E.B. Taylor, *Primitive Culture*, (London, 1871), Vol. 1.
5. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, V, VII, 2.
6. Anthony Flew, *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, (London: Pan Books, 1979), p. 281.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
8. K.C. Anyanwu, "The Notion of Chi (self) in Igbo Philosophy", *The Nigerian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 7, 1 and 2, 1987, p. 102.
9. G. Duncan Mitchell, *op.cit.*, pp. 46-47.
10. W.L. Butler, "A Philo-Historical Analysis of Negritude", *Presence Africaine*, (Paris: PA, 1976), p. 348.
11. N. Mackenzie, *Patterns of Culture*, (London, 1948), pp. 2 and 8.
12. N. Otakpor, "The Universe as a Subjective World", Unpublished Manuscript, 1989, p. 5.
13. Gregory Reck, "Narrative Anthropology", *Anthropology and Humanism Quarterly* Vol. 8, No. 1, 1983, pp. 8-12.
14. Ronald Lee Jackson, *op.cit.*, p. 384.
15. Thomas Aquinas, "On Truth" *De Veritate*, article 4.
16. Paul Veyler, "Ideology According to Marx and According to Nietzsche", *Diogenes*, No. 99, Fall 1977, p. 102.
17. Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and other Writings 1977-1984*, Translated by Alan Sheridan, ed. by L.D. Kritzman, (New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 95.
18. N. Otakpor, *op.cit.*, p. 10.
19. S. Korner, ed., *Nietzsche*, XIII, 21, No. 46.
20. Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, *op. cit.*, p. 317.
21. Richard Rorty, *Consequences of Pragmatism*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982); p. 203.
22. Agamemnon to Calchas, *Iliad*, 1, 106.

23. Ronald M. Green, *Religion and Moral Reason*, (Oxford: University Press, 1988), p. 7.
24. Jan M. Broekman, *Structuralism*, (Holland: Reidel Publishing, 1974), pp. 95-96.
25. Raymond, A. Belliotti, "Radical Politics and Non Foundational Morality", *International Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. XXIX, No. 1, March 1989, p. 49.
26. Ronald M. Green, *op.cit.*, p. 8.
27. Raymond A. Belliotti, *op.cit.*, p. 50
28. Aime Cesaire, *Cahier d'un Retour Au Pays Natal*, (Paris, 1939), p. 85. Emphasis mine.