

## From the Logic of the Particular to the Plea of Minority: A Philosophical Appraisal of John Stuart Mill's *Idiology*

JacquesCHATUÉ<sup>1</sup>, CenclaireSAAH<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Department of Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Professor- University of Dschang, Cameroon)

<sup>2</sup>(Department of Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Doctorate Student - University of Dschang, Cameroon)

**ABSTRACT:** The problem of minorities<sup>1</sup> is one of the constancies that is more and more being highlighted notably in the battling field of the social, economic, political, cultural and the military. But giving the diverse angles from which we may want to draw the question of minority<sup>2</sup>, or better still, make it elastic, there is a high risk of ignoring the fact that the latter is above all a philosophical problem. The struggle for the emancipation of minorities cannot be purely legal or moral; it must be rooted in a broader conception of man and the cosmos. This is the point of view defended by John Stuart Mill and some English authors. More precisely, he appeals for an argument which requires a revision of logic in connection with their revision of the cosmology, a revision which prepares what Wilhelm Windelband will later refer to as “idiological” logic. This article aims at showing that, faced with complex situations, generalized definition covers within it some frustrations giving that the world is first and foremost an agglomeration of private lives. But, can we thus value individuals and social-groups, without at the same time absolving the notion of private life and without a transcendental negation of values? Furthermore, should one of these arguments in favor of minority base the acceptance of all minorities? Besides, is it not pertinent we differentiate between objective minority (women, racial, Disabled) that can make a consensus, and a subjective minority (L.G.B.T.) whose acceptance can be problematic?

**KEYWORDS:** “Idiological” logic, minority, objective minority, subjective minority, liberalism.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be said here that, the problem of minority in the context of international law was introduced several international treaties between the 17th and 19th centuries. In that first period, the most frequently mentioned category of minority was by far that of religious minorities. After WW1, and under the mandate of the League of Nations, official documents referred to the formula “racial, linguistic and religious minorities”. After WWII, the word racial was substituted by ethnic and therefore the UN started using the three fold formula “ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities; which was also incorporated into article 27 of the international covenant on civil and Political Rights (hereinafter, ICCPR). Only in 1992, the United Nations Assembly adopted a Declaration on the Rights of members of National or Ethnic, linguistic and Religious minorities”. At the regional level, however, as soon as in 1950, the concept National minority was introduced in the European convention on Human Rights and later used in the framework of the OSCE; in 1995, the FCNM was adopted. (Cf. Eduardo Ruiz Vieyetz, cultural Traits as defining Elements of minority Groups, December 2016.

<sup>2</sup> When we talk of minority here, we do not globalize everything within the frame work of minority. To us, there exist two types of minority; a positive minority on one hand which includes (aged/ageing population as they are fragile and constitute a rich source of library, children, women, handicaps, and the poor and just to name but this. On the other hand, we can also talk of a subjective minority that generalizes what is often being referred to as LGBT (Lesbians, Gay, Bisexual, and Transsexual). So, it will be erroneous and perplexing if we don't differentiate the types of minorities that exist and that for which we claim to defend. With this said, our work targets principally the objective/ positive minority. Besides, in the African context in general, minority is mostly being apprehended in its positive sense. That is, to talk of minority groups implies the exclusion of the olds where an ethics of care needs to come in as these ageing populations constitute not only wisdom but are the main library for the future generation to serve from. This view is not however different in the occidental world whereby, the old are seen to be a burden in the eyes of the family and society reason why, retirement homes have been put in place such that these category of people are taken there under the watchful eyes of psychiatrist and doctors paid to follow their day to day up keep.

**RÉSUMÉ :** *Le problème des minorités est l'une des constantes de plus en plus mises en avant, notamment dans les conflits sociaux, économiques, politiques, culturels et militaires. Mais étant donné les angles divers sous lesquels on peut vouloir poser la question de la minorité, ou mieux encore la rendre élastique, on risque fort d'ignorer que cette dernière est avant tout un problème philosophique. La lutte pour l'émancipation des minorités ne peut être purement juridique ou morale ; elle doit s'enraciner dans une conception plus large de l'homme et du cosmos. C'est le point de vue défendu par John Stuart Mill et quelques auteurs anglais. Plus précisément, il plaide pour un argument qui nécessite une révision de la logique en lien avec leur révision de la cosmologie, une révision qui prépare ce que Wilhelm Windelband appellera plus tard la logique « idiologique ». Cet article vise à montrer que, face à des situations complexes, la définition généralisée recouvre en elle des frustrations étant donné que le monde est avant tout un agglomérat de vies privées. Mais peut-on ainsi valoriser les individus et les groupes sociaux, sans pour autant absoudre la notion de vie privée et sans une négation transcendante des valeurs ? Par ailleurs, l'un de ces arguments en faveur de la minorité devrait-il fonder l'acceptation de toutes les minorités ? Par ailleurs, n'est-il pas pertinent de faire une différence entre une minorité objective (femmes, raciales, handicapées) qui peut faire consensus, et une minorité subjective (L.G.B.T.) dont l'acceptation peut poser problème ?*

**Mots-clés:** *Logique « idiologique », minorité, minorité objective, minorité subjective, libéralisme.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The struggle for the emancipation of minorities cannot be purely legal or moral; it must be rooted in a broader conception of man and the cosmos. This is the point of view defended by John Stuart Mill and some English authors. More precisely, he appeal for an argument which requires a revision of logic in connection with their revision of the cosmology, a revision which prepares what Wilhelm Windelband will later refer to as an “idiological” logic . This amounts to considering the world as an addition of private and equivalent coaches/parts. From a social point of view, this was to result in the equal valuation of all the components of every individual and community of the State. But, can we thus value individuals and social-groups, without at the same time absolving the notion of private life and without a transcendental negation of values? Furthermore, should one of these arguments in favor of minority base the acceptance of all minorities? Besides, is it not pertinent we differentiate between objective minority (women, racial, Disabled) that can make a consensus and a subjective minority (L.G.B.T.) whose acceptance can be problematic?

## II. THE HISTORICAL SPECIFICITY OF STUART MILL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF THE MINORITIES

Throughout the history of philosophy, there have been several notable individuals from minority groups who have made significant contributions in the field. This is the case with Hypatia of Alexandria(350-415CE) whom as a woman in a male-dominated society succeeded to become renowned through her teachings, Al-Farabi (c.872-950CE), Averroes(1126-1198CE),David Hume (1711-1776), Frantz Fanon (1925-1961), Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986) and just to name but these few.

### 2.1. THE QUESTION OF MINORITY BEFORE MILL FROM THE ANTIQUITY TO THE MODERN ERA

The question of minority such that has been developed by John Stuart Mill is not a spontaneous affair, as it has a long history from which it can be traced.This explains the reason why, there is no other way round than that of going back to see into what the ancient thinkers had kept as heritage, for it is only by so doing that one can really perceive the concept and how it has been deployed in the history of western philosophy. Looking at things from this angle therefore, permit us to look critically into *The Republic* of Plato which, despite its pertinence, still seems very questionable, especially on the aspect of its impartiality and it's in capability of having the same favor to all its citizens proof being that, Popper in his *The Open society and its Enemies* holds that *The Republic* of Plato is not very far from the Communitarianism and the Nazism practiced in Germany. This therefore justify our ambition to scrutinize the philosophy of Plato and other precursors of this problem before Mill, so as to examine the degree in which their thought has serve as a springboard in the proliferation of minorities in the society.

The inculcation of Plato in the problem of minorities that plaques the contemporary society can be seen from three major angles; the platonicianeugenism, the search for a philosopher king and the dissection of the society in three. Just like the Nazi idea and the Spartan practice whereby the weak and the deformed infants are either killed through the slogan of purification and whose ambition is imbedded in the search for a better breed, so too is the philosophy of Plato, whose ideas can be seen to be the root cause of some malicious act we do experience today, and the genesis for the social discrimination. This is clear in that, Plato in the quest for the establishment of a just and perfect society goes on to fall into the same things he criticized from the Spartan government. That is, Plato rightly gives room for the implantation of eugenics as a means of getting the best rulers and auxiliaries

of the ruler. This is not fair at all, for you cannot be using to a wicked motive to achieve a good end if we want to establish a perfect society as he claims. Besides, if we must form a good society, we must begin by ensuring that the minds are free and willing to adopt the changes put in place voluntarily.

This recalls us with what Kant in the beginning sentence of his Ground Works for the *Metaphysics of morals* writes: "There is nothing it is possible to think of anywhere in the world, or indeed anything at all outside it that can be held to be good without limitation excepting only a good will." (I. Kant, 2002, p. 9) this affirmation implies from a deontological<sup>3</sup> point of view holds that, the aim which is to form a strong and elite class cannot be achieved while using a wicked means. Plato in building a society adopts wicked strategies which consist in doing a selective procreation of younger ones. That is, after spelling out the fact that both men and women can occupy the same function, but this is only done after the children have been given birth to and taken away from their biological parents. To confirm what we now consider disgraceful and eugenics<sup>4</sup> in Plato's work, he writes that, "our men and women Guardians should be forbidden by law to live together in separate households, and all the women should be common to all the men; similarly, children should be held in common, and no parent should know its child, or child its parents" (Plato, 1974, p. 71).

Besides, marriage amongst men and women in the society is supposed to be kept secret giving that no parent is supposed to identify his or her offspring. The issue of reproduction which is the sole base of any union becomes a matter of state decision as marriage is made selective and secretive. To Plato, "we must, if we are to be consistent, and if we are to have a pedigree herd, mate the best of our men with the best of our women as often as possible, and the inferior men with the inferior women as seldom as possible, and bring up only the offspring of the best. And no one but the rulers must know what is happening, if we are to avoid dissension in our guardian herd" (*idem*). This implies therefore that, the weak shall remain weak while the strong shall remain strong. This is not fair at all, given that though nature has produced both the weak and the strong; it has not distinguished or separated them as Plato is doing. So, it is a terrible act that in a society that claims to be just and perfect, just at the foundation lies the very seed of its doom. Not only does Plato encourage eugenics which goes a long way to further kill the social checks and balances in the society, but also, his method promotes sexual promiscuities as in the search of "purity" in the name of leader, he gives room for soldiers to have sexual intercourse with peoples wives. That is, among the other honors and rewards our young men can win for distinguished service in war and in other activities will be more frequent opportunities to sleep with women; this will give us a pretext for ensuring that most of our children are born of that kind of parent. These officers will take the children of the better guardians to a nursery and put them in charge of nurses living in a separate part of the city; the children of the inferior guardians, and any defective offspring of the others, will be quietly and secretly disposed of (*ibid.*, pp. 71-72).

Moreover, the fact that Plato gives priority only to a philosopher king, is a source of discrimination as he does not liberate the game for everybody. Plato after serious pondering on how to correct the ills of the Athenian society at time, saw that it was only in philosophy that a true lasting solution could be found reason why he came to the conclusion that, "the society we have described can never grow into a reality or see the light of day, and there will be no end to the troubles of states, or indeed, my dear Glaucon, of humanity itself, till philosophers become kings in this world, or till those we now call kings and rulers really and truly become philosophers, and political power and philosophy thus come into the same hands". (*ibid.*, pp. 191-192).

This solution proposed by Plato goes to show how there is no liberty for the people to choose their leader with a free mind as has been made elitist such that only a few can benefit from this privileges. If by liberty John Stuart Mill meant "*protection against the tyranny of the political rulers*" (J.S. Mill, 2009, p. 5), it should be said that the philosopher king defended by Plato is exactly the type of person to be combated as he uses all measures to oppress the greater majority without their concern. Besides, experience has proven to us that a lay man's child can fight his way to arrive in a position that he dreamt of, giving the conditions for education is opened to everybody. It is in this sense that we think Plato was not fair, giving that he does not conceive all the children at the tender age to be the same talk less of giving them equal opportunities to fight for. He rather makes the selection by himself where he goes up to the extent of depriving the biological parents their right to their maternity labor. This is a crime as for no motive can anyone endowed with the "good sense" can support this. Thus, it cannot be refuted that Plato had planted the décor of discrimination for which many will serve of it to

---

<sup>3</sup> Deontology is an ethical doctrine which demands that man's action must be tight to duty. That is, obligation is what stands as motive for any moral action.

<sup>4</sup> Eugenics is a social philosophy or practice which advocates the improvement of human hereditary qualities through selective breeding, either by encouraging people with good genetic qualities to reproduce (positive eugenics) or discouraging people with bad genetic qualities from reproducing (negative eugenics), or by technological means. So, there exist two types of eugenics as to know; eugenics that deals with state selection of race judged to be superior. (The case of Plato and the Nazi operation in Germany) and the second eugenics has to do in the domain of (biomedicine whereby genetic organs are being manipulated).

aggravate the situation. Aristotle working for end happiness is what should guide mankind though this happiness should not be biased. In the middle age, we see how emphasis will be laid on the sur valorization of God. Man is seen to be a creature in Gods image (*imago dei*) reason why he has to do all to worship God before anything else. Man needs to seek divine illumination before dreaming of any possible transformation into his own personal life.

But giving the fact that man cannot interact directly with God, intermediators who are the priest, act on behalf of God as middlemen to permit the Christians channel their message to God. Just that, being born of the flesh and possessing the same vice like that of any other, that is imperfection, this priest would at times work in service of their selfish interest and not in accordance to what the scriptures asked of them.

Besides, there's is a class distinction even within the very church which creates a sense of discrimination amongst its members. That is, there exist hierarchies in church whereby, we have the Pope, Arch Bishop, Bishop, and Priest and at the end Christians who receive orders from the church hierarchy and cannot contest. At this juncture thus, there is a need to say that, the notion of discrimination and minorities is deeply rooted in every epoch in one way or the other.

## 2.2. THE QUESTION OF MINORITY IN THE MODERN ERA

In the modern era, there exist several minority cases that have gained attention and sparked discussions on various social, political, and legal issues. This can be seen with racial injustice where racial injustice havegarned widespread attention and sparked movements like Black Lives Matter. High-profile cases such as the killing of Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown and George Floyd have brought issues of police brutality and systemic racism to the forefront of the public consciousness. Besides, the struggle for indigenous rights is another important minority case in the modern era. Indigenous communities around the world face challenges related to land rights, cultural preservation, and self-determination. This is the case with Standing Rock in the United States or protests against resource extraction projects on indigenous lands highlight these ongoing struggles. The advocacy for disability rights has gained momentum in recent years with efforts to ensure equal access to education, employment opportunities, and healthcare services and of course public spaces for people with disabilities. Besides, it's good to note that, women make up roughly half of the global population but they continue to face various forms of discrimination and inequality worldwide. This justify the cry of Simone de Beauvoir the existentialist in her *The Second Sex*, Harriet Taylor and Stuart Mill in *The Subjection of women*, Suzan Moller Okin and just to name but these few. But if should be noted that the struggles faced by minority groups are different and intersectional reason why different strategies are being use through out the globe to resolve this problem in order to enhance equality and justice for all. Unlike the classical conception of justice which puts Man at the center of its preoccupation, modern humanism tends to make a closure of one and to replace the charity humanism with that of justice. The modern society has installed laws as a medium of assistance to the underprivileged. That is, what links men is no more pity, sympathy or charity but laws. People come together once interest is to be shared equally as when it concerns charitable work, it becomes problematic. This is so because, charity to the underprivileged has no content as it rather provokes laziness to them and explain the reason why some people remain in none spot. This explains why John Rawls in his second "principle of justice" based on "social and economic inequalities amongst men" gives room to the fact that "the only condition for injustice to be implemented is only when it has to be in favor of the underprivileged. That is, handicaps, the old, women and children." (John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, (1971), 1999, p.54, 86, 87.)

Apart from this case, no other sense of justice is to be allowed. But whatever be the case, the role of charity exists because laws permit it to exist. Giving the fact that lapses exist in the deployment of justice in resolving problems amongst men, there is need for charity to be attached to law, not as the main source of helping men but a means for the underprivileged to have at least the minimum to survive. Besides, modern debate on the possibility of resolving the minority problem on the base of law and charity can be seen with Aristotle who calls for type of justice based on the proportionality of men. That is, men are given what is due to them as it will be unfair or better still unconceivable to him if people are given equal share of which the engagement were not the same. To Patrick Savidan,

"The difficulty, however, is to determine which facet of the inequality between people can be the basis for defining the proportion of the shares due to them. Today at its most fundamental level, the problem of social justice is still conceivable, little or prou, in these terms" (P. Savidan, 2007, p. 33).

Charity and justice can be perceived as the heart of humanitarian activity. This is the case in the Bible (both old and New Testament) where, the union between charity and justice is very evident. That is, when we read the Book of Luke (10:25-37), we realize how Jesus is talking about the Good Samaritan which means that, despite the society in which we may want to form, there's a place for good in itself. Besides, the history of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31) imprints in our memories a big lesson on how important a little good to a person can mean the world at a given moment. From the above analysis therefore, we can understand that laws cannot really restrict charity as ones humanism and sense of living can only be fully realized when he commits act of charity. It is the lesson we can get when we read Saint Paul according to whom "if I don't have love, I am

nothing” (first Corinthians 13.12). Meanwhile, limiting ourselves only on the aspect of charity will be erroneous on our part if we don’t bring in the symbioses that seal these two concepts as to know charity and laws. Even the Bible teaches on the obligation of respecting laws as doing so is the beginning of wisdom. This is evident when we read the passage talking of “Sermon on the mountain” where it is clearly written: “seek first the kingdom of God and his justice and all that you desire shall be given to you in addition.” (cf. Matthew 6:33). It is thus these two concepts that the church in his regalia mission of men, have as ambition to always defend. It is regrettable that this problem would not have degenerated to many epochs if only our needs were limited. Giving that our wants are insatiable, the idea of justice becomes difficult to be bear in mind. This is the view Hume puts forth as to him: “if uncertainty as to the course of things and without any care or effort on our part, he wrote, we can come into possession of whatever our most voracious appetites or whatever our most extravagant imagination can wish or desire, then justice would never have occurred to anyone” (P. Savidan, op. cit., p. 34).

Following the above affirmation, it is worth saying that, this would have been the perfect statement if resources and needs were evenly distributed. But sadly, it has never been the case. But having the tendency of always putting charity ahead of laws makes man to become a parasite not only for him but for the society. objective criteria should be used to take control over the minority cases, if not, even those that a lazy to work today would tomorrow be blaming the hard working rich as being egoistic. This justify why the modern society makes a complete rupture with the idea of blind assistance. To well explain this point, Patrick Savidan holds that “The multiple memoirs on pauperism, written throughout the 19th century, clearly show that before being recaptured in the language of rights. The work was also constructed as a duty reason why a distinction made very early on between the “good poor” and the “bad poor” which questions solidarity between the diverse” (*ibid.*, p.140).

Some few groups, in the name of authorities, try to transform democratic policies in their favor thereby putting the greater majority at the mercy of God. It is no doubt the reason why John Locke prohibits the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual as it was the case of his time under the pretext of “Divine Rights of Kings”. Laws have to replace the so-called “divine rights” so that, all what will be elaborated as laws will be the greater will having equal opportunities. This position can explain the reason why Marc Foglia, in commenting Locke, affirms: “Thus, the political organization does not constitute for him an original fact, but results from a properly human elaboration starting from a natural situation of freedom and equality. Unlike Hobbes, and like Pufendorf, Locke conceives of the social contract not as a methodical fiction, but as a historically situated moment, prior to the institution of positive laws”. (F. Marc, 2013, p. 284).

### III. THE ROLE OF LOGIC IN JOHN STUART MILL’S PRO-MINORITY ARGUMENT

If we want to tackle the problem of minorities in the world then, there’s a need to visit Stuart Mill’s view on logic which compels us to see the world as an agglomeration of logical parts. This falls in line with the objective of the “World Bank Group” whose research expertise calls for the negotiation of conflicts based on the “case by case” study, in other words an “idiological” type of logic which consist in approaching the world as an addition of particulars.(cf Chatue Jacques, *Logiqued’expertise*, p. 2, still to be published). John Stuart Mill condemns the act of always giving a kind of generalize conclusions over problems that have particular answers. In other words, John Stuart Mill thinks that, for some burning questions to be put behind us, we must learn to understand cases separately and from the outcome of each separate case before we can draw a lasting conclusion. That is, “until we know the particulars themselves, we cannot fix upon the most correct and compact mode of circumscribing them by a general description.” (J.S. Mill, 2011, p. 12) This section argues therefore the “idiological” logic that is aimed at understanding particular cases before passing unto generalize conclusions.

#### 3.1. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF IDIOLOGICAL LOGIC

Logic is a set of rules of valid reasoning which permits one to determine whether a statement is valid or not. The object of logic thus is to ascertain how we come by that portion of our knowledge which is not intuitive and by what criterion we can in matters not self-evident, distinguish between things proved and things not proved, between what is worthy and what is unworthy. To Aristotle, logic is the “Art of reasoning”. Logic plays thus a vital role in the understanding of the problem of the minorities in that, thanks to its different forms of inferences, one can easily switch from one premise to another while checking to know what the outcome will be thanks to its rules. To Stuart Mill, logic is:

“The science of the operations of the understanding which are subservient to the estimation of evidence both the process itself of advancing from known truths to unknown, and all other intellectual operations insofar as auxiliary to this. It includes, therefore the operations of naming, for language is an instrument of thought, as well as a means of communicating our thoughts” (*ibid.*, p. 20).

Following this definition, we can understand therefore that, since logic moves from facts to facts, it is important for it to be applied in other domains of life where generalize theories seems to be proving wrong. This is because, to Stuart Mill, “general truth is only an aggregate of particular truths.” If we want to seek a long lasting solution, then it must be characterized by the examination of truths that are known and clearly stated. That is, moving from particulars to generals. What characterizes logic therefore is its sense of precision that it imposes. It warrants a sense of clarification from our part so as to better diagnose the fault found in one system or the other. That is, “logic include at least precision of language, and accuracy of classification and we perhaps often hear persons speak of a local arrangement, or of expressions logically defined, then of conclusions logically deduced from premises (*ibid.*, p. 14).” If his same approach is maybe adopted in the examination of marginalize cases, few we think are those who are going to complain as decisions will be taken based on the reality of each given case and as a result, the final conclusion will seem to reflect and satisfy the aspirations of the different protagonist.

At this juncture thus, it is good to list out some of the different form of reasoning and show how it varies from another and the link it has with our subject. Reasoning by deduction is one of the most popularly used. Deductive reasoning describes the movement of thought that leads from the general to the particular, from cause to effect. Deduction designates a relationship between propositions and corresponds to the ideal of science advocated by classical rationalist philosophers; in particular Descartes and the great Cartesians, but also the post-Kantians, and all those who want to make philosophy a science. Its mode of functioning is as follows:

1st rule: from true only follows that which is true/real; from the false can follow the true or the false.

2nd rule: from the necessary only the necessary results; from the contingent may flow the contingents or the necessary, but not the impossible; anything can arise from the impossible.

3rd rule: everything that applies to the history applies to the result, but not the reverse; everything that is repugnant to the consequent is repugnant to the antecedent, but not the reverse.

4th rule: In a correct deduction, one can infer from the adversarial therefore the contradictory of the antecedent.

5th rule: Everything follows the antecedent, the result also follows, and all that follows from a result also follows from the antecedent.

It should be said that, even though the deductive reasoning is applied in many domains, not everybody sees it to be the ideal as to some, this tendency has as weakness of always generalizing everything. Stuart Mill discount deductive logic/ syllogism in that, it already tells us what we know.

Inductive reasoning consists in proceeding from particular observations in order to derive general statements, in terms of concepts, laws, hypotheses and of course even theories, etc., which help to explain what has been observed. Induction also has the function of making an eminent place in the criteriology of sciences, for their universal dimension. In most civilizations, there is little propensity to make universal judgments, which plays a prominent role in correcting and validating scientific statements. The value of the inductive approach depends on the level of precautions and details brought to the observation and study of particular cases and which is of course very important in most sciences for the collection of data. Apart from the above stated , there exist other forms of reasoning as to know, the hypothetical-deductive (It consists in forming hypotheses from observations, then in deducing models or even consequences likely to be subjected to empirical tests the aim of which is to confirm or invalidate them to varying degrees), Abductive reasoning ( which is a form of reasoning that wants to be realistic from the outset, and which consists, in the face of a mainly practical difficulty, in eliminating unlikely solutions in order to approach the most probable, then in deducing consequences which, while remaining uncertain, Reasoning through the absurd ( still called since Aristotle “reduction to the impossible”, consists in demonstrating a proposition or an implication starting from the demonstration of the contradictory consequences which would result from the contrary assumption).

After observing some of the forms of inference and how they operate, it is very obvious that, in order to curb the current challenges that rocks our contemporary society in the domain of marginalization, it is pertinent to always conceive truths not by concluding from one or two examples but rather, study each case to better assure yourself that, the results will not be biased at the end as it is the case with natural sciences. Stuart Mill could thus theoretically found a sub-process of induction, designated as “idiology”: the process, so to speak, of step by step on a case-by-case basis. Generalizations should be slow and careful. Hence also the growing importance of statistics in the scientific process, which will have contributed to distance modern science from its scholastic ideal, obstinate by direct and definitive access to the universal.<sup>5</sup> In the present case, induction seems to have better chances of solution to the problems raised as to Mill, “the conclusion in an induction embraces more than is contained in the premises.

---

<sup>5</sup>NB: It’s good to note here that, the idea developed above is that gotten from Chatue Jacques in a book still to be published..

The principle or law collected from particular instances, the general proposition in which we embody the result of our experiences, covers a much larger extent of ground than the individual experiments which form its basis. This form of “idiology” such that has been developed by John Stuart Mill aims to tackle problems from their roots, as the reason why some existing problems seems to be recurrent can only be point to the fact that, most often, decisions are not well scrutinize to see into it that the parts that forms the whole their interest are well defended reason why the same problem keeps emerging. Thus, we must always learn to proceed from step to step in order not to omit something or create a frustration that may in a closer future turn to destruct all concrete investment that has be made be it human or material. This therefore implies that, each person puts his truth in relation to his or her experience gotten. It is from the different dynamism of our experiences that a truth is being formed. Besides, logic does not take pleasures in an association of truths but, the relation that can exist between its domains such that from its conclusion, any errors can be wiped out. This can explain why Marc Fogile in interpreting John Stuart Mill affirms; “logic does not allow us to increase our knowledge, but only to analyze the relationship between the data provided by experience and the conclusions we draw from them in order to eliminate erroneous conclusions” *op. cit.*, p. 473).

The notion of belief is first and foremost sectorial, particular before being universal. One cannot generalize a particular community before a universal scale. For instance, traditional Africa has been considered barbaric just because he does not buy the occidental point of view. This implies therefore that, from general conclusions, we pretend to derive truth in themselves as passing through generalizations; we left out particular causes which too play a very important role in the verification process. We must pass or have the free will to pass from case to case to at least be at the center of truth. There exist according to Mill a single cause for an event and this is what condition all on nature. That is, the principle of causality appears to be the main principle which explains the general theories in nature, that is, “the notion of Cause being the root of the whole theory of induction, it is indispensable that this idea should, at the very outset of our inquiry, be, with the utmost practicable degree of precision, fixed and determined” (*ibid.*, pp. 310-311). Putting aside most of our metaphysical explanations of truth, Mill demonstrates how we can get the truth from a real selection. This process will then imply that, there exist just single causes valid amongst others that are to be examined.

### 3.2. THE TRANSITION FROM LOGIC TO POLITICS

Looking at the writings of John Stuart Mill, one can understand the role logic plays as it run across through his different works. This is not a fruit of fortune as when we read the early years of John Stuart Mill, it is very evident that he should seem very meticulous following the rigorous given to him by his father James Mill. Mill was aware of the fact that lived a period of great change giving that, he is coming at a period when the industrial revolution was changing the old economic order and with the new political movements being challenging the traditional way of doing politics. Mill expresses this view when he makes a difference between “social power and “political power.” But outside the government, public opinion was social power and it could affect now people behaved in their private lives. However, it is worth noting that, in the 1820s, a union between John Stuart Mill and the father shall lead to the creation of a group bearing the name the ‘philosophical Radicals’. Just like other radicals, they advocated universal suffrage shortening of parliaments and the ballot. But their objective was to put in place a political party completely committed to parliamentary reforms because, they considered the Whigs and Tories as both representing the aristocratic interest.

The rich educational career would push Mill to hold that, if the educated class could agree on moral questions the same way they already agreed on questions concerning natural sciences, then the problems concerning the rule would disappear. This was the point shared by Auguste Comte in his famous ‘law of the three stages’. The first stage being theological knowledge, the second being the metaphysical and the last stage which he concord with is the positive stage. It should be said that, mathematical sciences had reached the positive stage and moral sciences would eventually do so as well. It was therefore not necessary for the majority of the people to understand political issues (Hamburger, 1965, pp. 615-616). Based on the above arguments, one can see how the transition was very active. But the fundamental question remains to know whether this tendency of proceeding from major stages cannot be considered responsible for closeness to oneself as is the case of the contemporary society.?

## IV. CRITIQUE OF THE SUPPOSED (PRIVATE) PRIVATIZE IN THE DEFENSE OF MINORITIES ACCORDING TO JOHN STUART MILL

The plea in defense of the minorities in its first sense such that John Stuart Mill has the pretention to defend have some implications that make it doubtful in his ambitions to satisfy global aspiration with its tendency of taking particular cases as case study in the resolution of social injustice. In other words, moving from particular truths to general truth appears in the eyes of many to be the fertile ground that has given room for the advent of

postmodernism<sup>6</sup>, an era whereby people are liberated from the oppressive structures of the past but maintaining at the same time, the disquieted by its expectations for the future. For many decades, the historiography of liberalism was conceived as an attempt to identify all the characteristics of the current trends of thought. The affirmation of the axiological primacy of freedom, the promotion of individualism, defense of private property and the attachment to the rule of law. The liberalism of the 21 century promulgates equality amongst men and individual liberty that supports private property and individual rights. Due to this same rights, reason has been disqualified as the main guide for actions and pave way for what Michel Foucault openly declare “*is the ultimate language of madness*”(Foucault M., 1965, p.95). This implies the crisis of reason and the fact that there is no more limitation since there is no objective criteria for defining values and truth we can say or do whatever thing pleases as what gives matters is that “*which relieves me of the obligation to be right and demands only that I be interesting*” (Fish S. 1982, p.180.) to better trace the evolution through the evocation of its most representative figures (classically from Thomas Hobbes to John Rawls) and to recall the most significant battles (religious tolerance and freedom of conscience just to name but this few.)

More recently, a competing perspective initiated by Michel Foucault has developed which understands liberalism no longer as a doctrine more or less systematically constituted and historically identifiable as such, but as a practice of government based on the principle of self-limitation of power which would always be hunted by the risk of doing too much which would have gradually structured the different fields (legal, political, economic, educational and medical of modern human activity.<sup>7</sup> Here we have passed from liberalism (where emphasis was on the protection of properties), to neo-liberalism (where there is a Hegemonic domination of the strong over the weak with State interfering to regulate) and finally to Ultra-liberalism (whereby there is almost no state intervention faced with the Hegemonic domination) At this juncture, the stakes is how to defend minority cases without them forcefully becoming a hegemony of dictatorship like is the case of L.G.B.T., WOKE, BLM etc. becomes problematic in the sense that, most of what the modern society will have as ills in terms of values would be seen drawing its inspiration from the later.

#### 4.1. THE PUBLIC AND THE PRIVATE IN THE MODERN ERA

The twenty first century is marked and characterized by a kind of individualism and closeness to oneself that keeps all sense of solidarity away. Egoism is the base of this society as compassion is no longer the unifying factor that binds men together but laws and personal gain. To better understand this epoch, there’s a need to know the context under which man in the modern society live, before getting to know the impact of postmodernism and its values. The society is purely divided into micro structures whereby each person focuses on what concerns him. That is, the modern society functions mostly under the stirnerian sense according to which associating with the collectivity a danger for oneself giving that my fellow man is a target I must vanquish to survive. This simply implies we are purely in the stirnerian world where traditional views are not welcomed since they are blended with church doctrines and state intervention. He thinks that, the self-development of every individual is an obligation and duty of the highest degree he must realize. The spirited part of every individual is to lead him to his obligation and not recite what has been establish. That is: “*what ought I to do? You need only ask thus, to have yourselves told what you ought to do and ordered to do it, to have your calling marked out for you, or else to order yourselves and impose it on yourselves according to the spirit’s prescription.*”(Stirner M., 2000, p. 288.) No one needs to dictate to you what or how you have to relate to others. One’s personal instinct is to guide him/her in the enjoyment of pleasures nothing else. This can explain the reason why Stirner clearly affirms: “what is my relationship with the world tending towards? I want to enjoy it, so it must be my property and it is for this purpose that I want to earn it. I want neither the freedom nor the equality of men, but only my power over them. I want to make my property, that is to say, to make them such that I can enjoy them.”(Stirner M., (1972), p.353.)

He is against the traditional views and any form of association that brings people together. Alterity is a potential enemy for my own progress. One is unique so much so that no Being be it Transcendental or society has to interfere. Man constitutes his own might that all forces need to obey to him. To better comprehend the promulgation of private life and egoism in the modern era, one needs to make glance to this stirnerian qualification of man which holds that: “I am owner of my might, and I am so when I know myself as unique. In

<sup>6</sup> Postmodernism is a period that signals the crisis of reason in its largest sense as the essentials is to give the opposite of modernism. This implies that, instead of natural reality we have anti-reality, instead of experience and reason we have but linguistic and social subjectivism and instead of human interest as fundamentally harmonious and tending towards mutually interaction for a mutual good, there exist rather conflict and oppression.

<sup>7</sup> Michel Foucault, *Naissance de la biopolitique*. Cours au Collège de France. 1978-1979, Paris, Seuil/Gallimard, 2004.



the unique one, the owner himself returns into his creative nothing, of which he is born. Every higher essence above me, be it God, be it man, weakens the feeling of my uniqueness and pales only before the sun of this consciousness. If I concern myself for myself, the unique one, then my concern rests on its transitory, mortal, creator who consumes himself, and may say; all things are nothing.”(Stirner M., 2000, p.324.) Individualism to Max Stirner is therefore the process by which the Ego enjoys the present moment. This is carried out by what is therefore an instinct of enjoyment as well as what Albert Levy calls an instinct of “self-dissolution”. This explains why Tsala and Nguéfack Eugene Gabin criticize this stinerian approach giving that it contributes to hate speech and the banalisation and marginalization of other Beings. Any doctrine or value that necessitates the wiping out of others is not worth welcoming. It is in this sense that they affirm: “The selfish ethics of self-affirmation which architecturally structures Stinerian individualism necessarily leads to the negation of the non-self, that is to say of the other”. (Tsala and Nguéfack, 2015. P. 164.)

At this juncture, we must have in mind that there is a real meaning hidden behind each elements of the existing group. Thus, coinciding with the idea of Gilles Duluze who thinks that, “there is a difference behind everything but behind the difference there is nothing.”<sup>8</sup>Our contemporary society cannot function if we keep leaving as atomic entities where each person’s wants to dictate his or her laws. Besides Rawls in the The theory of Justice thinks that: “*the social system is not an unchangeable order beyond human control but pattern of human action. In justice as fairness, men agree to avail themselves of accidents of nature and social circumstance only when doing so is for the common benefit.*”(John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, 1999, p.88.) There’s a need for a minimum sense of discussion that we need to encourage amongst men. This is what Habermas affirms when he writes; « le consensus s’appuie sur la possibilité de la réconciliation des points de vue. Il valorise l’idée que les acteurs de l’argumentation peuvent s’entendre parce qu’ils parlent le même langage et partagent une commune humanité. »(ibid., p. 176). Just for the fact that they share the same humanity, there’s a need for the world to function as a bond giving that what unite them is stronger than what separates them. Moreover, on the base of private life system, it is forbidden to forbid. The society is anomic, implying that each person defines his intrinsically values with very little or no state intervention. Given the fragmentation of the modern society, whose origin can be traced right from Descartes (with his simplification principle) that has been condemned by Edgar Morin who thinks we must conceive the society in a holistic manner as is the case with the Hegelian philosophy given that the particular is always linked to the whole. The whole is an association of the particulars. Thus, the project of understanding societal problem by proceeding case by case can rather end up giving people the latitude to split if special attention is not taken. This has direct consequences on the economic market which leaves most of the power in the hands of the free individual.

#### 4.2. THE POLITICO-ECONOMIC LIBERALISM AND ITS DIFFICULTIES

The twenty first century market is based on economic liberalism which is centered on the principles of personal liberty, private property and limited government intervention. To better understand the context of political liberalism in the modern era, it’s good to situate first of all its historic sense, that is, the genesis of neo-liberalism which trace its origin from the association of seven (7) great powers under the banner of G7 that will launch an economic operation having as ambition to support the initiative of mondialisation (having as objective the breaking through of barriers amongst state so as to have a free trade zone). The neo-liberal economy in its exercise stands as the speed break to democratic societies. This can be justified by the fact that, democratic societies that was supposed to ventilate equitable social and economic rights towards one another in compliance with the laws and jurisdictions voted by the actors, has turned to transform man to an self-service man that only his gain matters. With the new neo-liberal economy, man stops from becoming a multidimensional being, but a *homo economicus*. That is, man is reduced solely to the economic or consumption level. This consequently stimulates the emergence of unfair competition that will generate immediately inequalities that would stand to serve as a new form of imperialism that is imbedded in the concept of globalization.

Authors like Robert Nozick and most especially Friedrich Von Hayek, limits individual freedom and liberty solely on the economic plan. It is in this attempt that Pascal Laval in interpreting this context thinks that; “Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault share the idea that, neoliberal transformation of the society that is taking place corresponds to a historic moment. It has two sides; the transformation of man into *homo economicus* (human devoted to the economy) and the lifting of rules, laws slowing down the market as well as the construction of new norms, institutions” (Laval C., 2018 p.40.) it is very obvious that man becomes in the neo-liberal economy, man now is tuned towards the market economy with the minimization of the role of the state. That is, in the economic domain, producers provide us with goods, not out of concern for our wellbeing but in their prime motive to make profit and likewise, workers sell their labor and buy the producers goods as a means of satisfying their own wants. The forces of a free competitive market economy would guide production, exchange and distribution in a manner that no government could improve upon. But what preoccupies the mind of critics

<sup>8</sup> Deleuze, Gilles. (1968). *Différence et répétition*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France. P. 80.

is the fact that, though markets and riches has been liberated, its satisfy mostly the few minority who live at the expense of the greater majority living in difficulty conditions as the laws are not equitable. According to the Cameroonian born author Tsala mbani,; “but what is the meaning of an economic policy that promotes the creation of wealth that only benefits a minority that is already sufficiently rich, leaving the majority of wallow in the most abject poverty? Is the reduction of inequalities the mentioned by Milton Friedman possible in a context where capital is directed only towards places where the reverse is the most profitable, that is to say, rich countries”(Tsala Mbani A. L.,2009 p.39)

There’s little or no state intervention as the role of the state ends at the protection of property rights, the enforcement of contracts providing public goods and maintaining internal and external security. We realize therefore that, inasmuch as the modern society is fragmented and void of compassion, self-interest and personal calculation is what sets inn. In the name of liberty thus, many have confused the meaning resulting to chaos. This explains the reaction of Abraham Lincoln who thinks: “*The world has never had a good definition of the liberty and the American people just now are much in need of one. We all declare for liberty: but in using the same word, we not mean the same thing...here are two, not only different but incompatible things, called by the same name liberty.*” We are in a context where everything is confused as on the basis of particular rights, fundamental human values to be infiltrated.

Even when humanitarian aids are being promised, it is aimed at a higher interest as nothing goes out for nothing. It is such that, even when those in the dominant and comfortable situation aims at helping the poor minority though majority in their numbers, it is done at an exploitative way. That is, what they receive from the vulnerable in return surpasses what they give as aid. This explains why Alain Destexhe shows in a significant way how ambiguous and contrary the term humanitarianism can be in the modern world when he affirms; “If humanitarian action had to be characterized in a single word, it would be “ambiguity”. This book is first of all the history of the equivocation which has never ceased to characterize the modern humanitarian movement since since its birth in 18<sup>th</sup> century, during the enlightenment, until the recent international interventions in Bosnia and Somalia. Humanitarian action has finally entered the era of suspicion and if it is today in crisis, it is paradoxically, because of the incredible success of which it is the first victim (A. Destexhe, 1993 p. 6).

The author makes mention of the fact that, organs that were created in the modern era with motive of showing care for the underprivileged irrespective of race or camp, if critical look is made, we shall realize how it has in most cases been contrary to the expectation. To illustrate this bitter truth, he calls us to revisit the position of history concerning humanitarian organs whereby (Red Cross faced with Nazi, Biafra war in Nigeria not leaving out the Ethiopian war) promises that were publicly being made to take care and transported vulnerable people were rather being left for the mercy of God. Besides, they pretend to help the vulnerable population of which they are contributing significantly in making the problem get worse. This is what pushes the author of *L’Humanitaire Impossible* to say that, “*Humanitarian aid is now in the dock; it would prolong conflicts uselessly, it would only be the alibi of impotence, the modern name of cowardice, the hideout of misery, the cautery on a wooden leg, the prosthesis, the sedative, the aspirin administered to the cancer patient who will die.*” (ibid., p. 9).

This situation is highly been fostered by the postmodern context whose ideologies is at the service of neo-liberals who prone nothing else but selfish and individualist interest under the influence of lobbying that possesses huge sums of capital to finance all apart from what is to preserve world peace. It should be said that postmodernism and utilitarianism constitute the two pillars that has contributed to the deterioration of today’s society in terms of values such that has pushed Jean Michel Besnier to ask to know if we are suffering from the irrational. Irrational according to the French author implies the dangers of everyone to sit and bring forth his or her personal view as an absolute. That is; “*the irrational is the risk that each person considers his axiological position as indisputable and that, consequently, he comes to assert it violently. Irrational consists in the refusal to choose reason insofar as it could engage us in a process of reasoned discussion to resolve our conflicts.*”<sup>9</sup>

## V. CONCLUSION

Our society must learn to function with equitable principles that ensure true justice in the like of the Egyptian maat. To Margaret Bunson, “maat was the model for human behavior in conformity with the will of the gods, the universal order evident in the heavens, cosmic balance upon the mirror of celestial beauty.” So therefore, if the “idiological” plea in defense of the minorities is done while taking into account other parameters of balance and equity, forcefully the problem of minorities<sup>10</sup> would be half solved if not completely in the society. Finally, liberal and neo-liberal democracies do not need secular reason requirements as a standpoint of public virtue as

<sup>9</sup> Besnier, J.M. quoted by A.L. Tsala Mbani, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 117-118.

<sup>10</sup> N.B.: We want to emphasize here on the fact that, each time we use the term minority, it should be understood as the defense of an objective minority (handicaps, old, children, women, and the poor) contrary to subjective minority (Lesbians, Gays, Bisexual and Transsexual).

what should count most is tolerance. But at the same time, let our plea for minorities not push us to fall back into a kind of hegemonic dictatorship of the majorities. People must be willing to listen to each other and of course willing to make concessions that fit the different ways of life irrespective of the domain. That is, the goal should not be well served by discouraging people from presenting their religious and cultural way of life as justifications for coercive policies. A better way to encourage healthy political debate would be to encourage people to acknowledge that their fellow citizens often have legitimate concerns that legitimately override their religious and cultural arguments. The claimed for minority should be discussed upon following rational principles and not imposed under the banner of universalism.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alain, *L'Humanitaire Impossible ou deux siècles d'ambiguïté*, Paris, Édition Armand Colin, 1993.
- [2] F. Marc, *Histoire de la philosophie*, Paris, Édition Ellipses, 2013.
- [3] S. Fish, *Is There a Text in this Class?*, Harvard University Press, 1982.
- [4] M. Foucault, *Naissance de la biopolitique*, Cours au Collège de France, Paris, Seuil/Gallimard, 2004.
- [5] M. Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, translated by Richard Howard Random? 1965.
- [6] Hamburger, *The Rejected Leaves of the Early Draft of the Autobiography*, Appendix in the 1st volume of the collected works, 1965.
- [7] F. A. Hayek, *The constitution of Liberty*, University of Chicago, 1960.
- [8] J. Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, 1999.
- [9] I. Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Edited and translated by Allen W. Wood, London, Yale University Press, 2002.
- [10] S. Max, *The Ego and its Own*, edited by David Leopold, Cambridge University Press, 1995-2000.
- [11] S. Max, *L'Unique et sa propriété et autres écrits*, 1972.
- [12] J.S. Mill, *On Liberty*, England, The Floating Press, 2009.
- [13] - J.S. Mill., *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive*. Being a connected view of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation, New York, eBooks Adelaide, 2011.
- [14] Plato (1955), *The Republic*, translated by Desmond lee with an Introduction by Melissa Lane second Edition, England, Penguin Books Ltd.
- [15] P. Savidan, 2007, *Repenser l'égalité des chances*, Paris, Éditions Grasset et Frasnelle, Laval, C., *Foucault, Bourdieu et la question de néolibérale*, Paris, Edition la Découvert, 2018.
- [17] A.L. TsalaMbani, *Les défis de la bioéthique à l'ère éconofascite*, Décryptage d'une prise en otage par des intérêts économique idéologiques, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2009.
- [18] A.L. TsalaMbani et E. G. Nguefack, « Hypertrophie de l'ego et conflits intersubjectifs : à propos du "Moi" arrogant de Max Stirner », in *Nka' Lumière*, Revue interdisciplinaire de la faculté des lettres et science humaines, n° 14, Université de Dschang, 2nd semestre, 2015.