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Abstract

In spite of the erroneous claim of superiority by males over their females’ counterpart in various spheres of human endeavours, it has become necessary to state that there is no need for such pride and irrational belief. Experiences in recent years have shown that such
claims no longer hold water. This paper believes that man in the
generic understanding as a socio-political being include womanhood.
Hence, giving women equal opportunity in polity is to help them bring
out those feminine qualities to balance political equation and
complementation of political values exhibited by men. In this
connection, this paper determines to highlight those silent but salient
areas of significance of women. And also to stress a point that
discrimination against women amounts to demotion of manhood in
our societies.

Introduction

The unavoidable relevance of women in the scheme of things has
become very obvious in recent times. Arising from this perceived
importance of women, there has been convergence of focus on the
plight of women in the civil society. In this light, the United Nation
General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Elimination of all
forms of discrimination against women in 1979 (Uchem, 10).
Feminism is founded on the basic tenet that women as the weaker
vessels (sex), are oppressed and disadvantaged by comparison with
men without justification. This marginalisation could be political,
economic, psycho-social, cultural, religious/spiritual or emotional
integration (Uchem, 19). Feminist political philosophy is also a
philosophical reflection on how best to arrange our collective life, our
political institutions and our social practices on the right pedestal of
gender equity. This political philosophy sometimes extends the
arguments of traditional political philosophy to indicate that women
are unjustly treated and de-womanized. Hence, it sorts to propose
ways in which such injustice might be removed. This paper shall,
therefore, examine the arguments for and against the oppression of
women, women’s effort towards restoring their rights and possible
ways of resolving or achieving the feminist political agenda.

What Is Feminism?

According to Gross, the most basic definition of feminism is the
conviction that women really do inhabit the human realm and are not
“other” not a separate species (qtd. in Donaldson & Kwok Pui-Lan, 24). He goes further to separate feminism into academic and social vision. As an academic method, it demands that women’s experiences be made visible in scholarship, while as a social vision, it takes a critical stance, demanding transformation of patriarchal culture, religion, traditions, and society. This implies that feminism as a movement is guided by an indubitable fact or assertion that women also have some capabilities like men which complementarily enhance world’s socio-political economy. If that is the case, it means women activism should be critically articulated through social expression, publications of academic papers to demand for a change in the dominant control of political power by men, at the expense of women. In other words, women should be accommodated equally in a socio-political society. Like in Nigerian polity today, women are demanding for 35% positions to be given to them. And that is a good start.

Feminism works against cultural beliefs that oppressed and subjugated womanhood to the advantage of men-folk. This is seen as illegitimate or unjustified (Taylor & Francis Group, 275). The twentieth century saw feminist becoming interestingly interested in the variety of social practices. As a result, the scope of feminist enquiry has broadened to include, jurisprudence, epistemology, aesthetics, ethics and political philosophy.

Having highlighted some few areas of enquiry where feminism has delve into, suffice it to mention that this paper shall dwell basically on feminist political philosophy.

**What Is Feminist Political Philosophy?**

To have a full grasp of what feminist political philosophy means, it is cogent to explicate first, and in a simply manner feminist theory or political theory. Feminist theory emerged as early as 1792 to 1920s in such publications as “The changing woman”, which is a Navajo Myth that gave credit to woman who, in the end populated the world. In 1851, “Sojourner Truth” addressed women’s right issues through her publication, “Ain’t I a woman?” The Sojourner Truth addressed the
issues surrounding limited rights given to women based on the flawed perception that men held about women. Furthermore, Truth maintained that, if a woman’s colour can perform tasks that were supposedly limited to men, then any woman of any colour could perform those same tasks (Wikipedia, Online). In 1873, Susan B. Anthony’s “speech after Arrest for illegal voting”, questioned the authoritative principles of the constitution and its male gendered language. She raised the question of why women should be punished under law but cannot use the law for their own protection. She also critiqued the constitution for its male gendered language and why women should have to abide by laws that do not specify women (Online).

Elaine Showalter summarized feminist theory thus; that the development of feminist theory has a number of phases. The first she calls “feminist critique, where the feminist reader examines the ideologies behind literary phenomena. The second is “gynocritics”, where the “woman is producer of textual meaning” including “the psychodynamics of female creativity; linguistics and the problem of a female language; the trajectory of individual or collective female literary career and literary history.” The last phase she calls “gender theory” where the “ideological inscription and the literary effects of the sex gender system” are explored (Wikipedia).

Feminist theory therefore, is the extension of feminism into theoretical, or philosophical discourse, it aims to understand the nature of gender inequality. It examines women’s social roles and life experience (Wikipedia, Online). Feminist political theory as an offshoot of feminist theory is relatively a new field which maintains that the state, public policies and institutions should impact gender relations (Wikipedia).

Having laid this historical background relation between feminist theory and feminist political theory, the task of explaining feminist political philosophy is less. The clarification of such a relationship is necessary, as it would enhance a clearer understanding of how
feminist theory, feminist political theory and feminist political philosophy are linked together or inter-related. In Wikipedia Encyclopaedia, it is argued that there is really no specific school for feminist philosophy like other theories implying that, feminist philosophers are just philosophers after all and can be found in the analytic and continental traditions. This also means that, feminist philosophers also have many different viewpoints taken on philosophical issues within those traditions. In other words, feminist philosophers who are feminists can belong to many different varieties of humanism (Online). The above background on the nature of feminist philosophers would no doubt aid our understanding of the character and purpose of feminist philosophy. By definition, feminist philosophy refers to a philosophy approached from a feminist perspective. It has to do with attempts to use methods of philosophy, to further the cause of the feminist movement. In this light it tries to criticize and / or re-evaluate the ideas of traditional philosophy from within a feminist point of view. At this juncture, it is now proper to articulate the meaning of feminist political philosophy. Noelle McAfee avers that, feminist political philosophy is an area of philosophy focused on understanding and critiquing the way political philosophy is usually construed. Feminist political philosophy is a branch of both feminist philosophy and political philosophy.

As a branch of feminist philosophy it serves as a form of critique or a hermeneutics of suspicion (1). That is, it serves as a way of opening up or looking at the political world as it is usually understood and uncovering ways in which women and their current and historical concerns are poorly depicted, represented and addressed. Whereas as a branch of political philosophy, feminist political philosophy, serves as a field for developing new ideals, practices, and justifications for how political institutions and practices should be organized and reconstructed. McAfee further argues that, while feminist philosophy has been instrumental in critiquing and reconstructing many branches of philosophy, from aesthetics to philosophy of science, feminist political philosophy on the other hand, may be the paradigmatic
branch of feminist philosophy, because it best exemplifies the point of feminist theory. And that, while other fields have effects that may change the world, feminist political philosophy focuses most directly on understanding ways in which collective life can be improved by understanding the ways in which power emerges and is used or misused in public life. Aside, the above mentioned critical role assumed by feminist political philosophy also addresses and engages a myriad of issues concerning women’s experiences and prospects of political beings. This is to say according to Christine Stefano that women as subject of power, come in many forms and permutations, they may be victims of power, wielders of power, transmitters of power, effects of power and / or inventive shapers of power (1). Stefano posits further that feminist political philosophy owes a great deal to the aspirations and achievements of second wave feminism, a complex social movement that succeeded in publicizing, problematizing, and contesting a plethora of sensibilities, symbolic practices, and politics that discriminate unjustly against women(1).

According to Susan Mendus, in all its forms, feminism asserts that social and political structures in society discriminate against women. Essentially, therefore, feminist political philosophy aims to show how traditional political philosophy is implicated in that discrimination and how the resources of political philosophy may be employed in the service of women. Put differently, feminist political philosophy implies the arguments that traditional political philosophy indicates that women are unjustly treated and to propose ways in which that injustice might be removed (qtd in Taylor & Francis Group 280).

A form of feminist political philosophy known as liberal feminism seems to propagate the central idea of feminist political philosophy. Under this type of feminist political philosophy, it is argued that since women are essentially the same as men in being rational creatures, they are entitled to the same legal and political rights as men, and that argument which defends the rights of man also support the rights of women.
Argument Justifying Illegitimate Oppression of Women

At this point, a few of the arguments advanced to justify the oppression of the women folk will be exposed.

According to Aristotle, the claim that they mutilated males, together with the biblical account of the sin of Eve, gave rise to an authoritative tradition in which the weakness, irrationality and in-educability of women, the inconstancy, inability to control their emotions and lack of moral virtue, were all regularly cited and assumed as grounds for controlling them and excluding them from the public scene (qtd Taylor and Francis 276). This explains why Eve’s weakness (irrationality) in the Garden of Eden, during her encounter with the serpent, has since been capitalized upon, generalized and misapplied in order to oppress women.

J. S. Mill on the other hand opined that men taught women to believe from childhood that submission was a part of women’s nature and that their business was to take care of the home, so that men could rule them more easily (Wallbank et al, 505).

Women, it was alleged, had smaller brains than men, and less intelligence, they were more emotional and unstable; in crises you could always depend upon them to sworn or become otherwise helpless, they were weak and sickly creatures, they had little judgment and less sense (Wikipedia, Online). It was also held that, women’s place is in the home, and man’s place is in the counting house and on the board of directors. Women should not meddle in men’s affairs (Wikipedia).

In the words of Maranon, sexuality is a unitary quality and that in man it attained full development, whereas in women it remained at a kind of halfway stage. Only the lesbian could have as rich a libido as that of the male and she would therefore represent a superior (De Beauvoir, 405). In other words, men’s biological sex organ is more developed than the women.
Literatures available, and experiences show that the above outlined are major ones among numerous. According to Thomas Jefferson, the stronger sex imposes on the weaker. It is civilization alone which replaces women in their enjoyment of natural equality (Montagu, 37). The implication of this statement thus was the revelation which it brought to the fore. In other words, although the self acclaimed stronger sex (men folk) though impose on the supposed weaker sex, the men had at the back of their mind the truth to the fact that the men and women were equal naturally and that it was a matter of time and civilization that would open the eyes of the women to such truth. We are inclined to think that it was one of such truth which gave birth to the agitation which characterized the 1800, thus lunching the match towards liberation of women from the offensive oppression by their male counterparts.

Those liberation movements popularly known as feminism helped the women-folk to develop a philosophic mindset against anti-women socio-political practices – like oppression of women, in terms of social deprivation of numerous rights and privileges. Having reflected on these societal imbalances, philosophically, women realized that they are entitled to the same legal and political rights as men, maintaining that argument which defend the rights of men also support the right of women, thus the struggle for equality.

The questions that seem pertinent now are; for how long have men exercised this dominance role over women? And how did, or when were women’s consciousness initiated and who were the women at the frontline of the struggle? These and similar questions with their answers formed the basis for the fight for women’s rights.

Women’s Fight for Legal Rights

Historians are of the view that the general feeling towards women since the 1800s had two sides. Male-run society did not think highly of women’s intelligence. Rather, women were looked on as the base of the home and family. So, it was feared that if women had a part in public business, they would not care for their families. Then the
cornerstone of all civilized life, the home, would fall apart (Wallbank, 504).

The effects of such social and political bias against women then were quite obvious in countries like Britain and France, where women were not allowed to own property, could not start divorce proceedings, had no legal claim on their children and could not vote.

However, events started changing in the mid-1800s, because reformers in Europe and the United States began to call for equal legal and political rights for women. Most of the leaders were intelligent. Middle-class women such as the American Susan B. Anthony quoted above were one of them (Wallbank, 504). Also prominent among the freedom fighters was the English philosopher John Stuart Mill, who helped the women cause. Thus, in his book *The Subjection of Women* (1869), Mill stated that men taught women to believe from children that submission was a part of women’s nature. So that men could rule them more easily. He maintained that as long as women had low legal and social status, no one would ever know their true nature and abilities (Wallbank, 505). For J. S. Mill, what we now call the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing - the result of force repression and that no other class of dependants have had their character so entirely distorted from its natural proportions by their relations with their masters.

Despite the efforts of Susan B. Anthony and J. S. Mill through writing, etc, public feeling was still hard to change and progress was slow. But gradually, women were able to find jobs outside the home. For example, Florence Nightingale, an English nurse during the Crimean war (1854-1856), helped to open nursing to women. Much later, women entered some universities, especially in Italy and Switzerland. In U.S.A, workers were needed in large number of womenfolk to become factory workers, teachers and secretaries (505). And according to Nancy Cott the turning point in the United States is placed in the decade before and after women obtained the vote in 1920 (1910-1930)(Wikipedia, Online).
History has it that, by the end of the 1800s, women in most western countries could by law own property but the right to vote was still denied them. On further struggle, the earliest voting right for women was gained in the frontier areas. Women there were more equal and had greater freedom. First was New South Wales in Australia (1867) Wyoming in the United States followed (1869) and then New Zealand (1886). But the first European country to allow women to vote according to history was Norway at about 1907. It is however noted that, the major countries held back, and that only after World War One, were women were allowed to vote in Great Britain in 1918. Here, Emmeline Pankhurst and her two daughters led a long mass political fight to gain that right. The United States gave the right in 1920, while most other European countries followed after that (Wikipedia).

Another historical fact that has really advanced the cause of women is Christianity. Here, Christianity recognized the personality of women and the human values they represent. In his view, Herrick Johnson (1832-1913) instructively pointed out that, Christianity has lifted women to a new place in the world. And just in proportion as Christianity has swayed, ‘will she rise to a higher dignity in human life’. Similarly, the influence of Christianity on marriage as an institution has also been noted as a permanent evidence of the benevolent impact of Christianity on the status of women (qtd in Iwe, 171).

Having fought gallantly over the years to expose both theoretically and practically the potentials of the women folk and why they should be allowed equal rights and privileges like their male counterparts, one would have imagined or expected men in societies to develop a free-minded mentality about women’s participation in all human endeavours. Rather a new dimension and skill of oppression has been adopted to further perpetrate inequality among men and women. “Discrimination and sexual justice” as extracted from her book “The Skeptical Feminist (1980, 2nd ed. 1994), Janet Radcliffe Richards examines a range of arguments about sexual discrimination. She
shows that discrimination against women where sex is not relevant is always unfair. In this case, the rejection of women who are actually more suitable for the position in question than the competing men becomes topical. The argument that if women are rejected because of poor education that may show discrimination against them at an earlier point. And that if they are unsuitable because they will work badly with a prejudiced worked force, because someone is wanted who will not be away to have children, that may show unfairness in the structure of society, but does not involve the reflection of actually suitable women. She however points that the selection cannot be accused of select discrimination as long as they choose the best candidate for the purpose of question (Warburton, 202). She maintains that discrimination on grounds of sex is counting sex as relevant in contexts where it is not leading to the rejection of suitable women, that it is not discrimination on grounds of sex to reject women who are not suitable even if their unsuitability is caused by their being women.

The effort made so far by feminist at various levels as we have exposed above to counter the illegitimate oppression of women is based on their political ambition that is, the argument that women are the same as men, and that they are entitled to the same legal and political rights as men. This is the onus which feminist political philosophy strives to lay to rest. The implication as earlier pointed out is that the argument of traditional political philosophy is to indicate that women are unjustly treated, and to propose ways in which that injustice might be removed. Let me now examine a few of the arguments and possible ways of reducing the injustice against women.

**Feminist Arguments in Support of Women’s Rights**

In view of the arguments, earlier raised by men to support their illegitimate oppression of women, it would also suffice to expose the position of feminist political philosophers, in support of their demand for freedom from men legal oppression.
It is thus argued that the times are gone when women were regarded as members of the weaker sex, on the strength of the false assumption of their biological inferiority and debility. It is maintained that this view is no longer tenable because of the conclusive evidence of vital statistics which reveal the low and declining mortality rate among women and the high and rising rate of male mortality. The argument continues that, if it is thus clear that female biological in-built resists death longer than the male frame wherein then lays the weakness of the so-called weaker sex? It is further pointed that, even if this weakness is to be morally interpreted, a question goes thus, who then is weaker – the one who could make “Herodian promises or even distort and pollute the course of justice, expose and leak the foundation of integrity and secrecy, while at the feet of a woman or the one who could unnerve, emasculate and “amaerikanize” a Sampson? (Iwe 174). It is more-so pointed out that the concept of the weaker sex lacks sufficient scientific valid evidence and is symptomatic of the mental aberration and prejudice of former times. When Apostle Peter referred to women as weaker vessels in 1 Peter 3:7, he implied the physiognomy of womanhood that promote their beauty, their emotional frailty which easily appeal men’s natural instinct. These are special qualities that God endows in women making them to be tender, loving and caring to their husbands and children and to the society as well. The concept of the weaker vessel has nothing to do with the in-built intellectual ability that enables woman to contribute to the socio-political needs of her family and the society at large.

Similarly, another argument holds that times have gone when it was held that only men should work outside the home as wage-and-bread earners while women remained at home as wage-and-bread consumers. This position is dismissed based on the fact that it is inconsistent with the dynamic dignity of womanhood. It is assumed to be bankrupt as its falsehood is evidenced by the economic realities of our age. For this reason, men now insist on marrying gainfully
employed women. This has come to stay, and is now a condition for choice of a life partner by most men.

Feminist are also of the opinion that the division of labour between the sexes has its origin in the biologically determined different functions of male and female, but that, it does not mean that the male is biologically designed to be a hunter. Rather it means that these roles are the social consequences of the biologically determined reproductive differences between the sexes.

In response to the claim of male superiority with regard to sexuality, the feminist counter argument is that, feminine sexuality has a structure of its own, and it is therefore absurd to speak of superiority or inferiority in connection with the male and female libidos. The choice of sexual object, it is maintained in no way depends on the amount of energy at the disposal of the woman (De Beauvoir 405-6). In the immediate post-war period, Simone de Beauvoir stood in opposition to an image of “the woman in the home”. She provided an existentialist dimension to feminism with the publication of Le Deuxieme Sexe (The Second Sex) in 1949. Here, de Beauvoir asks the question, “What is a woman?” Woman she realizes is always perceived of as “other”, and that, she is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not him with reference to her. More-so, in her essay, “Woman: Myth and Reality”, De Beauvoir anticipates Betty Friedan in seeking to demythologize the male concept of woman. A myth invented by men to confine women to their oppressed state (Wikipedia, Online).

Other common arguments, takes the line that women are to be excluded because they are not equal to the task in question. It is further argued that they cannot be dockers or bus drivers because they are not strong enough. More-so, they cannot go into the professional or business because they are not clever enough or can’t concentrate, or are prone to hysteria, or will leave to have children or follow their husbands (Warburton, 203). The feminist response in this case is total denial. Rather they maintain that either the accusations are false, or if
women are in some ways inferior to men it is because men have deprived women of proper education. Other arguments used by the feminist to counter the above oppressive claim of the men are those pointed out by J. S. Mill. Here, Mill posited that, nearly all the differences claimed to exist between men and women are differences of average. He maintained further that no one with the slightest claim to sense could argue that all men were stronger or more intellectual or more forceful than all women. In other words, the fact that the average woman cannot do something or other which the average man can do provides not a shred of justification for a rule or practice which also excludes all the exceptional ones who can do or demands that the women should perform better than the men to be admitted. Average differences between men and women according to Mill would account for different success rates in various activities, but they could not possibly account for selection policies which differentiated between them. In his second argument he opined that if there were cases where it looked as though all women actually might be worse at something than all men, that still would not account for a rule specifically excluding them or saying they should do better than men to be admitted, because what women by nature cannot do, it is quite superfluous to forbid them from doing.

Another interesting argument advanced by the feminist is that, if men really think for instance, that a certain level of strength is needed for driving buses, why not just say what that level is and test all applicants for strength? And that if the men think that all women will fail, why add but no woman? For if the presumptions were true no women would get in anyway. It is ridiculous to say that a rule specifically excluding women is needed because the work calls for a certain level of strength which women are presumed never to reach (Warburton, 204). It is also argued that, if most women are unsuitable for something, it is understandable that a selector has missed by accident some of the ones who are suitable. But quite different, and not acceptable to refuse to consider any woman, even the ones whose excellence cannot be missed.
Critical Analysis

A critical look at the arguments advanced by the men to justify their illegitimate oppression of women appears inadequate and absurd. This is because of the intimidating and stronger arguments put forward by the feminist to justify their movement or political programme. The feminist arguments stand true in our opinion until men are able to challenge and give answers to the many questions put forward by the feminist or argue otherwise with stronger and convincing reasons. On the other hand, we may ask, what possibly could be responsible for men oppressive tendencies? We seem to buy the idea of some feminists that the only conceivable reason for a rule of practice excluding women is its perpetrators’ thinking that without such a rule women would have to be let in, leading to situations where individual women are apparently suffering in the cause of male supremacy, and individual men are gaining in the same cause. This of course leads to unfair treatment or injustice.

However, in view of the arguments advanced by the feminist, which to us are cogent enough, our position is that women are equal to men in all respect in a socio-political setting. This is because of the one infinite source and unity of all beings. And more-so, because a man in whom the feminine principle is completely absent would be an abstract being, completely severed from the cosmic element. Also, a woman in whom the masculine principle is completely absent would not be a personality. The masculine principle is said to be essentially personal and anthropological, while the feminine principle is essentially communal and cosmic. It follows therefore that, it is only the union of these two principles that constitutes a complete human being (Berdvaev, 62). In other words, men and women are equal in the face of natural cosmic arrangement and although human nature seem to create artificial disparities, it is reasonable to work even as harmonious opposites, complementing each other in all respect. This articulation points to the following importance of the feminist political philosophy, in a society like ours, if it must make success in its endeavour.
Importance of Feminist Political Philosophy in Nigeria

(1) Feminist political philosophy has assumed importance because of the distinctive presence and standing it has achieved. This is seen in the growing body of literature, fed by a dazzling variety of philosophical and theoretical vocabularies.

(2) It has succeeded in problematizing the figure of generic man. It queries the political effects of definitions of locating women, gender, sexuality and the feminine within various narratives of the political systems; rethinking political concepts such as justice, freedom, equality and citizenship with a view to women’s experiences, needs, and aspirations.

(3) It also helped to develop a critical project designed to highlight the sexism, misogyny and gender blindness or complicity of canonical and contemporary mainstream philosophy and theory.

(4) It has enabled philosophers to carry on the development of constructive or reconstructive projects and approaches.

(5) It has the ability to raise critical question about the status of women, raised disturbing and compelling questions about the representational adequacy of women as a signifier and about the politics of such signification.

(6) The promotion of the dignity of womanhood will purify our social atmosphere of much sex misconceptions, prejudice and aberrations.

(7) The recognition of the dignity of womanhood will release the untapped reserves of female potentialities and expertise.

(8) The recognition of the equal dignity of men and women will enhance the domestic capabilities of women and infuse a greater sense of responsibility into them. It will again arouse greater sense of responsibility into them. That is, it will
arouse greater and fruitful initiative in women as it develops their capacity for self-reliance and confidence.

(9) That if our attitude towards women hitherto surround by much prejudice and moralizing platitude will be saner, sober and healthier through the acknowledgement of the human dignity of womanhood. Society and social life become more humane, tension-free, peaceful, creative and dynamic and more productive where the equal dignity of men and women is the guiding principle in the theory and practice and in the administration of justice.

(10) It will also promote healthy competition between men and womenfolk in a given polity.

The importance of the feminist political/philosophical endeavour stems also from the fact that, since the status of women is the measure and taste of any civilization, according to Marten, it is the law of eternal justice that men cannot degrade women without himself falling into degradation and he cannot raise them without himself becoming better (Iwe, 179).

**Conclusion**

This conclusion shall focus basically on some of the recommendations and or proposed ways in which the injustice against women might be removed. This concluding approach is pertinent in view of the fact that it is one of the essential goals of feminist political philosophy.

The feminist argue in this direction that in a just society the way to make individuals produce what is for the general good is not to exclude some people from parts of the competition in order to force them to do something else. By this way, they maintained that other work is less well done and individuals are made unhappy in the process. Rather, the work to be done should be attractive to the people, whom they want to do it, thus getting the work done well and increasing the satisfaction of individuals in the process.
The feminist also argue that injustice against women should be removed because it is always unfair to practice selective discrimination against women or against any other group.

According to the feminist, the usual form recommended for reverse discrimination is that women of lower calibre than men should be chosen for certain work in preference to them. Though they think is what ought to happen, they as well observed that, it would be absolutely unfair, and that reverse discrimination would be open to exactly the same conclusive objections as ordinary discrimination. Put differently, they maintained that although some compensation is due to women for their unjust treatments, the idea of compensation does not justify reverse discrimination in their favour.

The feminists argue further that, what they want to achieve is not compensation but an improvement of the position of women until society is fair to them, and that, the best way to achieve this is to appoint to positions of importance, women who are rather less good at the work than the men who are in competition with them.

Feminists also posit that if our present society is unfair to women, it is obviously fair that it should be changed. This can be done by setting in motion social programmes to turn society into one which is better for women. It therefore follows as N.S.S. Iwe opined that as we promote the dignity of womanhood, it is the welfare of man that is being fostered. He concludes his submission in the words of R. B. Sheriden which holds that women govern us: let us try to render them more perfect (175). For the more they are enlightened, so much the more we shall be. For on the cultivation of the minds of women depends on the wisdom of men.

With the above recommendations or proposed ways to remove the injustice against women, our opinion is that there are reasonable. So, feminist political philosophy should be intensified and to globalize its vision, which we think with time can cause complete liberation of women. But the question that could confront these right intentions is, what is the possibility that the men who are already controlling some
of the structures of political power would consider the need for urgent change as reasonable. In considering this fact, we have to bear in mind that we are dealing with man who naturally inclined to self preservation and oppressiveness because of his egoistic tendencies. Until adequate answers and solutions are found for some of these bordering questions, feminist political agenda may remain a utopia. However, since the feminist don’t really need or are not seeking to dominate men, we incline to think that there is hope already for them, as can be experienced in the consideration given to women via appointments into some political offices. But still to be desired is a global mindset among men and women, in whom both sex, see each other as complementary partners in all endeavours of life. We the men-folk should know that the headship right of husband over the wife is a divine order towards the management of the home which must be led by somebody. This should not be applied to the political society because everyone (man and woman) has something to contribute towards its development.
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