My formation in academic theology, which is not the same as popular theology, places me at the meeting point of faith and reason. It involves reading and taking philosophers seriously in intra and inter-religious matters because philosophers deploy the intellective power that pertains to our common humanity in addressing our common existential questions.\(^1\) This academic formation imposes on me an intellectual obligation, which is, to address the matter at hand in a way and manner to which even those in our multi-religious entity who may not share my Christian faith affiliation would be able to subscribe. If, therefore, you expect me to quote copiously from the Holy Bible, you may be disappointed. I shall not do that. Instead, I intend to undertake this as an exercise in philosophical commentary on the relationship between religion and politics in contemporary Nigeria. Peoples of divergent religious and political affiliations can enter into dialogue on a common ground located on the intellective faculty that is our common possession. Such dialogue is necessary for mutual understanding, and mutual understanding is a prerequisite for the management of tensions and conflicts, and for peaceful coexistence.

---

\(^1\) Whereas popular preaching would content itself with simply stating what Christians believe or ought to believe, academic theology undertakes the intellectual task of exploring the conceptual possibility of Christian creedal affirmations.


The topic, as formulated, places before us a multiplicity of concepts and a corresponding imperative of multiple clarification. Imposed is the intellectual obligation to inquire: what, in this discourse, is meant by religion and politics? And even the very concept of Nigeria calls for clarification. When reference is made to Nigeria, does one have in mind a country, a state, or a nation? When one hears the often repeated but rarely scrutinized assumption that the unity of Nigeria is non-negotiable, exponents of this assertion are allowed to get off the hook because no one seems to ask if, by Nigeria, they mean a country, a state, or a nation. It is my contention that repeated failure to clarify these most frequently used concepts has largely contributed to the state of sterile and destructive conflicts and arrested development associated with Nigeria today.

This philosophical discourse is elaborated in two moments. In its first moment, an attempt will be made to respond to the imperative of clarification which the topic imposes. And in its second moment, the relationship between religion and politics in Nigeria will be explored by presenting it as a human question that is, as a question that is best addressed by an inquiry into what it means to be human. These two moments of the discourse will lead us to our final submissions.

**Responding to the Imperative of Multiple Clarification**

Meant by “contemporary Nigeria” in this discourse is Nigeria from 1960 to date. But what has transpired since 1960 in the geographical space called Nigeria would be virtually inexplicable without an examination of a collapse of distinction in contemporary Nigerian political discourse. On October 1, 1960, the peoples inhabiting the Niger area replaced the Union Jack with the Green-White-Green flag. It was the birth of post-colonial Nigeria. But what was born on that day was a state and not a nation, and the refusal or failure to differentiate between a country, a nation, and a state is one of the greatest tragedies of contemporary Nigeria, indeed of Africa. This is the collapse
of distinction of which I speak, and this failure to clarify our notions leaves us in an unbroken but hardly habitable Nigeria.

I would offer further clarification by contending that a country is a piece of land, a territory. The English word “country” is derived from the Latin *contra terra*, literally, “the land that lies ahead”. A nation is an association of peoples who share common core ideals. For example, the peoples of the United States of America identify life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as their core ideals. A nation is an association constituted by peoples because they share a common belief that, by espousing and seeking to concretize these core ideals, they would arrive at the actualization of their individual potentials through the actualization of their collective potentials, and at the fulfillment of their individual aspirations in the fulfillment of their collective aspiration. They remain in the association because they are convinced that continued membership guarantees such actualization and such fulfillment.

On the basis of these common core ideals, and with the desire to protect members of the association in their individual and collective quest for the attainment of these ideals, the peoples who constitute the association give the association a Constitution—the *grundnorm* of their common life. The Constitution establishes institutions whose common primary objective is the protection of the citizens as they seek to actualize their individual and collective potentials, and as they seek to realize the fulfillment of their individual and collective aspirations. The state is a conglomeration of institutions so established, and this conglomeration of institutions that the state is, in a truly democratic polity, must be, at the service of the citizen. The opposite would be a dictatorship, that is, a polity where the state, instead of serving the citizen, is more powerful than the citizen. A polity where the state is more powerful than the citizen is a place where institutions that form the
conglomeration that the state is oppress, intimidate and brutalize the people. It is in fact the case that the loyalty of officials of such a state is not to the people but to the head of state, that is, the President or Governor or their equivalent. That is why security agencies in Nigeria, as is the case in many African countries, have been established and trained to protect the state and its functionaries, not to protect the citizen. They are, to the people, instruments of oppression, not of protection.

The twofold birth of Nigeria—at amalgamation on January 1, 1914, and at independence on October 1, 1960—was not the birth of a nation but the birth of a state. To borrow two expressions from T.M. Aluko’s *One Man, One Matchet*, on October 1, 1960, there was a transition from a state controlled by the Big White Man to a state controlled by the Big Black Man. Since October 1, 1960, Nigeria has remained a state held together at gunpoint. And quite often, those who dogmatize that the unity of Nigeria is non-negotiable are those whose hands are on the trigger. Instead of the presumption that the indivisibility of Nigeria is non-negotiable, its unity must first be desired and worked for. The danger and discomfort of mistaking a presumption for affection manifest themselves in recurrent tensions in post-colonial Nigeria: from the bloody politics of the First Republic that preceded the misguided military interventions of 1966, to the two bouts of pestilential military rule lasting 28 of our 56 years of post-colonial existence, the Nigeria-Biafra War, halfhearted post-war attempts at democratization, the imposition of military rules through a unitary constitution disguised as a federal constitution, the Kaduna religious riots of 1987, the Sharia debate of the year 2000 which was preceded at the constituent assembly of 1977 by a walkout staged by some Muslim delegates, the unanimous cry of marginalization, the Boko Haram insurgency, and other symptoms of generalized lawlessness in Nigeria.
The absence of clarification from our political discourse, exemplified in the collapse of distinction between country, state and nation, has left a vacuum which is now filled with the manipulation of the ethnic and religious diversity characteristic of Nigeria to attain egotistic political advantages. While some would blame religion, some others would blame politics. The Nigerian Christian lives in fear and suspicion of an Islamic Jihad, while the Nigerian Muslim lives in fear and suspicion of Christian evangelism. There is a gradual movement, or at least a secretly nursed desire, to exclude religion from the public square. It is a question of how to face the challenge of religion and politics in a multi-ethnic and multi-religious entity such as Nigeria. This does not call for an easy solution. In order to effectively face this challenge, we must address the human question. \(^2\)

**Religion and politics as human question**

Every intelligently formulated question is a quest for intelligibility, that is, a quest to know what one grasps when one understands. In this respect, the human question is a quest to understand the human being. What does it mean to be human? That is the question. As can be deduced in the course of this discourse, politics and religion are what human beings do. Our dogs and cats practice neither religion nor politics. A discussion on religion and politics compels us to raise this question because religion and politics are constitutive of the human question. The question is of capital importance in this discourse.

\(^2\) Cf. Michele Dillon, “Multiple Belongings : The Persistence of Community amidst Societal Differentiation” in *At the Limits of the Secular: Reflections on Faith and Public Life* Ed. William A. Barbieri Jr (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK, 2014) 275-304. Although Dillon’s essay is an exploration of the place of religion in a society differentiated by secularism, her statement in the concluding part of the essay is quite pertinent to the tensions occasioned by religious and political differences in Nigeria. According to Dillon, “Given that religious and other cultural differences are the hallmark of modernity, we are under an obligation to look for ways to create dialogue across differences and with a view to creating institutional and communal practices that incorporate rather than silence differences” (304).
In Plato’s dialogue on the *Republic* is to be found a dialogue within a dialogue, a simultaneous conversation undertaken in a manner that leads us to the conclusion that the quest to understand the human being and the quest to understand the city in which the human being lives are two inseparable quests. Plato’s *Republic* began with the question: who is the happy person? Is it the just or the unjust person? In the quest to find an answer to this question, interlocutors in the dialogue found out there was an inextricably related question, and that is: whether the happy city is the just city or the unjust city? Since a city is an aggregate of persons, a habitation of human persons, these two interrelated questions may be formulated thus: is a happy city a habitation of just persons or a habitation of unjust persons. From this we learn that we cannot understand the *anthropos* if we do not understand the *polis*, neither can we understand the *polis* if we do not understand the *anthropos*. Consciousness of this reciprocal relationship between anthropology and politics is a necessary condition for the resolution of the relationship between religion and politics in any polity.

But the human question does not lend itself to a simple solution because the human being is a multidimensional entity, and a multidimensional entity calls for multiple intelligibility. There is no answer that says it all. Every attempt to answer the human question can only be what it is—an attempt, an assemblage of aspects of human existence—in so far as every response is an attempt to come close to what is adequate. And if at all it comes close to anything adequate, it would only represent an aspect of what it means to be human.

In this discourse, I shall respond to the human question by asserting that the human being is characterized by rationality, relationality and religiosity. To be human is to be rational, relational and religious.
We can at least begin our explanation by saying what is perhaps most obvious, and that is, like every other being, the human being naturally seeks its own good. It is in fact the case that, by definition, the good is that which every creature seeks. The human being is a creature who belongs to the genre of animals. Like every other animal, he seeks his own good. Like every other animal, the human being is sensitive. But unlike other animals, he is both sensitive and rational. In his quest for the good, his feelings play a major role. Emotions play a big part in human existence. But the human being is one who is able to subordinate his sensitive powers to his intellective powers, his emotions to reason. And so he has been described as a rational animal, that is, an animal who deploys his rationality in the pursuit of the good. In other words, not only does he seek the good, he does so freely and intelligently. He is able to know and he is able to choose. He is able to know the good he ought to choose, and he is able to freely choose it. Moreover, not only is he capable of knowing and choosing the good, he is also able to know and choose the means to attain his goal.

The good the human being desires is the good understood. To desire what is misconceived as good is to become a liability by self-constitution. The human being is therefore endowed with a will whose orientation is to the good, and with an intellect whose orientation is to the truth. The intellect enables us to make right choices, to understand and differentiate between what appears to be good and what is really good, for, as the saying goes, all that glitters is not gold. The intellect is able to differentiate between appearance and reality so that the human being does not go about chasing shadows. The will wills that the intellect understand, and the intellect understands that

---

the will wills. The will, as it were, sends the intellect on a mission: go in search of the really good that is the order. The intellect understands and judges, passes the information to the will saying, “Here is the good you desire.” The function of the intellect is to know what is truly good, while the function of the will is to choose the good, not any kind of good, but the good presented to it by the intellect as the really good. That is why it is said that the function of the will is to choose the good understood by the intellect.\(^4\) In a nutshell, the human being is filled with a desire for the good way of life. But this quest for the good way of life is embarked upon in a rational way. The human being knows by moving from the known to the unknown. The human being has therefore been described as a rational animal. He is an animal who is able to deploy reason in his or her effort to attain the good life. Without reason, the human being reduces goodness to feeling. And when goodness is reduced to feeling, he erroneously believes that whatever makes him feel good is good, that whatever conforms to the pleasure principle is the right thing for him, that whatever brings pain is bad. The good then becomes a matter of sensual desires and aversions. Such is the case of a patient who is diagnosed with malaria. The doctor prescribes some painful injections to bring down his fever. He could not understand how painful injections could bring down his high fever. So he goes off to another doctor, a quack doctor this time around, who tells him that the antidote to his high fever is not a painful injection but a bowl of ice cream. It is to avoid this poor judgment that we are endowed with rationality, the power of the intellect that enables us to identify the good we ought to attain, and the appropriate means for attaining the goal.

\(^4\)Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 82 a. 4.
But rationality is not the only attribute in the human being. We must also speak of relationality. Men and women are not only rational animals, they are also political animals. The Greek philosopher Aristotle’s statement that man is a political animal is often quoted but seldom understood. It has often been misunderstood as saying the human being is one who spends all his time, energy and economic resources scheming to attain political advantage in ways that are inimical to the interests of others. But this was not what Aristotle meant. The human being as a rational animal is also a relational animal. In fact, it is because he is rational that he is political. Relationality is an eminent expression of his rationality. Whereas we cannot separate rationality from relationality in man, such a misrepresentation of Aristotle would want to separate the two. But rationality and relationality are mutually inclusive in the human being. By affirming that the human being is a political animal, Aristotle was saying that he is an animal who lives in the *polis*, the Greek word translated into English as “city”, as opposed to an animal who lives in the forest. The rational animal called man is an animal who relates with other rational animals in a life lived in the city. And their relationship is or ought to be characterized by rationality. To affirm, as Aristotle does, that the human being, who is a rational animal, is also a political animal, is to say that he is an animal who not only lives in the city, but who uses his intelligence to direct the affairs of the city. And that clarifies for us what politics is or should be. From the Greek word *polis* is derived the English word “politics”, which is management of the affairs of the city, just as economics, derived from two Greek words, *oikos* (home) and *nomos* (law), is the law that regulates the affairs of the home. Politics is the intelligent regulation of life in the city, the
rational management of human relationality. It is not a series of activities manifesting the power addiction in man. It is the intelligent regulation of common life for the sake of the common good.\(^5\) The human being who is animated by an infinite quest for the good does not live in isolation. For as the saying goes: no man is an island. The human being who is in search of the best possible life lives with others. Consequently, his search for the good, his search for the best way of life is in fact a search for the best way to live together. His search for the good is a moral quest that is inseparable from the political quest for the best way to live together. He cannot attain the good without living and collaborating with others. His potentials can be actualized only within the actualization of the potentials in others, only when he works for the actualization of the potentials in others. His aspirations can be fulfilled only when the aspirations of others are fulfilled. No one can attain any good singlehandedly. The moral quest for the good turns out to be a political quest because the quest for the good life is a quest for the best way to live together. Ancient Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle understood this quite well that we ought not to separate morality and politics, that the moral project is a political project, and that the political project is a moral project. The separation of the two projects came with Niccolò Machiavelli.

The titles of the political discourses of these three philosophers—the Republic of Plato, the Politics of Aristotle, and the Prince of Machiavelli—evoke two types of politics. One is politics for the sake of the common good, which is what Plato and Aristotle represent; while the other is politics for the sake of the political fortunes of the politician, which is what Machiavelli represents. Politics for the sake of the common good presupposes that the good of the human person is best served in a life lived with others, that the rational animal actualizes and fulfills himself in relationality.

Politics for the sake of the politician represents a monstrous misconception of human nature, of the human being as one who can attain the good without others. Plato’s Republic and Aristotle’s Politics represent an attempt to place leadership at the service of the common good. The subject matter of their political discourse is the good of the polis while the subject matter of the political discourse of Machiavelli is not the good of the polis but the good of the politician. Machiavelli ridiculed and repudiated the philosophical doctrine of convergence of morality and politics, substituting it with his doctrine of the separation of the two, and the history of political instability and religious tensions in Nigeria eloquently testifies to the fact that he has never ceased to win political disciples. I shall come back to this shortly. But what immediately concerns us here is the notion of human nature that the political doctrine of Plato and Aristotle puts before us. It is of vital importance for our understanding of the delicate relationship between politics and religion in our multi-ethnic and multi-religious Nigeria.

Let us recall that every human being is a moral agent in search of the good because, as Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas said, the good is that which everyone desires. Let us also recall that the human being who desires the good does not live in isolation. The human being lives with other human beings and cannot attain the good without the collaboration of others. In concrete terms, the quest for the good is an inter-subjective task. It is because every human being desires the good, and because the fulfillment of this desire requires an inter-subjective task that the moral project is a political project while the political project is a moral project. The repeated and related or unrelated actions in the history of civilization, even when they miss their goal, are intended to make the human being happy in the attainment of the highest good.
Collaboration is a necessary requirement for the attainment of the good because the human being is by nature a being who lives with other human beings. Every animal has a natural habitat. The fish lives in water, birds fly in the air, reptiles on land. The natural habitat of the human being is a network of relationships with other human beings, not any kind of relationship, but a network of loving relationships. And the quintessence of this network of loving relationships is the family. The family is the natural habitat of the human being.6

There is one more point to be made about what it is to be human. Perhaps it should have been the first. It is a description of the human person that will instantly generate vigorous objections from atheists and agnostics, and that is, the human being is a religious being. Objections to this statement are understandable. Isn’t religion itself a threat to human existence, to peace and stability, to human dignity? The Crusades and the Jihads, discrimination, entente and friendship of

---

6 Reason itself confirms that what is revealed on the pages of the Bible is an accurate description of human experience, and that is, “It is not good for the human being to be alone” (Gen 2:18). The most common translation of that passage says “It is not good for man to be alone.” But the Hebrew word used in that passage is not ish but ha adam. The Hebrew word ish means “man”, the word isha means “woman”. Ha adam means the human being. The appropriate translation would be, “It is not good for the human being [not just man, not just woman] to be alone.” It is a statement of the relationality of the human person. What is being said in that passage is that loneliness is injurious to human nature.

The human being is conceived and is to be nurtured in a network of loving relationships, beginning with the loving relationship of a man and a woman in a lawful conjugal union. This is how the human being gives birth to the family, and the family gives birth to the human being. It is because the human being’s natural habitat is a network of loving relationships that our deepest aspiration is to love and be loved. The Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard adds his voice to this by writing that the unhappiest person in the world is the man or woman who has neither loved nor has been loved.

The human being was created as an expression of God’s love. Created in the image and likeness of God. The human being longs to be with others. He is born and survives in a network of relationships because he is image of God who himself is a family of three Persons. The love of these three divine Persons gave us human beings life. For the work of creation is the work of the toitas Trinitas, of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This life is transmitted through the love of a man and a woman, our biological parents, expressed in their collaborative conjugal act. The love of a man and a woman creates a family and sustains it. This is the way in which God uses the instrumental agency of marital union of man and woman to create the family, and the family transmits and nurtures the life of other human beings. The family is where everyone owes his life to others even as he or she has to take personal responsibility for the life.
expediency among people of different religious persuasions, pending the acquisition of superior firepower to impose religious convictions and conversions on others, inability to differentiate between piety and public nuisance—do these not pose a threat to humanity?

These objections, understandable as they may be, are not necessarily sustainable. For the problem is not religion per se. The problem is the corruption of religion. Religion is corrupted when man turns his addiction into religion. The problem is man and his triple addiction to power, riches and pleasures. In this triple addiction, power is acquired and maximized so as to maximize riches, riches are maximized so as to maximize pleasure, and this is done in blasphemy, using the name of God in vain. When addiction becomes a religion, I begin to worship the person I see when I stand in front of the mirror, that is, the self, the power addict in me. We must never overlook the transformative effect of religion rightly understood. Religion is not any kind of submission. If at all religion is submission, it is not submission to the love of power but submission to the power of love—to God who is love.

A certain narrow understanding of religion would seem to buttress the objections of those who would prefer that religion be kept out of the public sphere and restricted to the closet. According to this narrow understanding, religion is what you do in the Church or Mosque or Temple or Shrine. But religion as a notion is bigger than Judaism, or Christianity, or Islam or African Traditional Religion. The French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau distinguished between the religions of man, which he said focuses on morality and God, and the religion of the society of civil religion which obliges allegiance to the state, to its symbols and institutions.⁷ Civil religion, he says, expresses itself in patriotism. The flag, the constitution, human rights and related things become

---

objects of worship. Whether or not one agrees with this typology of religion, whoever watches the inauguration of a President cannot but observe how the modern state has made certain things into objects of worship. The national anthem is sung in quiet reverence and awe. The National Pledge is recited with religious devotion.

The human being who is rational and political is also religious in character because there is at least one thing that preoccupies him absolutely and unconditionally in his search for the best way to live. Every human being is animated by an infinite desire for the infinite. He is in restless pursuit of the truth, the good, love and endless life. He is in search of the good of the intellectual and moral order. And underlying this search is the search for the good of the religious order. This is the religious dimension in the human person, the dimension that sustains every other dimension.

It chiefly manifests itself in rituals, and rituals are not restricted to Churches, Temples, Mosques and Shrines. They are found in sports and in music, in politics, in the academia and in the stock exchange. It is in fact the case that the denial of religion is in the name of religion, in the name of a point of reference which is held absolutely and unconditionally, in the name of whatever a human being cherishes most in his innermost sanctuary. In the theology of the Christian tradition it is God.

**Conclusion**

Given the experience of post-colonial tensions and conflicts in Nigeria, it is becoming fashionable to blame politics by calling it a dirty game. But politics, rather than be a dirty game is a virtue and a duty. It would have been right to call politics a dirty game if politics were as Machiavelli conceived it. But politics, conceived and practiced as intelligent regulation of common life for the
sake of the common good is a virtue and a duty. In the same way, it is becoming fashionable to blame religion for Nigeria’s problems. Indeed, religion would be indistinguishable from a vice if, in the name of evangelism, one were to mistake public nuisance for piety, which is quite often the case in contemporary Nigeria. I should add, by way of fleeting digression, that there is a compelling need to distinguish between evangelism and evangelization. Evangelism would be an imposition of the Gospel, evangelization is bearing witness to the values of the Gospel. The former is an imposition of values, a violation of rationality, relationality and religiosity. The latter is a proposition of values that promote the human person in his or her rationality, relationality and religiosity.

In so far as these three traits of rationality, rationality and religiosity are in the human person, neither politics nor religion can be wished away from any society. For politics, rightly conceived and rightly practiced, is an expression of rationality and rationality. Now, rationality and rationality are characterized by an infinite quest for the infinite that is in the human being. Religion, for its part, expresses this infinite quest for infinite truth, infinite good, and infinite love in the restless human spirit. Neither politics nor religion can be wished away. But both must be intelligently regulated to avoid the fanaticism and banditry that make society unsafe. In the absence of intelligent regulation politics is deformed, deformed politics becomes a religion, and instrumentalized religion becomes a servant to politics of Machiavellian inspiration. Religiosity, rationality and rationality are corrupted by a materialist trinity of power, possessions, and pleasure. Religion and politics become instruments in the hands of power addicts who seek power for the sake of riches, and riches for the sake of pleasure, and who do all that in the name of God.
It is my submission that what we have in Nigeria is a deadly mixture of corrupt politics and corrupt religion, and the toxic fumes issuing from this deadly mixture is suffocating the polity. For this reason, blame not religion. Blame rather those who misconceive and misuse religion, those who engage in religious malpractice. In the same way, blame not politics. Blame instead those who misconceive and misuse politics, those who engage in political malpractice. Blame the corruption of religion for which many preachers across the divide of Christianity and Islam are responsible. And blame the bipartisan corruption of politics found in post-colonial Nigeria.

Our problem is not multiplicity of political and religious affiliations but multiplicity of monstrous misconceptions. Nigeria’s post-colonial political and religious tensions and conflicts, which hinder national integration and authentic development, are traceable to multiple monstrous misconceptions and misuse of religion and politics, no doubt, but, ultimately, to the misconception of the human person itself. Our problem is not our differences but our unwillingness to manage our differences with civility, or rather, our willful mismanagement of our differences. The solution is an intellectual and moral conversion in the form of multiple rectification of conceptions. Such rectification will lead us to move from a land governed by an illegitimate constitution to a land where common life is regulated by a constitution that facilitates the emergence and administration of vital institutions. Such constitutionally provided for and regulated institutions must be capable of protecting citizens as they seek to actualize their individual potentials, and fulfill their individual aspirations by working for the actualization of our collective potentials and the fulfillment of our collective aspirations. For after all said and done, every human person seeks the good. But the good of the individual will remain a mirage if the individual fails to work for the common good.
Our differences need not to be suppressed. In fact, they cannot be suppressed. We shall not all become Christian, neither shall we all become Muslim. Our differences must not be exploited to gain political advantage. Even in our differences, we have a common ground in our common humanity, that is, in our rationality, relationality and religiosity. We can, and we ought to agree on how to organize our common life even in our differences, for, we cannot wish away the fact that every person is an unrepeatable and irreplaceable entity. On the basis of such an agreement, we can, and we must give ourselves an intelligently crafted constitution capable of guiding us to manage our differences. In our common life, we must ensure that religiosity does not suppress rationality and relationality, that rationality does not suppress religiosity and relationality, and that relationality does not suppress religiosity and rationality.

In concrete terms, the state should not interfere in the way religion is practiced just as the practice of religion should not interfere in the way the state is run—the state should not impose but must respect divergent religious convictions in so far as such convictions do not violate the rights of the citizen enshrined in a legitimate constitution. The purpose of the state is neither to compel nor to prevent the practice of any religion but to ensure that the citizen is protected while he or she professes and practices his or her religion, as long as such profession and practice do not violate the rationality, relationality or religiosity of other citizens.

I should add, by way of conclusion, that while an intelligently crafted constitution is a necessary condition for integration, stability and authentic development, it is not a sufficient condition. There is a further need to have at the helm of affairs men and women who are not only morally competent, but who are also intellectually and technically competent. The institutions established and
regulated by an intelligently crafted constitution cannot function as they should if the men and women who run them are lacking in multiple competence.