PHILOSOPHY OF INTEGRATED DEVICE TECHNOLOGIES: TOWARDS COMBATING INJUSTICE AND INSECURITY IN NIGERIA

Izuchukwu I.M. Emeam*

Abstract

At the heart of Nigeria's problem are the twin sisters of injustice and insecurity. Injustice is a vice that emanates from the choice of evil over and above the good in matters of public interest. It is a refusal to give each individual and/ or federating entities of a nation what is due to them in terms of social amenities, goods and services, appointments and other benefits that accrue to people on the basis of the social contract. Insecurity is a failure by the government to provide one of the essential physical needs of the citizens – security of national boundary, life and property of the citizens. The aim of this paper is to apply philosophical lens to these twin problem in order to establish rational grounds for possible solution to the problems by examining integrated device technologies. Philosophy is often critical of technology; but Heidegger's words of wisdom can help in order to enter into a relationship with technology. Heidegger admonished: "the essence of technology is mysterious but where the danger is there lies the saving grace." The research believes that the application of integrated device technologies can help in generating statistics, evidence-based cases as well as hardware to fight factors of injustice and insecurity. Dialogical method of philosophy is also to be employed to dismantle obstacles from one-sided view of the situation or discursive narrative in favour of one side.

Keywords: Integrated Device Technologies, Injustice, Insecurity

Introduction

Philosophy in its function as a law giver determines what ought to be the ideal situation of any reality under consideration. Similarly philosophy of technology lays down ideal situations for the production, use, change, enhancement and disruption of technologies. The nature of technology is that it is a contrivance that can be used to out-smart, control or even manipulate an opponent. Disruptive technologies can be used to disrupt network in the area of operation of an opponent, or disrupt the functioning of technological devices of the opponent. Disruptive technologies as virus can be sent to an opponent's computer, mobile phone or tracking devices to incapacitate the effective operation of the opponent. In addition, cooperating soft wares can be sent to opponent's mobile devices to record, generate videos of the activities of the opponent. These spying technologies can be used in file transfers, transfer of classified information and security passwords. It needs to be mentioned that robotic technologies fitted with artificial intelligence can do more in terms of security and addressing injustice by providing solid and irrefutable evidences on which to sue and argue a case of injustice to successful end. These mechanized robotic technologies have redefined the nature of warfare and security. The devices can do much more than what a human being can do. In war situation, war zones where human soldiers may not reach, mechanized creative robots are sent for rescue of soldiers trapped for instance in an area. Robotic technologies are also used in case of fire disaster to quench fire and rescue people.

These technologies, however, are to be zealously guided so that they do not enter into wrong hands. If unintended agents lay hold of such technologies, the final cause for the production of such technologies can be compromised. This is the meaning of the statement that

technology is value neutral. This means the value of a piece of technology depends on the use to which the possessor puts it. The emphasis is the possessor or agent not the producer. The producer can produce a piece of technology with good intentions but the wrong possessor or agent can put such technology to bad use. Consider the production of war technology called buffer which was designed to fire at fighter planes. The wrong possessor can used it to fire at land troops. This is the basis of the international fight over technology of nuclear weapon. The whole fight is centered on not allowing weapon of mass destruction in the hands of unjust possessor or agents.

The alarming level of injustice and insecurity demand that Nigerian nation should stop playing the Ostrich. The time has come to quit analogue systems in fighting the war of injustice and insecurity for digital systems. Integrated device technologies should be applied to combat this twin evil that has befallen the contemporary Nigerian nation. This calls for technology adaptation to the Nigerian environment. Technology is environmentally sensitive. This is why every people produce their own technology to suit their environment. It is the reason why technology transfer seems to be a naïve idea from the blues.

Statement of the Problem

Nigeria seats on a gun powder waiting to explode. There terrorist groups hunting the life of Nigerians: Boko Haram and Herdsmen. In addition, each ethnic group maintains its militia arms. These militia arms disrupt economic activities from time to time whereby reducing the productive capacity of the nation especially in the oil sector. The major problem behind the disruptions is injustice. The oil rich East and South feel aggrieved that they are not in control of natural resources of their land. Despite, their oil, unimaginable levels of poverty envelop their people. Oil spillage corrupt their environment. In spite of oil appreciation in the international market, the oil producing states still receive only 13% oil derivation. The possibility of upwards review is not in sight. The oil wells in the East and South are owned by more people from the North by official allocation.

The revocation of these licenses remain a mirage. Government seems to keep deaf ears to the call to make appoint to offices to reflect federal character. This is another source of worry. The lowering of JAMB cut off point for the Northern states portrays a picture of injustice in the eyes of many. The main foundation of injustice is the creation of States which pursue geographical land mass instead of population. The effect is that more States are created in the North than in the South. Along the same line more local governments are created in the North than the South. This means the allocation of federal accounts more money is sent to the North than the South. The same is applicable to federal constituencies. These and others form the basis of the call for restructuring of the nation. Akin to the already mention is that the constitution does not reflect a true federal state. The constitution is doctored to favor Islamic religion in a secular state and the Nigeria currency carry Islamic inscriptions, an indication that Nigerian is an Islamic state. This form the bases of agitations and insecurity. Citizen in response in the bid to register their grievances make the nation insecure. Further source of worry is the level of poverty in Nigeria. In 2018, World Bank records depict Nigeria as the poorest nation of the world. Students finish school without job. This situation creates room for injustice in human relationships and insecurity of life and property.

The greater problem is the real relationship between philosophy of integrated device technologies, injustice and insecurity. Justice and security are democratic ideals. Thus, the problem is the interaction between philosophy of technology on integrated device technologies and politics via democracy. The problems here center on the humanness of people who perpetrate injustice and insecurity in the human society, the loss of dignity which victims of

injustice and insecurity suffer, justification of ethical grounds for the use of integrated device technologies to combat injustice and insecurity, and the overall effects of IDT on human environment and public sphere. These are fundamental problems that cannot be easily wished away.

Concept of Integrated Device Technologies

A well-articulated procedural approach to this theme will first present the meaning of the concept technology. The true meaning of technology eludes precise definition under *genius, differentia ettelos*terms. According to Heidegger, the conception of technology as a means to an end is simply conceiving technology as an instrument. The other conception of technology is that technology is a human activity. Heidegger argues that these two conceptions belong together and can be referred to as: Anthropological-Instrumental conception of technology. Heidegger (4) writes:

> The two definitions of technology belong together. For to posit ends and procure and utilize the means to them is a human activity. The manufacture and utilization of equipment, tools, and machines, the manufactured and used things themselves and the needs and ends they serve, all belong to what technology is. The whole complex of these contrivances is technology. Technology itself is a contrivance, or, in Latin an instrumentum.

The contention of Heidegger is that the Anthropological and Instrumental conception of technology mediates human understanding of technology and conditions human relationship with technology in such a way that humans appear to be un-free and in chains in relating with technology. The real question that can bring humans closer to understanding the concept of technology is what is the essence of technology? In his view, the essence of technology is *enframing*. Enframing is a form of packaging, grid view, external decorations, cosmetic coatings which hide the true nature of what is inside but beautifies the external in such a way that humans get glued to it unreflectively. Ocay Jeffry (55) presents Heidegger's theoretical position on technology as:

> Technology cannot be defined. According to Heidegger, what we understand about technology is only the truth which it has revealed. Technology is simply a "way of revealing, bringing forth of what he calls "standing – reserve", i.e., of truth, of being. Thus, for Heidegger, the best way to approach technology is to attune ourselves to the "Being" of technology

Within the Nigerian circle, Nwachukwu Michael (4) arguing from the views of Van Bronckhorst, conceives technology as the practical application of scientific knowledge in providing solutions to human problems. The problematic nature of this conception is that it makes technology a child of science and seems to justify scientific claims that technology is a necessary environment for the realization of scientific objectives. In the words of William Barrett (22-28), *Technology is embodied technique*. This conception of technology brings out the real relationship between philosophy and technology. Technique is a method, a-know-how about things. It is a recipe that outlines steps to be taken to achieve a set goal. Philosophy is intimation with reality. By dwelling in the world of meditation and imagination, the philosopher raises questions about how to understand the world and other entities therein. The debates and counter debates on the questions generates knowledge and technique of resolving

human problems. Science takes up from here to articulate and test philosophical truths in general principles and technology applies the principles. Thus, both science and technology are offspring of philosophy.

On the other hand, integrated device technologies refer to a number of technologies that are compactable and can work together within a given environment to realize a set goal. A typical example of integrated device technologies is the Integrated Device Technology Assisted System (I.D.T.A.S.) equipment. This device for teaching and learning is a combination of many technologies. It has both in-put and out-put ports, ports for connection to a computer and external projector, internal projector and can support good number of soft wares required for teaching and learning. It is integrated because it can be easily adapted to any environment. Car battery can be used to power it and improvised source of power can be applied to it. In the case of combatting injustice and insecurity, integrated device technologies purposively understood refer to all technologies which are compactable and can work together for the purpose of eradicating and or reducing cases of injustice and insecurity in Nigeria. These devices can be disruptive and innovative. These may include but not restricted to the following: midget, camera pen, camera watch, CCT cameras, giant computer, private computers linked to the giant computer, internet based surveillance systems, tracking systems, mobile phones and advanced explosives.

Philosophy of Technology, Injustice and Insecurity in Nigeria

Philosophy is a revealer. By marveling at the wonder of existence, which is captured in the question: why does reality exist; while it should not have existed, philosophy reveals the truth of being, of the world, of human being, of other beings, and of other entities that exist. The business of philosophy is intimation with truth. Philosophy is as a speculative discipline is a lawgiver that lays down the thought to be in Being-in-the-world. Philosophy of technology fulfills this prescriptive function in relation to technology and micro and macro structures of human society. Within the Nigerian polity, the prophet role of philosophy seems to have waned. It appears there is no prophet-judgment speech to call back the derailing Nigerian society to the road of humanness and civility. Philosophy of technology acts as the umpire between technology and society. In the process of combatting injustice and insecurity in Nigeria can integrated device technologies be ethical right to be used? If they are ethical permissible; what happens to rights of privacy, dignity of life, sacredness of life, human freedom and public sphere.

Injustice is a vice and can be seen as a refusal to give each individual their due as at when due or a neglect of rule of law in a secular state and democratic nation. Chinua Achebe (21-45) discusses injustice in Nigeria within the context of mediocrity. In his work: The Trouble with Nigeria, he focuses on social injustice. Social injustice is fuelled by tribalism in Nigeria. Citizens are appointed to public offices not by merit and certification but by consideration of their tribe. The result is the promotion of grave moral evil. The appointed unqualified mediocre nesses up the office, the Nigerian society suffers the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the mediocre, suffers the anger of the qualified citizens who was rejected on the grounds of where he comes from, endures the decade of the society as a result unjust appointment. Injustice in Nigeria is evident in federal allocations made on the bases of geographical landmarks and not on demographic data. Distributive injustice is also problematic in Nigeria. Employment statistics in the army, Navy, Air Force, Police, Immigration, Road safety, National Youth Service Corp, Independent National Electoral Commission, Customs, Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation and Civil Defense is alarming. Furthermore, if the federal allocation that goes to the all the states and local governments in

the North is added up and compared to what the Southern states and local governments receive, the gap cannot be described otherwise than injustice against the South. And the skewing of the graph in the areas of allocation, employment, contracts, federal appointments, social amenities etcetra in favor of the North form the grounds for insecurity.

Aristotle (1002-1113) in *Nicomachean Ethics* discusses justice and injustice. Justice he sees as a vice, a deprivation of the virtue of justice. Injustice is a deficiency of the good. It is a deviation from the mean and at the extreme left. The case of injustice cannot have a mean. This is why it is always wrong and can never be morally right in any condition. Aristotle believes that injustice is a grasping of the good. The just person is one who keeps the law. Conversely, the unjust person is one who violates the law. In relation to moral act towards neighbor, the unjust man violates the neighbor and indulges in lawlessly conducts. According to Aristotle, just is the complete virtue and in justice all the other virtue are comprehended. In the other hand, injustice is a grave evil against the law, against persons and against properties of people. It is a complete deviation from the good. Injustice is violation of principle of equality (*dichia*). Equality is thought about as the mean between greater and lesser. Unjust actions are actions against the principle of proportionality. The sense of proportionality involves both discrete and continuous proportionality. When exact equality is not absolutely realizable, proportions can be applied to estimate the mean.

There is political justice as when citizens of a nation stand equal before the law, and can rule or be ruled. Political justice demands that each individual counts in the political arrangements of a nation. Political injustice refers to unjust actions against the principle equality of citizens before the law. Political injustice can also be natural as when reasons for inequality are based on natural limitations of certain citizens that may be accidental and not de facto substantial. Political injustice can also be distributive and social.

Injustice breads insecurity. Security is a basic physical need of human being. Insecurity is a threat to thought pattern, emotion and physical stability of human beings. One of the benefits of social contract is security that is one of most important rights of the citizens of a nation. When a nation does not live up to expectation in providing security to her citizens, some citizens form groups both good and bad to defend themselves; while others take to self-defense. The nation may be on her way to a return to the state of nature. This is the case of Nigeria. The horrendous deaths of citizens of Nigeria; since 2015 in Maidugeri, Zamfara, Jos, Ekiti, Benue, Abia, Kogi and other clandestine killings is behind the strong agitation for cessation and even disintegration of the nation.

Discussion of Problems

The whole paper can be reduced to interaction between philosophy, technology and politics. The extent of injustice and insecurity seems to have overwhelmed the political authority. The leverage from technology for combatting injustice and insecurity comes at a high cost that it even endangers the very life and properties it is supposed to conserve. Technological devices like robots as drone then to deskill and even displace soldiers and render them unemployed. These devices as well threaten human environment as when drone become a threat to airbus carrying hundreds of passengers. When such devices are out of use, the constitute menace to environment. The problem of agential factor cannot be ignored. When integrated devices are used to combat injustice and insecurity, definitely human rights are compromised as rights to privacy, rights to life, rights to freedom of association etc. The problem is who takes moral responsibility for the action- the political authority, the citizen's in-charge of the task of providing justice and securing the nation or the devices that did the work. When devices are conceived as agents, the problem of moral culpability remains

unresolved; since devices act as programmed without due knowledge, freedom and voluntariness.

This brings us to a consideration of the views of Herbert Marcuse as presented by Ocay, J.V, (57) that *Technology is 'value-neutral'* because in point of reference to its *telos*, it has no fixed value. *Technology is neither good nor bad*. Any value ascribed to technology depends on the value of the user. This argument is partly in support of use of integrated device technologies to combat injustice and insecurity. In a way, the argument presses on the use of technology products to choose to put them to good use. Thus, evidence for cases of injustice can be generated using integrated device technologies but without humiliating or dehumanizing their dignity as human beings. Integrated device technologies can as well be applied to capture insurgents, terrorists, kidnappers and enemies of the nation with the aim of modifying their behavior for good and not to kill them.

Technology is concerned with human capacities and fulfillment of human life. Politics is concern with protection of human interest and rights through codes and polities. It must be noted that these polities and codes are determined by the technology available at the time. Thus, technology drives politics. This is why human rights and dignity, quality of life depend to a very large extent on technology. Andrew Fleenberg in his work: Questioning Technology concedes Gerald Doppelt position that philosophy of technology has not formulated a good position in debates with political philosophy. Gerald Doppelt criticized Fleenberg on the grounds that philosophy of technology as conceived by fleenberg does not express procedural aspect of democracy and equal rights, and the good. When democratic and equal rights procedures are placed under philosophy of technology's lens, the two concepts wane, fade and become feather weight. Fleenberg (184) queries when we look at freedom as expression of equality, we may ask why is the pursuit of freedom sometimes praised by political society and at other times seen as criminal?When can integrated device technologies be morally right to be applied in the pursuant of freedom? When the citizens of a nation protest against bad governance, the political authority replies with a crackdown of the protest. This protest for freedom from bad government is judged as bad freedom by political authority. The same reaction from political authority is seen when a section of a nation takes to self-determination. The political authority can apply any available technology to crackdown protest for freedom.

The device paradigm of technology mediates human experience of reality. When technological device as tear gas is thrown into a crowd, the security agent does not really perceive the effect of the tear gas on human beings and on each individual in the crowd. In the crowd, there are people with terminal illness, cognitive disorders, eye problems etc. the tear gas device does not allow the security agent to experience the individual differences in the crowd. The political authority that uses bullet proofed car is insulated from direct experience of reality of insecurity which the average citizen face on day to day bases in the nation. This indicates that integrated device technologies multiply problems as it solves problems. Philosophy, technology and politics should work out what Fleenberg called a common substance of life. This can form the ground for debates on the framework of their cooperation in serving the world, beings and human beings in particular.

Conclusion

The interaction between philosophy, technology and politics is an interesting one. The concepts of injustice and insecurity are political concepts on deficiency side. These concepts deviate so much from the mean of what can be called virtue. They are rather vices. These societal vices can be combatted with integrated device technologies but not without problems. There are a number of moral problems to be considered for morally acceptable use of these

technologies to checkmate injustice and insecurity. The Nigerian situation is pathetic. The democratic procedure is sick and reduces democratic ideals to garbage. Technological devices have their shortfall and tender to create further problems while attempting to resolve others. In spite of that, integrated device technologies should be applied to combat injustice and insecurity in the positive sense while holding out the good of human society as the ultimate end of the process.

*Rev. Fr. Izuchukwu I.M. Emeam PhD
AlvanIkoku Federal College of Education Owerri
Email:centiz@yahoo.com

References
Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1941, Bk. 5, in *the Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York: The
        Modern Library.
Achebe, C., The Trouble with Nigeria, 1983, Enugu: Fourth Dimension.
Barrett, W., The Illusion of Technique: A search for Meaning in a Technological Civilization,
        1979, New York: Anchor Press.
Nwachukwu, M. A., *Beyond Teknuzu: Reflections on Igbo Perception and Practice of
        Technology,* (2003) Owerri: Government Press.
Fleenberg, A., *Democratizing Technology: Interests, Codes, rights, The Journal of Ethics,*
        vol.5, No. 2, (2001).   http//www.jstor.org/stable/251/5688, Accessed: 19/07/2012.
Heidegger, M., *The Question Concerning Modern Technology*, 1977, New York: Harper and
        Row.
Ocay, J. V., *Technological Dimension, and The Great Refusal: Marcuse Critique of the
        Advanced Industrial Society*, in *Kritike,* vol.4, no.1, (June, 2010)