



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

An Appraisal of the Concept of Beauty in Immanuel Kant's Philosophy

Michael Sunday Sasa
Department of Philosophy
Veritas University, Abuja.
Email: fantasy1952@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The central argument of this paper is to examine the idea of beauty in Kant's thought. As it were, it is very difficult to have a universally acceptable standard or ground for Aesthetic judgement, it is mostly conceived that, an object of beauty must create attraction and appeal relatively to the human senses. This subjective conceptualization of Beauty has long been contested by philosophers like Plato, who held that Beauty is Objective. Like his contemporaries, Plato's account has failed to resolve the problem of how to determine or adjudge an event, phenomenon, object or art work as beautiful. In this paper, Kant proposes a concept of beauty that goes beyond personal interest, pattern and structure of realities. He observed that if interest, structure and pattern make up beauty, then how would sublimity be achieved, which directs the pleasure principle in watching a pattern? Kant therefore defined beauty in terms of moments of quality, quantity, relation and modality. With these, Kant also conjectured that beauty is a symbol of morality. The conclusion that was reached in this paper is that, if Kant's theory of beauty leads us to morality, then it is also therapeutic for moral crisis in Nigeria and the world at large.

Keywords: Beauty, aesthetics, purposiveness, disinterestedness.

INTRODUCTION

Today, the world is overflowing with many beautiful and ugly things. It is very commonsensical to hear people describe events, places, objects and entities as beautiful. This implies that, there are distinctive attributes and even grades of beauty. Our daily experience of beauty refers us to our own sensation and requires a free play of our imagination. Ibanga declared that "much of humanity is perpetually in search of beauty and the beautiful" (2017, pp. 250). For Greer (1999), "the subject of beauty is critical to many people despite racial, cultural and gender boundaries" (pp. 250). In fact, there is no gain saying that, the beautiful is the bedrock of all religions. Christians, Muslims, Hindus,

Buddhists, Traditional Religions and virtually all men and women of religious affiliations spend a great deal of time and efforts preparing for a beautiful life after death. That is, a transition into a place called Heaven or paradise, which they describe as most *beautiful*. This means that Beauty or the beautiful is an essential and luxurious commodity. But what is Beauty itself?

Godreich declared that, “beauty can neither be reduced to concepts nor can it be determined by interests nor perceived purposes” (2012, pp. 2). Beauty for him is independent of human judgement. The search for the philosophical interpretation of the beautiful traced to antiquity. According to Ibanga, “even long before Thales began to set the path for Western philosophy, all cultures had already started their search for the beautiful” (2017, pp. 250). Grube noted that in the Greek culture, the word “beautiful” referred mainly to physical attractiveness that was anthropocentric (1927, pp. 269). But the concept of beauty did not attract the attention of Western philosophers until Plato. Plato himself probably inherited philosophical discourse of beauty from Socrates (Ibanga 2017, pp. 250). In his dialogues, Plato defines beauty or the beautiful as sublimate, a sublime muse, and harmonious juxtaposition of elements. Sartwell (2012) notes that in the *Symposium* Plato connect a beauty to a response of love and desire, even though he locates beauty in the realms of the Forms; and he identifies the beauty of particular objects in their participation in the Form. Pappas corroborated that in Plato’s thought, “beauty possesses the reality that Forms have and is discovered through the same dialectics that bring other Forms to light” (2018, pp. 1).

Following Plato’s dialogue, the fur began to fly. Aristotle agreed with Plato that beauty is objective rather than subjective to individual experiences, but disagreed on what beauty is, hence he rejected Plato’s theory of Forms of which Plato’s theory of beauty is built. In the *Metaphysics*, Aristotle compared the good and the beautiful stating that, the good and the beautiful are the beginning both of knowledge and the movement of things (Ibanga 2017, pp 250). He defines beauty in terms of appropriateness, symmetry, exactity, and proportionality. He said, “the greatest species of the beautiful are order, symmetry, and the definite” (Barnes 1984, pp. 315). Marshall (1953) notes that, for Aristotle, beauty is cosmic, ontologic – which “in its highest form, it is fixed and eternal. Thus, in the ancient Western world, Plato and Aristotle became prominent aestheticians in who were efforts to encode beauty in morality which of course had cosmic foundations in their thought. According to Ibanga, “their view influenced the philosophies of Plotinus, St. Augustine, and St. Aquinas, Avicenna, Al Ghazzali, and Al Farrabi who used it to justify their escapist philosophy, whereby heaven was created as a beautiful place where people could escape from the vagaries and elements of the world” (2017, pp. 251).

In this paper, the searchlight beams on the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant. His theory of the *beautiful* is represented in *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*. According to Kant “the beautiful is what, without a concept, is liked universally” (2000, pp. 220). This implies that beauty has to be universal. That is to say, what is judged as beautiful should be universalized; such that “in making a judgment of beauty about an object, one takes it that everyone else who perceives the object ought also to judge it to be beautiful, and, relatedly, to share one's pleasure in it” (Ginsborg 2018, pp. 1). This approach bears directly on Kant’s Categorical Imperative which implies universability for every moral judgment.

Hence, Kant declared that, beauty is also a symbol of morality. This paper found Kant's theory relevant to the extent that his recommendations would be therapeutic against decadent behaviour in the society.

AESTHETICS: TOWARDS A DEFINITION

Generally, the concept 'Aesthetics' is a sub-branch of philosophy that investigates art and beauty. In other words, it is the philosophy of art. Karsten Harris (2015) in his work *The History of Aesthetics* maintains that the term 'Aesthetics' generally conceived as the 'Theory of Beauty' has been one of the early pursuits of human mind. The ancient use of the term *aesthetics* is same like its modern sense and it is commonly attributed to Alexander Baumgarten in 1735. Although later studies in the 18th century by writers such as Francis Hutcheson (1738) mark the first systematic inquiry into aesthetics in its familiar sense as a distinct branch of philosophy. Undoubtedly therefore, the 18th century saw the flourishing of inquiries into the notions of beauty, taste, the sublime, and genius, but few would be content to start a history of aesthetics in that century (1938, pp. 67).

KANT'S THEORY OF BEAUTY

Kant began his theory of Beauty by first acknowledging three major human faculties that serve to determine the beautiful. These faculties include; understanding, judgement and reason. Understanding is that capacity that allows us to know the nature of phenomenon and to make a judgement of it. Understanding splits into two capacities but is bound together by imagination. The first capacity is receptive, the second conceptual. Kant calls the receptive capacity "sensibility," and the conceptual capacity "understanding" (Wenzel 2009). As the receptive capacity, sensibility receives information from the external world of experience within time and space. On the other hand, as conceptual capacity, understanding enlists particular intuitions under universal concepts. Intuition here signifies the act of looking at or creating a mental picture of an object (Wenzel 2009).

Concepts allow us to "understand" facts. In other words, without concepts man cannot understand the intuitions that hit our senses. For instance, the "Buckingham Palace" is just a concept that can only be understood with a physical tour to United Kingdom where it is located. Similarly, the concept of "unicorn" remains obscured and masked but helps us to understand the reality of a single-horned mammal. Kant would say; "Concepts without intuitions are empty; intuitions without concepts are blind... only from their union can cognition arise" (Firestone & Palmquist 2006, pp. 44). At the same time, "we can only see the appearances of things, never beyond them" (Manfred 2002, pp. 246).

Kant conjectured that; personal experience is prior to conceptualization of reality. For instance, before one develops a concept of say, "a beautiful tree" one may have experienced it; otherwise, it remains a universal. This allows judgment to experience the supersensible and the sensible as a unity. In that way it bridges understanding and reason together. Thus, when aesthetic judgment reflects on nature, it does not labour to know or to decide. It's relaxed, at rest, on its own. All it's concerned with is taking pleasure in the *purposiveness* in nature. At times rational ideas may come in to help appreciate the way

nature continually creates itself. At other times understanding may come in to appreciate the beautiful e.g of the “Buckingham Palace”, that “unicorn” or that “tree”.

This, Kant called dependent beauty in aesthetic judgment. At this stage, Reason and Understanding are now in the service to judgment. Kant supposes that, “aesthetic judgment” centers on the experiences of the beautiful and the sublime, and those reflections help us produce art. The beautiful corresponds with understanding and imagination. The sublime corresponds with reason and imagination. In fine art, imagination plays a key role alongside both reason and understanding (Firestone& Palmquist 2006, pp. 63-65). From these preliminaries, Kant organized the analytic of the beautiful into four “moments” of quality, quantity, relation and modality. Kant thought he could display how beauty is universal and at the same time, “in the eye of the beholder” using an *a priori* principle.

i. Quality: Disinterested Interest

Kant (2001) chose to begin his analytic with “quality” for the reason that our experience of beauty starts with disinterested interest. According to Firestone& Palmquist (2006, pp. 72). “interest means “I want” an object, it involves desire, while disinterest means “not wanting an object”. The experience and judgement of the beautiful, then entails pleasure (interest) yet not needing to “have” the object of beauty (disinterest). Kant reasoned that, Beauty also entails disinterest because it can refer to a real thing in nature (e.g Mkar Hills) or a thing that doesn’t exist but is imagined (three-headed monster).

From Kant’s moment of *Quality*, it’s noticeable that an “inclination” or “personal preference”, is in the eye of the beholder. For instance, a personal preference for red apple or roasted fish is the outcome of a personal desire; it’s not valid for all humans. Similarly, any predilection of Leonardo Da Vinci’s “The Last Supper” among many other ancient paintings is a personal desire that is not convincing for all humans. On the contrary, disinterested interest allows beauty to be universal. Rather than by intellectualizing or conceptualizing, the beautiful and the ugly are discerned through a feeling of either pleasure or displeasure, which remains subjective. The pleasure in beauty does not need to possess.

The beautiful, though, does not need any concepts to please us. It doesn’t have to agree with our pleasure of taste, vision, or sound. For instance, one may prefer green apples to red apples; another may prefer “The Blue Skies” to “The Last Supper” etc. Again, beauty of a thing is not about achieving the Good. Aimless lines, shapes, arrangements, rhythms can please without knowing what its goal is. So, the beautiful does not need a real object. Instead of desire, only the feelings of pleasure or displeasure are deployed. Man doesn’t need to possess or consume an object as with the agreeable; its needless to act to achieve a goal as in the good. The beautiful is both intellectual like the good and sensible like the agreeable, but there’s no inclination to have. Kant’s first moment of beauty then is the observation that humanity finds pleasure in beauty without needing to possess it.

ii. Quantity: Universal yet Subjective

In many ways, the second moment of beauty is related to the first. To make our judgement valid, Kant proposed that every person have to agree with one's judgment of beauty (Atalay 2007, pp. 44). Nonetheless, their various, individual judgments must come from within their own Subject too. It relates to quantity in that every individual (i.e. quantity) must agree on what's beautiful, without being told "that's beautiful". In other words, each person must come to the "conclusion" on their own that, "red apples" are sweetest fruits or that "The Last Supper" is the most beautiful painting. If a person was to be told to "believe" that "Buckingham Palace" in the United Kingdom was beautiful, without experience and personal evaluation, the aesthetic judgment about Tortiv Palace would then remain unreal (Kant 2000, pp. 55-58).

Kant remarked that, even though beauty is subjective and personal, it must also agree with every other person. Quantity is linked with quality because the way this "universal yet subjective" judgment is possible is through *disinterested* interest. To say "honey is beautiful to me" is an incorrect use of the term "beautiful", for Kant. If something were truly beautiful, it must not only be true of one person, but for *all* persons. Otherwise, the term "beauty" wouldn't be necessarily needed. It would refer to nothing, if everyone simply had their own preferences. Therefore, the claim that "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" as if it's a personal preference, is outrightly erroneous (Kant 2000, pp. 55-58).

Amoroso (2017) further explained that, when we say "that's beautiful," we speak as if beauty were a property of a thing. It's not. For Kant, here's where "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" has a sound point. Beauty must be subjective like the agreeable. Again, regurgitating an authority figure's concept of what's beautiful means a person hasn't had a subjective experience of beauty (Amoroso 2017, pp. 75). On a final analysis, Beauty must be a subjective feeling of pleasure, yet paradoxically it's a subjective feeling shared with *every* person. That's the point of the second moment. The beautiful must be beautiful for every person, regardless of the *a posteriori* conceptual rules (and perhaps bias) in vogue of a culture. This allows us to judge more accurately what's universally beautiful.

iii. Relation: Purposiveness without Purpose

Kant (2001) defines purpose as striving towards an end. Similar to Plato and Aristotle's "The Good," the ground of all nature is directed to The Good, i.e., an end desired not for-the-sake-of something else but for-itself. The Good is the final *telos* (goal) on which all other goods (or ends) depend. In fact, Meredith translates "purpose" and "purposiveness" as "final" and "finality" respectively (Amoroso 2017, pp. 82). In any event, if purpose is an end, then where there's purpose there's a will, or the faculty of desire. That is, purpose is a desire to get to that end.

Kant's third moment of beauty explains what's happening in the entity, phenomenon or object that causes us to feel pleasure. Kant was convinced that beauty isn't a property of the object; hence, this third moment is concerned with what goes on in an object that makes men feel disinterested interest. By implication, Kant sets to demonstrate

how beauty is universal, yet a subjective experience. The moment of relation projects an idea that there's something beyond the appearance of a thing.

Alternatively, Kant rephrased this by saying that, what causes us to feel that a thing is beautiful (disinterested interest) is that, we perceive in the form of an object, its purpose but we don't know what its purpose is (2001, pp. 55-58). So, here's the third paradox of beauty: beauty is both purposive and without purpose. Meaning, man relates to an object's purpose, without knowing its explicit purpose. Purposive instead means to look at an object as it is, not as an object to know or to use. When we use aesthetic judgment to reflect on an object's beauty, we get close to seeing it as a "thing-in-itself". So, one can either approach an object as purposive, or some objects have the form of purposiveness and awaken aesthetic judgment within us.

iv. Modality: Common Sense

Modality is a rational taxonomy that asserts or denies the possibility or impossibility, contingency or the necessity of a proposition. Kant's fourth moment claims the mode of beauty is *necessary*, but beauty has a special kind of necessity. According to Kant, beauty is necessary in the sense that if a person describes something as beautiful, everyone *ought* to agree (Atalay 2007, pp. 48). The universal agreement does not derive from concepts or from experience. Everyone must agree on their own volition. Each person feels disinterested pleasure without being told. Beauty is aesthetically necessary because it makes a person aware of the purposive form in an object.

Again, acquiescing to beauty is subjective but it's necessarily universal. According to Kant, being a real communal sense is a possibility only in regard to taste. *Sensus communis*, which is a subjective principle, operates as a universal taste (Alison 2001, pp. 144). In other words, beauty is not a private feeling, but a public feeling. In fact, the necessity of beauty says more about us humans than an "object" of beauty. It says an aesthetic judgment is a "common sense". Common sense here does not imply logic or knowledge. Kant calls it "common understanding." For Kant, common sense means every human has an aesthetic ability that operates in the same way. It entails that every human being can sense beauty, as if the ability to see beauty is part of our hardware as human beings (Alison 2001, pp. 145-147). "Common sense" belongs to each human because the faculties of understanding, imagination, and sensibility are involved, and those faculties are present in *every* human *a priori*. So, the existence of "common sense" hinges on the universality of understanding and imagination, and the free play between them. To be human is to have an aesthetic sense. To be human is to sense the supersensible underlying the sensible realm (Kant 2000, pp. 59-60).

Summarily, Kant's four moments set limitations on aesthetic judgments. The first limitation is that aesthetic judgments must involve no self-interest. The second limitation is that, aesthetic judgments must be universal yet subjective. It's a subjective feeling that doesn't look through the lens of a concept yet it's a feeling that also belongs to every person. The third limitation is that the object's form seems like it has purpose but it's a purpose that is neither known, nor be used. The fourth limitation is that the beautiful is an aesthetic instinct or "common sense" every human has. All men have the ability *a priori* to see beauty, even if self-interest might sometimes blind them to it.

UNDERSTANDING BEAUTY AS A SYMBOL OF MORALITY

Kant (2000) declared that beauty is a symbol of morality. He describes symbols as a “presentation” or a sensible illustration. Symbols are representations or analogy of reality. Kant maintained that, the beautiful belongs to the realm of intuitions but points us toward something higher than mere intuitions. Through beautiful intuitions, we’re elevated above mere sensibility, above mere self-interested pleasure, above mere impressions. Beauty, like a sign, something visible to all individuals, is like an arrow pointing up (or down towards the depths, i.e., whatever is beyond appearance) (Amoroso 2017, pp.117).

Accordingly, the beautiful links understanding and reason together. In other words, aesthetic judgment brings our higher cognitive faculties into accord. Aesthetic judgments don’t separate understanding and reason from each other. Man relies on understanding to focus on external phenomena and often shut off reason (to stay close to evidence). In ethics, man relies more on reason, focus on internal freedom (or noumena) to transcend “scientific” understanding (and evidence) (Amoroso 2017, pp. 118). But in reflective judgment, understanding, reason, and judgment are all on the same accord. When the faculty of judgment isn’t working to understand or isn’t working for reason to see beyond, but works for itself on its own terms, aesthetic judgment neither tries to determine nature nor determine the right course of action (Alison 2001, pp. 211). Yet it includes both external nature and internal freedom. So, in beauty humanity experiences the supersensible and the sensible bound into one, a single unity. Phenomena and noumena are no longer dichotomous. Neither are reason and understanding shut off from each other.

As noted earlier, beauty cannot be based on experience, because each person has different experiences from each other. Kant is after something universal that precedes experience. In this way judgment is like reason as reason also gives the law to itself to allow us to act ethically. Ethics like Beauty is universal and are determined through rational judgement. The beautiful pleases without interest. Like morality, we drop our self-interest in moments of the beautiful.

The beautiful frees our imagination and understanding. In the beautiful one experiences a freedom that’s similar to the freedom underlying Kant’s categorical imperative. When humans free themselves from self-interest, they become freer human beings. Just that, where the freedom of the will is in harmony with the universal moral laws of reason in morality, it’s the imagination that’s free, in accord with understanding in the beautiful and with reason in the sublime. The beautiful is valid for every human even though it’s also subjective. Similarly, the moral law of reason is universal and valid for every human, as the categorical imperative is universal but the choice is always a subjective one.

The beautiful, then, operates like morality. Even more, the beautiful prepares us for a moral state-of-mind (Dadosky 2007). Disinterested interest puts aside self-gratification in the same way that following the categorical imperative does. Beauty excites us, in a way analogous with a moral state-of-mind. Disinterested interest “pays attention to” the sensible realm without needing to self-satisfy. This allows us to transition from the realm of sense to the supersensible realm of morality “without too violent a leap”

(Kant 2000, pp. 59) as Kant says. Once again, beauty in nature and in fine art produce a mind-state we can take into our relationships, as well as our polity.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF KANT'S THEORY OF BEAUTY

The theory of Beauty Kant proposed is not without flaws. For instance, the first moment of quality allows judgement only on the grounds of disinterested interest. This means that our judgement of beauty must not be based on personal desire or affections. But, how can we adjudge things beautiful without interest? Besides, the general concept of the beautiful does not suggest disinterestedness as Kant wants us to believe. How can the entire human race withdraw self-interest to affirm the beauty of say, "Buckingham Palace" to qualify it? Then of what use is beauty if we cannot describe it? In the second moment of quantity, Kant tells us that all aesthetic judgements must be universal. This paper observed that, to base judgement on universal affirmation means that judgement is impossible. It could take an infinite time to come across any beautiful thing at all, because of the vast nature of humanity. Again, Kant's third moment of purposiveness directs our attention to the *teleos*, the end or essences of things. But there is no guarantee that all ends, essences or *teleos* must be beautiful. What if the end of atomic bomb is simply to end human life? This paper found that these few points delimited Kant's account of the beautiful.

Apart from the fallbacks acknowledged above, Kant's thought remains relevant. First, our aesthetic judgement must be selfless, 'subjectively universal'; purposive without purpose, and must be based of 'common sense'. Kant moved further to identify beauty as a symbol of morality. He thinks that a "purposive" object symbolizes morality. Thus, reducing beauty to morality, i.e., beauty is really a moral good. That is, a beautiful object symbolizes good (free) will, what's beyond appearance or the supersensible, where freedom resides. The beautiful reality allows us to taste what freedom may be like even though the object is sensible and could be determined (e.g a beautiful garden could create a feeling of love and affection). That's why the term "purposive" is so crucial to Kant's aesthetics. Purposive means a beautiful reality can be used as an object with purpose in the phenomenal world or it can be known. But when we judge an object is beautiful, we refrain from using it or knowing it. A purposive object then becomes like morality where we respect a thing as an end rather than as a means. As purposive, a beautiful object stands for both the sensible and the supersensible realms at the same time.

From the perspective that purposiveness of beauty promotes goodness (moral), Kant's theory of beauty retains a great deal of relevance. In Nigeria, people chase after beauty and goodness in life (a balanced life) but their pursuit fails in translating to moral good that Kant describes here. For instance, the problem of moral decay has had unimaginable consequences on the society. It is no gainsaying that decadent behaviour has caused the challenge of insecurity and civil unrest in Nigeria to a deplorable dimension. After independence, the nation passed through series of military coup and a civil war, and in the past few decades, there emerged new forms of civil unrest; Religious extremists and fundamentalists (Boko Haram, Shi'ites etc), armed gangs, cattle herders and ethnic militia groups. Udoh corroborated that "armed groups have intensified their activities of terror" (2015, pp. 2). Imhonopi and Urim (2012) specified the number of

violent crimes to include; kidnapping, rape, cultism, drug abuse, ritual killings, carjackings, suicide bombing, religious killing, politically-motivated killing and election violence, ethnic clashes, armed banditry and others. This has increasingly become the regular signature that characterises life in Nigeria since 2009. This has indeed overwhelmed the poor citizens who are truly vulnerable and defenseless.

Like the adage that “there is no smoke without fire”, researchers have deduced several factors observed to be responsible for decadent behaviour in Nigeria. This paper envisages an uncompromising search for the highest *Good* as the cause. Whether moral decadence is caused by unemployment, corruption, illiteracy, and other economic leakages, the bottom line is that, the people desire better conditions of life. Contrary to Aristotle’s view that, “well-being, or happiness, is the highest good for people, and in order to achieve this, a virtuous character is necessary” (Karuzis, 2015, pp. 1-2), many people chose vices. While every citizen desires a good life, how to achieve it is not defined. Those that perpetrate evil such as, the rapists, hired assassins, thieves, bandits, armed robbers, political thugs or kidnappers, if asked, will sure admit that their actions is circumscribed around creating and promoting a *good life* for themselves. This means, they only chose a wrong alternative to the end they seek. Hence, this paper argued that, if our society is guided by Kant’s recommendations, decadence will be lessened.

On the question of the beautiful, Plato would say that “everything that is good is beautiful and everything that is beautiful is good” (Crowther 2016, pp. 133). Kant famously went beyond Plato, to propose that “beauty is really a moral good”. This implies that, when people conceive beauty in a course of action (e.g rape, murder, thuggery, robbery, banditry, cultism etc), it must be from a disinterested interest, ‘subjectively universal’, purposive without purpose and must ensue from ‘common sense’. If the above does not apply, then our actions have to be corrected. In other words, the criteria for determining beauty should guide our moral behaviour as well; hence beautiful actions are also moral good. For instance, a kidnapper who desires a good life and finds beauty in the kidnapping business must first, withdraw his interest; consider the universality of the act, the purpose of human freedom and its commonality (i.e general acceptability).

Understanding beauty from the perspective of purpose directs our attention to the essence of the beautiful itself. Similarly, morality has to be understood within this same universal context. Thus, the desire for the greatest *Good*, as in the case with bandits, rapists, armed robbers etc, should not be narrowed to the individual good alone which is detrimental but to everyone. In other words, perpetrators of decadent acts would see beauty beyond their immediate selfish needs. Accepting with Kant that beauty leads to moral goodness, the society would understand that, the path to one’s “cherished good” is in fact evil. Hence, decadent behaviour is unacceptable in the society. When weighed on Kant’s scale, it neither lead to good life (universally) nor is it beautiful (practically).

CONCLUSION

This paper examined the theory of beauty or the beautiful in Kant’s philosophy. Kant indicated that Aesthetic judgement is built on three human faculties of understanding, judgement and reason. In these, Kant defined the beautiful as moments of quality, quantity, relation and modality. In these moments, Kant proposed that our

aesthetic judgement must be based on disinterested interest, subjective universality, purposiveness without purpose, and on common sense. Hence, the Kant conception of beauty means that whatever is judged as beautiful must not be socially disharmonious, but it must also enhance community balance. The functional conception of beauty implies that beauty, must serve to lead to some purpose. Kant also associated beauty with the development of moral awareness; there is no beauty for beauty's sake, it must serve some good. This paper found out that, Kant's theory of Beauty did not only take the debate beyond his contemporaries, he also demonstrated that beauty is a symbol of morality. Therefore, it is worthy to conclude here that Kant's theory of beauty remains imperative in lessening the scourge of moral decadence in the society.

REFERENCES

- Alison, H. (2001) E. *Kant's Theory of Taste: A Reading of the Critique of Aesthetic Judgement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Amoroso, J. P. (2017). "Kant on The Beautiful". *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. The University of Maine, 2017. <http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd/2677>
- Aristotle, (1984). *Metaphysics*, trans. W. D. Ross, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, Vol. 2. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Atalay M. (2007). "Kant's Aesthetic Theory: Subjectivity vs. Universal Validity" in *Percipi* 1. Stanford University.
- Barnes, J. (1984). *The Complete Works of Aristotle. (The Revised Oxford Translation)* 2 vols. Princeton University Press.
- Ginsborg, H. (2018). Kant's Aesthetics and Teleology. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Feb. 13, 2018. <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-aesthetics/#2.1>
- Godreich O. (2012) *Lessons from Kant: On Knowledge, Morality, and Beauty*. Israel: Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot.
- Greer, G. (1999). *The Whole Woman*. London: Transworld Publishers.
- Grube, G. M. A. (1927). Plato's Theory of Beauty. *The Monist*, 37(2).
- Hutcheson, F. (1738). *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. 4th ed. London.
- Ibanga, D. (2017). The Concept of Beauty in African Philosophy. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 10(7).
- Ikuenobe, P. (2016). Good and Beautiful: A Moral-Aesthetic View of Personhood in African Communal Traditions. *Essays in Philosophy*, 17(1).
- Imhonopi, D. & Urim, U. M. (2012). "The Spectre of Terrorism and Nigeria's Industrial Development: A Multi-Stakeholder Imperative". *The Nigerian Anthropological and Sociological Association (NASA)*. Awka: Nnamdi Azikiwe University, November,.
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. New York: Cambridge.
- Karsten H. (2015). *Principles of Philosophy*. Translated by John Veitch. *Online Distributed Proofreading Team*. <http://www.fullbooks.com/The-Principles-of-Philosophy1.html>.
- Karuzis J. (2015). "On Proper Action and Virtue: An Essay on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*". Hokkaido University, Japan

- Manfred K. (2002). *Kant: A Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, J. S. (1953). Art and Aesthetic in Aristotle. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 12(2).
- Pappas, N. (2018). Plato's Aesthetics. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-aesthetics>
- Carus, P. (1997). "Kant's Philosophy" in *Prolegomena by Immanuel Kant*. Chicago: Open Court Classics .
- Sartwell, C. (2012). *Beauty*. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Sept. 4, 2012. <http://www.plato.stanford.edu/edu/entries/beauty>
- Ted C. (1982). "Why Beauty Is A Symbol of Morality," in *Essays in Kant's Aesthetics*, Ted Cohen and Paul Guyer, ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Udoh, E. W. (2015). "Insecurity in Nigeria: Political, Religious and Cultural Implications" *Journal of Philosophy, Culture and Religion: An International Peer-reviewed Journal*, 5(1).