Existentia: Concrescence Journal of Arts and Humanities
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 36-45
©: B. Michael & T. E. Igyom
https://doi.org/10.68251/ecojah.v2.i1.4

BRIDGING SOCIAL DIVIDES THROUGH THE LENS OF PHILOSOPHY: UNDERSTANDING OTHERS BEGINS WITH QUESTIONING OURSELVES

Benedict Michael Ph.D
Department of Philosophy,
Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria
benmike3@gmail.com, bmichael@bsum.edu.ng

Terzungwe Emmanuel Igyom
Department of Philosophy
Benue State University, Nigeria
emmanueligyom@gmail.com

Abstract

In an era marked by polarization and deepening social divides, fostering understanding across differences has become a pressing challenge. This paper explores how philosophical inquiry can serve as a powerful tool for bridging these divides by emphasizing self-reflection and critical questioning. Drawing from traditions such as existentialism, phenomenology, and dialogical ethics, the study argues that understanding others begins with interrogating our assumptions, biases, and worldviews. By examining the role of empathy, recognition, and the capacity for dialogic engagement, the paper highlights how philosophy encourages individuals to transcend narrow perspectives and appreciate the complexity of others' experiences. Furthermore, it underscores the transformative potential of questioning as a means of cultivating humility and fostering genuine connection. Through this lens, the paper seeks to demonstrate how philosophical practices can be applied to real-world contexts, offering pathways to reduce conflict, build mutual respect, and create inclusive communities. Ultimately, it suggests that bridging social divides is not merely about understanding others but about a deeper, on-going journey of self-discovery and ethical engagement.

Keywords: Social Divides, Philosophy, Bridging, Self, Other

Existentia: Concrescence Journal of Arts and Humanities
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 36-45
©: B. Michael & T. E. Igyom
https://doi.org/10.68251/ecojah.v2.i1.4

Introduction

In an era marked by increasing polarization, understanding the roots of social divides has never been more pressing. From political disagreements to cultural misunderstandings, the chasms that separate individuals and communities often stem from a lack of empathy and self-awareness. Bridging these divides requires a multidimensional approach that not only seeks to understand others but also compels individuals to reflect on their own beliefs, biases, and assumptions. Philosophy, as a discipline that prioritizes critical thinking and self-examination, offers a powerful framework for addressing this challenge. By fostering a deeper understanding of ourselves, philosophy creates opportunities to engage meaningfully with others, facilitating dialogue and reducing alienation. Philosophy's emphasis on self-questioning has been central to its teachings for millennia. Socrates, often regarded as the father of Western philosophy, famously proclaimed that an unexamined life is not worth living (Plato 38a). This call to introspection serves as a foundational principle for bridging social divides, as it encourages individuals to critically evaluate their own values, prejudices, and motivations. Through such reflection, people become more open to the perspectives of others, fostering mutual understanding and reducing the tendency to dismiss or demonize those who hold different beliefs. At the heart of this process lies the recognition of shared humanity. Philosophers like Martin Buber and Emmanuel Levinas have emphasized the relational nature of human existence. Buber's concept of the *I-Thou* relationship highlights the importance of treating others as subjects rather than objects, emphasizing genuine encounters that transcend superficial judgments (78). Levinas further deepens this perspective by asserting that ethical responsibility begins with acknowledging the face of the other, which demands a response grounded in respect and care (50). These philosophical insights underscore the idea that understanding others is not merely a cognitive exercise but an ethical imperative rooted in the very fabric of human interaction. Contemporary philosophers also contribute valuable perspectives to the discourse on social divides. For instance, Martha Nussbaum's capabilities approach challenges individuals to consider what others need to flourish, thereby promoting empathy and justice (Nussbaum 35). Similarly, Kwame Anthony Appiah advocates for *cosmopolitan urging individuals to balance respect for cultural diversity with a commitment to universal values* (151). However, the journey to bridging divides begins with the self. As John Stuart Mill observed, "He who knows only his own side of the case knows little of that" (50). Engaging with opposing viewpoints not only broadens one's understanding but also reveals the limitations of one's perspective. This intellectual humility is crucial for constructive dialogue, as it shifts the focus from winning arguments to seeking truth.

In today's fractured social landscape, the need for philosophical inquiry is more urgent than ever. By encouraging individuals to question themselves and embrace the perspectives of others, philosophy offers a path toward greater empathy, understanding, and unity. It reminds us that bridging social divides is not merely a matter of resolving external conflicts but of transforming the way we think about ourselves and our place in the world. As Alain de Bottonaptly notes, "Philosophy's task is to help us grow kinder, calmer, and more capable of love" (12). Such growth is the cornerstone of building bridges in a divided society. Thus, this paper seeks to explore how philosophy provides a vital lens for examining and addressing the social divides of our time. In fostering introspection, promoting empathy, and encouraging

ethical engagement with others, philosophy equips individuals to navigate the complexities of human relationships.

Understanding Social Divides

Social divides refer to significant and often systemic separations or disparities within a society, typically based on socioeconomic, cultural, racial, or political differences. These divides manifest as barriers to equality, inclusivity, and shared prosperity, often leading to unequal access to resources, opportunities, and privileges. Sociologists and policymakers frequently analyze these divides to understand the underlying causes of inequality and identify potential pathways toward social cohesion. Social divides are not static; they are influenced by historical, economic, and political contexts and can shift over time. Pierre Bourdieu highlighted how power dynamics and resources such as cultural capital play a pivotal role in reinforcing divides (241). For instance, those with access to higher education may secure better jobs and social networks, perpetuating a cycle of privilege. Understanding social divides necessitates exploring not only their visible manifestations but also their roots in societal structures and practices. Social divides include:

Economic Divides: Economic divides often centre on disparities in wealth, income, and access to economic resources. For example, the gap between the wealthiest and poorest individuals in many nations continues to widen. In the United States, the top 1% of earners control more than 30% of the nation's wealth, while the bottom 50% own just 2% (Saez and Zucman 47). These divides can lead to unequal access to housing, healthcare, and education, perpetuating poverty cycles. Globally, economic divides are also evident between developed and developing countries, where differences in GDP, industrialization, and access to international markets contribute to inequality.

Racial and Ethnic Divides: Racial and ethnic divides are among the most visible and deeply entrenched social divides. These disparities often stem from historical injustices such as colonialism, slavery, and institutional racism. For instance, in South Africa, the legacy of apartheid has resulted in persistent socioeconomic divides between Black South Africans and white South Africans (Seekings and Nattrass 123). In the United States, systemic racism has contributed to disparities in incarceration rates, income levels, and educational attainment between racial groups (Alexander 56).

Educational Divides: Education often reflects and reinforces social divides. Access to quality education is a key determinant of social mobility, yet many communities face significant barriers. For example, children in underfunded public schools often lack the resources and opportunities available to their peers in affluent neighbourhoods. According to UNESCO, nearly 244 million children and youth worldwide are out of school, with the majority concentrated in low-income regions (UNESCO). These divides often intersect with economic and racial disparities, compounding their effects.

Digital Divides: The digital divide refers to unequal access to technology and the internet, creating gaps in opportunities for education, employment, and communication. In rural areas and low-income communities, individuals lack reliable internet access or digital literacy skills, putting them at a disadvantage in an increasingly digital world. For example, during the COVID-

19 pandemic, students without access to online learning resources faced significant setbacks compared to their digitally connected peers (Anderson and Kumar 45).

Gender Divides: Gender-based social divides are deeply rooted in societal norms, cultural practices, and legal frameworks. Women often face systemic barriers to achieving parity in education, employment, and political representation. For instance, in many parts of the world, women earn less than men for the same work, with the global gender pay gap estimated at 20% (ILO 33). Additionally, gender divides intersect with other forms of inequality, such as race and class, further marginalizing women from disadvantaged groups.

Political Divides: Political divides often arise from ideological differences, partisanship, and polarized media. These divides can hinder collaboration and governance, creating gridlock in democratic systems. In recent years, many countries have experienced rising political polarization, with individuals increasingly aligning along ideological lines, leading to fragmented societies. For example, in the United States, the divide between conservatives and liberals has grown, influencing debates on issues such as healthcare, climate change, and immigration (Pew 55).

Psychological Division: The *us vs. them* mentality drives much of the division we experience. In-group/out-group dynamics, as studied in social psychology, reveal how people tend to favour those who align with their identities while alienating others. This *us vs them* mentality is compounded by confirmation bias, where individuals selectively seek information that supports their existing beliefs, further entrenching divides (Tajfel and Turner 43).

The Role of Philosophy in Addressing Division

Philosophy plays a pivotal role in addressing societal divisions by encouraging individuals to examine their beliefs and engage in constructive dialogue critically. Rooted in inquiry and reason, philosophy seeks to uncover the underlying causes of conflict and propose pathways toward understanding and reconciliation. By challenging entrenched ideologies, promoting self-reflection, and fostering dialogue, philosophy serves as a vital tool for bridging divides. Philosophers often challenge ingrained tendencies toward division by emphasizing the importance of critical thinking. Through questioning assumptions, individuals are invited to consider perspectives beyond their own, cultivating a more inclusive mindset. Socrates, regarded as one of the foundational figures in Western philosophy, epitomized this approach. His declaration that *an unexamined life is not worth living* underscores the necessity of self-reflection and intellectual honesty (38a). This ethos invites individuals to interrogate their biases and preconceptions, laying the groundwork for greater understanding, empathy and dialogue.

Dialogue, a cornerstone of philosophical practice, plays a crucial role in mitigating division. Philosophers from various traditions have recognized the power of open communication in resolving conflicts. For example, the Socratic Method, characterized by asking probing questions to stimulate critical thinking, encourages interlocutors to engage deeply with opposing viewpoints. By doing so, it transforms conversations into collaborative efforts to uncover truth rather than adversarial debates. Similarly, Jürgen Habermas, a contemporary philosopher, highlights the importance of communicative rationality, where participants engage in dialogue with mutual respect and a commitment to understanding (89). Such

practices can help dismantle the barriers that perpetuate division, fostering a sense of shared humanity.

On the other hand, theories of justice, as articulated by figures like John Rawls, provide a basis for equitable social arrangements. Rawls' principle of justice as fairness, encapsulated in his veil of ignorance thought experiment, challenges individuals to consider societal organization without knowledge of their status, thereby promoting impartiality (118). This thought experiment encourages societies to design institutions that minimize inequality and foster inclusion.

From ethical perspective, philosophy addresses the moral dimensions of division through ethical theories, such as utilitarianism and deontology which offer insights into the moral obligations individuals and communities have toward one another. For instance, Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative calls for actions to be guided by principles that could be universally applied, advocating for respect and dignity for all individuals (4:421). By appealing to universal moral principles, philosophy transcends cultural and ideological boundaries, providing common ground for addressing division. In contemporary contexts, philosophy remains relevant in tackling issues of polarization and social fragmentation. Philosophers like Martha Nussbaum emphasize the role of emotions in shaping human interactions and advocate for cultivating empathy and compassion as tools for bridging divides (31). Her work illustrates how philosophical inquiry can address not only rational but also emotional aspects of division, highlighting the complexity of human relationships.

Bridging Divides through Philosophical Frameworks

There are several ways in which philosophy helps in bridging divides, these includes empathy, challenging entrenched ideologies, and encouraging or mutual dialogue. Empathy is one of the first and most potent ways of bridging social divides. There are several ways of looking at the concept of empathy in the domain of philosophy; first it is seen as a phenomenon in philosophy of mind, as a phenomena it looks at how others are considered from the perspective of the self. Jean Paul Sartre contends in his existentialist philosophy underscores the responsibility individuals have in shaping their perspectives and actions. By recognizing the other as an equal subject rather than an adversary, existentialism encourages empathy and accountability in bridging divides (49).

Another method of bridging divides is through mutual dialogue. The concept of mutual dialogue was put forward by pragmatic school especially by John Dewey who in his deliberative reflective moralistic theory identified some moralistic ethos which includes trust, mutual cooperation, dialogue and tolerance (12). Dewey conceives of the value of trust as the value that encompasses other values such as mutual dialogue, social cooperation, and tolerance. He traces the origin of trust to his conception of epistemic instrumentalism and in his reflective value of democracy and believes that, the value of trust is crucial for the establishment of social order in which people can act responsibly and intelligently (15). And that the cultivation of trust in the society is necessary because it ensure the strong ties and the adherence to commonly accepted values. He believed that the value of trust is central in maintaining the dignity and responsibility of the human person (21). Trust ensures that mutual dialogue is fruitful, through dialogue the individuals or their representatives and the various

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 36-45
©: B. Michael & T. E. Igyom
https://doi.org/10.68251/ecojah.v2.i1.4

sector of the jointly negotiate the basis of their conception of certain values and common good and device the rules for mutual cooperation and commitment.

The argument here is that, Dewey conceives of trust as the basis upon which democracy is possible in a democratic society, accordingly, dialogue provides the platform for consideration of relevant experiences and formation of better values and legitimate policies to ensure a just and fair opportunity for human interactions. Through the value of trust, dialogue and the sharing of experiences facilitates the conduct of interpersonal relations in an atmosphere of fair recognition of the worth, and contribution of each person to the communities pool for social good. Mutual dialogue and trust he further argued are essential for social harmony and peaceful existence since men live in community in virtue of things which they have in common. For there to be trust and agreement between people in the community there should be room for dialogue. This is precisely because dialogue militates against those feelings of isolation, frustration, mistrust, injustice and oppression that arise in a political society which affects individuals. Dialogue implies an acceptance of pluralism and the need for tolerance and respect for the views of others. It recognizes the possibility of various approaches to the resolution of differences, this in turn create room for tolerance. By implication, the acceptance of pluralism implies recognition of a rational cogency of various openness and complementary reflection on problematic situation so as to provide better salutary method.

Another framework is referred to as social fragmentation and engagement. Philosophy involves with issues of social fragmentation in various ways, in recent times as expressed by Paul de Man's assertion that philosophy is "an endless reflection on its own destruction at the hands of literature" captures this shift. By embracing deconstructive inquiry, philosophy is compelled to question its foundational assumptions, fostering introspection that strengthens its capacity to address complex social issues. In this self-critical light, philosophy mirrors literature's interpretive openness and inexhaustible reading practices, embracing Barthes' ethos of the "*writerly text*" as it moves away from the prescriptive "*readerly text*." This allows philosophy to examine and dismantle its own paradigms, enhancing its responsiveness to human complexities with agility and empathy (2). In the same light Lyotard's concept of the "loss of metanarratives" challenges the overarching, universalizing conception that was once provided as the basis of coherence to society, advocating instead for localized society, plural narratives that reflect diverse experiences and perspectives as seen by John Dewey.

The concept of polarity, universality and individualism was seen by Adorno's "negative dialectics" calls for a rejection of simplified synthesis, insisting that philosophy must remain open to contradiction and tension rather than resolving them into harmonious conclusions. Both thinkers exemplify how philosophical inquiry can critically engage with and deconstruct its own foundational assumptions, fostering a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of the world.

Building Empathy through Philosophical Frameworks

While philosophers throughout history have paid attention to various issues, they have explored the questions of empathy, the dignity of the human person, social divisions, and care for the other. Empathy is morally significant because it plays an important role in informing our moral deliberations. Empathy is thought of not as an alternative to rational deliberation

about how we are to act, but rather as an important input into such deliberation. Thus, within philosophy are frameworks that can deepen our understanding of empathy's mechanisms and applications in human interactions.

Immanuel Kant in his *Metaphysics of Morals* and the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals,* through rational reflection, seeks to establish the principle of morality. He stated in his notion of duty that we should act from the point of duty. By thus Kant means acting *from good will*." A good will is good not because of what it effects or accomplishes because of its fitness for attaining some proposed end" (28), that is, it is good through its willing alone that is, good in itself (29). It is also good without qualification. Kant thinks that any act like which is performed despite conflicting desires are due to the good will. To act from good will is acting for the sake of duty. We act despite our desires to do otherwise. For Kant this means that acting for the sake of duty is the only way that an action can have moral worth. Kant's ethical framework emphasizes treating individuals as ends in themselves, rather than as means to an end. By recognizing the intrinsic value of others, we can approach social interactions with respect and dignity, laying the groundwork for mutual understanding (30).

John Stuart Mill in his conception of utilitarianism and the common good, following the **c**lassical utilitarian theories is characterized by the basic premise that there exists one and only one exclusive ultimate criterion for evaluating one thing as better than another. Mill also embraces this premise as the fundamental starting point for formulating his own version of utilitarianism that is; actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness (6). In his analysis, he contend that the happiness that determines the right or wrong of actions is not any one individual's happiness, but is an aggregate of all individuals happiness, the "happiness which forms the utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct, is not the agent's own happiness, but that of all concerned (16). Mill's utilitarian philosophy advocates for balancing individual and collective well-being. By prioritizing shared goals over differences, this framework encourages communities to find common ground and work toward the greater good (22).

Hannah Arendt in her power of understanding, she highlights the transformative potential of dialogue in overcoming alienation. She argues that true understanding arises not from agreement but from the willingness to engage with others' perspectives, creating opportunities for empathy and growth (15). Arendt believes violence and power are mutually connected, they cannot be seen as 'opposites' but rather as phenomena implicit in every political relation. Thus, far from being 'peripheral,' violence lies at the heart of the political. This is not a consequence of modernity's identification of government with brute force or, indeed, of the false turn initiated by Plato, as Arendt repeatedly suggests, but a feature of *all* polities and times insofar as violence permeates or is potentially present in every judgment and new beginning. Moreover, to the degree that engagement in politics is both intrinsically valuable and legitimate in Arendt's sense, so too is violence at times intrinsically valuable and legitimate. In affirming the 'political' we cannot but affirm it in all its fundamental aspects, embracing coercion and domination just as we do speech and solidarity. On occasion Arendt comes close to conceding this point. Neither violence nor power 'is a natural phenomenon,' for both belong to the political realm of human affairs whose essentially human quality is guaranteed by men's

faculty of action' (*OV*, 179, 133). In other words, violence, like power, bears the imprint of natality and freedom. However, instead of recognizing the full ramifications of this insight, Arendt falls back on a reductive opposition between 'nonpolitical' and 'political' realms governed by two contradictory logics. A number of reasons explain this peculiar turn. Most obvious is her fear that in modernity violence and war admit of no limit, that they are 'not "storms of steel" (Jünger 65) that cleanse the political air, nor are they "the continuation of politics by other means" (Clausewitz) … [but] monstrous catastrophes that can transform the world into a desert and the earth into lifeless matter' (*IP* 191). Fear of 'wars of annihilation,' then, impelled her to endorse an alternative vision which might displace and correct our present understandings of politics' meaning. But there is a more prosaic reason for her mistaken equation of the 'political' with 'being-with.' Arendt understood, in contrast to Weber, that all power depends on 'acting-in-concert,' that inter subjectivity and solidarity are prime conditions of political existence. However, her error was to equate political solidarity with a general solidarity, political inter subjectivity with togetherness *per se*. Power presumes togetherness, yet this togetherness is nearly always *partial*, a matter of determinate groups of actors combining with specific purposes in mind. And it is precisely this partial solidarity that underlies and enables all forms of political violence. Thinking violence implemental and working with an image of the solitary actor, Arendt neglects that *political* violence, as distinct from other forms, is necessarily group-based and therefore dependent on 'acting-in-concert.' Thus, while the isolated 'machine gunner' certainly can control a crowd, this control is not simply, as Arendt (*OV*, 163) believes, a matter of his possessing superior killing technology, but also of the web or nexus of relations that places this technology in his hands in the first place and upholds his resolve throughout.

Philosophy bridges divide by Cultivating Civil Discourse. Philosophy teaches humility and intellectual openness, crucial traits for meaningful conversations. Strategies such as active listening and asking clarifying questions can foster civil discourse, even in contentious discussions. It encourages perspective-taking. Thus, philosophers like John Rawls propose exercises like the "veil of ignorance," which asks individuals to consider social issues from an impartial perspective. This exercise encourages perspective-taking, fostering empathy and fairness (Rawls 56). Philosophical principles can also be applied to education, politics, and activism. For example, integrating philosophy into school curricula can teach critical thinking and empathy from a young age, while community dialogue programs can bridge cultural and ideological divides. However, bridging divides through philosophy is not without its own challenges and limitations such as the misuse and accessibility to philosophy one challenge is the perception of philosophy as elitist or overly abstract. Efforts must be made to make philosophical inquiry more accessible and practical for diverse audiences. Additionally, philosophy can deepen divides when wielded dogmatically, as seen in ideological debates. Secondly is overcoming resistance to self-reflection, self-reflection is often uncomfortable, as it involves confronting deeply held beliefs and biases. Strategies like guided discussions and facilitated workshops can encourage openness to philosophical inquiry and self-awareness.

Conclusion

In the complex, interconnected world, social divides based on race, class, gender, religion, and other factors remain pervasive, creating tensions that hinder cooperation and progress.

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 36-45
©: B. Michael & T. E. Igyom
https://doi.org/10.68251/ecojah.v2.i1.4

Philosophy with its rich tradition of introspection and critical thought, offers valuable insights into how we can bridge these divides by first questioning our assumptions, beliefs, and actions. The idea that understanding others begins with questioning ourselves highlights the essential role of self-awareness in fostering empathy and bridging divides. Philosophical inquiry encourages individuals to reflect on their own biases and prejudices. When we engage in deep self-examination, we begin to recognize that many of our views are shaped by cultural, societal, and personal influences, some of which are limiting or inaccurate. Understanding these influences enables us to critically assess our beliefs and be more open to the perspectives of others.

Philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, John Rawls, and Martha Nussbaum have advocated for approaches that centre on respect for others' autonomy and dignity. Kant's notion of the categorical imperative teaches us to treat others as ends in themselves rather than as means to an end, emphasizing the need for mutual respect. Similarly, John Rawls' veil of ignorance invites us to think about justice and fairness without the bias of our current social positions, prompting us to consider the lived experiences of others and the systemic structures that perpetuate inequality. These philosophical frameworks provide the moral and ethical basis for recognizing the inherent worth of every individual, regardless of their background or identity. Philosophy also emphasizes the importance of dialogue as a tool for understanding. Communicative action, as proposed by Jürgen Habermas, highlights the role of open and rational discourse in bridging social divides. By engaging in respectful, inclusive dialogue, individuals from different backgrounds can share their experiences, challenge stereotypes, and build a common ground based on mutual understanding. This process, however, requires humility and the willingness to listen, qualities that are cultivated through philosophical reflection. Additionally, contemporary philosophers such as Bell Hooks and Cornel West emphasize the role of love, empathy, and compassion in bridging social divides. They argue that fostering a "beloved community" rooted in care and solidarity is essential to overcoming divisions, as love transcends social barriers and connects people on a human level. (75). In this view, philosophical reflection on the nature of love and empathy becomes a powerful tool for creating meaningful relationships that transcend prejudice and foster social cohesion.

While philosophical insights can offer profound guidance in addressing social divides, it is important to recognize that the work of bridging divides is not merely intellectual but also requires action. Philosophy can help shape the framework for understanding, but it is the practical application of these ideas through policy, activism, and daily interaction that ultimately fosters social cohesion. The philosopher's role, then, is to inspire individuals to reflect critically on their own lives, challenge oppressive structures, and engage with others in a spirit of openness and equality. Finally, bridging social divides requires an ongoing process of self-questioning, critical reflection, and genuine engagement with others. Philosophy provides the tools necessary for individuals to explore their assumptions, examine the ethical principles of justice and equality, and open themselves to diverse perspectives. By understanding ourselves more clearly, we are better equipped to understand others, fostering a society that values empathy, compassion, and mutual respect. As we strive to build more inclusive and equitable communities, the philosophical practice of questioning ourselves becomes not only an intellectual exercise but a vital step in the collective journey toward social harmony and understanding.

WORKS CITED

Alexander, Michelle. "The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness". *The New Press*, 2010.

Anderson, Monica, and Madhumitha Kumar. "Digital Divide Persists Even as Lower-Income Americans Make Gains in Tech Adoption." *Pew Research Center*, 2022.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* W. W. Norton, 2006.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Benedict Michael . "John Dewey Epistemic Justice and Democracy" in *Anyigba: Journal of Arts and Humanities.* Journal of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba Kogi State. Volume 16,No1 2022

Bourdieu, Pierre. Distinction: *A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Harvard University Press, 1984.

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou.* Scribner, 1970.

De Botton, Alain. *The Consolations of Philosophy.* Vintage, 2000.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 1, Beacon Press, 1984.

ILO. "Gender Pay Gap." International Labour Organization, 2021http:iiwww.ilp.org.gender.pay accessed on 21st November, 2024

Saez, Emmanuel, and Gabriel Zucman. *The Triumph of Injustice: How the Rich Dodge Taxes and How to Make Them Pay*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2019.

Seekings, Jeremy, and NicoliNattrass. Class, Race, and Inequality in South Africa. Yale University Press, 2005.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Duquesne University Press, 1969.

Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations. Penguin Classics*, 2006.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Longman, 1859.

Mill, John Stuart. *Utilitarianism.* Hackett Publishing Company, 2001.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach.* Belknap Press, 2011.

Plato. *The Apology of Socrates*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press, 1971.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Yale University Press, 2007.

Tajfel, Henri, and John Turner. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by S. Worchel and W. G. Austin, Nelson-Hall, 1986, pp. 7–24.

UNESCO. "Out-of-School Children and Youth." United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2023. htp:\\www.unesco.org.out of school children and youth. Accessed 21st November, 2024