

MARTIN BUBER’S RELATIONAL CONSTRUCT AND THE NECESSITY OF DIALOGUE

Abasiono Edet Essien & Chidiebere Obi*

Abstract

Dialogue is at the heart of conflict resolution and peace mediation. Dialogue has also been considered to be very important in human relation as it facilitates a medium of engaging with other humans using words in a constructive manner that engenders peace and good neighborliness. Martin Buber is regarded as a very significant figure that has done so much in terms of widening the scope of dialogue by his relational construct of “I and Thou” as an authentic way of engagements needed for humans as against the “I-It” relationship. This paper critically examined Buber’s relational construct from the pigeon hole of understanding dialogue and its place for human harmonious relationship. The major finding of the paper is that human relationship requires the kind of deep analysis that Buber carried out and much more than that, dialogue has to be understood as a consequence of human quest and will to mitigate conflicts and live in peace.

Keywords: Dialogue, Relationship, Peace, Conflicts, Resolution, I-Thou, I-It.

1. Introduction

Dialogue is a focused conversation, intentionally engaged with the goal of increasing understanding, addressing problems, and questioning thoughts or actions. It engages the heart as well as the mind. It is different from ordinary conversation, in that dialogue has a focus and a purpose. In Buber’s view, dialogue -whether spoken or silent – is when each of the participants really have in mind the other in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation, between himself and them.¹ The etymological definition of “dialogue” is drawn from the two Greek words, *dia* and *logos* meaning “through” and “word”.² Considered as a literary device, it is written or spoken conversation between two or more characters and is essential for creating of plot, characterization and bringing text to life. Dialogue is a “specific discourse accomplished through the use of language and verbal transaction.

As a human interactive enterprise, philosophy is done through the medium of language, with both verbal and nonverbal dimensions and this suggests that dialogue is possible through either method. While it is correct to say that verbal transactions are

commonplace, it is also correct to say that dialogue can be through other exchanges, provided it is interactive in nature. People do not just engage in dialogue to prove a point but to boost understanding or provoke critical reasoning. Viewed in this way, a point of divergence then emerges between dialogue and debate or even discussion, because unlike debate, dialogue is more interested in the relationship between the dialoguers than in the theme analyzed. Life is about dialogue and there is no way one can escape it. This paper attempts to examine Buber's relational construct with regards to how it can engender deep dialogue necessary for conflict resolution and peace mediation.

2. On Dialogue

David Bohm, in his "On Dialogue", sees dialogue as suggesting a flow of meaning through two or more individuals, out of which understanding may emerge.³ Bohm's view means that understanding is the end of dialogue, and the idea of superiority between or among dialoguing parties does not exist here. Rather, each party tries to bring the other into understanding of the topic at hand and the result is mutual respect and accommodation. Buber talks about "confirmation and inclusion", which Ezeogu interprets as "acknowledgement and recognition of the other".⁴ Cuentas and Mendez opine that dialogue must be democratic in nature, meaning that it must be inclusive and respect the views of others. They advocate for dialogue that respects and strengthens democratic institutions, seeking to transform conflictive relationships so as to prevent crises and violence and therefore, contribute to enhance democratic governance. A dialogue has a systematic approach to the problem and therefore seeks to include a diverse group of actors related to such problem, and not just parties seeking to negotiate something tangible.⁵ Ronald Smith goes on to qualify Buber's account when he affirms that we often treat our fellow man as "It", but he does not match it by any note that the 'thou relation' may extend to things, and he uses "persons" and "personal" as keyword for it throughout.⁶

Paulo Freire provides avenue to critically understand the import and constituents of dialogue. He explains that dialogue involves more than a one-sided view imposed on the other. According to Freire, dialogue is seen as the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world. It follows that, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming – "between those who deny others the right to speak their word and those who's right to speak has been denied them."⁷ It follows from this view that dialogue is

an existential necessity. Incidentally, since it is the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized, this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person “depositing” ideas in another, nor can it become a simple exchange of ideas to be “consumed” by the discussants, nor yet is it a hostile, polemical argument between those who are committed neither to the naming of the world, nor to the search for truth, but rather to the imposition of their own truth.

Freire invigoratingly critiques the dominant banking model of education leading to his democratic proposals of problem-posing education, where “men and women develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves”.⁸ Freire focuses a lot on words and how they impact on the world. As an attempt to analyze dialogue as a human phenomenon, Freire focuses a lot on words and how they impact on the world. According to him, one may discover “the word” which is the essence of dialogue itself. But the word is more than just an instrument which makes dialogue possible; accordingly, we must seek its constitutive elements. Within the word, Freire finds two dimensions of the word as reflection and action, in such radical interaction that if one is sacrificed even in part, the other immediately suffers.⁹

Freire opines that human existence cannot be silent, nor can it be nourished by false words, but only by true words, with which men and women transform the world. What this means is that men have no option but to dialogue, if they must impact the world. To live authentically is to be in relation with the other; to relate with the other is to dialogue; to exist humanly is to name the world and to change it. Naming the world involves not just words spoken to the other so it can be brought into actuality. Human beings are not built as entities of silence, but of words, works, actions and reflection. It might also be pointed out here that dialogue is significant to the development of man because it aids understanding. A situation where there is constant misunderstanding would definitely attract eventual violent conflict; but where there is dialogue, understanding would help clear some grey areas thereby checking unnecessary conflict. Hosle makes this point clearer when he asserts that actual dialogue takes place only when the dialogue parties “understand each other.”¹⁰

3. Buber on Dialogue

According to Buber, dialogue assumes a conversation and a necessity to listen to the other and indicates that a real discovery of a true “I” lies in the encounter with “You” and “I” does not exist without a relation with “You”. Dialogue constitutes the essential basis of philosophy in general, in being the only effective form of communication contrary to one-sided expression of opinions. Man can enter into a monologue relation with reality of “I-It” which lacks dialogue, or in a dialogue relation of “I-You”. Whatever occurs between people is a sphere of mutual “confrontation” and constitutes the foundation of dialogue and on this account, dialogue should be built not based on searching for unity and common truths but on axiological experience of otherness.

Through dialogue, participant creates and sustains a conjoint agreement and shared discourse. Hence, as a relation, dialogue is characterized by inclusion and a reciprocal sharing, such that the individual becomes one both in and with each other. Buber’s philosophical dialogue¹¹ exposes his audience to a new way of understanding human relationship on an inter-subjective basis, thereby putting aside the belief that objectivity is the first or only way of understanding reality. This is why Gabriel Marcel and Emmanuel Levinas hold that rationality and dialogue are over empiricism and objectivity which must be understood as a secondary or continued way of relating to the world.¹²

Buber maintains that “in the beginning is the relation”.¹³ Hence, to be, is to be in relation. By this, to be a human being is to hold oneself in an attitude of relation by saying the right basic word. Buber insists at this point that there are two basic words, namely “I-Thou” and “I-It”. One cannot say the word “I” without relating to a world outside the self. These two basic words mark two ways of being in relation to the world. The “I-It” relationship is characterized by experiencing and using objects, constituting a one-way relationship. The “I” of I-It relation understands and experiences the world as one composed of objects locatable in space and time and this way of relating to the world makes no distinction between people and things, whereas the relationships are constituted within the horizon of objective temporality understood as a chain of moments passing from future, to present, to past. Quite notably, man is at the center of this relationship: Whether he is relating with the other as a “thou” or whether he is relating as objects by way of experiencing them, these two relational constructs are so powerful that they determine human relationship with his fellow humans as well as his environment. The paper now focuses on the components of Buber’s dialogue.

4. Buber's I – Thou Relational Construct

Though *I and Thou* is a title of Buber's work, it is also a relational construct. The main thesis of *I and Thou* as a book also captures it as a kind of relationship. There is a radical difference between a man's attitudes to other men; the attitude to other men is a relation between persons, in the personal relation one subject I confronts another subject Thou. In other words, the "I-Thou" relationship is a two-way drive based on dialogue in which one person encounters another with mutual awareness. When one meets another as Thou, the uniqueness and separateness of the other is acknowledged without obscuring the relatedness or common humanness that is shared. I-Thou relationship is established in the present: the present in this case is not the abstract point between past and the future but like the eternal now of the mystic, it is the present of intensity and wholeness and exists only in so far as meeting and relation exist. The "I-Thou" relationship lives in what Buber calls "The between", It stresses the mutual and holistic existence of two entities. It is an encounter which recognizes each participant as equal. Buber, argues that the I-Thou relation lacks structure and content because when two free rational human beings encounter one another and recognize each other as equals, then an infinite number of meaningful and dynamic situations may take place. Indeed, I-Thou relationship is hard to describe precisely because its nature is not captured in object oriented I-It analytic language. However, Buber depicts the description in his own poetic language thus:

If I face a human being as my Thou, and say the primary word I-Thou to him, he is not a tiling among things and does not consist of things. This human being is not He or she; bounded from every other *He* or *she*, a specific point in space and time within the net of the world; nor is he a nature able to be experienced and described, a loose bundle of named qualities. But with no neighbor, and whole in himself, he is Thou and fills the heavens. This does not mean that nothing exists except himself. But all else lives in his light.¹⁴

The experience of I-Thou is so powerful that it is not sustainable. Buber thinks that, it is not possible to live in the bare present as life would be quite consumed if precaution were not taken to subdue the present speedily and thoroughly.

I-Thou relationship is a realm of freedom: where "You" alone is impossible and the relationship makes one completely human by building up one's wholeness while it encompasses a world of personal acquaintance. Though one cannot create I-Thou

relationship through force of will, there must be a certain openness to their development on both sides. It is therefore possible for a person to have an I-It relationship that never becomes an “I-Thou” and, in Buber’s view, such a person is not a man but a thing.¹⁵ If a relationship is exclusively characterized by experiencing and using, then the other never becomes a Thou. This is the basis of the human world. Buber thereby maintains that it is only when things from being our “Thou”, becomes our “It”, can they be coordinated, that it can be arranged in order: in this way the Thou knows no system of coordination.¹⁶ Gergen speaks with regards to man as a relational being and thereby questions the notion of the bounded being. He aims in this to show that man constantly exists in relational processes, arguing that “There are no separate individuals and no entirely subjective experience, a relationship is a process of coordination that precedes the very concept of the self”.¹⁷ According to Buber, “when I relate to someone as another living being, Thou meets me”.¹⁸ To relate to someone as “Thou” means to be directly involved in his/her essence. When “I” relate to the world as an object for my perception or actions, the world becomes “It” to me. From the foregoing, it is gathered that the human person is born in relation to Thou, and from this relationship, I develop. Accordingly, it is argued that when I get conscious of myself as an object, separated from Thou, it makes its entry. I-Thou is a primary and immediate relationship, while I-It is a secondary and mediated relationship.

Buber speaks of the sphere of between as a fundamental fact of human existence in *Between Man and Man*. The sphere of between is conceived as the pure substance which is left if we exclude inner impressions and external conditions. Buber considers this sphere to be a primal category of human reality and the beginning of a genuine alternative to individualistic anthropology and collectivist sociology. Buber claims that the fundamental fact of human existence is neither the individual as such nor the aggregate as such. Therefore, the individual is a fact of existence in so far as he steps into a living relation with other individuals. The aggregate is a fact of existence in so far as it is built up of living units of relation. The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man. Buber’s two-dimensional concept of relationship makes a distinction between the inter-human and the social. The inter-human relationship is an ontological concept as it stands for the basic fact of human existence. The social aspect on the other hand captures different kinds of group’s phenomena, such as roles, norms, conventions and patterns of communication. In regard to the social, a person

communicates with words and gestures and coordinate his or her behavior with others: it is an ordered activity. But as regards the inter-human, there is a dynamic facing of the other, a flowing from I to Thou. The inter-human is therefore an unpredictable and basically indescribable event, including elements of pre-social relationship and hence could not be identified as social construction.¹⁹

The “I-Thou” relationship is direct, mutual, present and open. Here, what happens between partners in a relationship is more important than what goes on within the minds of the partners. For Buber, “the inmost growth of the self does not take place through our relationship to ourselves, but through being made present by the other and knowing that we are present by him”.²⁰ It follows that the innate subjectivity that unfolds within every human being can begin to be actualized only when it is accurately mirrored in the eyes of another. Being made present as a person is at the heart of what Buber calls “confirmation”, which is inter-human rather than simply social or interpersonal. Unless one is confirmed in one’s uniqueness as the person, one cannot become. The confirmation of the other must include an actual experiencing of the other side of the relationship so that one can imagine quite concretely what another is feeling, thinking and knowing.

5. Buber’s I-It Relational Construct

The “I-It” attitude is an objective one, involving an egocentric and a monological attitude. In the I-It encounter, one relates to another as object completely outside of themselves. The ‘I-It’ is blind to the “otherness” of the other, but instead tries to incorporate the other into oneself²¹. The “I-It” leaves individuals with a sense of homelessness, loneliness, rejection and emptiness. Canales reaction to the view is a reflection of Buber’s ethical philosophy when it asserts that evil is the constant viewing of a person as an It. In making one’s self the central element of a relationship, an act which renders it impossible to achieve the “I-Thou” relation is the root source of human sin. The I asserts self in a grandiose fashion making it the only authentic being while the It is subservient to I. unfortunately, the It that can also be a Thou is reduced to a mere object of experience, instead of relation as in the case with I-Thou.

For Buber the fullness of being is developed for us in the “I-Thou” relationship, in “boundlessness”. The “I-It” relationship, though it can be ontologically primal, does not represent fullness. The “I-It” relationship is diametrically opposed to the “I-Thou” and is based upon the axioms of positivism, such as abstractive contemplation, objectivity, determinism and utilitarian approach to the other. Even Buber affirms that we live in a world of facts and objects, and views philosophy itself as the “highest expression” of the I-It relation. Other thinkers agree that the I-It attitude is often

misconceived and misunderstood as not being at all relevant to everyday living. But, it is not the existence of the I-It attitude that is wrong, as opined by Richard Hycner but rather, "its overwhelming predominance that manifests *itself* in modern technocratic society".²² Accordingly, Buber asserts:

I perceive something. I am sensible of something. I imagine something. I will something, I feel something. I think something. The life of human beings does not consist of all this and the like alone. This and the like together establish the realm of It. It is said that man experiences his world, what does that mean? But the world is not presented to man by experiences alone. These present him only with a world composed of It and He and she and It again.²³

The world is twofold for man in accordance with his twofold attitude. Man perceives the being that surrounds him, plain things and beings of things. He perceives what happens around him, plain processes and actions as processes; things that consist of qualities and processes that consist of moments; things recorded in terms of spatial coordinates and processes recorded in terms of temporal coordinates. We are talking about things and processes that are bounded by other things and processes that are capable of being measured against and compared with those others - an ordered world, a detached world.

Buber notes that the mankind of mere "It" that is imagined, postulated, and propagated by such a man has nothing in common with a living mankind where the idea of "Thou" may truly be spoken. The noblest fiction is fetish; the loftiest sentiment is depraved. Ideas are no more enthroned above our heads than resident in them; they wander amongst us and accost us. The man who leaves the primary word unspoken is to be pitied; but the man who addresses instead these ideas with an abstract or a password, as if it were their name, is contemptible.²⁴ The relationship regarding "I-It" is not based on real love but a subject to object relation and there is no sense of caring, respect, commitment and responsibility in the I-It. The subject "You" is the "I" while the object is the "It" and the being of the "I" belongs to "I", but not to "It". The "I-It" is a relationship that is based on sensation, utility and experience. The object in question is not real to the individual as a separate self, but it exists only to satisfy the whims of individual wants and needs. To the individual, it is a mental representation

of reality, not something valuable in the world. It does often happen that even the relationships we have with other people (who are not objects but subject themselves) follow an I-It dynamic. People can still engage in a dialogue in the “I-It” relationship, but this does not mean that they are engaging in a true and honest dialogue. It is possible to find a conversation that flows authentically bouncing between two different people and the one that is flat, transactional and only occurs to serve a purpose. There can still be emotion and feeling involved when there is an I-It dynamic, but these manifestations are not engagements within a relationship, they are instead expressions of attitude towards an object that has either pleased or dissatisfied an individual.

The “I-It” is a subject-to-object relation. In it there is no awareness of each other as having a unity of being. There is a perception of each other as consisting of specific, isolated qualities without the whole being involved in dialogue. Human beings perceive each other as being separated and detached without mutuality and reciprocity. Buber shares the belief that human beings may try to convert the subject to subject relationship to a subject-to-object or vice-versa, but the being of a subject is a unity which cannot be analyzed as an object. For, when a subject is analyzed as an object, the subject is no longer a subject, but becomes an object. In the same vein, when a subject is analyzed as an object, the subject is no longer a Thou but becomes an It. The being which therefore is analyzed as an object is the It in an I-It relation. The “I-It” therefore establishes a mode of existence as experience, as an experience of some particular thing, of an object. The “It” world combines experience which constitutes this world again and its uses which leads it towards its multifarious purpose such as the preservation, alleviation and equipment of human life. Nevertheless, the ability to confront a world of discrete things is an indispensable aspect of human survival and life. Buber for example, speaks of many ways that we can contemplate, say a tree. We can accept it as a picture, a rigid pillar in a flood light or experience the tree aesthetically as some beautiful thing. Buber makes the point clear that as the tree ceases to be it does not lose any of the aspects of experience that we were but a moment ago contemplating. When a tree is addressed as a Thou, all of those myriad experiences of the tree are joined. When we leave the It world we leave behind the separation that the It allows and instead confronts the tree exclusively and indivisibly. This is equally true of every “he or she” that has been divided from the presencing world.

The “I-It” experiences can best be understood in contrast to the “I-Thou” relation. It is a relation in which the “I” approaches the other not in a direct and living immediacy, but as an object to be known or to be used. In the “It” phenomenon, a human feel something, imagine or want something from the object. For example, one sits on a chair because it gives one rest, one buys milk from the other because the other sells milk, and one sells a book to another because another would like to read it. Here the words “one”, “another” and “the other” can be used to refer to “he”, “she” and “it”. Consequently, “He”, “She” and “It” are serving my needs and therefore “I” uses them. Though having less ontological value or worth, the I-It relation is not negative on its

own, rather, its overwhelming predominance manifests itself in modern technocratic society. The gains apart from being found in human-to-human relation, can aid in knowledge advancement and can be used also for practical purposes as well as having various speculative, artistic or scientific value.

6. Evaluation

Persons exist with some "distance" between them since they are not in relation until they choose to be. Existential distance is when each living person is separated from other living persons. In his *Knowledge of Man*, Buber opines that "distance provides the human situation, while relation provides man's becoming in that situation".²⁵ Persons therefore overcome their existential separateness by entering into relation. This choice is a key element in the "I and Thou" relation, thus bridges the distance and creating the between. Buber is more interested in interpersonal situations than in principles, which is why he uses words like "dialogue", "meeting", "encounter", "I-Thou" and "I-It", "relations", and "between". All of these terms point to his thoughts about relationship. Generally, relation is understood in terms of a person's attitude as being friendly, cruel or kind to others. Where there is a gap or distance between humans, there can be no relation hence the gap of distance must be bridged for there to be an "I-Thou" relation. Buber asserts that "it becomes crystal clear to us that the spiritual reality of the primary words arises out of a natural reality, that of the primary word I-Thou out of natural combination, and that of the primary word I-It out of natural separation". Existence requires worldly and personal environment and humans meet in the worldly environment. Humans co-exist and not as objects. We and other existents are in the world as centers of concern that shape the world. For Buber, the anthropological principles are basic to man and constitute his existence as a special category of being.²⁶

Lesser Animals are conditioned by their environment, surroundings and needs but man is conditioned by the world and he is able to condition this world and transcend all the necessities of life. Buber often speaks about the twofold character of the world and by world he means in relation to man. Therefore, man standing over against the world in a twofold attitude and that determines his correlation with it and subsequently his twofold existential being. This twofold character of his attitude also finds expression in his language through medium of speech. These fundamental postures or a way of setting oneself in one's relation to the world are the "I-Thou" and "I-It" attitudes. Buber notes that Thou is a primary word that intimates a relationship that comes about from the whole being. A "Thou" is made what it is through relationship to an "I" and conversely, the mention of a Thou stands in the origin of all individual human becoming. A "Thou" is one who manages to overcome the distance and achieve a relation with the other. Hence, a Thou is not a thing to be used or something to be

experienced in an objective manner. A "Thou" is unbounded to the point where it fills the heavens. A "Thou" is whole and full and is made complete through its relationship to an "I". The relationship to the Thou is exclusive; a Thou is perceived as being both ontologically separate and unique and yet connected to all else within the "net of the world" and is the hallmark of a true dialogue.

Conversely then, the Thou is an "I" just like the "I" is a Thou. This understanding closes every gap and makes relation possible through dialogue. There is bound to be distance where the "I" sees the Thou as an "It". This is where conflict and hostility creep into a subject - subject relationship because the attitude is wrong, hence the words too will be wrong. But the moment we change our attitude and see the other as a Thou, a subject and not an object, the distance shortens and the gap closes. Then, we suddenly find ourselves in an "I-Thou" relation. This means, our orientation to the other, whether as an object or an inter-subjective reality is ontologically primal i.e. it comes first before any other consideration. Put differently, we do not exist fully as beings without the presence of the other and our relation to the other. Every stand is "taken in relation". And this can be accomplished through spoken words of either I or Thou. There is a great correlation between what is spoken and what is conceived in the mind. Thus words verbalize our attitude and represent a relational stand as well as expose the differences in the nature of any relationship. A person or object is made present or brought into being in and through the relationship he or It has with the other. Humans thus come into an ontological presence when they enter into an essential reciprocity and any objective reality of an object is distinguishable from its unique inter-subjective presence. For Buber, those who turn to the world and become aware of it enters into relation with it. And this is predicated upon an integrated and holistic knowing. Talking about distance and relation, Buber is of the view that he becomes aware of wholeness and unity in such a way that from then and he is able to grasp being as a wholeness and a unity; the single being has received the character of wholeness and the unity which are perceived in it from the wholeness and unity perceived in the world.

7. Conclusion

The "other" is very necessary for confirmation and that occurs in the "I-Thou" relation and this is why Buber uses various terms such as "embrace", "inclusion", "imagining the real", "synthesizing apperception" to describe the grasp of the "other". The highest expression of man's imagination to capture the real or to make present is the capacity in the genuine meeting of two persons. For instance, when one embraces the pain of another, that knowledge becomes very specific to the pain of another not necessarily what pain means in general. Thus, to confirm the "I", the Thou must be inclusive. Buber maintains that in philosophical anthropology, man himself is given to man in the most precise sense as a subject. Here, "where the subject is man in his wholeness, the investigator cannot content himself, as in anthropology as an individual science, with considering man as another part of nature and with ignoring the fact that he, the

investigator, is himself a man and experiences his humanity in his inner experience in a way that he simply cannot experience any part of nature".²⁷

Inclusion is necessary for dialogue and it is, according to Buber, different from empathy in the sense that, one's own concrete personality and situation are lost in aesthetic absorption in the other, in empathy. But inclusion, one person lives through a common event from the standpoint of another person without giving up their own point of view. Buber asserts that the moment of meeting another is a stirring happening that can be light and sometimes more pronounced and fraught with depths. Working towards confirmation and inclusion may be a delicate and subtle process requiring refinements of sensitivity, but the meaningful results are palpable.

As the paper closes, Buber's philosophy of dialogue rests on the ability to turn in response and responsiveness to the other, the ability to enter into relation and connection with the other. As Buber notes, "the Thou meets me. But I step into direct relation to it". There is the response of the Thou. There is the responsiveness and confirmation of the individual I stepping into relation with the Thou. The individual, by his act of will turns to the other, having recognized that other as Thou. The turning, the going out, the engagement are all volitional acts undertaken to move toward establishing the "I-Thou" relationship. Though a volitional act, they are undertaken with humility, moving towards grace. The awareness of the other and the other's address to us is our confirmation of the other as the other. In turning to the other, we validate the ontological status of the other as a whole being out of our awareness of the other and in our relation to the other, we apprehend the other as different, unique but inclusive to our being or makeup. We apprehend beingness and wholeness. It is one's awareness and receptivity to the other which put one in relation with the other and out of that awareness and openness come the responses and the attendant confirmation of the other.

Dialogue is necessary in order to meet and connect fully with another Thou. This oftentimes has to do with the other person's feelings and psyche which can take place even where words are not spoken. Silence, as long as genuine dialogue is concerned, involves experiencing and relation with the other person and being in his world without losing yours. Buber asserts that one must bring oneself into the process of dialogue and "make the contribution of one's spirit without abbreviation or distortion. It is only in genuine dialogue that the real dimensions and depth of any human being can be truly explored and understood fully. No one lives and experiences in complete isolation but is always in relationship to someone or something. The creation of dialogue therefore in the between is what Buber calls the dialogical and it is an important aspect in human relationship in the pursuit of peace and harmonious coexistence.

***Abasiono Edet Essien**

Department Of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Email: essienabasiono93@gmail.com

***Chidiebere Obi, PhD**

Department Of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Email: ccy.obi@unizik.edu.ng

References

- ¹M. Buber, *Between Man and Man*, (London: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2004) p.22
- ²D. Bohm. “On Dialogue”. Schouten & Nelissen <http://sprott.physies.wisc.edu/Chaos-complexity/dialogue>, p.6.
- ³D. Bohm. “On Dialogue”. Schouten&Nelissen <http://sprott.physies.wisc.edu/Chaos-complexity/dialogue>, p.6.
- ⁴U. Ezeogu *et al.* “Herders-Farmers Conflict in Nigeria: Applying Martin Buber’s Dialogue Approach”. Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of Philosophy, Vol.11 (1), (2019). p 141
- ⁵C. Mima and M. Anai Linares. *Practical Guide On Democratic Dialogue*. The United State Development Program. 2013, p.11.
- ⁶R. Smith. “*The Knowledge of Man: Selected Essays by Martin Buber*. (London: Morrison and Gibbs Ltd 165), p.38
- ⁷P. Freire. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, (New York: Continuum, 2005), pp. 88 – 89.
- ⁸*Ibid*, p. 12.
- ⁹P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, (New York: Continuum, 2005), p. 87.
- ¹⁰V. Hosle, “*The Philosophical Dialogue: A Poetics and a Hermeneutics*”. Trans. by Steven Rendell. (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012), p. 16.
- ¹¹M. Buber. *Between Man and Man*. (London: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2004), p.23
- ¹²E. Levinas. *Totality and Infinity; An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans by Alphonso Lingis. (Boston: The Martinus Publishers, 1979), p.121
- ¹³M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke, 1937) p.18
- ¹⁴M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke, 1937) p.8
- ¹⁵*Ibid*, p.34
- ¹⁶M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke, 1937) p.31
- ¹⁷K. Gergen. *Relational Being: Beyond Self and Community*, (Oxford: University Press, 2009), p.15

- ¹⁸M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke,1937) p.35
- ¹⁹J. Aspelin, “Co-Existence and Co-operation: The Two Dimensional Conception of Education”. In *Education* Vol.1 (1), (2011), p.3
- ²⁰M. Buber. *Good and Evil: Two Interpretations*. (New York: Rutledge, 1952), p.61
- ²¹M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke,1937), pp.4-5
- ²²R. Hycner. *Between Person and Person: Toward a Dialogical psychotherapy*. (New York: The Gestalt Journal, 1991), p.6
- ²³M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke,1937), pp.4-5
- ²⁴M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke,1937) pp.13-14
- ²⁵M. Buber. *The Knowledge of Man*. (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p.63
- ²⁶M. Buber. *Eclipse of God; Studies in the Relation between Religion and Philosophy*. (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1952), p.127
- ²⁷M. Buber. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. (Edinburg: T and T Clarke,1937), p.11