

SUSTAINING THE CULTURE OF PARTICIPATION AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE THROUGH THE INCLUSIVIST APPROACH TO DIVERSITY

Dr. Isaac Chidi Igwe
Department of Philosophy
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: ic.igwe@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

The concept of diversity expresses a situation, in which different components constitute a whole in a uniquely different manner. It could also be described as a condition of affairs in which entities such as peoples, races, or cultures manifest varying degrees of differences and identities. Two broad ways of understanding diversity are easily distinguishable. Diversity could be understood in terms of exclusivity or better still, it could be understood in terms of inclusivity. When understood in exclusivist terms, diversity becomes a problem because vital aspects of reality are decreed out of recognition and attention, only because they fail the test of familiarity. But when understood in inclusivist terms, diversity becomes a blessing as it then allows unfettered access of all persons and groups to discourse, participation, care and attention. Most crisis bedeviling modern societies in the social and political realms has its root in the exclusivist dimension to diversity. Accordingly, the aim of this essay is to interrogate the concept of diversity with the objective of demonstrating that it is only when understood through inclusivist terms that it can become a tool for peace building. The method most suitable for this kind of analysis is phenomenology, which teaches that reality should be allowed to manifest itself as it truly is.

Keywords: Diversity, Exclusivity, Inclusivity, Participation, Phenomenology

Introduction

It is rather paradoxical, though instructive, to hold the view that the world we live in is so close to us, yet we seem so much apart from it. This is to the extent that we often neglect the very things that lie below and dwell more on the elusiveness of the things that are far beyond. Most often, it happens as a manifestation of ignorance of the phenomenological knowledge that the notion of 'beyondness' is meaningless except in relation to nearness. From the nature of the configuration of entities such as peoples, races, cultures, life ways or practices; there are manifest pointers to the reality of diversity in these entities. This perhaps, necessitates the assumption that entities with varieties of differences and peculiarities would consequently yield more robust output with greater complementary engagements and interrelationship among the varying components.

It is in the light of the foregoing assumptions that the popular sayings, 'strength in diversity' often derive its fiber. But again, to what extent are these assumptions true without compliance to the doctrine of inclusivity within a diverse system? Closer observation in a quite number of systems and institutions whether social, ideological or religious, abounds expressions of dissatisfactions which signal a collapse of confidence in the "whole" by its various "parts"? Otherwise captured by Jones and

Fogelin (1997, p.2), there is a “growing feeling of the radical ambiguity of the human mode of being in the world” which compels us into reasoning that perhaps, there could be something fundamentally wrong with the way we understand diversity which is the reason there is a high level of unrest in the various facets of the society.

There lies two ways by which we can understand diversity. These two distinguishable ways are in inclusive terms and in exclusive terms. When understood in exclusivist terms, diversity becomes a problem because vital aspects of reality are decreed out of recognition, support and attention, only because they fail the test of familiarity. The exclusivist understanding of diversity throws up crisis and conflicts in human relations. The crisis bedeviling modern societies in the social and political realms down to professional practices is a function of the exclusivist understanding of diversity. But when understood in inclusivist terms, diversity becomes a veritable tool for social bonding as it then allows unfettered access of all persons and groups to discourse, to participation, to care and attention. This understanding brings everybody on board and creates room for participation and for the disclosure of what people truly think and feel towards a system.

In the views of Martin Heidegger, there are two radical modes of thinking which influence the human ways of thinking and behaviour. The first, he calls Calculative rationality. The second, he calls Meditative thinking (Heidegger, 1968). These two modes of thinking are analogous to exclusivist and inclusivist approaches to diversity respectively. The exclusivist notion of diversity issues from the calculative mode of thinking, while inclusivist notion of diversity manifest the meditative mode of being.

The synthesis which we seek to strike in this article is that human beings must approach the issue of diversity in such a way that while trying to create rooms for all and sundry to co-inhabit, we must at the same time not lose the courage to exclude as many elements or radicals as are incongruent to the dictates of collective social existence. It is this new social order that can usher in authentic peaceful world; a world order where both calculative and meditative mindsets are given equal access in the creation of values and meanings. A type of new order whereby while partaking in calculative rationality or other forms of thinking, man will not only be creating happiness for the world, but also will be preserving human civilization from total disintegration.

Diversity and the Nature of the World

The concept of diversity talks of a state of affairs, characterized by varying degrees of differences constituting a body of a whole. It could also be said to express a condition of affairs in which entities such as peoples, races, cultures, life ways or practices manifest unique identities. According to Anna Holmes (2015, p. 144), diversity is “the quality or state of having many different forms, types, ideas”. It is a general characteristic of the world and pervades the nature of all things including the hitherto assumed smallest form of matter (atom) which was later discovered to further comprise other sub-atomic particles. Diversity is said to be so important to the extent that, without it, systems die. It is not created but native in all natural things. Virtually in all human activities, emphasis is always placed on the need to replicate such natural state of affairs. It is such that in human biology, we talk about genetic diversity, embedded in genetic codes. Even among identical twins, there are still some degrees of variations

in their features. In concrete reality, diversity permeates gender, age, sexual orientation, physiological ability, intelligence quotient, mental configuration, ethnicity, culture, belief systems, language and nationality. Diversity is not limited to anyone of these but cuts across all of them. As an attribute inherent in all things, diversity we can say; is value-neutral. In other words, it is neither positive nor negative, it is neither a blessing nor a curse but depending on the way it is conceived and understood.

Naturally, diversity ought not need human managers because all the aforementioned degree of variations have a way of falling into shape on their own accord but for the human tendencies of wanting not to allow reality manifest itself the way it is, diversity therefore calls for phenomenological intervention (Heidegger, 1962, pp. 50-53). In essence, diversity is all about difference, and it permeates all things, be it systems, people or life ways. However, diversity is at the same time, value neutral. In other words, it is what we do with or how we understand diversity that gives it a certain definition. There are two broad ways of understanding diversity both of which confers value on it. The first is diversity in its exclusivist terms. The second is diversity in the inclusivist terms.

The Exclusivist Terms of Diversity

As observed earlier, diversity is not a problem in itself. It only becomes a big problem when understood in the exclusivist sense because, in doing so, competing or lesser alternatives are consigned into irrelevance. This manner of understanding diversity is inimical to the attainment of a harmonious social order because it breeds injustice, rancor and revolt. The exclusivist conception of diversity, for instance, groups people along ethnic and religious lines. However, such groupings are done not in an equal and participatory basis, but in a superior/inferior, civilized/uncivilized and master/subordinate arrangement. "Ethnic group identity has a strong psychological or emotional component that divides the people of the world into the categories of 'us' and 'them' (Peoples and Bailey, 2006, p. 355). This kind of mindset produces a form of mental representation and complexity syndrome which in turn affect the way people view and interact with others. And according to Tan Cheng Im (2012, p.61), it stretches further in determining the way the people view and treat the environment. In its socioeconomic dimension, it groups people along class lines (class stratification) and their only basis of unity becomes a function of which class one belongs. Of course, the end result of this is alienation, domination and exploitation. The underlying mindset in this practice is the calculative assumption to reality. The calculative mindset is any form of reasoning or thinking which evaluates experience with the parameter of "the meaningful" and "the meaningless". The meaningful in this understanding is anything that falls and can be explained within a given conceptual framework and measuring apparatus. In this, competing alternatives are treated as pseudo reality which amounts to nothing. It is a matter of following a laid down and accepted procedure of reasoning or system or meaning, outside of which there is no more meaning.

In essence, the real point at issue about diversity is not that people out-rightly dismiss its existence and values. On the contrary, it is the fact that human beings often make reference to it when it is convenient for them to do so. Such reference is rarely borne out of phenomenological inclination of live-and-let-live attitudes, but with

superior/subordinate mindset which in the long run, deprive humanity, the beauties of complementarities. This manner of progression, Unah (1997, p. 319) says, is propelled by viewing things in competitive terms. It is along this line that today, the various disciplines in human endeavour seem to engage in a sort of rivalry of meanings. For instance, the medical discipline wants to outshine the discipline of the humanities. In the same vein, the sciences on the other hand are ready to defend till death that there is no other reliable knowledge and method apart from the scientific and the empirical. In the same vein, the religious man would dismiss with a wave of the hand any claim that is not revealed by God or the angels. This, we call the exclusivist or calculative view of faith. In fact, this has become one of the most destabilizing elements in the human quest for a peaceful world order. This practice identifies a particular faith or body of religious views and upholds it to be the essence and substance of divine truth, beside which there is no other religious possibilities. However, it does not just stop at that, it deploys all its arsenals in compelling the entire human race to accept this perspective as the only truth. This is carried out in form of evangelizing the non-believers. Aptly captured by Diana Eck (1993):

The exclusivist affirms identity in a complex world of plurality by a return to the firm foundations of his or her own tradition and an emphasis on the distinctive identity provided by that tradition....Exclusivism is more than simply a conviction about the transformative power of the particular vision one has; it is a conviction about its finality and its absolute priority over competing views (p.174).

Against this backdrop also, the Christian faith would insist that outside the church and Christ, there is no salvation. Jesus is the only way, the truth and the life (Hick, 1977, p. 121: John 14:6, The New King James Version). Then, for their Islamic counterpart;

Those who reject Allah follow vanities, while those who believe follow the truth from their lord. Thus does Allah set forth for men their lessons by similitude. Therefore when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until when you have overcome them, then make (them) prisoners (Quran 47:3-4, discover-the-truth.com).

To continue in this temperament simply means that mutual tolerance in the society may never be attainable. Also, training the children with this nature of confrontational orientation would imply preparing them for violence and hatred against the other person with a contrary religious view. This partly explains why religious related extremism is daily gaining ascendancy in the world. For instance, how could one explain how two brothers born of the same father (Ishmael and Isaac), would be the same people that have so polarized the world into two religious divide, with each religion laying claim to divine copyright. This arrogation of exclusive and absolute ownership of divine patent falls within the calculative mode of existence. And further demonstrates that the kernels upon which they are founded are skewed towards

conquest mentality. It gives the impression that somehow, not being a Christian or not being a Muslim, makes one inferior specie.

Again, this exclusivist view of diversity has also affected the medical practice as earlier observed. From the perspective of the Western trained medical practitioner, it is assumed that only he or she has the skills and equipment to diagnose and treat all ailments. As such, the traditional alternative to health and healing either in China or in Africa is derided and dismissed as pseudo-medication. But the truth of the matter is, both the western medical practitioner and the traditional medicine-man receive different types of professional training and they apply different tools in the course of their investigation and diagnoses. In view of this, the kind of tools or equipment needed to diagnose a newly developing uterus cancer would definitely be different from the kind of tools required to capture the spirit of an “Abiku” or “Ogbanje”. As a consequence,

For the person who uses an instrument to detect microbes to claim that he cannot apprehend ghost with the same instrument and therefore that ghost does not exist, is to surrender to the nihilistic metaphysical thinking that outside what we know and can understand, there is ‘total nothing’ (Unah, 1997, p. 345).

Another trend of exclusivist understanding of diversity is that promoted by the western imperialists, multinational-companies and the agents of liberal democracy. In this type of understanding, the basis for discussing diversity is not with the intention of allowing each society to express its degree of variation in the way it deems fit but rather, with an attempt to superimpose the western system of value over the contact states. Expressing this view in another way, Holmes (2015, p.144), states that “it has become both euphemism and cliché, convenient shorthand that gestures at inclusivity and representation without actually taking them seriously”. What Holmes meant to say is that two problems of diversity are easily distinguishable. First, is the inability of man to fully come to terms with its reality which in turn presupposes the second; that man is unwilling to allow what is naturally different to be so in truth. In fact, to be blunt, western agents of liberalism have contributed in no small measure in further destabilizing hitherto peaceful societies just in the name of entrenching the western notion of liberalism without adequately taking into cognizance the varying degrees of the cherished values in the receiving states. What this easily calls to mind are the states of Libya, Syria, Iraq and some others. Diversity nurtured in this manner would only mean accepting everything that is western and refusal to accept is viewed as a diplomatic offence. The consequence of this usually comes with threats to withdraw foreign aids from such state. An instantiation of this occurred when Nigeria and some other African countries refused to sign gay right laws into operation in their respective states. It is for this reason that Thomas (2005) concludes that diversity is relative and “dynamic given that diversity is not the same everywhere, nor is the issues classified as diversity-related the same over time. That is, diversity itself is fluid”.

This explains what Holmes (2015, p.144), means when she says that the notion of diversity is today being understood in relative terms despite the fact that its dictionary

meaning remains constant. But when it begins to apply to something in concrete reality, she says, its meaning begins to change depending on whose interest it serves. That is, when it concerns the question of who gets what, diversity would mean positioning one group or persons at certain places in the guise of diversity. Similarly, in a research work carried out to determine what constitutes diversity to different people, Holmes, corroborates this argument thus:

Reynolds Farley, a demographer at the University of Michigan, researched the attitudes of people in Detroit about the racial composition of residential neighborhoods in 1976, 1992 and 2004, most African-Americans considered “integrated” to be a 50/50 mix of white and black, while a majority of whites considered such a ratio much too high for their comfort each time the study was conducted (ibid, p.144).

Now, the point to be made from the excerpt above is that when the question of diversity does not factor the varying degree of differences and allow these differences to manifest themselves in a well guided manner, it ends up destroying the very value that diversity is naturally meant to promote. That was why Jeff Chang, according to Holmes, expresses the view that diversity for him is an empty signifier because the concept has today become radicalized from its original multidimensional outlook to serve the whims and caprices of self-interested agents. He further decries the fact that people, who talk about the need for diversity most, are today the very people who do less or nothing concerning it in practical terms. Thus, he concludes that he is neither surprised nor dismayed because; after all, ‘talk is cheap’ (ibid, p.144).

Consequently, these account for “the growing visibility of ethnic minorities with increased demands, varying from cultural or political autonomy to outright independence” (Rothschild and Wingfield, 2000, p.302). *On the basis of this*, Unah (1997), further warns that “any insistence by historical man that a particular perspective is the only perspective of which the various other perspectives and other possible perspectives are but appendages or distortions is an event in the obliviousness of Being and a voyage of nihilism” (Unah, 1997, p.299). However, the good news is that, irrespective of the dire implications of understating diversity in the exclusivist form, all hope is not lost; there is still another way we can approach diversity and it will become a catalyst for social bonding, promote national progress and usher humanity into that authentic peaceful world order which we all crave for.

The Inclusivist Terms of Diversity

Earlier, we defined diversity to mean a condition whereby different components constitute a whole, or that it is a situation in which entities, whether human, material or system, manifest varying degree of differences. When diversity is understood in this manner, more often than not, it is assumed hook-line-and-sinker to be an end in itself. But as the preceding discussion above revealed, diversity taken from its exclusivist perspective, becomes a recipe for conflict, crisis and war in human relation. Again, while in contemporary times, a lot of companies, organizations and nations devote

much effort to diversify their operations, resources and means of attaining certain set goals, little attention seems to be paid on how to make such organizations inclusive. This means that having a plural system is one thing but making such a system inclusive is a different thing all together. Diversity, when understood in inclusivist terms, yields blessing as it paves the way for untrammelled access of all to discourse, to participation, to care and at the end, engenders reciprocal solidarity. Du Vernay, according to Holmes (2015), admitted this fact in one of her speeches when she was asked what she understood by diversity and she responded by saying that she hates the word. According to Homes, she said:

It feels like medicine, she said in her speech. “‘Diversity’ is like, ‘Ugh, I have to do diversity.’ I recognize and celebrate what it is, but that word, to me, is a disconnect. There’s an emotional disconnect. ‘Inclusion’ feels closer; ‘belonging’ is even closer (Holmes, 2015, p. 144).

This is another way of saying that the ultimate objective of diversity is inclusivity and integration, in such a manner that the different components constituting a whole are not counter-reactive or become repellant to the audacity of cohesion in that system. Inclusion creates greater altruism and increases teamwork and bonding. It is a product of meditative understanding of the workings of nature which allows reality to negotiate for meaning based on the attitude of openness, respect and recognition in a non-compelling manner.

From the views of Du Vernay above, a much more crucial feeling derivable from inclusivist approach to diversity is ‘belonging’. This is a kind of consciousness that one has towards a body of a whole which has accepted one’s own reality as an integral and indispensable part of that whole. This type of psychological attainment does not just happen. As a matter of fact, it is a reciprocal gesture of an act of responsibility that a part stretches towards a whole. It is not a forced loyalty but earned. In statesmanship, it results in patriotism and spirit of nationalism. This is the kind of scenario that multicultural societies and diverse institutions like the Nigerian system ought to strive hard to attain. This is a basic human yearning. Consequently, for human flourishing to be at its peak, the conditions for the attainment of this yearning must be made utmost priority by state actors, institution managers and cohesive world agents like the United Nation Organization (UNO).

Indeed, having a sense of belonging by different component parts that constitute a whole engenders a greater sense of value, recognition and sense of security. In other words, a feeling of the sense of belonging guarantees security and stability for the system as every part would work for the sustenance of the whole because its disintegration or misfortune would gravely affect the well-being of the parts. But on the contrary, a feeling of exclusion kills creativity and solidarity, jeopardizes common objective and brings down institutional cum national performances to their lowest ebbs. It decreases the sense of commitment and honesty as every part would decide to be complacent and watch things degenerate to the ridiculous. Could it be right to say *that*

this is the current state of affairs in most African societies? Well, we shall leave that for political scientist to answer.

However, the view that this paper holds strongly remains that a peaceful world order cannot be attained by calculative (exclusivist) approach to thinking because it forces truth to show up by deliberately excluding other unfamiliar components and when this happens, the revealing capacity that is derived in openness and in the feeling of belongingness withdraws. It is in the inclusivist sense that we understand diversity to mean a state of recognition, valuing and accepting the reality of people's or entities' differences, backgrounds, orientations, abilities, needs, opinions, idiosyncrasies and nuisance values. This manner of understanding promotes eclecticism, cross-fertility of ideas and creates a cohesive system, society and mutually benefitting human relation. It is the inclusivist application of diversity that confers on systems or institutions legitimacy, moral credibility and stability. It means creating allowance for contraries to exhibit their possibilities. It is an attitude of not always wanting to appropriate an encyclopedia of wisdom, knowledge and methodology to any singular authority. Instead, it is a manner of existence in which we acknowledge that "what does not appeal to us may appeal to someone else; that what we do not feel can be felt by another person; that what we cannot see can be seen by someone else" (Unah, 1997, p.342).

When we understand diversity in this way is when we can be said to understand the value of diversity. Inclusivist understanding of diversity does not discard any view as absolute nothing. Instead, it recognizes and encourages all specters of ideas, method, solutions to come on board in such a way that in the end, it would be clear that there is a form of sense and meaning in all the aggregated angles. In this way, it eliminates the dichotomy between calculative rationality and meditative thinking, between the western/scientific method and the traditional/supra-scientific perspective. The emphasis instead, would be on achieving effective result and adding value to human life. This kind of feeling reinforces our humanity and sustains the earth. The approach to diversity in this form ushers in tremendous organizational benefits which include; greater customer satisfaction with better market position, robust decision-making outcome and an enhanced ability to reach strategic goals (Riordan, 2014).

In contemporary times, the virtue of inclusivity appears to have taken the back stage because of what we earlier described as human tendencies not to let be of what is. Thus, is the calculative nature of man which main aim is to have a controlled outcome of experience. Simply put, it is an instrumental form of rationality. It is the fallout of the drive to institute human will as the arbiter of experience. With rationality understood in this way, man is left with the impression that there is always a quick-fix to every problem. It is akin to what Riordan (2014), calls the influence of strong social norms and disapproval from dominant partners. By dominant partners here, I suppose he is referring to what Karl Marx describes as the tendency for the ruling ideology being determined by the ruling class in a capitalist setting (Marx, 1867, 1848; Ogundowole, 1989). Little wonder that Kofi Annan (2013), in a speech at the "Global Center for Pluralism", stated emphatically that "if diversity is seen as a source of strength, societies can become healthier, more stable and prosperous. But there is another side of the coin if we fail to manage the conflicting pressures that pluralism inevitably brings". The dangers of failing to heed the call for inclusivity he says increase the feeling of marginalization, oppression, conflict and violence.

Sustaining the Culture of Participation and Disclosure through the Inclusivist Terms of Diversity

The mood and feeling which our discussion of inclusivist approach to diversity above evokes into consciousness is that of identity, tolerance and recognition. This is in line with the meditative mode of being. The conviction being that when entities and people which manifest varying degrees of differences are given recognition and accorded respects for their varying identities, frictions and fragmentations in human society would drastically reduce to the barest minimum, if not totally eradicated. The way to achieve this is not to clamour for a unified world outlook (in the sense which the proponents of globalization often intend) or to have a one true story about the world. It is not by championing a stronger center as often the case in most heterogeneous societies like Nigeria. In fact, it is an indirect invitation to anarchy to try to subjugate a diverse society by whipping everybody into line. In the same vein, the exclusivist view that truth and salvation must be universal values is by itself antithetical to the threshold upon which the term diversity stands.

On the contrary, the most embalming way to heal the wound inflicted on humanity by exclusivist drive to diversity is to begin to encourage varying cultures, beliefs, ideologies and peculiarities towards achieving a global civilization where people, races, life-ways are brought on board to express themselves the very way they truly feel in a properly guided manner. In other words, we can have a world order in which “certain views are shared, but within the borders of subcultures” (Viljoen-Terblanche, 2008: 100). It is within this culture of global consciousness derived as a synthesis of sectional consciousness that diversity would mean a blessing. It is to be noted that the emphasis placed on the term “guided” above is to show that, while we clamour for diversity of views, positions, life-ways, et cetera, such must be “guided” to take shape in a non-compelling manner so that the objective of diversity is not eroded by rancorous and supremacy tussle often thrown up under a multiplicity of experience. To sustain a culture of participation within a multiplicity of experience, the adoption of the attitude of live and let live is the required ethical code.

This kind of culture, if entrenched in human relation and organizational operation, would build and restore trust and enhance the feeling of security in the system. There is no doubt that people would go to any length to protect and defend the interest of any system which guarantees their wellbeing and which gives them advantage over others. In fact, when this kind of situation is the order, the people will by themselves, form fortresses around the organization, knowing that its failure will lead to collective downfall. But when a part begins to feel detached from the whole, the motivation for commitment to its course begins to water down. For people to truly express themselves the way they feel, under a well guided manner, there ought to be a continuous and unhindered access to inclusive dialogue, negotiation and compromise. The culture of dialogue of language, ideas and meanings reinforces the resilience of the society, while arbitrariness and will to power becomes its albatross. Inability for institutions and societies to guarantee the former increases the risk of conflict and all forms of agitations.

Consequently, in some situations, weaker component units are bullied into the state of conformity and pretentious silence. In other words, a given situation in a rigid society

or institution where individuals or constituent units may, out of the fear of being seen and treated as renegade and as a conquered party, decide to pretentiously play along in a conspiratorial silence and watch the system collapse. In such state of affairs therefore, individuals may, out of pretence, behave as though they share common objective and destiny with the system, but in actual fact, they care-less because there is no feeling of a sense of belonging towards the system or institution. This again, is the most dangerous way to run a system because it only serves as the fastest way to hasten a system's disintegration. An inclusive system must learn how to leverage the unique perspectives of all varying component units effectively. Thus, "the unique contribution of this study orbits around the phenomenon of Inclusivity. The phenomenon is uniquely positioned as a radical methodology contributing to sustainable transformational results" (Viljoen-Terblanche, 2008, p.17). In the light of the stated, our notion of inclusive diversity in this study is geared towards attaining a state of affairs in a plural system whereby every part sees itself as being recognized, and valued as a stakeholder, and in turn, strives towards optimal performance and stability of the system. We are fully convinced that in getting everybody involved in the quest to attain either a national or group objective, the room for sabotage and resentment are drastically minimized. On the contrary, we state that a divisive and alienating culture of exclusive sense of diversity heightens individuals' feeling of dissatisfaction, decrease commitment and cohesiveness, and in the end leave every part working towards disintegration of the whole (ibid, p.51). The most damaging outcome of this state of affairs is that motivation and productivity levels dwindle to the abysmal point.

This appears to be exactly the case in most multicultural, multiethnic and multi-religious societies of our world with African societies as case studies. For instance, a crucial aspect of diversity in terms of human concrete social terms is ethnic diversity. Ethnic diversity is a social reality and big problem in most third world nations, particularly in African society. According to Elijah and Usoro (2016, p.140), "a society is plural if it is culturally diverse and if its cultural sections are organized into cohesive political sections". The inability of leadership to effectively manage ethnic diversity in African societies has engendered a situation where at first; people pay more allegiance to their immediate ethnic descent before considering national patriotism. Thus, this inept management of diversity in this perspective has become the bane of progress, development and happiness in the African social order. As a consequence, among African states, all that abounds according to the poem of William Yeasts *The Second Coming*, is:

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world
(cf. Jones and Fogelin, 1997, p.2)

This phenomenon again reinforces our belief that except diversity is approached in the inclusivist terms, diversity becomes a fertile ground for conflicts to breed and societies to disintegrate. Against the danger that exclusivist approach to diversity brings, we insist that there must be a sustained culture of free participation and unhindered access to open discourse for all sheds of perspectives to make their contribution towards the greatness of the overall system. As it stands at the moment, among African states,

there is palpable disconnect between component units and the center. This widening gap must have to be bridged for the benefits of inclusivity, equality and diversity to be fully reaped. One of the ways in ensuring a bridge of this widening gap, we posit, is the initiation of processes for a genuine national discourse (not dubious reconciliatory conferences) to enable component units discuss their differences, how they truly feel, and then renegotiate the bases for their integration into a whole. This will increase the sense of inclusion and belongingness.

Summary

In this article, an attempt has been made at exposing the various ways of understanding the concept of diversity and their corresponding implications to actions in line with calculative and meditative modes of being. The concept of diversity, the paper explains, expresses a situation in which different components constitute a whole in a uniquely different manner. It was also described as a condition of affairs in which entities such as peoples, races, cultures, life ways or practices manifest varying degrees of differences and identities. Accordingly, two broad ways of understanding diversity were further distinguished. It is said that diversity could be understood in terms of exclusivity or better still, it could be understood in terms of inclusivity. When understood in exclusivist terms, diversity becomes a problem because vital aspects of reality are decreed out of recognition, support and attention, only because they fail the test of familiarity. But when understood in inclusivist terms, diversity becomes a blessing as it then allows unfettered access of all persons and groups to discourse, to participation, to care and attention.

Attempts were made to show how these two modes of understanding diversity correspond to the two modes of thinking about the world. In this way, while calculative rationality better captures the exclusivist mode of diversity, the meditative procedure corresponds with the inclusivist sense of diversity. The point that was made in the final analysis was that each of these temperaments has a corresponding consequence on human relation and the search for authentic peaceful world order. To show how these temperaments manifest in our daily experience, we looked into different areas of human engagement. From the human concrete social experience, it was said that exclusivist approach to diversity kills human solidarity and probably accounts for the many troubles facing human relation today.

On the other hand, the research eulogized the virtues of inclusive diversity as one which engender integration, restores the feeling of belonging, trust and security in any system. However, in order not to defeat the very principle that inclusivity aims to promote, the essay insisted that not everything that must be included. In other words, whatever that does not enhance and promote human solidarity, unity and tranquility, such thing must be excluded from the scheme of things. When this situation obtains, exclusion becomes a legitimate action. In as much as waiting for the other enthrones human solidarity and care for the other, care must be taken in order not to kill the ingenuity in an individual with high flying spirit. In other words, while human essence is better actualized when existence becomes shared, such necessity for the otherness must not be allowed to dwarf individual authenticity. In the final analysis, while we cherish the principle of letting-be as the right phenomenological attitude for authentic

peace, we insist that human beings must always summon the will to despise what is despicable when the need arises.

In view of this, we conclude that for the principles of diversity in multicultural system to be actualized, the recognition of contraries must be made an actionable policy. It is only through the recognition of contraries and unique individualities that human beings can enthrone authentic and genuine peaceful world order.

References

- Annan, K. (2013, May 23). Pluralism: A Key Challenge of the 21st Century. *The Global Centre for Pluralism* .retrieved @ <http://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/speeches/%E2%80%9Cpluralism-a-key-challenge-of-the-21st-century%E2%80%9D/>
- Eck, D. L. (1993). *Encountering God, a Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Banares*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Trans. J Macquarrie and E. Robinson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Heidegger, M. (1968). *What is Called Thinking?* Trans. J. Glenngray. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Elija, O. J. and Usoro, I. U. (2016). Plural Society and the Challenge of Democratic Practice in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, Vol. 6, No.1 ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online)
- Hick, J. (1977). *God and the Universe of Faiths*, rev. ed. London: Collins.
- Holmes, A. (2015, October 27). Has 'Diversity' lost its Meaning? *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Jones, W.T. and Fogelin, R.J. (1997). *The History of Western Philosophy: The Twentieth Century to Quine and Derrida*, Third Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: A critique of Political Economy*, vol. one, Moscow: progress publishers .
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848). *Manifesto of the Communist party*. Moscow: progress publishers.
- Ogundowole, K. (1989). *National Ideological Orientation: A Methodological Approach*. In the *Nigerian Journal of Philosophy*, University of Lagos, Vol. 9. Nos 1&2, Rothmed International Ltd.
- Peoples, J. and Bailey, G. (2006). *Humanity: An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology* 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Riordan, C.M. (2014, June 5). Diversity is Useless without Inclusivity. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved @ <https://hbr.org/2014/06/diversity-is-useless-without-inclusivity> 1/9/2017
- Rothschild, J. and Wingfield, N. M. (2000). *Return to Diversity: A Political History of East Central Europe since World War II*, third edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tan Cheng Im, (2012). *Managing a Plural Society: Issues and Challenges of Multiculturalism in Malaysia*. *The Asian Conference on Cultural Studies*. www.iafo.org 30/8/2017.
- Thomas, K.M. (2005). *Diversity Dynamics in the Work Place*: Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth
- Unah, J. I. (1997). *Heidegger Through Kant to Fundamental Ontology*. Ibadan: Hope Publication.
- Viljoen-Terblanche, R. C. (2008). *Sustainable Organizational Transformation through Inclusivity. A Doctoral Thesis on Business Leadership*, submitted to the University of South Africa.