

The Art of Understanding

Empathy, Equanimity, and Coexistence

Juan Segurola

Volume II · First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola · All Rights Reserved

Contents

I. The difficulty of understanding

1. Understanding without taking possession of another person's experience
2. Listening before interpreting
3. Empathy, difference, and the limits of projection
4. Understanding is not justification

II. Judgment and equanimity

5. Disagreement without contempt
6. Equanimity in conflict
7. The freedom to say no without hostility
8. Recognising our own errors

III. Relationships and care

9. Care, reciprocity, and boundaries
10. Vulnerability and autonomy
11. Helping without controlling
12. Forgiveness, repair, and their limits

IV. Living with pluralism

13. Coexisting across different perspectives
14. Dialogue, evidence, and reasonable disagreement
15. Group Pressure and Independence of Judgment
16. Institutions, power, and unequal voices

V. Ethics of shared existence

17. Justice beyond private goodwill
18. Responsibility, complicity, and omission
19. Conflict, cooperation, and everyday practices
20. Understanding as an unfinished discipline

Preface · Understanding without domination

Understanding another person is not the same as adopting their interpretation of events. It is an inquiry into what they have lived, what they believe, and what circumstances make a course of action intelligible. That inquiry can be careful without presuming access to another person's inner life.

This volume explores the tension between empathy and impartial judgment, between care and autonomy, and between individual goodwill and institutions. Its central claim is modest: coexistence improves when listening, evidence, proportional responsibility, and limits are practiced together rather than turned into competing absolutes.

The chapters are philosophical arguments, not clinical protocols or claims that one moral framework can settle every case. Illustrative situations are not empirical findings. Ethical conclusions depend on circumstances, including power, consent, safety and the claims of third parties.

I. The difficulty of understanding

1. Understanding without taking possession of another person's experience

To understand another person is not to become that person. We never gain direct possession of someone else's sensations, memories, fears, or intentions. What we have are their words, their gestures, the situation in which we encounter them, and our own fallible attempts to interpret what they communicate. This limitation is not a defect that can be eliminated by greater sensitivity. It is a permanent feature of life among distinct people, and one reason why ethical understanding calls for humility.

We often speak as though empathy could dissolve the distance between two lives: "I know exactly how you feel." Such confidence can be comforting, but it can also conceal an appropriation. The speaker may substitute a familiar experience for what the other person is actually living. Similar circumstances do not guarantee similar meanings. The loss of a job, a disagreement with a parent, or a sudden illness can be endured with grief, relief, shame, fear, or several feelings at once. The other person's response need not replicate our own in order to deserve attention.

Understanding therefore begins with a double movement. We approach the other person closely enough to care about what is happening, while maintaining enough distance to avoid treating our interpretation as their truth. Closeness without restraint risks projection; distance without concern becomes indifference. An attentive relationship requires both. We may offer a tentative interpretation—"It sounds as though that conversation left you feeling excluded"—and remain ready for the reply: "No; I felt angry because I was not allowed to explain." The correction is not a failure of empathy. It is one of its conditions.

Listening is more demanding than remaining silent while planning our answer. It includes noticing what has been said, what remains uncertain, and what we are adding ourselves. We should distinguish observation from inference: a person who avoids eye contact may be uncomfortable, distracted, tired, or simply accustomed to a different conversational style. An interpretation may be reasonable without being established. Asking a careful question is often more respectful than offering a confident diagnosis of someone's motives.

There is also an asymmetry that moral advice can overlook. The person who describes an experience may not be able, willing, or safe to explain everything. Trauma, fear of retaliation, linguistic barriers, and unequal authority can all affect what can be shared. Respecting another person's perspective does not mean demanding disclosure. Sometimes the appropriate response is to acknowledge uncertainty, make a practical offer, and leave the decision in their hands. Privacy is not an obstacle to be conquered by an insistence on intimacy.

Empathy does not, by itself, settle the question of what is right. We can understand why someone acted harshly without endorsing the harm. We can recognise an offender's fear while affirming the injured person's right to safety and redress. Conversely, intense identification with one individual may narrow our attention and leave out people beyond that relationship. Caring well calls for more than feeling strongly: it requires evidence, proportion, fair consideration of those affected, and attention to consequences.

It is useful here to distinguish three activities. First, we try to grasp what another person reports and the context in which their experience takes shape. Second, we evaluate claims about events using the best information available. Third, we judge actions and responsibilities in light of ethical commitments. These activities influence one another, but they should not be confused. A sincere account of distress deserves respectful attention; it does not automatically establish every factual inference attached to it. An accurate account of events, in turn, does not remove the need for moral judgment.

The body complicates these distinctions without dissolving them. Our reactions—tightness in the chest, agitation, withdrawal, or a moment of ease—can alert us to what a conversation means to us. They are not instruments that reveal another person's hidden intentions. Someone may make us uneasy because they have behaved threateningly, because they resemble a person from our past, or because we are exhausted. Bodily awareness is useful when treated as information about our own state, rather than as infallible proof about the world.

Consider an ordinary disagreement between colleagues. One insists that a deadline is unrealistic; the other hears this as a lack of commitment. If both defend their initial interpretations, the discussion can rapidly become a contest over character. A different response would separate the shared practical problem from the attribution of motives: Which tasks remain? What resources are available? What is the consequence of delay? Each person can state a concern without claiming to know what the other secretly intends. Understanding does not guarantee agreement, but it can prevent unnecessary humiliation.

The same care is required in closer relationships. Loving someone does not confer authority over their inner life. A friend can say, "I am worried about you," without insisting, "You are afraid of change, and that is why you refuse." A parent can attend seriously to a child's account without abandoning the duties appropriate to the child's age or safety. A person receiving support can value that help and still disagree about the best course of action. Respectful understanding protects agency even where people depend on one another.

No universal conversational formula can substitute for context. Sometimes an explicit question is welcome; at other times it burdens someone already overwhelmed. Sometimes disagreement should be spoken clearly; at other times an immediate interruption is needed to prevent harm. Power matters: an employee may not be able to contradict a manager as freely as a manager can contradict an employee. Advice that assumes equal freedom can unintentionally reinforce the very inequalities it seeks to soften.

Nor is understanding an obligation to remain in a harmful relationship. A person may comprehend the history, insecurity, or suffering that contributes to another's conduct and still need distance, protection, or legal intervention. Explaining behaviour does not transfer responsibility from the person who acts to the person who is harmed. The ethical task is not to dissolve every boundary in the name of compassion, but to judge which forms of contact are possible without abandoning dignity and safety.

We also need the humility to revise our judgments of ourselves. When someone challenges our account of a conversation, an immediate defensive impulse may appear: we remember what we intended, and we want that intention to settle the matter. Yet intentions and effects can diverge. We can acknowledge an unwanted effect, offer repair, and clarify our intention without declaring ourselves wholly guilty or wholly innocent. This is the practical work of coexistence, not a demand for perpetual self-accusation.

The art of understanding, then, is neither mind-reading nor endless agreement. It is a disciplined openness to another person's reality, combined with a willingness to test interpretations, protect boundaries, and accept the responsibilities that follow from our actions. It makes room for curiosity without surrendering judgment, and for disagreement without reducing the other person to an enemy. Its first lesson is simple but difficult: another life is always more than the story we tell ourselves about it.

Imagine someone remaining silent in a meeting. Reading silence as agreement may be as premature as reading it as fear. Responsible understanding asks what conditions allow people to speak, distinguishes the absence of objection from consent, and accepts that the person may choose not to disclose their reasons. The interpretation remains revisable.

2. Listening Before Interpreting

Listening is a form of attention that temporarily suspends the urge to decide the meaning of what we hear. It does not require us to abandon judgment or accept every account as true. It means allowing a person to express an experience before turning it into a familiar category: exaggeration, complaint, threat, irresponsibility, or lack of interest.

Interpretation is unavoidable and may be useful. We recognise patterns, anticipate risks, and connect what we hear to prior knowledge. The problem arises when we treat an initial interpretation as though it were a direct observation. "You arrived late" describes a fact that can be checked; "you do not care about our time" attributes an intention for which the evidence is far less certain. Confusing these statements often closes the conversation.

Careful listening distinguishes what was said, what we suppose was meant, and what it made us feel. This separation is particularly difficult when a conversation touches an old wound. One person says they need to be alone; the other hears rejection. The emotional reaction is real, but it does not establish that the first person intended exclusion or punishment.

Questions can open understanding when they do not become interrogation. "Which part worries you most?" leaves room to clarify a problem; "why do you always do this?" presents an accusation as a question. Form matters, though no technique guarantees a response. At times a person needs silence, time, or assurance that disagreement will not be punished.

Listening also requires attention to our position in the relationship. Under a hierarchy, an invitation to speak may not be free when the questioner controls pay, evaluation, or continued employment. Meaningful listening requires conditions: the possibility of saying no, protection against retaliation, and readiness to revise decisions. Kindness without such conditions is insufficient.

Silence calls for cautious interpretation. Not speaking can signify agreement, disagreement, exhaustion, prudence, fear, a lack of words, or simply a wish for privacy. Respect does not consist in confidently decoding silence. It means acknowledging that we do not know its meaning and declining to exploit that uncertainty.

Nor does listening oblige us to absorb another person's distress indefinitely. We may establish times, request a pause, and recognise our limits without neglecting responsibilities that genuinely belong to us. Caring for a conversation also means caring for the conditions that make it sustainable.

In a household disagreement, for instance, one person says they shoulder too many tasks. The defensive response immediately lists the other person's contributions. A more fruitful listener asks for examples, checks the actual distribution of work, and allows changes to be negotiated. Validating a feeling is not enough: if there is a verifiable inequality, listening should lead to reconsidering facts and practices.

Learning to listen, then, means delaying our appropriation of another person's words. It is neither passivity nor submission but a discipline of attention that distinguishes experience, evidence,

interpretation, and decision. Such a pause can make fairer disagreement and better-informed action possible.

Listening requires checking both the content and the setting of a conversation. In a family disagreement, paraphrasing what we heard and asking whether we understood it can repair misunderstandings; yet this does not justify demanding endless explanations. Listening loses its value when it becomes interrogation or a requirement to disclose private matters.

3. Empathy, Difference, and the Limits of Projection

Empathy is often celebrated as though we could feel another person's life from within. In reality, even when we recognise a familiar emotion, the other person's biography, body, culture, and circumstances prevent perfect equivalence. Similarity can bring us closer; it can also tempt us to project our motives onto a situation that is not ours.

When someone loses a job, we may remember our own financial uncertainty. That memory may make us more attentive, but it does not entitle us to assume that the person experiences the same mixture of shame, relief, anger, or fear. Help improves when we move from "I know what you need" to a respectful question about what the person considers useful.

Not all differences are visible. The same situation affects people unequally depending on available resources, caring responsibilities, disability, legal security, or access to support. Understanding requires attention to those conditions without reducing anyone to a label. Two people who share a social circumstance may differ profoundly in priorities and aspirations.

Projection can even wear a benevolent appearance. We decide that someone "should" feel grateful for our assistance or that their refusal proves they do not understand their own good. At that point, apparent empathy approaches paternalism. Offering support respects autonomy when it permits preferences to be expressed, interventions to be declined, and arrangements to be reconsidered, within limits justified by safety and duties of care.

There is also a difference between emotional resonance and deliberate understanding. Sharing another person's pain may mobilise us, but it can also overwhelm us or favour someone who feels familiar. Ethical attention should not depend solely on how strongly a face or a story moves us. We can recognise legitimate needs even without an intense emotional response.

That distinction matters in public decisions. A moving narrative can reveal an injustice hidden by statistics, while rigorous evaluation can reveal people absent from familiar stories. Responsible understanding needs both perspectives: sensitivity to particular lives and critical examination of the wider effects of decisions.

These distinctions can be placed in dialogue with two different approaches. Edith Stein's account of empathy (1917) distinguishes access to another person's experience from living that experience as one's own. Paul Bloom (2016) warns that affective empathy can focus attention selectively and may be a poor guide to impartial moral decisions. The argument developed here is not derived from either author: it treats empathy as a possible way of approaching another person, while requiring evidence, proportionate judgment, and fairness.

Empathy also needs boundaries. We are not required to guess thoughts or endanger our integrity to demonstrate understanding. Understanding the circumstances of someone who uses pressure or violence does not turn their demands into entitlements over us. Protection and distance may be compatible with humane judgment.

When we do not know what another person feels, acknowledging this is a strength, not a moral defect. We can say that we do not fully understand, ask without demanding disclosure, and offer assistance that

can be withdrawn or adapted. Prudence matters especially when unequal power makes it difficult to refuse our proposals.

Mature empathy does not seek to erase difference. It allows us to remain attentive to an experience we do not own, revise inferences when evidence changes, and act considerately without usurping another person's voice.

Two people may assign different meanings to the same bodily or social experience. One shares a story seeking recognition; another seeks practical help. Before choosing a response, it is reasonable to ask what kind of support is wanted. Even a well-intentioned response may fail when it replaces expressed needs with the observer's preferences.

4. Understanding Is Not Justification

One persistent obstacle to understanding conflict is the fear that explaining conduct amounts to excusing it. Seeking the reasons why someone acted harmfully can make us appear indifferent to the person harmed. Yet explanation, evaluation, and response are separate tasks. Precisely by distinguishing them, we can examine causes honestly and take just consequences seriously.

To understand conduct is to reconstruct, from available evidence, the circumstances, beliefs, and decisions that contributed to it. To justify it is to claim that the conduct was acceptable under a moral or legal standard. A causal explanation may be accurate while also revealing that an action violated rights or caused harm that calls for repair.

Consider someone who humiliates a colleague out of fear of losing their position. Fear may be a relevant explanation, but it does not make humiliation legitimate. Ignoring the fear might prevent us from changing the competitive environment that encourages abuse. Attending only to the fear leaves the humiliated person unprotected. Understanding requires both dimensions.

A fair assessment considers intention, knowledge, genuine alternatives, severity of harm, and conditions of coercion. Not everyone has the same range of choices; nor does all responsibility disappear when circumstances are difficult. The ethical task is to avoid both automatic condemnation and automatic absolution. Sometimes uncertainty must be acknowledged and judgment revised.

The distinction also applies to ourselves. Knowing why we responded in anger does not undo a hurtful remark. We can acknowledge exhaustion, shame, or a history of fear while still apologising, changing conduct, and repairing what we can. Self-compassion ceases to be responsible when it becomes a means of evading those obligations.

In abusive situations, insisting that the person harmed should "understand" the aggressor can reproduce the injustice. Understanding must not become a one-sided demand to relinquish boundaries, reportable facts, or protection. A person who has suffered harm retains the right to prioritise safety and decide what relationship, if any, to maintain.

Institutions need this distinction too. Investigating the social causes of conduct does not deny individual agency, while sanctioning without examining context can produce disproportionate or ineffective responses. A reasonable approach combines fair procedures, verifiable evidence, proportionality, prevention, and opportunities for repair where appropriate.

Understanding does not demand neutrality in the face of cruelty. We can hear different accounts without pretending that all are equally supported. We can respect the dignity of persons while rejecting false claims, threats, or practices of domination. Equanimity is not indifference: it is the attempt to judge carefully even when a firm protective decision is needed.

Ultimately, understanding and accountability are not enemies. More accurate understanding lets us address causes, establish proportionate boundaries, and avoid simplistic attributions. The aim is not to

soften every consequence but to prevent our rejection of harm from blurring the distinctions among facts, explanations, justifications, and responses.

II. Judgment and equanimity

5. Disagreement Without Contempt

To disagree with someone is not to regard them as less worthy of respect. This distinction seems simple, yet it blurs when an opinion becomes a badge of belonging, a threat to our identity, or a judgment about who we are. We then argue to defend a personal position rather than to understand what is at stake.

Disagreement may arise because we have different information, interpret the same facts differently, or assign incompatible priorities to legitimate goods. It helps to identify which of these levels supports the dispute. A dispute about facts calls for evidence; one about values calls for clarification of reasons and consequences; one about interests may require negotiation.

Listening does not require treating every claim as equally valid. A position supported by strong evidence is not equivalent to an unsupported assertion. Respect for the person making a claim requires precisely that we be able to examine the claim without confusing its validity with the speaker's dignity.

Contempt reduces the other person to a caricature. Instead of a complex human being, they come to stand for a defect: ignorance, selfishness, naivety, or bad faith. This simplification makes it difficult to recognize their partial reasons, doubts, or capacity to change their mind. It also shields us artificially from revising our own view.

Not every conflict is symmetrical. When someone coerces, discriminates against, or denies another person basic rights, demanding calm dialogue from the person harmed may itself be unjust. Rejecting contempt is not the same as giving up denunciation, firm boundaries, protest, or institutional avenues of protection.

We can begin a conversation by distinguishing what we think we heard from what was actually said. Restating another person's position in terms they recognize helps identify the precise disagreement. Asking "What evidence would change your mind?" is meaningful if we are willing to answer the same question ourselves.

Some discussions should not continue. Repetition, aggression, or an absence of good faith can turn an exchange into a source of exhaustion without learning. Ending a conversation clearly and proportionately is compatible with recognizing the other person's humanity. No one owes unlimited attention to someone who violates their boundaries.

In living together, the reasonable goal is not always consensus. Sometimes it is enough to agree on shared procedures, prevent harm, and sustain a civil relationship despite enduring disagreements. Mutual respect does not require identical beliefs: it requires recognizing that our differences unfold in a shared space.

Disagreeing without contempt is therefore an intellectual discipline and an ethical practice. It asks for precision in argument, caution when attributing motives, and firmness in the face of harm. It cannot guarantee harmony; it can, at least, prevent conflict from destroying the possibility of understanding at the outset.

Respectful disagreement does not require pretending that every assertion has equal evidence. For testable claims, we can ask for reasons and correct facts; for value conflicts, we can identify competing interests. Respect is owed to persons, not to an exemption of their arguments from criticism.

6. Equanimity in Conflict

Equanimity is not the absence of emotion. Anger at injustice, fear in the face of danger, or grief after a loss may inform our decisions. What requires care is not experiencing these emotions but mistaking their intensity for the accuracy of our interpretation or for proof that we should act immediately.

In conflict, the body may respond before we have formed a complete explanation. Breathing, attention, and tone of voice change; the range of options we perceive can narrow. Noticing these signals can help us decide whether to respond now, ask for a pause, or seek support. Bodily sensations deserve attention, but they are not infallible evidence of another person's intentions.

Equanimity means holding several questions together: What happened? What do I actually know? What am I assuming? What harm might my words cause? What duties do I have to myself and others? The aim is not to postpone decisions indefinitely but to keep subjective urgency from replacing judgment.

Balance does not mean distributing blame or merit equally. In situations involving abuse or unequal power, automatic neutrality may reinforce harm. Equanimity requires listening and checking facts, but also identifying responsibilities, asymmetries, and conditions of safety. Calm evaluation need not entail a weak response when protection is required.

A pause can help when both parties have a safe way out and delay will not worsen the situation. By contrast, an immediate threat may call for action without prolonged deliberation: seeking help, leaving, or contacting appropriate services. No self-regulation technique should become an obligation to remain in danger.

Equanimity can also be practised after a conflict. We can review what happened without turning each mistake into a condemnation of our identity. Perhaps we were unfair, responded too harshly, or endured more than we should have. Examining these possibilities requires honesty, not self-punishment.

Long-term coexistence benefits from explicit rules: discuss concrete behaviour rather than attacking persons; allow pauses; distinguish requests from threats; agree on how to repair consequences. Such rules matter especially when one person controls resources, information, or decisions that affect another.

Equanimity is compatible with firm boundaries and vivid emotions. It does not aim at an image of perfect calm but at preserving our capacity to perceive, judge, and act in proportion to the facts. Sometimes its clearest expression is a patient conversation; at other times, a decisive refusal.

Equanimity cannot be measured solely by a calm tone of voice. Someone facing injustice may express legitimate anger, while someone who appears calm may be avoiding responsibility. What matters is whether the response preserves the ability to perceive facts, protect those affected, and act proportionately.

7. The Freedom to Say No Without Hostility

Saying no is part of personal autonomy, but its meaning depends on context. A refusal may protect time, health, integrity, or convictions; it may also evade a legitimate duty or unjustly abandon someone who depends on our care. Responsible freedom requires distinguishing these cases before treating every act of resistance as a virtue.

Many people delay a refusal because they fear disappointing expectations. They confuse kindness with permanent availability and assume disagreement will be interpreted as personal rejection. Yet a relationship sustained only while one party agrees to every demand does not rest on robust consent.

A clear refusal often requires less explanation than a lengthy defence. "I cannot take on that task," "I do not consent to that treatment," or "I need to reconsider" communicate different boundaries. Courtesy

may make it easier for another person to listen, but the right to set a legitimate boundary does not depend on finding a flawless phrase.

We should not confuse an absence of hostility with an absence of conflict. Someone who benefits from our compliance may respond with pressure, guilt, or anger. The fact that a refusal causes discomfort does not prove it unjust. Nor does it prove it right: we still need to examine the commitments and consequences involved.

Reciprocity matters. We can ask others to respect our boundaries while also listening to theirs. Our own boundary is not a licence to disregard agreements, break promises without explanation, or shift responsibilities onto someone else. When a commitment cannot be fulfilled, we should communicate that and seek proportionate alternatives.

In some relationships, saying no carries real risks: economic dependence, coercion, violence, or institutional retaliation. In such cases, the abstract advice to “set boundaries” is insufficient. Safety, available support, and the possibility of leaving the situation must take priority over any ideal of direct confrontation.

Saying no without hostility also means learning to accept another person’s refusal. Not every declined request expresses a lack of love, selfishness, or contempt. The other person may have unseen obligations, personal needs, or priorities unknown to us. Receiving a refusal without demanding unlimited access to their reasons is a form of respect.

The aim is not to say no more often, but to choose more consciously when to accept, negotiate, or refuse. Mature autonomy is measured not by the number of refusals but by the coherence between decisions, responsibilities, and consideration for those who share our lives.

The legitimacy of a boundary also depends on context. Declining a social invitation is not equivalent to abandoning someone dependent on our care. A responsible refusal may require arranging alternatives, communicating in advance, or seeking resources, without turning a duty of care into unlimited availability.

8. Recognizing Our Own Mistakes

Understanding others requires acknowledging that our own interpretations of the world are fallible. We may err in remembering an event, attributing a motive, evaluating conduct, or anticipating an outcome. A willingness to correct ourselves need not weaken our convictions; it can make them more responsible.

Mistakes are difficult to admit when we confuse an opinion with our identity. If revising a belief feels like losing personal worth, every contrary piece of evidence can seem like an attack. Separating our judgment from the dignity we retain creates room to revise hypotheses without abandoning ourselves.

Recognizing a mistake calls for precision. It is not enough to declare vaguely that “no one is perfect” when a concrete decision caused harm. We should establish what we did, what we knew at the time, what we ought to have checked, and what consequences remain unresolved. An accurate account avoids both automatic excuses and indiscriminate guilt.

Repair is not the same as remorse. An apology may be appropriate, but it does not replace returning what was taken, correcting false information, changing a procedure, or ending harmful behaviour. A person who has been harmed retains the autonomy to decide whether to accept an apology, rebuild trust, or maintain distance.

Not all mistakes have the same gravity. An awkward interpretation in an ordinary conversation is not equivalent to repeated negligence with consequences for others. Responsibility should be proportionate to foreseeability, effective control, duties undertaken, and the harm caused.

Self-compassion, understood as a willingness to acknowledge our vulnerability without denial or cruelty, can make correction possible. It does not require minimizing responsibility. On the contrary, it can prevent fear of being defined by a failure from stopping us from facing it and taking reparative action.

We can cultivate simple habits of review: listen to dissenting voices, keep records when decisions matter, explain what evidence supports our conclusions, and acknowledge a correction publicly when the mistake was public. Intellectual humility requires verifiable practices, not merely statements of intent.

In shared life, admitting mistakes changes our relationship to authority. Someone who never corrects course may project certainty and discourage questions. By contrast, a person who corrects transparently shows that the legitimacy of a decision rests not on the decision-maker's infallibility but on reasons open to review.

Recognizing our mistakes does not mean obsessively reviewing every word or pursuing impossible moral purity. It means remaining ready to learn and repair when sufficient reasons arise. Understanding others more fully often begins by giving up the fiction that our own perspective is without limits.

III. Relationships and care

9. Care, Reciprocity, and Boundaries

Care begins by recognizing that another person has needs and a history that we do not fully know. It is expressed not only in feelings but in sustained attention, practical acts, and the willingness to adjust our conduct. Yet care does not grant ownership of the person we care for. Its quality is measured partly by whether it protects the other person's capacity to speak and choose.

Reciprocity matters because relationships become fragile when responsibility is continually transferred to one side. But reciprocity is not an accounting ledger. A child, a person with significant support needs, or someone facing a temporary crisis may be unable to return care in equal measure. Fairness must be assessed over time, with attention to capacities, circumstances, and the asymmetries that are sometimes unavoidable.

An ethic of care does not demand unlimited availability. The value of attending to particular needs, explored by Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984), must be considered alongside the fair distribution of care work. When one person shoulders every family duty, praising their generosity is not enough: we must ask who can rest, who decides, and what support is missing. The historical association of care with femininity concerns contested social roles; it does not establish an innate moral aptitude based on sex.

Boundaries prevent care from becoming exhaustion, resentment, or coercion. A boundary identifies what one can responsibly offer and what one cannot undertake without disproportionate cost. It should be expressed as clearly as the situation permits: what help is available, for how long, and what alternatives can be sought. Refusing an impossible demand is not necessarily abandoning someone; nevertheless, urgent vulnerability can generate duties that a convenient appeal to personal freedom does not erase.

There is an important distinction between a request and an obligation. Some duties arise from explicit promises, parenthood, professional responsibility, or having caused harm. Others belong to the sphere of voluntary solidarity. Confusing them creates moral pressure; separating them requires judgment rather than a formula. The question is not simply whether I wish to help, but what I owe, what I can do, and who else ought to share the burden.

Consider an older relative who needs increasing assistance. Immediate availability may appear generous, yet an arrangement dependent on a single exhausted family member is often unsafe for

everyone. A more responsible response might involve conversations about preferences, accessible services, shared schedules, and periodic review. The aim is neither to withdraw affection nor to promise unlimited availability, but to make care sustainable and accountable.

A relationship becomes more humane when limits can be discussed without humiliation and needs can be named without manipulation. Care, reciprocity, and boundaries are therefore not rival values. They correct one another: care prevents indifference, reciprocity checks exploitation, and boundaries protect the conditions under which help can continue.

In long-term care it is worth asking who decides, who bears the cost, and what support is available. An affectionate relationship can become unsustainable when the entire burden falls on one person. Reciprocity need not mean symmetrical exchange: it may also take the form of recognition, adjusted expectations, and socially shared support.

10. Vulnerability and Autonomy

Human vulnerability is not an exceptional defect affecting only a few people. Bodies change, plans fail, and every life depends at times on knowledge, infrastructure, affection, and material support provided by others. Recognizing this condition does not mean denying agency. It means abandoning the false choice between absolute independence and total dependence.

Autonomy is better understood as the practical ability to participate meaningfully in decisions that affect one's life. That ability can be strengthened by accessible information, time to reflect, communication aids, reasonable accommodations, and trustworthy advice. Dependence on a support person does not automatically transfer the right to decide to that person. Assistance should enlarge the range of real choices wherever possible.

Effective autonomy is tested when someone needs assistance to deliberate, communicate, or carry out a decision. The question is not whether help is present, but whether real opportunities remain to express and revise preferences. The capabilities approach associated with Sen and Nussbaum offers a vocabulary for examining such opportunities; it does not, on its own, supply a rule that resolves every family or clinical disagreement. Where serious risks exist, protective measures require proportionate and reviewable justification.

Vulnerability also creates opportunities for abuse. A person who controls transport, money, medication, communication, or access to information may exercise power even without overt threats. Good intentions are insufficient safeguards. Transparency, independent advice, opportunities to contest decisions, and attention to the person's expressed preferences help prevent support from becoming domination.

Not every choice has the same stakes. Ordinary preferences about clothing, leisure, or social contact should not be overridden merely because observers disagree. Decisions involving serious, foreseeable harm may call for protective measures, but those measures require legal and ethical justification and should be proportionate and as little restrictive as possible. Capacity is often decision-specific and context-sensitive, not an all-or-nothing label.

Imagine a person recovering from an accident who needs daily assistance but wishes to return to work. Treating this wish as naïve ignores personal purpose; promising that everything will be simple ignores genuine obstacles. Respectful support explores accessibility, safety, costs, fatigue, available adaptations, and alternative paths, while keeping the person central to the decision.

A society that takes autonomy seriously must therefore ask not merely whether individuals appear self-sufficient, but whether they have the conditions to exercise a voice. Vulnerability is not the opposite of freedom; it is one of the circumstances within which responsible freedom must be built.

The autonomy of someone who needs assistance is not assessed by counting tasks performed without help. A person may decide clearly what they prefer while needing support to carry it out. A respectful framework distinguishes decision, execution, and material access, and recognizes that environmental barriers may restrict choices without reducing personal worth or dignity.

11. Helping Without Controlling

Help has an ethical paradox: the more resources or expertise the helper possesses, the easier it becomes to replace the recipient's judgment with the helper's own. What begins as an offer can turn into a rule, and gratitude can be demanded as the price of assistance. To help well, we must distinguish providing means from appropriating another person's purposes.

Before intervening, three questions deserve attention: Has the person asked for help? What kind of help would actually be useful? What risks or obligations would remain if we did nothing? These questions are not a mechanical checklist. Immediate danger may demand action before consent can be obtained; ordinary uncertainty usually calls for listening rather than taking over.

An offer respects autonomy when the recipient can decline it without being punished, shamed, or excluded from other opportunities. Conditions may nevertheless be legitimate: a lender may require repayment, a professional may follow safety procedures, and a public service must apply fair rules. The crucial issue is whether conditions are relevant, transparent, proportionate, and open to scrutiny, rather than hidden instruments of obedience.

Expert knowledge introduces a further responsibility. A clinician, teacher, or technical adviser should communicate what is established, what remains uncertain, and which decisions depend on the other person's values. Simplifying explanations is useful; suppressing reasonable alternatives is not. Professional authority is most defensible when it helps others understand options, not when it shields decisions from questions.

Consider a friend who struggles with debt. Taking control of every purchase may appear effective, but it can produce secrecy and dependency. A less intrusive response may combine an agreed budget, practical information, clear limits on loans, and the freedom to review the arrangement. Where serious risks exist, the degree of intervention should still match the evidence and applicable duties.

Helping without controlling is not passive indifference. It involves effort, patience, sometimes difficult disagreement, and willingness to remain present after an offer is refused. Its ethical ambition is to make the helper progressively less central whenever circumstances permit.

In professional settings, offering clear alternatives and checking understanding protects autonomy better than securing hurried agreement. Consent cannot simply be inferred from a signed form: language, time pressure, unequal information, and the genuine ability to refuse an option all matter.

12. Forgiveness, Repair, and Their Limits

When someone causes harm, several distinct questions arise. What happened? Who is responsible? What can be repaired? What protection is now necessary? Is reconciliation possible or desirable? Treating all these questions as one produces confusion. An apology, forgiveness, restored trust, and reconciliation are different acts; none automatically entails the others.

An apology has moral substance when it identifies the conduct, acknowledges its effects without defensive qualifications, and accepts a feasible duty to change. "I am sorry you felt hurt" may avoid naming what was done. By contrast, taking responsibility requires listening to the person harmed without demanding that they immediately make the offender feel better.

Repair may be material, relational, institutional, or symbolic. It can involve returning money, correcting a false allegation, changing a workplace practice, or acknowledging a public wrong. Some losses cannot

be undone. In such cases, honesty about irreversibility is preferable to promises of complete restoration. Where violence or coercion is involved, safety and accountability take priority over pressure to reconcile.

Forgiveness, when freely chosen, may release a person from a consuming desire for retaliation. But it is neither a universal psychological prescription nor an obligation owed to someone who has caused harm. Not forgiving does not prove moral immaturity; forgiving does not require renewed contact. A person may wish another no harm while maintaining firm distance and pursuing lawful remedies.

Restoring trust demands evidence over time. Repeated conduct, transparent agreements, boundaries, and the possibility of independent support matter more than dramatic declarations. In relationships marked by a severe imbalance of power, invitations to “move on” can disguise a demand for silence. The perspective of the harmed person must therefore carry weight in any proposed process of reconciliation.

An ethics of understanding does not dissolve responsibility in compassion. It seeks to understand the conditions of harm precisely so that they can be changed, while preserving the harmed person’s freedom to decide what relationship, if any, remains possible. Sometimes the most humane outcome is renewed cooperation; sometimes it is an honest and protected separation.

IV. Living with pluralism

13. Coexisting Across Different Perspectives

Human plurality is not an anomaly to be corrected before we can live together. People who share a neighborhood, school, workplace, or family may interpret the same events differently even when they have access to similar information. Experiences, expectations, loyalties, and fears act as filters. Acknowledging this does not require abandoning tests against reality: an interpretation may be mistaken, and an action may cause verifiable harm, even when its defender feels that it is profoundly true.

Coexistence begins when we stop treating disagreement as a threat to identity. We can ask what the other person means precisely, what problem they are trying to solve, and which experience they regard as decisive. Such questions do not amount to accepting their conclusions. They help reveal shared assumptions and locate the real point of contention. We often argue over words—respect, justice, freedom, security—that each speaker uses in a different sense.

Understanding other perspectives also requires distinguishing negotiable differences from limits that protect dignity. Tastes, habits, and many life projects allow flexible arrangements. Violence, intimidation, and the arbitrary deprivation of rights are not mere conflicting preferences to be divided evenly. This distinction prevents a misplaced idea of tolerance from turning into indifference toward harm.

Consider two neighbors in conflict over noise. One needs to sleep after a night shift; the other considers musical practice essential. Both have understandable reasons, but neither need automatically cancel the other. Agreeing on hours, exploring sound insulation, and allowing exceptions may be more productive than accusing one another of selfishness or intolerance. Cooperation asks us to translate fixed positions into specific needs without pretending that every interest can be fully satisfied.

Not every difference ends in agreement. Sometimes the responsible outcome is to maintain respectful distance, establish public rules, and keep a process of revision available. Living together does not mean feeling close to everyone or turning each disagreement into friendship. It means creating conditions under which no one must erase their individuality to be treated fairly.

This attitude has an inner dimension. Confidence in our own outlook need not depend on persuading others to reproduce it. We can hold firm convictions, open to revision in the light of evidence, while recognizing that shared life requires intelligible rules and a minimum willingness to reciprocate.

In a plural community, coexistence does not mean erasing profound differences. It means agreeing on procedures for resolving disagreement, protecting rights, and allowing people to hold different convictions. When a position seeks to deny equal freedoms to others, an abstract appeal to tolerance is insufficient; institutional limits must be examined.

14. Dialogue, Evidence, and Reasonable Disagreement

Dialogue is not simply taking turns to deliver speeches. Genuine dialogue requires attention to another person's reasons and a willingness to let some of them alter our understanding. This does not place every opinion on the same epistemic footing. Some claims can be tested, others express preferences, and still others propose values or collective choices. Confusing these levels turns conversation into an endless exchange of subjective certainties.

A basic practice is to identify the kind of question first. When discussing a health or environmental risk, we need data, methods, and an appraisal of uncertainty. When deciding how burdens should be shared, normative criteria also matter: fairness, need, responsibility, and protection of those with the least room to choose. A sound argument makes explicit which facts it assumes and which values it prioritizes.

Reasonable discussion is not merely a tally of arguments without regard to who can make them and who will be believed. Fricker (2007) distinguishes credibility harms connected to prejudice; this calls for listening to testimony without assuming that every perception is accurate. A fair procedure combines respect, scrutiny of evidence, and means to correct mistakes. Invoking "neutrality" when participants risk retaliation can preserve inequality rather than resolve it.

Rigorous listening involves reconstructing another person's position in terms they would recognize before responding. We might ask, "Is it fair to say that your main concern is this?" Often this reveals that we had been arguing against an exaggerated version of their position. Equally, it is legitimate to request precision, expose contradictions, and ask for sources when an assertion purports to describe facts.

Evidence has limits and degrees. Personal experience may disclose an overlooked need or suggest a hypothesis; by itself it does not establish how common a phenomenon is or how effective an intervention will be in general. A published study is not immune to error either. Design, replication, measurement quality, studied populations, and the possibility of contrary findings all matter. Admitting uncertainty is not a weakness in argument: it is a recognition of the actual conditions of knowledge.

In reasonable disagreement, people may reach different conclusions even after sharing the facts. Some give priority to preventing serious harm; others fear excessive restrictions on autonomy. The task is not to declare every criterion neutral, but to set out the costs of each option and explain why a particular solution is proportionate. Deliberation improves when those affected have a voice and understand how a decision will be made.

We must also recognize when dialogue is no longer viable. If one side manipulates evidence, makes threats, or turns every question into a personal attack, continuing without boundaries can enable abuse. Ending a conversation, documenting facts, or seeking mediation does not contradict intellectual openness. Honest dialogue requires both a willingness to learn and protection from coercion.

Deliberation improves when it distinguishes verifiable facts, plausible inferences, and normative preferences. A figure may be verifiable, while its policy implications remain open to discussion. This separation limits the temptation to present a personal value as a technical necessity, or empirical uncertainty as proof that every position is equally defensible.

15. Group Pressure and Independence of Judgment

Belonging offers security, recognition, and opportunities for cooperation. None of these goods is trivial: we need relationships to develop and to withstand difficult periods. Yet the same need to belong can lead us to suppress doubts, repeat an opinion, or join in conduct we would not approve of alone. Conformity is not always imposed by orders; it often appears through disapproving gestures, silence, or implicit promises of acceptance.

Group pressure may be explicit, such as a threat of exclusion, or subtle, such as the expectation that we show enthusiasm for a decision already made. Even communities that celebrate independent thought may punish dissent when it challenges their central symbols. Detecting this pressure means asking which questions can be raised without disproportionate social sanctions, and which doubts disappear from meetings only to reappear in private conversations.

Keeping one's own judgment does not mean automatically rejecting majority views. Collective decisions may draw on information and experience that no single member possesses. Independence means being able to examine reasons, recognize others' expertise, voice reservations, and revise one's position without making it dependent on the rewards or penalties of belonging. An independent person does not need to go against the majority; they need to be able not to.

Imagine a team proposing an improbable delivery date to a customer. Each participant assumes that others possess information justifying the promise, and no one wants to appear uncommitted. A single person asking what evidence supports the schedule may bring shared doubts into the open. Creating spaces in which informed dissent does not invite retaliation improves both decision quality and collective accountability.

Freedom of judgment depends on practical resources: time to think, access to diverse information, relationships beyond the dominant group, and some capacity to endure disapproval. It becomes harder when livelihood, housing, or care depend on an authority able to withdraw support arbitrarily. We should therefore avoid turning resistance to group pressure into a heroic demand placed on those who have the least protection.

Living together well means fostering conditions in which a reasoned objection is heard before it is branded disloyalty. The strongest cohesion is not enforced unanimity, but confidence that disagreement can be expressed and resolved without humiliation.

When a group rewards unanimity, a minority view may disappear from discussion without being rebutted. Supporting dissent requires concrete procedures: opportunities to speak, protection from retaliation, and examination of objections before decisions. Independence of judgment does not mean ignoring the group, but being able to disagree without exclusion.

16. Institutions, Power, and Unequal Voices

Human relationships do not take place in a vacuum of power. A conversation between equals is not the same as one between employer and employee, clinician and patient, administration and citizen, or adult and child. Institutional rules distribute resources, authority, and opportunities to challenge decisions. Ignoring such asymmetry and merely asking everyone to "listen" can conceal that one party faces much greater costs for speaking.

Authority serves legitimate purposes. Coordinating services, applying specialized knowledge, and protecting rights require decisions to be delegated. Yet the legitimacy of a role does not make every decision of the person holding it unquestionable. Authority should be able to explain its criteria, acknowledge conflicts of interest, correct mistakes, and answer to proportionate procedures of review.

Institutions can offer impersonal rules that protect against favoritism, yet rules alone are insufficient when participation is unequal. Before celebrating an agreement, we should ask who set the agenda, who

could challenge it, and what resources existed to appeal decisions. The deliberative ideal is offered here as a normative criterion, not an empirical description of every real institution. Safe withdrawal must also remain possible when negotiation becomes coercive.

Listening to someone in a vulnerable position requires more than granting a few minutes to speak. They must understand the process, receive accessible information, have enough time, and possess a route for complaint without retaliation. Sometimes they need linguistic, technical, or legal support. Participation is meaningful only when it can reasonably influence decisions or, at least, leave a reviewable record of dissent.

Consider someone unable to understand an administrative decision affecting an essential benefit. Repeating regulatory language may satisfy a formality while leaving that person equally defenseless. Explaining reasons clearly, indicating deadlines, and offering an effective appeal turns a one-sided relationship into a more accountable process. Institutional understanding is also measured by an institution's ability to hear the unforeseen consequences of its own rules.

Power should be neither idealized nor demonized in the abstract. Some restrictions protect people who would otherwise suffer harm through others' choices; others perpetuate privilege or impose unnecessary control. Evaluating them means asking whom a rule benefits, who bears its costs, what alternatives exist, and whether affected people can challenge it. Equanimity does not mean standing halfway between authority and subordinate; it means assessing reasons and the actual distribution of risks.

An ethics of coexistence links interpersonal courtesy with procedural justice. Listening well matters, but so do the rules that make it possible to speak, dissent, and seek repair. Without these conditions, appeals to empathy may remain an agreeable ideal that leaves relationships of domination unchanged.

V. Ethics of Shared Existence

17. Justice Beyond Private Goodwill

Goodwill matters, but it cannot replace the conditions that allow people to live with dignity. We may treat someone courteously while taking part in institutions whose rules make it difficult for that person to be heard. An ethics of understanding must attend both to personal conduct and to the structures that distribute power, opportunity, time, and recognition.

Justice does not require everyone to receive exactly the same thing in every circumstance. It requires asking which differences are relevant, which needs demand a response, and whether rules can be justified to those who bear their consequences. Equal respect can coexist with different forms of support when starting circumstances are unequal.

Imagine a service designed for people who have free time, internet access, and administrative skills. Someone lacking any of these resources may be excluded without anyone insulting or treating them with hostility. Listening to their experience helps distinguish an apparently neutral rule from its real effects.

Understanding also requires caution about our own perspective. Not every inequality is, by itself, evidence of injustice, and not every difference can be removed through a simple intervention. We should examine causes, hear those affected, compare alternatives, and consider unintended consequences before claiming to know which reform is right.

Concern for justice does not oblige us to turn every everyday encounter into a moral trial or to assume unlimited responsibilities. We can act within our spheres of influence, cooperate with others, and acknowledge limits of resources and knowledge. A modest contribution need not be an insignificant one.

To understand someone is sometimes to recognize that their difficulty does not arise solely from private choices. Living together improves when courtesy and empathy are accompanied by clear procedures, genuine avenues for appeal, and ways to correct errors made by those who exercise authority.

Justice requires attending not only to the intentions of those who help, but also to conditions that enable or prevent participation. Charitable intervention may relieve an immediate need without changing the barrier that reproduces it. It is therefore worth examining urgent relief, institutional design, and the right of affected people to take part in decisions together.

18. Responsibility, Complicity, and Omission

Our actions have visible consequences, yet we also participate in practices whose effects are distributed among many people. The difficulty of assigning responsibility is no reason to treat every contribution as equivalent. Available knowledge, freedom of choice, degree of involvement, and realistic opportunities to prevent harm all matter.

Deliberately causing an injury is not the same as maintaining a harmful practice through ignorance, fear of losing one's job, or lack of reasonable alternatives. Distinguishing these situations does not automatically excuse any of them; it allows prevention, repair, and necessary changes to be more accurately directed.

Responsibility for structural injustice is not allocated as though everyone caused the same harm. Young (2011) proposes considering our connections to social processes and our capacity to help transform them. This does not replace the concrete duties of someone who has coerced or injured another person. Distinguishing shared political responsibility, legal culpability, and individual repair avoids both indiscriminate exculpation and abstract blame directed at those without power.

Omissions, too, may matter morally. If we witness serious harm and have proportionate means of intervening without creating greater danger, indifference deserves scrutiny. But not everyone has an identical duty to intervene, and a duty to help does not demand unlimited sacrifice of one's safety or that of dependants.

Consider someone who notices repeated errors in access to a service. They might document the errors, report them through a safe channel, request a review, or cooperate with those empowered to correct them. Such responsibility is easier to exercise when institutions protect people who report problems from retaliation.

Diffuse guilt can paralyse us. Blaming ourselves for every injustice in the world obscures what we can actually change; claiming that none of it concerns us obstructs cooperation. Between these extremes lies situated responsibility: examining our practices, taking credible signs of harm seriously, and responding proportionately.

Understanding the pressures that constrain conduct does not remove accountability. A productive ethics of responsibility combines care in attributing fault, support for people who need to change, and a willingness to repair the effects of what has happened.

Not having directly caused harm does not always settle the question of responsibility. The genuine capacity to intervene, the risks of doing so, available information, and one's position all matter. Analysis must avoid two extremes: assigning unlimited guilt for others' suffering and using causal distance as a universal excuse for inaction.

19. Conflict, Cooperation, and Everyday Practices

Living together does not depend only on abstract convictions. It takes shape in repeated habits: how we ask questions, share tasks, respond to interruptions, and react when another person rejects a proposal. These may be small acts, yet their repetition creates a climate of trust or surveillance.

In conflict, it helps to distinguish stated positions, underlying needs, and non-negotiable boundaries. Two people may argue about schedules when the real issue is an unequal distribution of care. Recognizing that difference can open possibilities, though it cannot guarantee a solution acceptable to both.

Cooperation requires reciprocity, but reciprocity cannot always be measured transaction by transaction. A person who is ill may need more help for a time; another may contribute in less visible ways. Fairness must account for abilities and circumstances without requiring anyone to remain indefinitely in an abusive relationship.

One useful practice is to describe events before assigning motives. “We agreed on a task, and it was not done” allows us to ask what happened; “You never care about anyone” closes the exchange with a sweeping accusation. It also helps to make requests that can be checked and to agree when to revisit them, without turning respectful communication into a method of manipulation.

Some conflicts cannot safely be addressed through direct dialogue. Where there are threats, coercion, or a severe imbalance of power, firm boundaries, witnesses, appropriate mediation, or protective mechanisms may be necessary. Insisting on dialogue must not displace safety measures or force a harmed person to reconcile.

Everyday practices cannot, by themselves, resolve institutional inequality, but they can sustain wider changes. Cooperation means building conditions for acting together without demanding unanimity, recognizing others’ contributions, and accepting that some disagreements will persist in civil form.

Everyday cooperation is tested less by grand declarations than by small rules: how tasks are shared, what follows a broken promise, and whether agreements can be revised. Repeated conflict may reveal incompatible unspoken expectations; making them explicit allows negotiation without confusing every disagreement with personal disloyalty.

20. Understanding as an Unfinished Discipline

Understanding is an unfinished task because people change, contexts shift, and no single perspective exhausts what is happening. Empathy may bring us closer to another person’s experience, but it can also mislead us when we mistake our imagination for their testimony.

Equanimity does not mean neutrality in the face of harm or the absence of emotion. It means trying to let emotion inform judgment without monopolizing it, allowing convictions to be examined, and recognizing that firmness need not entail contempt. It is compatible with denouncing abuse, protecting boundaries, and acting urgently when circumstances require it.

Nor can coexistence rest on a duty to understand everyone at every moment. We need rest, distance, privacy, and freedom to decide with whom we share our lives. Respecting others’ autonomy includes accepting that their experience is not ours to claim.

We might summarize this orientation in four revisable movements: listen before concluding, test interpretations against facts, acknowledge the consequences of our actions, and adjust relationships when new information emerges. None offers an infallible formula; together they help resist rigidity.

What this volume explores is connected to personal freedom in the first. Being free does not mean living without obligations; understanding others does not require abandoning our own judgment. Autonomy and coexistence reinforce one another when relationships make room for dissent, cooperation, requests for support, and repair without humiliation.

The art of understanding is, finally, a practice of responsible attention. It promises neither permanent harmony nor a humanity without conflict. It proposes something more modest and more demanding: keeping open the possibility of learning, acting justly when we can, and recognizing the dignity of people we will never know completely.

A responsible discipline of understanding includes the possibility of stopping. Not every relationship can be repaired, and not every interpretation must be resolved before action. Sometimes the best response is to seek more information; at other times it is to establish distance or protect someone at risk. Intellectual openness does not require suspending moral judgment indefinitely.

Scope and interpretive limits

The examples are conceptual scenarios, not empirical studies. Interpretations are the author's own unless expressly attributed.

Bibliography

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (ancient). Cambridge University Press, Roger Crisp translation, second edition 2014.

Immanuel Kant. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785). Cambridge University Press, Mary Gregor translation, *Practical Philosophy* (1996).

John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill. *On Liberty: With Related Writings* (Hackett, 2026, edited by P. Norris Turner et al.). Original work 1859.

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

Carol Gilligan. *In a Different Voice* (1982). Harvard University Press, 1982.

Nel Noddings. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (University of California Press, 1984).

Martha C. Nussbaum. *Frontiers of Justice* (2006). Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Amartya Sen. *The Idea of Justice* (2009). Harvard University Press, 2009.

Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing* (2007). Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jürgen Habermas. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society (Beacon Press, 1984; translated by Thomas McCarthy; German original 1981).

Iris Marion Young. *Responsibility for Justice* (2011). Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kwame Anthony Appiah. *The Ethics of Identity* (2005). Princeton University Press, 2005.

Edith Stein. *Zum Problem der Einfühlung* (Halle, 1917). English translation: *On the Problem of Empathy*, trans. Waltraut Stein (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1989).

Paul Bloom. *Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion* (New York: Ecco, 2016).