

UDC 297

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/spj1561-1264.2023.4.9>**Gulmaliyeva Vusala Loghman**

Scientific Specialist at the Ethics Department

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan

115, G. Javid Ave., Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan

orcid.org/0000-0002-2206-5919

THE SOCIOPHILOSOPHICAL NATURE OF THE DIALOGUE PROBLEM

The article is devoted to one of the most pressing issues of the modern era, which is the issue of dialogue. It has been emphasized that in the context of globalization, which has brought about significant changes in the modern world, the role of dialogues is indispensable in addressing the problems that have emerged as a result of these changes. Dialogue is recognized as a powerful tool for resolving the contradictions and conflicts that arise due to religious, ethnic, cultural, political, and economic diversities. It is noted that through dialogue, it is possible to achieve positive changes in the spiritual enrichment, harmony, stability, and order within human society. Various factors that contribute to the success of the dialogue process, such as communication, and the resulting collaboration, have been analyzed separately. Therefore, the article provides a comprehensive exploration of dialogue as a type of intercultural and international communication based on the sound analysis of problems in states or specific communities. The article highlights the essence of communication and human-world dialogue as a fundamental philosophical and sociological concept, focusing on mutual understanding, enrichment, and transformation, as well as the organization of effective communication, which is considered the key factor for the success of dialogues. The dialogue process is described as a negotiation process in which both parties are involved, but it is essential to emphasize that the dialogue process is the search for a way out in the format of negotiations by the parties facing problems. The success of this negotiation format depends on a systematic approach, which enables the establishment of correct and constructive communication. This approach includes listening, mutual reflection, putting interests at the center of discussions, displaying will, determination, and adaptability to changing conditions. All these factors contribute to the development of cooperation and partnership. The article emphasizes that dialogue is the starting point for the development of collaboration and its highest form is the mutual partnership of civilizations in solving global problems. On the other hand, the role of soft power and mediation is also crucial in promoting constructive dialogues in the modern world.

Key words: *dialogue, consensus, communication, relationship, unity, conflict*

Introduction. Humanity is experiencing a profound global crisis on a planetary scale. This crisis can be attributed to several pivotal factors, including concerns related to matters of war and peace, ecological considerations, the global population's rapid expansion, substantial shifts in familial and demographic dynamics, and pressing energy-related issues. Within the context of this historical epoch, the exclusive means for humanity to navigate this crisis entail the establishment of a world order that guarantees peace and prosperity. To recalibrate the world, principles such as humanism, communication, dialogue, tolerance, solidarity, mutual respect, cooperation, trust, and soft power must be diligently applied.

Dialogue is a philosophical problem of broad scope and dialectical nature. In this sense, dialogue is an event that manifests itself in various spheres, ranging from the global level to the local level. The fundamental factors driving dialogues are the existence of essential problems requiring concrete solutions or critical issues that demand discussion. Moreover, the existence of problems or conflicts in general underpins the relevance of dialogue. Absent problems or stakeholders, dialogues would find no rationale for their existence. Thus, for dialogues to take place and assume various forms, the existence of issues mandating solutions is an imperative prerequisite. The primary outcome of dialogues is the creation of new humanitarian and political opportunities for addressing problems.

Therefore, dialogue should be reflected both in inter-state and inter-society contexts, as well as in specific internal forms within a society to have its essential impact.

The level of problem elaboration. The historical emergence and development of perspectives on the issue of the dialogue problem are notably ancient, with investigations reaching back to the earliest periods of human intellectual exploration. From ancient Greek philosophy, featuring luminaries such as Socrates, Aristotle, and beyond, to the contemporary era, various scholars have dedicated efforts to expound upon the nature of dialogue. This article, in particular, explores diverse scholars' perspectives on dialogue, communication, and collaboration.

Considering these factors, it becomes imperative to delve into the above-mentioned topics as independent subjects of scrutiny. This is of significant importance. The post-Soviet landscape, in particular, warrants specific attention regarding the dialogue problem. In this context, the research on dialogue is not only examined in depth concerning its nature but also emphasizes its effectiveness.

Notably, Norwegian scholar Johan Galtung's name deserves particular mention for his pioneering work in redefining dialogue. This article references Galtung's work, "Religious Resources in Peace: Peace and Conflict, Development, and Civilization." Galtung underscores the paramount importance of dialogue, highlighting its mechanisms for implementation [9; 10].

In general, in addition to the researchers discussed above, in the modern era, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the dialogue problem have been developed in the West and the United States by H. Yeonqun in "Management and Resolution of Conflicts" [11], Robert M. Krauss, Morsella Ezequieun in "Communication and Conflict" [12], Joseph Nye, David Welsh in "Understanding Global Conflict and Cooperation: An Introduction to Theory and History" [13], Duro Susnich in "The Meaning and Significance of Dialogue" [14], Harold Saunders in "The Process of Changing Dialogue Relationships" [15], to name a few. It is precisely in this article that reference is made to the ideas of the mentioned scholars regarding the dialogue.

Research on dialogue in Azerbaijan is also addressed in the article. As the result of research conducted in this area in our country, works such as A. Abbasov's "Geopolitical and Social Philosophy: Towards a Just Order and Progress" [1], F. Ismayilov's "Human Problems" [2], I. Mammadzade's "On Philosophy Again, Modern Approaches. Imaginations. Perspectives" [3], Sh. Zeynalov's "Philosophy of Dialogue" [4], "Inter-Civilization Relations: Problems and Perspectives" [5], "Dialogue Culture and Modernity" [6], and others have emerged.

Aim and Objectives. The main purpose of the research is to provide a socio-philosophical analysis of the problem of dialogue. In this regard, considering the uniqueness of the topic, determining the reasons for the necessity of dialogue, explaining specific terms related to the subject, and investigating the role of dialogue in creating order, stability, and harmony in humanity are among the main goals and objectives.

Methods. During the research, a comparative analysis methodology related to the subject and, in general, an analytical research method were utilized. Depending on the tasks set for the research, methods such as generalization, historical-comparative and systematic approaches, and analysis were applied.

Main Section. The Socio-Philosophical Nature of the Dialogue Problem. The problem of dialogue presents itself as one of the pivotal issues in contemporary philosophical thought. This problem directly emanates from various relationships, such as human-world, human-society, human-worldview, and the like. In other words, the culture of dialogue currently emerges as a kind of challenge for the living society, civilization, and state on Earth, which needs to be expounded in terms of its methodological, philosophical, epistemological, and other contexts as a direct response to the demands of the time in contemporary philosophy. However, the main purpose of this article is to explore the socio-philosophical aspect of dialogue. Given the multi-faceted nature of the dialogue problem, its essence is quite extensive. As a social being, humans require dialogue as it holds significant importance in shaping their personalities, socialization, improving social relationships, and in various aspects of life activities.

The issue of dialogue has been a significant philosophical concern since ancient times, not only acquiring a scientific form within Ancient Greek philosophy but also becoming an integral part

of everyday life. For instance, "dialogue was a way of life for Socrates" [4, p. 34]. Even in ancient times, Socrates (469–399 BC) recognized the appropriateness of dialogue in his interactions with people. Moreover, due to the considerable pluralism of ideas among Greek city-states, Socrates also acknowledged the importance of maintaining balance in dialogues to ensure peace. In this regard, "philosophy has always carried a dialogic character. There is no real philosophy without dialogue, and it cannot exist" [7, p. 1149]. Thus, dialogue has been ingrained in philosophy from ancient times, and this tradition continues in modern times. Nevertheless, despite being reflected in various fields of knowledge, the problem of dialogue is primarily investigated within the realm of philosophy today. One of the key reasons for this focus is the shared concept of thought. Thought is the fundamental element underpinning philosophy, and, as such, it plays an essential role in dialogue. Thought is the key factor that enables the constructive nature of dialogues. On the other hand, thought also necessitates the preservation of neutral balance between the parties involved. In this sense, in modern times, "dialogue is a process of seeking shared meanings, developing common actions through common thought, and promoting shared meanings, reaching an agreement through thought" [11, p. 196]. "Dialogue serves as a diplomatic means between states and as a means to end violence in societies" [11, p. 200]. The attainment of shared and common meanings by all parties during dialogues is the primary indicator of the success of dialogue. In light of the realities that have emerged today, dialogues are an essential means for creating long-term order and sustainable harmony on a global scale on behalf of humanity. Dialogue is also vital in maintaining stability in societies. Furthermore, dialogue is one of the main prerequisites for the coexistence and joint activities of modern societies. According to the American public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich (1924–2017), "dialogue is a process of building successful relationships" [15, p. 378]. Taking into account the requirements of modern market economics, the continued existence of all societies in a dialogue environment is an inevitable reality. In this sense, dialogue is an essential element of intercivilizational order and harmony. "Dialogue is nothing more than a view, conversation, or ideological debate shared between civilizations and cultures" within a broad sociocultural context [7, p. 13]. "In a broad social and cultural context, dialogue is a discussion that aims to address and share common matters, discussions, and ideological debates between civilizations and cultures" [7, p. 26]. In short, the philosophy of dialogue is a means to achieve the long-term order and sustainable harmony of societies in the broader sociocultural context of the world. In the face of current realities, the socio-philosophical problem of dialogue has taken on greater importance. In this regard, "the world today is made up of different worlds, and each of these worlds is an independent, complete world. Therefore, without giving up the use of force in the struggle for superiority and dominance, they must engage in dialogue and compromise" [3, p. 63]. Our belief is that constructive dialogues in all areas are necessary for independent worlds to find their place within the broader world. Recognizing the social-philosophical problem of dialogue as one of the most pressing issues in modern philosophy requires an understanding of this notion. *The issue of dialogue is a human phenomenon that arises from and is shaped by problems.*

On the other hand, dialogue serves as a form of therapy for modern societies, providing an effective means to sublimate conflicts and tensions. This is because in contemporary societies, the social environment has reached a stage where "production and exchange lead to the pollution of the psyche, an increase in neuroses, non-rational expenditure of intellectual energy, manipulation of consciousness for various political purposes, the deterioration of tastes, and a decrease in humanistic inclinations in the worldview" [2, p. 270]. The demands of the modern world necessitate a dialogue culture not only on a global scale but also in all other spheres of life. In this regard, dialogue has gained prominence due to epidemiological characteristics in our time. "Dialogue is capable of eliminating the limitations resulting from religious, ethnic, cultural, political, and economic diversity, fostering tolerance and harmony, and enhancing the positive aspects of coexistence" [1, p. 211]. Since the culture of dialogue is essential for ensuring both intra-societal and inter-societal equilibrium, "unity is no longer just a reality, but a goal" [6, p. 76]. The concept of unity fostered by dialogue is one of the fundamental factors contributing to the functional interdependence of modern societies in

a chain-like fashion. The idea of unity is crucial for resolving critical problems on behalf of humanity in the contemporary world.

Any formal dialogue always originates from individual internal dialogue. In this sense, dialogue starts specifically at the individual level before extending to society. It gains meaning through individual initiation. Therefore, the problem of dialogue is not separate from the fundamental problem of humanity, which is one of the essential problems of philosophy. Johan Galtung (1930), a world-renowned expert in peace and conflict studies, believes that "internal dialogue specific to an individual is as crucial as dialogue between individuals" [10, p. 191]. Hence, in the modern world, every person's internal dialogue, meaning self-critique, self-responsibility, and purposeful action, holds great significance for humanity. Philosophically, *dialogue begins with individuals and spreads to societies, aiming to address global human issues, and it is a universal and human phenomenon that is fundamentally associated with communicativeness.*

Dialogue constitutes an enduring endeavor in the perpetual quest for answers. Its quintessentially human character fundamentally resides in this quest. In this vein, dialogue equally represents an unceasing address to the interlocutor. The proper articulation of inquiries in this quest and the act of addressing them are pivotal determinants directly influencing the efficacy of the dialogue. As Yohan Galtung contends, "Dialogue finds its foundation in a question" [9, p. 166], and he aptly asserts that "Dialogue continually questions and searches" [9, p. 20]. In this context, the philosophical essence of dialogue is intrinsically linked with the question-answer dichotomy. *Thus, dialogue invariably remains an ongoing process, driven by the pursuit of pertinent responses to the queries it poses.* Consensus, subsequently, represents one of the most congruous solutions reached upon conclusion of this process.

The prevention of any conflict or the attainment of a proper solution to any problem, driven by the objective of conflict avoidance, or problem resolution, invariably originates from the thoughtful formulation of pertinent questions. In this sense, dialogue signifies a procedural undertaking involving the discussion of precisely framed questions and the collaborative search for responses that will maximize the engagement of the dialogue participants. Even though dialogue inherently pertains to the "interplay of subjectivities" [7, p. 216], the crucial factor is that this process remains constructive. Dialogue, indeed, upholds equality and mutual respect among participants. Its objective extends beyond mere knowledge enrichment or conveying personal viewpoints to the interlocutors; rather, it aims to seek shared approaches to addressing existing, new issues, and contradictions. Dialogue is constructive, not destructive [8, p. 99]. In contrast to the destructiveness of monologue-centered approaches, dialogue in the form of discussions, debates, and negotiations is a phenomenon that elevates problem-solving to a more advanced stage. In this regard, H.H. Saunders writes, "Debate strengthens adversarial views, while dialogue paves the way for new and better approaches" [15, p. 378]. Therefore, dialogue provides a more comprehensive and fundamental platform for achieving common outcomes. "While monologue is monocentric by emphasizing a single point of view, dialogue is dualistic, carrying a binary character. The presence of one or more other interlocutors, the 'voices,' different thoughts, and perspectives in discourse represents mutual participation" [7, p. 25]. Dialogue is a dualistic process in search of constructiveness. Dialogue is a creative process with the power to address any destructiveness and a communicative process with the power to eliminate monologue.

We believe that for dialogues to be constructive, paying attention to two fundamental principles is essential:

1. A pivotal factor contributing to the highest level of constructiveness and success in dialogues is the direct alignment of the dialogue topic with the vested interests of the parties involved. Introducing surrogate topics into the dialogue process has the adverse effect of diminishing the probability of the dialogue being truly constructive. It is crucial for the dialogue topic to inherently encompass the interests of the participating parties, particularly in the context of resolving contentious issues. As succinctly put, "Encouraging participation and fostering mutual understanding among various stakeholders, and utilizing one's own knowledge and experiences rather than importing external elements are indispensable for conflict transformation" [7, p. 256]. In our view, it is imperative for dialogues

of any format to invariably anchor themselves in genuine foundations, eschewing any external inclusions. Failure to adhere to this principle would render successful dialogue completion and consensus-building an unattainable goal within the stipulated timeframe.

2. One of the conditions for dialogues to be constructive, successful, and a fundamental factor in resolving conflicts is to ensure the proper integration of the dialogue process into the context of the conflictual issue. In other words, when dialogue is appropriately and prominently situated within the framework of the conflict context, its chances of being effective are significantly enhanced. As H.H. Saunders notes, "When dialogue is supported, continued, applied as a serious, well-prepared process, and, fundamentally, when it is embedded within the context of deep-rooted conflicts, it can become a systematic means of transforming contentious, dysfunctional, or disruptive relationships" [15, p. 376]. In essence, the proper and systematic implementation of all the core functions and capabilities of dialogue in the philosophical sense is a prerequisite for its successful outcomes. In this regard, the initial organization and conduct of dialogue are of paramount importance. The pre-determination of the purpose of dialogue also stands as a key factor that ultimately affects its success.

Dialogue, communication, and constructive collaboration. As previously observed, dialogue, grounded in the dichotomy of well-structured interrogations and constructive rejoinders, constitutes a reciprocal process of listening and hearing. In this context, one of the paramount prerequisites for the efficacy of dialogue lies in the establishment of proficient interpersonal communication throughout the dialogue. Indeed, the nature of dialogue not only profoundly influences the efficacy of communication but also significantly shapes its constructive consequences.

For this reason, it is expounded that "dialogues that aspire to encompass points of mutual agreement transpire through the medium of listening, reflection, and deliberation" [11, p. 201]. These elements are instrumental in rendering the continuity of dialogues inevitable. Consequently, the very foundations for dialogue, such as attentive listening, mutual reflection, and purposeful discussion, facilitate the transformation of dialogue into a perpetual process. Hence, adherents to dialogue as a continuous model, along with the initiator of the Continuous Dialogue Institute in the United States, Harold Henry Saunders (1930–2016), posit that "dialogue is an exclusive mode of communication that configures the essence of interpersonal relationships. In contrast to discussions, mediations, debates, legal contentions, diplomatic exchanges, negotiations, or everyday conversations, dialogue represents a comprehensive, widely applicable method characterized by interactive conversing and attentive listening. It is a crucial prerequisite not only for conflict resolution but also for the majority of dispute resolution mechanisms" [15, p. 376].

As previously noted, dialogue is a *distinctive form of communication* that encompasses various intricate factors. Its nature extends beyond that of other forms of communication. Factors such as comprehensive elucidation, precise presentation, eloquence, attentive listening, and deep understanding are all encapsulated within dialogues. These elements have a positive influence on the outcomes of dialogues. In this sense, dialogue, unlike other forms of communication, is characterized by its thoughtful and profound foundations. Furthermore, the inherent nature of dialogues emphasizes a concrete idea, directing a more precise and profound focus on issues. Often, the necessity of employing complex communicative factors for conflict resolution underscores the importance of dialogue as a universal actor in dispute resolution. Thus, in contemporary society, dialogue remains one of the most effective means of conflict resolution.

In this context, it is acknowledged that "genuine dialogue demands empathetic communication (*meaning mutual understanding between the parties – G.V.*), seeking to foster an integrated, all-encompassing 'system' rather than exclusive care for the other party. Instead of traversing fixed lines of thought back and forth, it aspires to attain a new shared perspective system" [8, p. 220]. Dialogue is a progressive and continuous process that directs itself not towards individual aspirations but rather towards rational improvements and just compromises for the common good. In a philosophical context, *when dialogue is pragmatic, it becomes a phenomenon capable of yielding more positive results.* Conversely, when dialogue primarily rests on positive emotions and proceeds dogmatically, with pragmatic considerations taking a back seat, its ultimate result may not be deemed successful.

Effective and systematic communication plays a pivotal role in dialogues. Communication is the most fundamental factor that shapes dialogue in a constructive manner. Communication is also an essential element in the dialogue of cultures. Any culture that remains isolated from interaction with other cultures inhibits its own development. Indeed, the clash and decline of cultures throughout history have, to a large extent, been caused by this isolation. The nature of culture inherently encompasses elements such as connection, communication, mutual influence, syncretism, eclecticism, and more.

As a result, "an individual who solely identifies with their own culture becomes imprisoned, cut off from all other cultures, and thus, a person of a single culture is destined to be deprived of spiritual elevation. Therefore, communication is the most essential hallmark of an advanced, open, and creative culture" [14, p. 19].

Conversely, it is imperative to approach the issue of communication, a fundamental systemic component in intercultural interactions and our specific research context of dialogues, with a discerning perspective. This is warranted by the empirical evidence from both contemporary and historical processes, which underscores that even when effective communication is established, dialogues may still falter. To illustrate, characterizing communication as a universal panacea (*a cure for all diseases* – *G.V.*) for conflict resolution is unduly simplistic. When there is a lack of genuine intent to resolve a conflict, communication can have the dual effect of exacerbating the divergent viewpoints of the parties involved, while paradoxically serving to ameliorate tensions [11, p. 155]. As an illustration, following the 44-day war, despite Armenia's capitulation to Azerbaijan, Armenia's persistently insincere stance in contravention of international legal norms stands as an illustrative case. Irrespective of the continuous legal dialogues and communicative exchanges, this insincere posture has garnered substantial approval within Armenian society. Thus, the judicious and rational dispositions of societies in their communicative efforts and dialogic undertakings hold significant prominence.

In this vein, within the modern global milieu, the establishment of diplomatic relations between nations necessitates a framework that encompasses contacts, negotiations, and constructive dialogues as pivotal components. This requirement underscores their paramount significance. Establishing any form of bilateral relationship without recourse to constructive dialogue hinders the resolution of contentious matters, inhibits the enhancement of partnerships, and impedes the process of mutual agreements. Likewise, in the crucible of conflict, as dialogues and other forms of interactions gain depth and breadth between the disputing parties, the mechanism of approaching consensus experiences an accelerated trajectory. In this regard, "as dialogues between conflicting parties evolve and deepen, the terms of engagement between opponents can be determined and redefined" [11, p. 142].

In the modern world, the realization of the crucial social phenomenon known as dialogue necessitates the proper initial framework. The robustness of this framework is fundamentally correlated with the success of dialogues. In general, "partnership, cooperation is the highest level of dialogue, meaning a more advanced stage in its development." [5, p. 41] "Partnership seeks to deepen mutual understanding and trust between civilizations, maintain the stability of a broad range of mutual relations, combine potentials, and establish the necessary global institutions for solving global problems." [6, p. 162] In the contemporary world, alongside dialogues being essential for the coexistence, cooperation, and partnerships of societies, the proper establishment of the initial basis for these dialogues is equally important. The outcome of a dialogue depends significantly on the preparation preceding it. In this sense, the constructiveness of dialogue is rooted in the proper organization of the stages leading up to the dialogue and the synthesis of its subsequent stage, cooperation. Constructiveness, as a process, is the most critical factor in the occurrence and effectiveness of dialogues.

The soft power factor and the mediator factor in dialogues. In the context of the complex global processes taking place in the world today, we observe that certain understandings have undergone a shift in meaning or have gained a broader interpretation than before. Considering the realities of the 21st century, the concept of soft power has evolved to become an essential element of the logic of dialogue. On the other hand, the logic of cooperation, a logical outcome of constructive dialogues, is not an eternal process. In this process, continuous setbacks are also possible. Given the dynamic

vector of the modern world, the long-term sustainability of dialogues is a highly challenging issue. "Dialogue establishes the initial conditions for cooperation in the specific areas, forms, and mechanisms of solving common problems. However, such cooperation is often short-term, as it can change its forms or end when the situation changes, or when contradictions intensify" [9, p. 45].

It is known that the primary achievements resulting from dialogues can lose their initial essence against the backdrop of political, economic, and military cataclysms. Considering the pervasive influence of economics and politics on global events today, dialogue is not a complete solution to conflict situations. Therefore, in order to minimize setbacks in the outcomes of dialogues conducted in various fields, the *decisive roles of contemporary power factors must also be understood*. Among the power factors in the modern world, soft means outweigh traditional hard means. Examples of such power factors include economic pressures, diplomatic warnings, sanctions, and others. In this regard, "another fundamental understanding in the study of global conflict and cooperation is power. However, unlike love, it is easier to quantify or measure power" [13, p. 46]. In the modern world, the essence of cooperation, which is often underpinned by dialogue, is measured by power factors. In many cases, the interest in cooperation with wealthier and more powerful nations is equally substantiated by the lessons of history and repeatedly confirmed. Thus, within the conditions of the modern world, dialogues also serve as a means of maintaining a kind of balance.

In the contemporary global landscape, alongside the influential role of the soft power factor in fostering constructive and sustained dialogues, various other factors come into play that are capable of assuming a pivotal role, with mediation being one such fundamental factor. Mediation, in essence, involves serving as an intermediary actor whose role is to facilitate dialogue between conflicting parties, establish connections among them, and gradually guide them toward a potential resolution [7, p. 235]. It is important to underscore that the fundamental condition for ensuring the constructiveness of dialogues is the element of neutrality. Neutrality, by providing an objective framework, allows for the realization of constructiveness within dialogues. Nevertheless, given the intricate and diverse nature of the contemporary world, it is often a challenging endeavor to maintain neutrality in an entirely objective manner.

Conclusions. To consolidate the aforementioned points, it can be ascertained that within the modern era, the role of the dialogue process assumes a pivotal significance in the resolution of conflicts, mitigation of contradictions, and the navigation of crisis situations within an individual's social and socio-political milieu. It is worth noting that the philosophical exploration of dialogue as an autonomous concern and the cultivation of a dialogue culture within society are integral components. The dialogue, in such contexts, functions as a paramount instrument when communication channels become exhausted, and crises reach their zenith. In this current age, marked by acute contradictions, ongoing events, and the inherent diversity of human consciousness, dialogue stands as an effective tool for reconciliation. The establishment of mutual relations and the fostering of coexistence among civilizations, religions, cultures, and political systems in a harmonious and tolerant fashion hinge upon the successful implementation of dialogue. Notably, dialogue holds the potential to ameliorate issues stemming from ethnic, social, and cultural diversity and provides opportunities to ensure societal stability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abbasov Əbülhəsən. Geosiyasi və sosial fəlsəfə: ədalətli nizam və tərəqqi naminə. Bakı: "Zərdabi LTD" MMC, 2017. 284 s.
2. İsmayılov Fərman. Bəşəri problemlər. Turan evi, Bakı: 2010. 390 s.
3. Məmməd zadə İlham. Bir daha fəlsəfə haqqında. Müasir yanaşmalar. Təmayüllər. Perspektivlər. Tamamlanmış və yenidən işlənmiş ikinci nəşri. Bakı: Elm və təhsil, 2019. 200 s.
4. Zeynalov Şölət. Dialoq fəlsəfəsi. Bakı: Avropa nəşriyyatı, 2017. 304 s.
5. Zeynalov Şölət. Sivilizasiyalararası münasibətlər: problemlər və perspektivlər. Bakı: Oğuz Eli nəşriyyatı, 2014. 240 s.
6. Zeynalov Şölət, Dialoq mədəniyyəti və müasirlik, Bakı: Avropa nəşriyyatı, 2020. 330 s.

7. Brand-Jacobsen, Kai Frithjof, with Jacobsen, Carl G. Beyond mediation: towards more holistic approaches to peacebuilding and peace actor empowerment. Searching for peace the road to transcend. By Johan Galtung and Carl G. Jacobsen. London: Pluto Press. 2000. pp. 231–267.
8. Galtung, Johan and Tschudi, Finn. Crafting peace: On the psychology of the transcend approach. Searching for peace the road to transcend. By Johan Galtung and Carl G. Jacobsen. London: Pluto Press. 2000. pp. 206–227.
9. Galtung, Johan. Transcend and Transform: An introduction to conflict work. London: Pluto Press. 2004. 197 p.
10. Galtung, Johan. Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute. 1996. 289 p.
11. Jeong, Ho-Won. Conflict Management and Resolution. An introduction. New York: Routledge. 2010. 256 p.
12. Krauss, Robert M., Morsella Ezequiel. Communication and Conflict. The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice. Editors Morton Deutsch, Peter T. Coleman, Eric C. Marcus. Second Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 2006. pp. 144–157.
13. Nye, Joseph S. Jr., Welch, David A. Understanding global conflict and cooperation: An introduction to theory and history. Boston: Pearson. 2017. 449 p.
14. Susnjic, Duro. The meaning and significance of dialogue. Religious dialogue in the Balkans: The drama of understanding. Edited by Milan Vukomanović and Marinko Vučinić. Belgrade: Belgrade Open School. 2005. pp. 11–19.
15. Saunders, Harold H. Dialogue as a process for transforming relationships. The SAGE handbook of conflict resolution. Edited by Jacob Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk, and I. William Zartman. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 2009. pp. 376–391.

REFERENCES

1. Abbasov Əbülhəsən (2017). Geosiyasi və sosial fəlsəfə: ədalətli nizam və tərəqqi naminə [Geopolitical and social philosophy: for the sake of fair order and progress]. Bakı: “Zərdabi LTD” MMC, 284 s. [in Azerbaijani].
2. İsmayılov Fərman (2010). Bəşəri problemlər [Human problems]. Turan evi, Bakı: 390 s. [in Azerbaijani].
3. Məmməd zadə İlham (2019). Bir daha fəlsəfə haqqında. Müasir yanaşmalar. Təmayüllər. Perspektivlər [Once again about philosophy, Modern approaches. Trends. Perspectives]. Tamamlanmış və yenidən işlənmiş ikinci nəşri. Bakı: Elm və təhsil, 200 s. [in Azerbaijani].
4. Zeynalov Şölət (2017). Dialoq fəlsəfəsi [Dialogue philosophy]. Bakı: Avropa nəşriyyatı, 304 s. [in Azerbaijani].
5. Zeynalov Şölət (2014). Sivilizasiyalararası münasibətlər: problemlər və perspektivlər [Relations between civilizations: problems and perspectives]. Bakı: Oğuz Eli nəşriyyatı, 240 s. [in Azerbaijani].
6. Zeynalov Şölət (2020). Dialoq mədəniyyəti və müasirlik [Dialogue culture and modernity]. Bakı: Avropa nəşriyyatı, 330 s. [in Azerbaijani].
7. Brand-Jacobsen, Kai Frithjof, with Jacobsen, Carl G. (2000) Beyond mediation: towards more holistic approaches to peacebuilding and peace actor empowerment. Searching for peace the road to transcend. By Johan Galtung and Carl G. Jacobsen. London: Pluto Press. pp. 231–267 [in English].
8. Galtung, Johan and Tschudi, Finn (2000). Crafting peace: On the psychology of the transcend approach. Searching for peace the road to transcend. By Johan Galtung and Carl G. Jacobsen. London: Pluto Press. pp. 206–227 [in English].
9. Galtung, Johan (2004). Transcend and Transform: An introduction to conflict work. London: Pluto Press. 197 p. [in English].
10. Galtung, Johan (1996). Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute. 289 p. [in English].
11. Jeong, Ho-Won (2010). Conflict Management and Resolution. An introduction. New York: Routledge. 256 p. [in English].
12. Krauss, Robert M., Morsella Ezequiel (2006). Communication and Conflict. The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice. Editors Morton Deutsch, Peter T. Coleman, Eric C. Marcus. Second Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 144–157. [in English].

13. Nye, Joseph S. Jr., Welch, David A. (2017) Understanding global conflict and cooperation: An introduction to theory and history. Boston: Pearson. 449 p. [in English].

14. Susnjic, Duro (2005). The meaning and significance of dialogue. Religious dialogue in the Balkans: The drama of understanding. Edited by Milan Vukomanović and Marinko Vučinić. Belgrade: Belgrade Open School, 11–19 [in English].

15. Saunders, Harold H. (2009) Dialogue as a process for transforming relationships. The SAGE handbook of conflict resolution. Edited by Jacob Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk, and I. William Zartman. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp. 376–391 [in English].

Гульмалієва Вусала Логман

науковий спеціаліст відділу етики

Інституту філософії та соціології Національної академії наук Азербайджану

просп. Г. Джавіда, 115, Баку, Азербайджанська Республіка

orcid.org/0000-0002-2206-5919

СОЦІАЛЬНО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКА ПРИРОДА ПРОБЛЕМИ ДІАЛОГУ

Стаття присвячена одному з найактуальніших питань сучасності – питанню діалогу. Підкреслено, що в умовах глобалізації, яка спричинила значні зміни в сучасному світі, роль діалогів є незамінною у вирішенні проблем, які постали внаслідок цих змін. Діалог визнається потужним засобом вирішення протиріч і конфліктів, які виникають через релігійні, етнічні, культурні, політичні та економічні відмінності. Зазначається, що через діалог можна досягти позитивних змін у духовному збагаченні, злагоді, стабільності та порядку в людському суспільстві. Окремо проаналізовано різні чинники, які сприяють успіху процесу діалогу, такі як спілкування та співпраця, що виникає в результаті. Тому в статті комплексно досліджено діалог як різновид міжкультурної та міжнаціональної комунікації на основі обґрунтованого аналізу проблем у державах чи конкретних спільнотах. У статті висвітлено сутність комунікації та діалогу «людина-світ» як фундаментальної філософсько-соціологічної концепції, яка акцентує увагу на взаєморозумінні, збагаченні та трансформації, а також на організації ефективної комунікації, яка вважається ключовим чинником успішності діалогів. Процес діалогу описується як процес переговорів, в якому беруть участь обидві сторони, але важливо підкреслити, що процес діалогу – це пошук виходу у форматі переговорів сторонами, які стикаються з проблемами. Успіх такого формату переговорів залежить від системного підходу, який дозволяє налагодити коректну та конструктивну комунікацію. Цей підхід включає в себе слухання, взаємне обмірковування, поміщення інтересів у центр дискусій, прояв волі, рішучості та здатності адаптуватися до мінливих умов. Усі ці фактори сприяють розвитку співпраці та партнерства. У статті наголошується, що діалог є вихідною точкою розвитку співробітництва, а його вищою формою є взаємне партнерство цивілізацій у вирішенні глобальних проблем. З іншого боку, роль «м'якої сили» та посередництва також має вирішальне значення для сприяння конструктивному діалогу в сучасному світі.

Ключові слова: діалог, консенсус, спілкування, стосунки, єдність, конфлікт.