

Philosophy of dialogue in Karl Popper's wheelers

فلسفة الحوار في عجلات كارل بوبر

Diffalah KHAOUNI ¹

¹ University of M'Sila (Algeria), Khouni_dif@yahoo.fr

Received: 24/04/2018

Accepted: 19/12/2020

Published: 31/03/2021

ABSTRACT:

Dialogue is a human phenomenon emerged as a result of the difference among human beings in their thoughts and views, whether it is religion, ideology or thought. These differences led to conflicts, some of them end in disagreement and others end in agreement and peace. Karl Popper uses dialogue as a means of spreading knowledge and science that inherited from philosophers of the Greek era, such as Socrates, to the modern and contemporary era, such as Habermas.

In this work, we want to respond to Karl Popper's analysis of the clash of civilizations and the importance of using dialogue to avoid humanitarian disasters and serve the entire human civilization. The world wars are a clear proof of the lack of constructive dialogue between all the conflicting parties.

Keywords: Dialogue, clash of civilization, tolerance, criticism, open society, myth framework, values

ملخص:

الحوار ظاهرة إنسانية نشأت نتيجة الاختلاف بين البشر في أفكارهم ووجهات نظرهم ، سواء كان ديناً أو أيديولوجيا أو فكراً. أدت هذه الخلافات إلى صراعات ، انتهى بعضها بالخلاف ، وانتهى الآخر بالاتفاق والسلام. يستخدم كارل بوبر الحوار كوسيلة لنشر المعرفة والعلوم الموروثة من فلاسفة العصر اليوناني، مثل سقراط، إلى العصر الحديث والمعاصر، مثل هابرماس.

في هذا العمل، نريد الرد على تحليل كارل بوبر لصدام الحضارات وأهمية استخدام الحوار لتجنب الكوارث الإنسانية وخدمة الحضارة الإنسانية بأكملها. إن الحروب العالمية هي دليل واضح على عدم وجود حوار بناء بين جميع الأطراف المتنازعة.

كلمات مفتاحية: الحوار، الصدام الحضاري، التسامح، النقد، المجتمع المفتوح، اسطورة الاطار، القيم.

1- Introduction:

Man is provided with various characteristics such as religion, language, customs, etc. It is noticeable that these phenomena vary from one society to another and from one social model to another, often resulting in clashes and conflicts that have led many peoples to wars and destruction and the spread of philosophy of rejection or rejecting the other. The continuity in life has become difficult and this is pushing the human to think of a tool to get out of this situation, and this tool is dialogue. Given the complexity of this topic, "dialogue" we will limit ourselves to the concept of dialogue at Karl Popper. What are his philosophical approaches on this subject?

2- Dialogue concept

Dialogue is an exchange of words between two or more people beings for the purpose of human communication and the exchange of ideas and experiences and their integration. The word of dialogue has been mentioned by many thinkers and philosophers who given their profound significance and different dimensions at the level of the individual and the community. In his book *Constitutional Law and Political Institutions*, thinker André Hauriou (1897-1974) favoured the definition of Francois Perot in the introduction to the first part of Karl Marx's work published in "La Pléiade". "The exchange of free speech and free action, the mutual speech holds images, ideas, views and judgments and one of the parties take the initiative or import it and each of them the ability and the ability to say and to veto" (Hauriou, 1977, p. 59). Dialogue is also used for cognitive, religious, political or other purposes.

The experience of dialogue stems from the springs of our civilization; Socrates was an ardent proponent of this method to achieve cognitive, moral and social goals. He resisted scepticism and said that truth is attainable and that it sets the ladder of moral values and controls many of the political concepts on which a just state is based.

Socratic dialogue is a (process intended to discover the truth through contradictions, in a reciprocal movement between the limited individual), educating the people, especially young people, about the ways to find out the truth, and his pupil Plato followed him. This act is called Socrates naming the rising and descending argument. It is the curriculum that later became a pillar in our schools, in which the teacher moves from the personified to the abstract and vice versa.

In the Judeo-Christian dialogue, the idea of an exchange of speech between the creator and the creatures arises. Active attempts, which use the face-to-face debate, to form valid proposals or opinions close to the truth, are conducted in the presence of a judge who judges liars and false witnesses. Either in the Islamic dialogue or the so-called "Shura", which is a constitutional principle, that highlights the exchange of views among the leaders of the people with a view to deciding matters relating to the interests of the world and the silence of the law and left it to the human mind to search it. The "Shura" was the basis for the choice of the ruler and the rule of control of his authority, and by showing the people his rights and duties. It should be noted that

the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) did not set a special status for them and did not assign a fixed system to them because of the different social conditions due to different natural environments (Chabel, 1974, p. 77).

In summarized the history of the philosophical thought of the theme of dialogue, it was mentioned in the meaning of the dynamics of thought in the method of Socratic generation, thought and proof of Aristotle, the struggle for recognition with Hegel, and as a criterion for the rational dialogue of Aristotle, Kant and Merleau-Ponty, and in the meaning a of freedom and tolerance in Habermas.

3- Karl Popper's philosophical approach

We return to the populist thought "Karl Popper, 1902/1994", which was raised in the European cultural throne and accompanied the culture of modernity and postmodernism and lived the scourge of the first and second wars and the tragedies, pain and tears left for itself to step down to this European nation that lost its security and became strong devour the small and the number of the dead exceeded thousands. The authoritarian totalitarian regimes came to power, freedom was lost and man became only that organism who could only dream of the birth of life or as Popper wanted to call it a "deaf line in the state apparatus".

Therefore, we do not rule out that Popper was taken from this and that to make him the man of feat, which came out of one or the other of the current developments in philosophy and science, it is imperative to express the most accurate expression of the positives of contemporary Western philosophy, as long as science is the lesson of its civilizational and stronger factors in which it is created.

His philosophy was characterized by richness, its multiple facets and consistency is reflected in a civilized vision on the intellectual and cultural level. It revolutionized the philosophy of science, rejecting the principle of inductive verification adopted by the classical positivism and the logical positivism of time. In political philosophy, he acknowledged the peaceful handling of the process of dismissal of rulers that provided the avoidance of violence and non-bloodshed. If his philosophy was characterized by this "revolutionary" epistemology or what philosophers call theory of knowledge and peace in politics, we are aware of the depth of his thinking and his prophecy.

The philosopher has surrounded these poor social and political conditions, such as the well-known events in Austria in 1919. In scientific terms he has witnessed excellent scientific developments such as the discovery of determinism and physics in Einstein's theory of relativity, as witnessed in World War II Especially the "Hiroshima and Nagasaki bomb on 6 and 9 August 1945" and the legacy of the remaining tragedy so far.

One of the most important axes of research in political philosophy is that the author is aware of the political phenomenon that requires speaking in the concept of dialogue that has already been defined, and therefore Popper and his intellectual reputation did not hesitate to establish dialogue in any political, social or other practice. This can be revealed through his epistemology and political philosophy based on open liberal democracy.

4- Epistemological Background of dialogue

Popper's political philosophy has always been associated with epistemology, which emphasizes the unity of his thought. One of the most important features of this epistemology is the pursuit of a monologue by a critical or deterministic approach.

Popper's political philosophy has always been associated with epistemology, which emphasizes the unity of his thought. One of the most important features of this epistemology is its approach to a methodology that is characterized by criticism (refutation).

Popper is haunted by the obsession of criticism, insisting too much on its necessity in every subject. Criticism is all that sums up his vast philosophy: "science, politics, society and history".

Let us go directly to what is devoted to dialogue in his epistemology, "Epistemology as a model," dividing it into three sections.

- World 1: is the world of things, the world of physical physics, nature and its physical manifestations, the subject of physical science.
- World 2: is the world of psychological conditions, the world of consciousness, and feeling and psychological tendencies and in general the world of self.
- World 3: are the objective world of human civilization and the inhabitants of this world language and criticism. And highlights the role of language in dialogue the language is the mystery of humanity.

There is no human being without the language of "language in its three degrees". In particular, the language of prose is so much focused on it, in which we convince others and through them we become convinced of others and ourselves. Man is talking to others and discussing his ideas, and this can only be based on the evidence and justifications so that the views of the others can mutually refute one another.

Human language has allowed the transfer and exchange of experiences between generations and their growth as a human being cannot begin in every generation from zero as is the case with the animal, the role of language is to communicate between people and transfer knowledge from generation to generation, these generations correct this language.

Popper claimed that the mind is not a queen that is naturally possessed by the individual, but a process. When an individual claims that something is true or moral, or that what he or she offers is true to a practical or technical problem, his claim includes, in Popper's principle, opening to an intersubjective-process evaluation. Objectivity in Popper's approach must be understood through limits that describe openness to self-critical scrutiny, so there is always the possibility of error in every claim of objectivity; it means that the allegation of objectivity by someone is subject to modification by others. This reflects the culture of dialogue and discussion between the ego and the other.

If one wishes to describe an individual or position as objective or rational, he must do so by using limits that describe or indicate his openness to such criticism, which through limits that show that the individual has produced what he produced, his ability to criticize.

Popper's conclusion is that it is possible to apply his approach to the artist and author who works in isolation from others. For him, they are engaged in a process of solving problems and thus operate according to the principle of trial and error.

Perhaps through these lines we have shown the course of the dialogue in Popper's philosophy who is eliminated in the concept of his long-standing in all his writings, namely the rational criticism that identifies the wrongdoers and opens the way to correct them, and not the negative rejection that disappears behind the silence of convincing others when criticizing "I am rational. The rational is the person who wants to understand the world and learn by exchanging arguments with others (...). By "exchanging" arguments, I intend to criticize them more precisely, to provoke criticism and try to draw lessons from it. The art of argumentation as a rather peculiar variant of the art of combat, in which words take the place of "swords" and whose motive is the interest for the truth and the desire to approach it" (Boyer. 1995, p16).

This has led him to defend the open society to a lesser extent than the attack on his opponents in the closed society advocates of the comprehensive framework and the unified format that devote dictatorship and monopolization of opinion and fanaticism and extremism, whether this totalitarianism is Marxism or other such as Platonism and Hegelian, these patterns which closed the mouths of people and refused to dialogue with the other individual or group and the affirmative critical debate.

In the latter part of his life, he made a study that appeared only in 1972, "The myth of the reference", which was put into practice at the "Cerisy" conference in 1941 under the title of Karl Bopper and Science of the Day (Baudouin. 1994).

5- Political and social background of dialogue

Popper mentions in his book "conjectures and refutations" "if the Tower of Babel was not there, we would have to invent it" (Popper. 2006, p154). He repeated this sentence several times in his writing.

- In the social context in which individuals and groups generally surround systems of multiple values that may be contradictory, the activation of the word " The discussion becomes better and better than violent conflicts, so the critical discussion among individuals, groups and peoples is essential to the process of civilization, meaning the constructive dialogue that develops in the nation its power and removes the spectre of violence and destructive conflicts of societies. He went even further by setting conditions for productive dialogue or fertile debate:
- 1. On the one hand, it is not useful to agree on a strong moral consensus, because that will undermine the parameters of freedom of discussion and criticism.
- 2. On the other hand, leading one or the other of its supporters to recognize the strength of the argument of the other's point of view and thus recognize the truth of his opinion.

We see from these conditions that the discussion is far from the constraints or frame "myth of the framework" that guides the dialogue, but be open free, whether it is in the field of

scientific discovery as evidenced by his hostility to theses Cohen "1966/1922 Thomas S Kuhn" on its use of the concept of intellectual framework or "paradigm" around which consensus is being debated in any discussion and thus restricts the parties to the debate, even in the realm of social life, as well as their interest in the clash of cultures.

The consensus around it in any discussion and therefore restricts the parties to discuss the exit, even in the field of social life also reveals his interest in the clash of cultures. If we adhere to these two conditions, we have succeeded in refuting closed thinking that refuses to open up to oneself and others.

6- Cultural clash

This is what we call civilizational dialogue between one nation and another or interaction between them. Popper consistently argues for the possibility of learning through cultural confrontation and interaction with others who see things in different forms and dimensions.

This matter has been brought to the attention of his attention to the problem of the characteristics and origin of European civilization. He expressed his opinion in his book "The Open Society" in the form of historical intuition that Western civilization derived from the Greek civilization and that the latter in his opinion - "intuition" was the result of the clash of cultures of the eastern Mediterranean. Therefore, he said in a lecture on the clash of cultures in 1981 "a clash of this kind does not have to result in bloody battles and destructive wars, but may lead to the development of fruitful and enhanced life, and may lead to the development of a culture as unique as the Greeks later taken by the Romans and then returned to life in the Renaissance after many clashes, especially with the Arab culture, to become the culture of the West civilization of Europe and America, which eventually transformed all cultures of the other world after clashes with them" (Popper, 2001, p. 150).

The experience of such a clash may not be easy or exhilarating, despite its great utility. In the myth of the frame, Popper referred to the story recounted by the Greek historian Herodotus about the confrontation of the Persian king Darius I among his Greek subjects who burned their dead and the caterers who ate them.

In his lecture on the clash of cultures, he repeats the same story. He then concludes that Herodotus did not intend to tell this story to his contemporaries of the Greeks to teach them only to respect other customs, but also to criticize their things. He clearly wanted to share the experience of the reader ... "my hypothesis, my intuition, is that the differences themselves are the ones that highlight the critical and mental position that was of the utmost importance to his generation and future generations, which I thought had a decisive impact on European culture" (Popper, 2001, pp. 62-63).

Returning to Herodotus's story, the two teams can learn from this experience only if they are willing to do so, but it is unlikely that any of them would have thought of it. If we speak in general, we will say that the work of discovering that our preconceived notions are wrong or that the group to which one belongs views certain customs as necessary or universal, despite their customary and localized nature, this type of action cannot be definitively resolved.

Popper argued in favour of an idea that we can learn from others, meaning that different frameworks should not be barriers or barriers to individuals in their quest for dialogue and learning. What Popper puts forward is very important, but there are two things we should be aware of in this context: the first thing is that the individual learning process may not go normally, in which case it requires us to take a decision that adopts open ideas for criticism, our ideas in a public sphere can be evaluated, as are the avoidance of boundaries or approaches that close our minds to themselves and thus render them beyond the reach of others (Popper.1979, p212-213). We may already express this communication in the words of Habermas, who seeks to achieve understanding through dialogue.

The second is a case raised by Popper himself in his lecture on tolerance. The issue concludes that we may benefit from cultural shocks, but this possibility does not allow us to expect that this will lead to agreement. Therefore, we must not judge in advance that shocks of this kind will be fruitless as it may lead us to agreement.

In this lecture, Popper addressed the great dispute between Einstein and Niels Bohr, stating that the clash between them was fruitful, although neither was ultimately convinced of what the other was saying.

7- Critical

There can be no doubt that dialogue is a virtue of civilized societies. Dialogue is a method of communication that moves ideas from one nation to another and from one society to another. It is a way to build civilization and to ward off evil and conflict.

In analyzing this concept, we deduce that the philosopher not admit the principle of rationality in the debate alone and the principle of irrationality, but recognizes the possibility of using both and as a form that believes in multiple approaches and does not exclude any approach. Therefore, he criticizes the Popper's approach to the same problem in the absence of a single scientific approach agreed upon by scientists, and this greatly harms the essence of knowledge that need the slightest agreement so that we can distinguish between truth and lies, and circumvents them.

There can be no doubt that dialogue is a virtue of civilized societies. Dialogue is a method of communication that moves ideas from one nation to another and from one society to another. It is a way to build civilization and to ward off evil and conflict.

Popper launched the principle that enriches the debate in the twentieth century about rationality and the delineation of his philosophy and his general view of civilizational and human issues, considering that the rational debate will not be fruitful if the shareholders share a common framework of the basic assumptions. In the sense that the interlocutors do not require issues starting from them as he did Descartes and Aristotle before, because what is important to him is the criterion of the viability of any scientific knowledge.

Here, we can refer to "Feyerabend" position, which looks at the myth of the framework from a different angle, as it emphasizes the concept of commission. In analyzing this concept, the philosopher finds that he does not recognize the principle of rationality in the discussion

alone, nor the principle of irrationality, but rather recognizes the possibility of using both and as a form that believes in multiple approaches and does not exclude any approach. Therefore, he criticizes the Popper's approach to the same problem in the absence of a single scientific approach agreed upon by scientists, and this greatly harms the essence of knowledge that need the slightest agreement so that we can distinguish between truth and lies, and circumvents them.

8- Conclusion

The dialogue has several intellectual and philosophic levels in its various epistemological and political meanings, embodied by Popper in his philosophy with new data. Many philosophers took part. That the phenomenon of dialogue was not exclusive to the thinker or the world or other, and if the goal is to communicate between humanity and the different walks of interest, and raise the ceiling of understanding and the continuous reduction of hostility and unilateralism. The dialogue was also manifested in several images that all religions recognized.

In light of contemporary developments and complex problems, we have become more committed to this tool at a time when the tools of communication and communication from television, telephones and web networks. International and governmental non-governmental organizations is only a tool to keep up intimate meetings with the aim of finding solutions to intractable issues such as agreement on finding solutions to global warming and the use of renewable energies instead of fossil energies.

- References:

- Alain Boyer, (1995/2) « Karl Popper ou le rationalisme critique», Hermès, La Revue (n° 16). P 271-275.
- Baudouin, J., (1994). La philosophie politique de Karl Popper. Puf
- CHABEL, M. F., (1974). Political Thought, Comparative Studies of Political and Social Doctrines, Part 1, The General Egyptian Book Organization.
- DE CHRIS, A., & MINOUH, K., (1996). Translation and study of Nassar Abdullah, the Egyptian Book Authority.
- Hauriou, A., (1977). Constitutional Law and Political Institutions, a translation of a group of professors. I 2, part one. Eligibility for publication and distribution
- Karl, P., (2001). On the clash of civilizations from the book In Search of a Better World, translated by Ahmed Mostagir. Egyptian Book Authority, Family Library.
- Karl, P., (2003). Frame legend. In Defense of Science and Rationality, translated by Youmna Tarif Al-Khouli. Kuwait, National Council for Culture, Arts and Literature.
- Karl, P., (2006). Opinions publique et opinions libéraux. In Conjectures et réfutations. La croissance du savoir scientifique. Edition Payot.