Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

Rational Dialogues and Its Constructive Social-Cultural Functions

Imam Mohammad Savee

Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Badakhshan University, AFGHANISTAN.

Corresponding Author: sayee@badakhshan.edu.af



www.ijrah.com | Vol. 4 No. 1 (2024): January Issue

ABSTRACT

One of the tools that human civilizations use today to understand each other and resolve misunderstandings is dialogue. Dialogue can reduce social distances and bridge human and cultural gaps. In this research, the social and path-opening functions of dialogue as a bridge between social, political and cultural groups have been discussed. Dialogue is a dynamic process, which has two aspects of collective and social nature. Also, with the logic of dialogue and the method of conversation, it is possible to create a bridge over social, political and ethnic gaps and connect people and groups together. The purpose of writing this article is to explain and describe the functions of dialogue, whether it is possible to fill the social, gender, cultural and cognitive gaps in a society with this method. Today's democratic political systems use dialogue as a communication and cognitive bridge between themselves and the nations. Because there are many similarities between bridge and dialogue, which are also discussed in this article. Due to the fact that dialogue has a collective nature and gathering character, this research with a survey method seeks to know the importance, position and role of dialogue in reducing conflicts in social and cultural relationships. The question is, can this collective character and collection of dialogue prevent the separation and division of people and social groups and reduce misunderstandings towards each other. In addition to the theoretical part of this article, a descriptive-analytical method has been used by distributing the questionnaire. The statistical population of Badakhshan University is considered. The findings of this research indicate that dialogue is one of the appropriate ways to connect social division in a society. Based on the findings, dialogue is like a bridge, which can fill and connect social, linguistic, cultural, ethnic and political gaps. (80%) of the sample population considered the role and importance of dialogue in reducing social misunderstandings, preventing violent social, linguistic and ethnic conflicts.

Keywords- dialogue, social bridge, social functions of dialogue, dialogue characteristics.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are many secrets and blessings hidden in dialogue. Undoubtedly, dialogue and conversation have a dynamic nature and civilization-building capacity. In the present day, this lofty value surrounds all aspects of social life. Conversation and dialogue have a very long and distant root and history; its first roots reach the Socratic tradition. Today's social and political systems consider dialogue between individuals and groups to be the most important tool for citizens and the government to get to know each other better. Today, even the biggest conflicts are resolved through negotiation and dialogue. In Afghanistan, we can solve social, ethnic, linguistic and cultural problems with this method.

In political and social systems, in order to identify the problems of the nation and the people and find suitable solutions, they always keep open the ways of dialogue and dialogues with the people. Because governments need constant criticism, opinion and dialogue for the purpose of addressing the people's demands and eliminating shortcomings, guaranteeing and continuing their power. Social reforms and adjustment of political and cultural systems become more possible through continuous constructive dialogues and conversations (Soroush, 2017).

Dialogue and conversation is a social matter, when both sides of the conflict agree to talk, they accept the principle of gathering in a place, which is a step towards the social solution of a problem.

ISSN (Online): 2583-1712

Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

One, the most important function of dialogue is gathering, the opposite of which is division and separation, misunderstanding, tension, and discord. In other words, by accepting the principle of dialogue and conversation, we approve the principle of coming together. We reject division, separation, single-minded decisions and avoidance of consultation (Garder, 2004: 88).

Second, gathering together and sitting face to face in a single environment expresses positive behavior and social interaction, which has a good effect and can help the members of the discussion groups to recognize a collective problem and find a collective solution for that problem.

Third, the acceptance of the principle of dialogue by the involved parties is to trust in a common value called collective reason that God has given us. This itself can provide a good help to exchange thoughts and the field of knowing and understanding each other. Problems and conflicts can be political, social, cultural, linguistic, ethnic, gender, racial, etc., but dialogue and conversation are the most important tools that today's world uses to understand and solve political, social, cultural, linguistic and tribe problems (Soroush, 2017).

In a social sense, dialogue can become the basis of social understanding, social reconciliation, social and political harmony.

In his classes, Socrates used this method in order to reach a temporary definition, collective insight and limited truth. Of course, traces of dialogue can be found in Persian cultural and civilizational fields, but its roots and history require another discussion.

Dialogue and conversation have been compared to a bridge, which is a logical and conscious comparison. It has been said that dialogue is a bridge that is created between two people, two social groups, two racial, sexual or political groups like a bridge. A bridge is needed in a place where there is a sea, a ditch and a gap. We always use the bridge to cross and build it between two valleys, two borders and on the sea. until we connect and reconcile the two sides and separate directions (Bakhtin, 1393: 100).

Similarly, in the human society, what has the dignity and dignity of the bridge is the human language, from which dialogue flows. Therefore, dialogue as a social method is the only means that can provide the grounds for understanding, mutual recognition, responsibility and tolerance among social, gender and political groups during conversation.

In this article, 162 people, including professors and administrative employees of Badakhshan University, were given their opinions by distributing a questionnaire. Cochran's formula was used to select this sample from the statistical population.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Today, one of the major problems and issues of human society is social gaps, which appear in different forms and make the society suffer and sick. A large number of people and social groups are scattered, divided and live in constant misunderstanding with each other, which is caused by the lack of constructive and healthy dialogue.

The social and political gaps in Afghanistan have deepened in the last forty years and the social situation has become worse and more abnormal, but the people of this country and the political and social groups of this country have never abandoned the method of conversation and logic of dialogue in order to understand the issues and solve their social problems. They don't use it. They always use force and firearms to solve social problems. The issue of coercion, tyranny and uncivilized behavior in this country has caused the vicious cycle of war not to subside and to continue forever. In this sense, dialogue and conversation have been introduced as important tools to connect separations.

The main research question

Is it possible to connect the ethnic, cultural, political, gender divides and fill the social gaps with dialogue?

Peripheral research questions

Can dialogue be constructive and effective during social, political and cultural conflicts?

Can dialogue reduce social and cultural misunderstandings?

Hypotheses

It seems that dialogue can reduce social, political and gender misunderstandings in a society. It seems that dialogue can become a bridge to cross social gaps and bridge historical and social divisions. It seems that dialogue can reduce social, political and cultural conflicts.

III. THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

This research has discussed the functions of dialogue. Because Afghanistan society has been suffering from multi-layered divisions for years. We need to find ways to fill these gaps. One of the ways that is emphasized today on its impact and positive role is dialogue. The dialogue of civilizations, the dialogue of cultures, the dialogue of spiritualties, etc. all indicate the importance of dialogue. It is dialogue that reduces misunderstandings and accelerates and increases the process of mutual understanding.

IV. RESEARCH PURPOSES

The first goal is to examine the social functions of conversation and dialogue as one of the reasonable

Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

methods and to analyze and describe its importance and role in filling social gaps and distances.

Second, to what extent dialogue can reduce social, political and gender misunderstandings in a society.

Third, the role of dialogue in the process of mutual understanding and turning ignorance into constructive awareness has been investigated and analyzed.

V. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

Definition and social functions of dialogue from Jacobsen's point of view:

Dialogue and conversation is a dynamic and productive process, which results from the confrontation and interaction of two individuals or groups, new cultural and spiritual products are created, and a new meaning emerges from the world of possibility.

Socrates' belief was that every truth is realized in a two-way process of dialogue, so dialogue is rooted in logic and human thought, and whatever is formed in thought flows into language. Socrates did not create anything, but in confronting others, he helped the other person to create something new. He didn't give birth and produce by himself, but he wanted to give birth to a creative and reproductive human being with the method of motherhood and midwifery. Therefore, in order to bring humanity and human closer to the forgotten valley and his origin, we must move him to the area of using dialogue, logic, conversation and negotiation as much as possible, we must take care of Socratic methods in cognitive and social affairs (Garder, 2014: 88). The method of conversation and dialogue can bring us closer to common vision, collective solution and social understanding. In order to reach a temporary definition, a universal and collective definition, Socrates had a dialogue with his students, and in this process, he named a common result that they reached as limited truth.

Roman Jacobsen, one of the famous Russian linguists, says in the definition of dialogue: Dialogue is a bridge, one side of which is on my shoulders and the other side is on your shoulders. Or in other words, dialogue is a bridge, one pillar of which is you and the other is me (Ahmadi, 2004: 66). Therefore, the logic of conversation. the tradition of pluralism polyphonicism should be expanded and reduced until we get rid of dogmatic and combative beliefs and achieve sustainable life and a new social and human order; Because "every speech is related to other speeches and is closely related" (Bakhtin, 2013: 100).

Of course, the interpretation of the bridge and its analogy to conversation and dialogue are very worthy

of consideration in this definition. According to Jacobsen's definition, important functions can be considered for dialogue as a bridge of social communication:

First, that the bridge is always created where there is a gap and a border. From the point of view of sociology and social pathology, today the society of Afghanistan is severely affected by social, religious, political, ethnic, gender and linguistic divisions. In such a situation where social contagious diseases are damaging the society and destroying social cohesion, promoting the logic of dialogue, expanding the culture of conversation and dialogue methods can have many functions.

Second, a bridge is always a means to break dead ends and connect gaps. In order to fill social gaps, get to know each other and bring different mindsets of a society closer, dialogue can be widely promoted in the society and spiritual and cultural gaps can be filled with this tool.

In Afghanistan, there is an urgent need to promote and institutionalize the culture of dialogue and tolerance, instead of the culture of violence and wars that are rooted in vague religious emotions and ambiguous tribal, gender, ethnic and political feelings.

Third, in the interpretation of the bridge, which has two sides, the burden of responsibility is equally placed on the shoulders of two people or two social groups. In dialogue and conversation, the position of both parties or several parties is the same.

The parties to dialogue and conversation have equal social and human responsibilities. In social conversations, it is not meant to overcome each other. Both sides of the dialogue conversation try to reach social, political or cultural understanding. This process increases their awareness.

Fourth, destroying the bridge is difficult and expensive for both sides of the dialogue, when one side of the dialogue throws the burden of responsibility away from his/ her or their shoulders, it inevitably creates a deadlock first for himself/ herself or themselves and then for the whole society. People's passageways are blocked and restricted. There is no other way to solve social and political conflicts than dialogue. By running away from any conversation, we create a new impasse not only for others, but also for ourselves. That is why conversation and dialogue have been called the language of civilizations.

This is where the concept of meekness, tolerance and patience is needed, to carry the burden of conversation and dialogue like the foundations of a bridge with steadiness and firmness. Not to create a gap due to intolerance and indifference to destroy and block social and cultural exploration, interaction and evolution.

Dialogue is a social thing, when two sides of a conflict talk face to face, they accept the principle of gathering in a place, which is a step towards a social solution to a problem.

¹ Tzutan, Todorov, Bulgarian-French philosopher and semiotician, born in 1939, died in 2017 in France.

Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities

ISSN (Online): 2583-1712

Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

The most important function of dialogue is gathering, the opposite point of which is division and separation, misunderstanding, tension and discord.

Second, gathering together and sitting face to face in a single environment expresses positive behavior and social interaction, which has a good effect and can help the members of the two groups to recognize a collective problem and find a collective solution for that problem.

Third, the acceptance of the principle of dialogue by the involved parties is to trust in a common value called collective reason. This itself can provide a good help to exchange thoughts and the field of knowing and understanding each other.

Problems and conflicts can be of political, social, cultural, etc. naturally, but dialogue is the most important tool used in the modern world to understand and solve political, social, cultural, linguistic and ethnic issues.

From a social point of view, dialogue can become the basis of social understanding, social reconciliation, social and political harmony.

The most important condition of dialogue is that in social and political dialogues, the parties to the dialogue should present their views fairly and in a fair atmosphere.

The parties to the conflict want to reach a social or political solution, not that one wants to conquer the other.

For example, securing peace in Afghanistan requires a regular dialogue, in this dialogue different social, political, civil and cultural groups should have a meaningful presence.

The views of cultural organizations, the views of social groups such as civil society and human rights defenders, and the views of different strata such as youth and women should be brought up in the discussion place, so that this dialogue has a good social outcome.

In another definition, conversation and dialogue have been called a process of adding light to each other's dark space. Two people or groups sit around a table with great tolerance and shine light on each other's unknown and dark areas with the method of conversation and the logic of dialogue.

Humans always have dark and light areas in their lives, which need the help of others to lighten those dark parts. As a result of this interaction and cooperation that takes place between two people or social groups, they can know their own and others' strengths and weaknesses more.

This causes new awareness and insights to be created for both sides, and to eliminate their deficiencies and dispel their ignorance from their dark areas.

This is where our awareness increases and our tree of knowledge becomes more fruitful, which doubles our patience and tolerance. Knowledge has a direct relationship with tolerance. According to the famous

expression, a fruitful tree is humble and heavier than a leafless tree.

According to the second definition, the most important social functions of conversation and dialogue are raising awareness and developing insight into conversational aspects. In the process of conversation and dialogue, the ignorance of both sides turns into knowledge, and social awareness and knowledge about each other is created and increased.

Recognition is a prelude to tolerance and tolerance of each other. In today's times, tolerance and patience are the most important factors, which guarantee and ensure peace, mutual presence and living with differences in a society. Of course, scientific and conscious tolerance is created as a result of effective dialogues in a society.

According to the author of "Dialogue of Civilizations Book", for national, regional and global coexistence, companionship and solidarity, dialogue and conversation should be sought, not anything else (Khatami, 2010: 62).

But if we leave aside the concept, tolerance means gentleness, rational flexibility, wisdom and conscious tolerance, not tolerance that is hidden behind reluctance and compulsion. that's mean; Tolerance is the praiseworthy and popular tolerance, not the reprehensible tolerance, which is accompanied by compulsion.

Or in other words, best tolerance is the noble tolerance, which comes from the breadth of your chest, the breadth of patience, the breadth of vision and the breadth of your knowledge. All in all, conversational dialogue brings dynamism, flourishes, and constructive light, which adds to your humility.

VI. DIALOGUE AND ITS SOCIAL DIMENSIONS ACCORDING TO BAKHTIN'S² IMAGINATION

Another book in this field is Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogue logic, Bakhtin considers the basis of dialogue logic to be the desire to discover the truth with the help and cooperation of others. According to him, meaning is created and produced in occasions and meetings with others. Bakhtin even found the essence of humanity in relationships and conversations and dialogues between people, repeatedly and emphasized building oneself under another's gaze (Ahmadi, 2014: 96).

Another role is very prominent in this definition, there is no mention of selfishness and ego and self-projection.

Rather, the discussion of conversation and cooperation and helping the parties and reaching common spirituality and unanimous and understanding is the subject.

-

² Mikhail Bakhtin, Russian philosopher, born in 1889 and died in 1978 in Germany.

Therefore, "the most personal action, in principle, the achievement of self-awareness always requires an audience, it requires another look that is thrown at us"(Bakhtin,2013:44). So, in fact, all spiritualties are created and bear fruit in the process of dialogue.

Otherwise, any method, minus dialogue and conversation, has adverse consequences for different social, cultural and political groups of a society.

According to Bakhtin's interpretation, discovering the truth is the most important social and cultural function of dialogue and conversation. As a social being, meaning-maker and creator, man is always looking for truths. Another function is dialogue and conversation, help and cooperation of others (Sayee, 2015: 55).

Today, in human society, no work and activity can achieve a result by itself. Basically, the concept and foundation of human society is built with cooperation. Most importantly, reaching a common understanding and discovering the limited truth is achieved through dialogue.

Whatever this truth may be, it is discovered in the interaction and relationship with the other and others, and it gains meaning and evolves.

In the theory of intertextuality, there is still a debate about the fact that without cooperation and relying on others, one cannot speak, write, or walk. It even starts with this question, is it possible to say and write something without other help? This approach still emphasizes the prominent role of conversation and logic of dialogue in social cognition and cultural understanding (Alan, 2012: 8). Meanwhile, linguists and philosophers are looking for the roots of intertextual theory in Bakhtin's thoughts.

Also, Karl Popper's opinion in this field is similar to Bakhtin's, he believes that the basis of critical thinking is the recognition of one's own shortcomings and darkness by another person. According to his belief, "a rational man knows that he owes his wisdom to others" (Poper, 2010: 144).

Undoubtedly, the blocking of social, cultural and political crossings causes the worst damage to the body of a society. These blocked passages can be rebuilt and opened only through dialogue.

It is still possible to demystify each other's sphere through conversation, and by abandoning this tradition, a society will not reach clarity, dynamism and prosperity.

In today's times, it is difficult and even impossible to discover the truth and create common spirituality except with the help and cooperation of others. Undoubtedly, each individual and group may be unique and special, but due to the collective needs and being a social animal, interactions, communication and coexistence are a necessity for humans, which makes conversation and dialogue possible for everyone. Boaz, 1388: 109). In the same way, legal anthropology, which

is a new and serious field, all its emphasis and reflection is on this issue, that different cultures and civilizations have capacities and talents that should, instead of conflict, introduce, understanding and talking, of course this understanding and knowing each other is obtained as a result of positive and logical contacts (Rolan, 1378: 177). Therefore, in order to know more about different social, political and cultural groups and strata, we must expand the culture and logic of conversation in the society.

Dialogue is an important principle in democratic systems:

Today's democratic systems benefit the most from conversation and dialogue. Societies and systems that are popular and civil in nature solve their problems and challenges through dialogue. Dialogue and setting the ground for democratic and free discourses is one of the characteristics of open and modern societies, which can help governments and they to know themselves more and better. Second, with the dialogue method, the ground for knowing the citizens is provided. Third, people find the courage to ask and the ability to express their desires. When the governments enter with their people and nation through dialogue and conversation, all the misunderstandings between the two sides will be resolved.

Fourth, governments and political systems use democratic discourses conversational dialogue to ensure and maintain their power. Democratic systems are nourished and fattened by criticism. But on the contrary, single-axis systems do not have the ability to be criticized (Soroush, 2017). Also, through dialogue, the common points of the parties to the dialogue and even the conflict are known and discovered, and the ambiguities of the parties are removed (Tamana, 2019: 22). Information exchanges between governments and citizens and the existence of multiple information channels can be the basis for better and more knowledge for the citizens of a society.

It is still a dialogue that guarantees the survival of social and political systems and improves people's security and their social status, not only between governments and nations, but it can be done between political, social, cultural and ethnic groups (Ebrahimi, 2012: 7-8).

It is only dialogue that has brought today's society and civilized human to the heights of knowledge and success and has provided them with social, biological and human peace. Dialogue is the basis for understanding different civilizations today, all of which are rooted in a common human vision.

VII. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

Educational characteristics of the respondents:

In this research, the opinions and views of 164 scientific and administrative members of Badakhshan

Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities

ISSN (Online): 2583-1712

Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

University have been taken regarding the importance of logical dialogue. In terms of education, 28 of the respondents had bachelor's degrees, 120 had master's degrees, and 16 had doctorate degrees.

| Educational level of the respondents | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Options | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | | |
| Bachelor | 28 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 17.1 | | |
| Master | 120 | 73.2 | 73.2 | 90.2 | | |
| PHD | 16 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 100.0 | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Table number (1) | | | | | | |

Respondents were asked about the impact of conversations on reducing social misunderstandings; 122 (74.4%) people by choosing the option (very much), said that rational conversations can reduce social misunderstandings.

| To what extent can rational discussions in a society reduce social misunderstandings? | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Options | Frequency Percent Valid Percent Percent | | | | | |
| Very much | 122 | 74.4 | 74.4 | 74.4 | | |
| Much | 34 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 95.1 | | |
| Partially | 8 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 100.0 | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Table number (2) | | | | | | |

Also, 85 (51.8%) respondents said that rational conversations can reduce cultural misunderstandings. 79 people (48.2%) have specified and emphasized the importance of dialogue in reducing social conflicts by choosing the option (much).

| To what extent can intelligent discussions in a society reduce cultural misunderstandings? | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Options | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | | |
| Very much | 85 | 51.8 | 51.8 | 51.8 | | |
| Much | 79 | 48.2 | 48.2 | 100.0 | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Table number (3) | | | | | | |

The questioning population has been asked, to what extent dialogue can bridge social divisions and fill social gaps. 114 people (69.5%) of the respondents have chosen the "very much" option. Also, 50 people (30.5%) chose the option (much) and emphasized the importance of dialogue in bridging social and cultural gaps.

| To what extent can dialogue fill social gaps and connect social divisions? | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Options | Cumulative Percent | | | | | |
| Very much | 114 | 69.5 | 69.5 | 69.5 | | |
| Much | 50 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 100.0 | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Table number (4) | | | | | | |

Regarding the impact of dialogues in preventing violent conflicts, the respondents were asked; Also, 122 people (74.4%) have emphasized the importance of dialogues in preventing violent conflicts by choosing the "very much" option. The remaining 42 people, which constitute 25.6% of the sample population, defined dialogue as very important in preventing violent conflicts.

| To what extent can dialogue reduce the level of violent conflicts among individuals and social groups? | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Options | Frequency | Valid Cumulative | | | | | | |
| Very much | 122 | 74.4 | 74.4 | 74.4 | | | | |
| Much | 42 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 100.0 | | | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Table number (5) | | | | | | | | |

131 people (79.9%) consider intercultural and social dialogues necessary for the peaceful resolution of conflicts in a society. The remaining 33 (20.1%) of the respondents emphasize the necessity of dialogue in solving social conflicts by choosing the option "much".

| How important do you think intercultural and social dialogues are for the peaceful resolution of conflicts in a society? | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Options | Frequency Percent Valid Cumulative Percent | | | | | | | |
| Very much | 121 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 79.9 | | | | |
| Much | 33 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 100.0 | | | | |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Table number (6) | | | | | | | | |

VIII. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Since a number of scientists in the field of humanities have theoretically considered logical dialogues to be an important matter in filling social and cultural gaps, and they have been and are claiming the character of a bridge for the logic of conversation and dialogue, in this article, the social and cultural

importance of dialogue is examined in a survey form and has been measured. The hypotheses of this research are such that dialogue and its role in reducing social misunderstandings and filling cultural and social gaps have been assumed and examined.

In fact, (80%) of the respondents to the questionnaire of this research considered the role of scientific and logical dialogues in reducing social misunderstandings, preventing violent conflicts, creating positive relationships between social and cultural groups, filling linguistic and ethnic gaps, and bringing people and groups closer together. They have known and emphasized on logical dialogues. On the other hand, the hypotheses and theoretical foundations of the research were proved to be completely positive.

Most of the respondents chose the options (much) and (very much) in relation to the social and cultural functions of dialogue. If we combine the results of both options, (80% to 98%) the answers move between the options (very much) and (much).

The findings of the research show that (79%) academic and administrative members of Badakhshan University were fully aware of the importance and role of elite dialogue by choosing the option (very much) and the rest by choosing (much). The findings confirm the foundations and theoretical framework of the research. Also, the research questions and hypotheses that were extracted from the framework and theoretical foundations of the research, all received positive answers.

IX. RESULT

Dialogue can be seen as having many social and sociological functions:

Dialogue is a bridge between people and groups of a society, which always prevents social and cultural disconnection and connects people. Dialogue is an important tool in today's people-centered societies. People-oriented systems solve their social, political and cultural problems through dialogue.

Dialogue bridges social gaps. In other words, it becomes a bridge and crossing over social borders and trenches.

During it, the social awareness of the dialogue parties is increased and the mutual understanding between them is widely strengthened and created.

Dialogue is an equal relationship between two parties, who seek to solve a social problem, not trying to dominate each other.

Dialogue increases the responsibility, humility and tolerance of the parties involved in the conversation process and provides them with social and cultural interaction.

There is another concept in the conversation. With the cooperation of others, we can advance the process of dialogue and conversation and reach a limited

truth. This prevents self-centeredness and cultural and social selfishness.

The most important feature of dialogue is its community-building and unifying nature, which saves conflicting groups from division and discord and brings them together in a single place. In this way, reading each other takes place in the process of conversation, the result of which is mutual understanding and elimination of misunderstandings of people and social and political groups towards each other.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmadi, Babak. (2005). Text structure and interpretation, 7th edition, Tehran: Center Publications.
- [2] Allen, Graham. (2012). Intertextuality, translated by Payam Yazdanjo, Tehran: Center Publications.
- [3] Ebrahimi, Nabizadeh. (2012). Justice, Dialogue and International Security, Strategic Studies Quarterly, Fall Number 61.
- [4] Bakhtin, Makhail. (1994). Conversation of desire, Laughter and Freedom, a collection of essays, (Basic selections of Bakhtin, Tzutan Todorov) translated by Mohammad Jafar Payandeh, Tehran: Arist.
- [5] Boaz, David. (2009). An introduction to libertarianism, translated by Reza Eslami, published by Chirag Azadi.
- [6] Popper, Karl. (2011). Life is all about solving problems, translated by Shahriar Khajian, 9th edition, Tehran: Center Publications.
- [7] Tamna, Farmarz. (2019). The Enigma of Afghanistan's Peace and Security, Kabul: Amiri Publications.
- [8] Todorov, Tzutan. (2013). Makhail Bakhtin's Dialogue Logic, translated by Dariush Karimi, third edition, Tehran: Center Publications.
- [9] Khatami, Seyyed Mohammad. (2010). Dialogue of Civilizations, Tehran: New Design Publications.
- [10] Durant, Will. (2004). The pleasures of philosophy, translated by Abbas Zaryab, Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- [11] Roland, Norber. (1999). Revenge and its transformation from the perspective of legal anthropology, translated by Ali Hossein Najafi Abrandabadi, specialized journal of Razavi University of Islamic Sciences.
- [12] Quinn, Bruce. (2011). Fundamentals of Sociology, translated and adapted by Ghulam Abbas Tusli and Reza Fazel, Tehran: Samt Publishing House.
- [13] Gadamer, Hans Georg. (2005). Hermeneutics and politics, arranged and translated by Mehdi Derari, Tehran: Kavir Publications.

Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities

ISSN (Online): 2583-1712

Volume-4 Issue-1 || January 2024 || PP. 150-157

https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.1.21

| [14] | Giddens, | Anthony. | | (2004). | World | Vis | ions, |
|------|--------------------|----------|------|-----------|----------|-----|-------|
| | translated | by | Reza | Jalaipour | r, Tehra | an: | New |
| | Design Publishing. | | | | | | |

- [15] Gronden, Jean. (2013). Hermeneutics, translated by Mohammad Reza Abolqasmi, Tehran: Mahi Publishing House.
- [16] Mushtaq, Abdul Samad. (2014). Social Pathology, (Study of Social Issues), Kabul: Wazha Publications.
- [17] Sarukhani, Bagher. (2005). Sociology of Communication, 16th edition, Tehran: Information Publications.
- [18] Sayee, Imam Muhammad. (2016). The Human's Responsibilities, of intellectuals, Kabul: Parand Publishing.
- [19] Sayee, Imam Muhammad. (2017). Humanity of human, Kabul: Parand Publishing.
- [20] Soroush, Abdul Karim. (2007) Tolerance and Management, 3rd edition, Tehran, Serat Publications.
- [21] Garder, Eustein. (2005). The world of Sophie, a story about the history of philosophy, translated by Koresh Safavi, 5th edition, Tehran: Cultural Research Office.