Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS), Vol.8 No.4 December, 2025; p.g. 43 – 50; ISSN: 2695-2319 (Print); ISSN: 2695-2327 (Online)

THE ETHICS OF DIALOGUE: RE-EXAMINING COMMUNICATION AND TRUTH IN CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

ARUM OBUMNEME MATTHEW
General Studies Division
Enugu State University of Science and Technology
Agbani, Enugu State-Nigeria
Orchid: 0009-0003-7093-014x
mathew.arum@esut.edu.ng
+234 8033270871

ABSTRACT

Dialogue has always been central to philosophical inquiry, from the Socratic method in ancient Greece to contemporary debates on deliberative democracy, communication ethics, and hermeneutics. Yet the ethical dimensions of dialogue — truthfulness, sincerity, responsibility, and openness to the Other — remain contested in both philosophical theory and practical communication. This paper revisits the ethics of dialogue in light of contemporary philosophy, focusing on the contributions of Hans-Georg Gadamer, Jürgen Habermas, Emmanuel Levinas, John L. Austin, and Paul Ricoeur. It argues that dialogue cannot be reduced to a mere exchange of information; it is an ethical encounter grounded in responsibility, trust, and interpretive openness. Methodologically, the paper adopts a critical-philosophical analysis, engaging primary texts and secondary interpretations to compare theoretical frameworks and situate them in the context of contemporary communicative challenges such as misinformation, political polarization, and algorithmic mediation. The paper concludes that a comprehensive ethics of dialogue requires both individual moral commitment and institutional frameworks that safeguard conditions for genuine communicative interaction.

Keywords: Truth, Communication, Dialogue, Philosophy, Ethics.

Introduction

Dialogue has been a hallmark of philosophy since the time of the ancient Greeks, particularly with Plato, who employed it as a method for uncovering truth. In the Socratic dialogues, philosophical inquiry unfolded through dialectical questioning, where truth was not imposed but discovered through reasoned exchange. For Plato, this dialectical method was not only epistemological, aimed at attaining knowledge, but also ethical, demanding honesty, humility, and respect for the interlocutor (Plato, 1997). Dialogue was, therefore, both a way of knowing and a way of living — a moral practice that cultivated intellectual rigor alongside ethical responsibility.

As philosophy evolved, dialogue retained its centrality but also took on new forms and challenges. In modernity and postmodernity, where societies are increasingly pluralistic, democratic, and technologically mediated, dialogue has acquired renewed significance. The rise of multiculturalism, globalization, and digital communication has reshaped the contexts in which dialogue occurs, raising urgent questions about truth, justice, and ethical responsibility in communication. Dialogue today must grapple not only with interpersonal

exchanges but also with the broader dynamics of political discourse, media representation, and algorithmic mediation that shape how voices are heard or silenced.

At its heart, the ethics of dialogue concerns enduring philosophical and practical questions: What does it mean to speak truthfully in an age of misinformation? How should one listen across deep differences of culture, religion, ideology, or identity? What obligations do individuals and institutions have to their interlocutors, especially the vulnerable and marginalized? How can dialogue resist manipulation, coercion, and domination under conditions of unequal power? These questions situate dialogue at the intersection of ethics, politics, and communication, making it indispensable to both philosophical reflection and public life.

Philosophers such as Hans-Georg Gadamer, Jürgen Habermas, Emmanuel Levinas, John Austin, and Paul Ricoeur provide key resources for exploring these issues. Gadamer emphasizes hermeneutic openness and the "fusion of horizons," underscoring that understanding requires a willingness to be transformed by the perspective of the Other (Gadamer, 2004). Habermas advances a normative model of communicative rationality, linking dialogue to democratic legitimacy and grounding ethics in the "ideal speech situation," where equality and freedom of participation prevail (Habermas, 1984). Levinas offers a radical reorientation by arguing that responsibility to the Other precedes cognition and ontology, framing dialogue primarily as an ethical obligation rather than a rational exchange (Levinas, 1969). Austin and Searle, through speech act theory, reveal that speaking is never a neutral activity but always an act with consequences; promises, commands, and declarations can create obligations or perpetuate harm, depending on their sincerity and felicity (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Ricoeur adds a narrative dimension, highlighting that identity is shaped through storytelling, and that dialogue often requires narrative reconfiguration to enable recognition, reconciliation, and responsibility (Ricoeur, 1991).

This paper seeks to re-examine dialogue ethically by drawing upon these philosophical traditions while situating the discussion in the context of contemporary challenges. In an era marked by rising misinformation, media polarization, digital surveillance, and intercultural conflicts, dialogue cannot be taken for granted as a natural or neutral process. Instead, it must be critically rethought as an ethical practice that safeguards truth, justice, and mutual recognition. By weaving together classical insights and present-day dilemmas, this study argues that dialogue is indispensable not only for philosophical inquiry but also for building humane and democratic societies.

Methodology

The methodology of this paper is **critical-philosophical analysis**, which involves systematic engagement with primary philosophical texts and secondary scholarship to interpret, compare, and evaluate conceptual frameworks. This approach is not empirical but normative, seeking to clarify ethical principles of dialogue and apply them to present communicative contexts. The method includes:

1. **Textual Interpretation** – analyzing the writings of Gadamer, Habermas, Levinas, Austin, Searle, and Ricoeur.
2. **Comparative Analysis** – contrasting their frameworks to highlight convergences and divergences in their treatment of dialogue.

3. **Contextual Application** – applying philosophical insights to contemporary challenges such as misinformation, digital communication, and intercultural conflict.

This methodology is appropriate because dialogue, as both a philosophical and practical phenomenon, requires interpretive reasoning rather than empirical measurement. It enables the paper to bridge normative theory with real-world implications.

Philosophical Foundations of Dialogue and Ethics

Gadamer: Hermeneutics and Openness

Hans-Georg Gadamer situates dialogue within the framework of philosophical hermeneutics, which emphasizes that understanding is always historically and culturally conditioned. According to Gadamer, no act of interpretation begins from a neutral standpoint; rather, every individual brings with them a set of "prejudices" or prior assumptions that shape their horizon of understanding (Gadamer, 2004). Dialogue, in this sense, is not merely the exchange of propositions but the fusion of horizons — the dynamic process in which one's limited perspective is expanded through encounter with the Other. Crucially, Gadamer insists that dialogue requires *openness to the other*, which is not simply tolerance but a genuine readiness to be transformed by what one hears. The ethical dimension of this hermeneutic openness lies in humility: the recognition that one's viewpoint is partial and provisional, and that truth emerges only through dialogical engagement. In a world fractured by cultural, political, and ideological divisions, Gadamer's insistence on dialogic openness provides a philosophical foundation for tolerance, intercultural communication, and mutual respect. His insights remain vital in today's polarized societies, where the temptation to retreat into echo chambers undermines the very possibility of shared understanding.

Habermas: Communicative Rationality and Truth

While Gadamer emphasizes interpretive openness, Jürgen Habermas develops a more explicitly normative framework for dialogue. In *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas (1984) distinguishes between *strategic action*, in which individuals use communication as a tool to achieve personal goals, and *communicative action*, in which the aim is mutual understanding. Habermas posits the notion of the "ideal speech situation," which presupposes equality of participation, freedom from coercion, and sincerity in communication. Within this framework, participants raise and contest three types of validity claims — truth claims (whether statements correspond to reality), normative claims (whether actions are justifiable), and sincerity claims (whether the speaker is genuine). The discursive testing of these claims is what makes dialogue rational and ethical. For Habermas, truth and justice cannot be separated from the ethical conditions of communication: where speech is distorted by manipulation, inequality, or coercion, dialogue loses its legitimacy. His work has profound implications for democratic deliberation, suggesting that genuine consensus can only emerge under conditions that respect the communicative rights of all participants.

Levinas: Responsibility for the Other

Emmanuel Levinas radically reorients the philosophy of dialogue by shifting its foundation from epistemology or mutual understanding to ethics. In *Totality and Infinity* (1969), Levinas argues that in encountering the face of the Other, one is immediately and irreducibly placed under ethical obligation. This encounter is asymmetrical: the Other is not an equal partner in rational exchange but someone whose vulnerability calls forth responsibility. Dialogue, therefore, is not primarily about reaching consensus or validating truth claims, as in

Habermas, but about responding to the ethical summons of the Other. Levinas challenges models of dialogue that assume symmetry or neutrality, pointing instead to the moral weight carried in every interaction, especially with those who are marginalized or oppressed. His perspective is particularly relevant in contexts of social injustice and inequality, reminding us that dialogue is ethically grounded even before it becomes cognitive or deliberative. To listen attentively to the suffering, silenced, or excluded is already to perform a moral act.

Austin and Searle: The Ethics of Speech Acts

The philosophy of language, as developed by John L. Austin (1962) and further elaborated by John Searle (1969), offers another dimension to the ethics of dialogue. Their speech-act theory demonstrates that language is performative: in speaking, we do not simply describe the world but also enact commitments, obligations, and social realities. Utterances such as promises, apologies, or declarations create binding expectations between interlocutors. An insincere promise, for instance, is not just a failure of accuracy but a moral failure, since it undermines trust and responsibility. From this perspective, dialogue is laden with ethical weight: every utterance carries potential consequences that shape relationships and institutions. In political rhetoric, insincere speech erodes public trust, while in personal relations, manipulative communication damages bonds of responsibility. Thus, the ethics of dialogue requires attention to the sincerity, felicity, and accountability of speech acts, recognizing that language is not morally neutral but a vehicle for enacting truth or deception.

Ricoeur: Narrative and Identity in Dialogue

Paul Ricoeur adds yet another layer by emphasizing the role of narrative in dialogue. For Ricoeur (1991), human beings understand themselves and others through *narrative identity* — the stories they tell and retell about their lives and communities. Dialogue, therefore, is often structured through narrative, which shapes collective memory, moral responsibility, and social reconciliation. Ethical dialogue, in this sense, requires responsibility in storytelling: avoiding dehumanization, acknowledging complexity, and creating space for recognition and forgiveness. In societies marked by conflict and division, Ricoeur's insights suggest that dialogue can play a reparative role. Narrative reconfiguration allows individuals and communities to reinterpret past trauma, imagine alternative futures, and build bridges of reconciliation. His philosophy demonstrates that the ethics of dialogue is not only about rational procedures (as in Habermas) or ethical asymmetry (as in Levinas), but also about the imaginative and moral power of storytelling to heal wounds and reconstruct identities.

Toward a Unified Ethical Model of Dialogue

The comparative synthesis of Gadamer, Habermas, Levinas, Austin and Searle, and Ricoeur points toward a multidimensional framework in which dialogue is at once interpretive, rational, ethical, performative, and narrative. Each philosopher highlights an indispensable element of dialogical life, and when integrated, these elements form the contours of a comprehensive ethics of dialogue suited for pluralistic and conflict-ridden societies.

At the interpretive level, Gadamer reminds us that dialogue begins in hermeneutic openness. To engage in dialogue is to accept the possibility of transformation, acknowledging that our own prejudices are partial and that the Other brings insights that can expand our horizon. This fosters humility, an essential virtue for preventing the closure of understanding.

At the rational level, Habermas provides procedural safeguards to ensure that dialogue is not merely an exchange of perspectives but a practice oriented toward truth, justice, and fairness. His "ideal speech situation" requires equality of participation, freedom from coercion, and sincerity of contributions. These conditions protect openness from degenerating into manipulation and ensure that dialogue has a normative grounding.

At the ethical level, Levinas re-centers dialogue in responsibility. Before we reason or negotiate, we are already called into accountability by the face of the Other. This introduces asymmetry into dialogue, underscoring that ethical obligation precedes consensus or agreement. Levinas's insight prevents the rational model from becoming coldly procedural, rooting dialogue in compassion, care, and responsiveness to vulnerability.

At the performative level, Austin and Searle remind us that dialogue is not only about meaning but also about action. Words are deeds that create obligations, establish trust, or betray commitments. The ethics of dialogue, therefore, requires attention to the sincerity and felicity of speech acts. This dimension guards against hypocrisy, empty promises, or manipulative rhetoric, insisting that dialogue must be enacted with integrity.

At the narrative level, Ricoeur shows that dialogue is deeply bound to the stories through which individuals and communities make sense of themselves. Narrative identity frames how participants understand and engage with one another. In fractured societies, ethical dialogue requires responsible storytelling — narratives that humanize rather than demonize, that acknowledge complexity rather than oversimplify, and that open space for reconciliation rather than deepen division. This narrative dimension provides dialogue with its healing power.

When woven together, these five dimensions suggest a **unified ethical model of dialogue:**

1. **Openness (Gadamer)** – humility and readiness to be transformed.
2. **Equality (Habermas)** – procedural safeguards ensuring fairness.
3. **Responsibility (Levinas)** – ethical obligation preceding deliberation.
4. **Sincerity (Austin/Searle)** – performative integrity in speech.
5. **Narrativity (Ricoeur)** – identity and reconciliation through storytelling.

This model underscores that dialogue is not reducible to consensus, debate, or persuasion. It is a relational, ethical, and transformative practice that integrates interpretation, rationality, responsibility, action, and narrative. Such a framework is particularly vital in societies marked by cultural pluralism, historical wounds, or political conflict, where dialogue must serve not only as a tool of communication but also as a means of justice, healing, and coexistence.

Policy and Practical Implications

1. **Strengthening Democratic Communication**
   Habermas's notion of communicative rationality stresses fairness, transparency, and equal participation in public discourse (Habermas, 1984). In practice, this requires democratic institutions to build mechanisms that allow citizens to contribute meaningfully to decision-making. For instance, **citizens' assemblies in Ireland** on constitutional issues such as abortion and same-sex marriage exemplify Habermas's "ideal speech situation," where diverse citizens deliberate collectively, free from

coercion. Similarly, freedom of information laws in countries like **Sweden and Nigeria's Freedom of Information Act (2011)** provide legal frameworks that enhance transparency and trust in governance. By embedding deliberative practices into democratic life, policymakers can foster legitimacy, accountability, and civic participation.

2. **Promoting Intercultural and Interreligious Dialogue**
   Gadamer's call for openness to the Other and Levinas's ethics of responsibility are particularly relevant in multi-ethnic and multi-religious societies (Gadamer, 2004; Levinas, 1969). In Nigeria, initiatives such as the **Interfaith Mediation Centre (IMC) in Kaduna** bring together Muslim and Christian leaders to mediate tensions and promote peaceful coexistence. Globally, **UNESCO's intercultural dialogue programs** also provide platforms for fostering tolerance and cross-cultural understanding. These examples demonstrate that dialogue can bridge divides, reduce prejudice, and prevent conflict when institutions promote sustained encounters across cultural and religious boundaries.

3. **Regulating Digital and Algorithmic Mediation**
   Austin's and Searle's insight that speech acts can produce real-world consequences (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) is evident in the digital age, where disinformation, hate speech, and algorithm-driven polarization undermine public trust. Governments and international bodies are increasingly responding: the **European Union's Digital Services Act (2022)** requires platforms to remove illegal content swiftly and increase transparency in algorithmic processes. In Kenya, the **National Cohesion and Integration Commission** monitors online hate speech during elections to reduce violence. These interventions highlight the balance between protecting free expression and curbing harmful communication. Equally important is **digital literacy education**—such as Finland's national program that trains citizens to critically evaluate online content—ensuring individuals are equipped to resist manipulation.

4. **Building a Culture of Narrative Reconciliation**
   Ricoeur's emphasis on narrative demonstrates that dialogue through storytelling can heal divided communities (Ricoeur, 1991). A striking example is **South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)**, where victims and perpetrators narrated their experiences of apartheid, fostering recognition and laying the groundwork for national healing. Similarly, **Rwanda's Gacaca courts** provided narrative spaces for communities to engage in truth-telling and reconciliation after the 1994 genocide. These cases show that narrative dialogue can dismantle stereotypes, acknowledge suffering, and build new identities. Policymakers in post-conflict settings can institutionalize storytelling initiatives, memorial projects, and restorative justice mechanisms to embed reconciliation into nation-building.

5. **Embedding Ethics of Dialogue in Education and Media**
   Educational and media institutions serve as incubators of dialogical virtues. Incorporating dialogue-based learning into curricula, as seen in **Denmark's democratic education model**, helps students practice listening, reasoned argument, and openness to difference from an early age. In Nigeria, civic education programs

increasingly emphasize peace education and intergroup dialogue as tools for nation-building. Media also has a responsibility: for instance, **BBC's editorial guidelines** prioritize fairness and accuracy, modeling the sincerity and accountability emphasized by Austin and Searle. By aligning education and media with dialogical ethics, societies cultivate citizens who view dialogue not as confrontation but as cooperative inquiry.

6. **Personal Responsibility and Moral Agency**
   Levinas's (1969) insistence on the ethical primacy of responsibility for the Other reminds us that institutions alone cannot safeguard ethical dialogue. Individuals also bear responsibility for sincerity, attentiveness, and openness in their everyday interactions. Practical examples include grassroots peacebuilding initiatives, such as **Everyday Peace Indicators (EPI) projects in Colombia and South Sudan**, where local communities engage in daily practices of listening and dialogue to build trust. On the interpersonal level, practices like active listening in conflict mediation or sincerity in professional communication embody dialogical ethics in action. This highlights that fostering ethical dialogue requires not only systemic reforms but also personal moral agency.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that dialogue, far from being a mere exchange of information, is an ethical encounter grounded in responsibility, sincerity, and openness to transformation. By engaging the insights of Gadamer, Habermas, Levinas, Austin, Searle, and Ricoeur, we have seen that the ethics of dialogue is multidimensional: it is interpretive, rational, ethical, performative, and narrative. Each philosopher contributes a vital strand — from Gadamer's hermeneutic openness to Habermas's discursive rationality, Levinas's radical responsibility, Austin and Searle's performativity of speech, and Ricoeur's narrative reconciliation. Together, these perspectives provide a comprehensive framework for rethinking communication and truth in our contemporary world.

The policy and practical implications illustrate that these philosophical insights are not abstract ideals but living resources for addressing urgent challenges. Democratic communication requires Habermasian safeguards of fairness and transparency; intercultural and interreligious dialogue depends on Gadamerian openness and Levinasian responsibility; digital speech must be regulated with attention to the performative consequences highlighted by Austin and Searle; narrative reconciliation, inspired by Ricoeur, can heal divided societies; and education and media must model dialogical virtues. Ultimately, as the case studies from Ireland, Nigeria, South Africa, Rwanda, and the European Union show, philosophical ethics of dialogue can inform real-world practices that foster justice, peace, and mutual recognition.

Yet the ethics of dialogue is not solely the responsibility of governments, institutions, or media. As Levinas reminds us, the encounter with the Other begins at the personal level, in the moral choices individuals make in everyday communication. This means that the cultivation of sincerity, humility, attentiveness, and openness is essential for sustaining dialogue in both civic and interpersonal life. In an age of misinformation, polarization, and algorithmic mediation, dialogue remains humanity's most vital resource for pursuing truth and building communities founded on trust and justice.

In sum, the ethics of dialogue offers both a philosophical orientation and a practical framework for contemporary societies. It calls for a re-examination of how we speak, how we listen, and how we construct meaning together across difference. By embedding this ethics in our institutions, policies, and personal practices, we not only strengthen democratic life but also affirm the dignity of every interlocutor. Dialogue, rightly understood, is not only a method of communication but also a way of being in the world — one that honors truth, justice, and the ethical responsibility we owe to one another.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

European Union. (2022). *Digital Services Act*. Official Journal of the European Union.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and method* (2nd rev. ed., J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). London: Continuum. (Original work published 1975).

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1991). *Narrative identity*. *Philosophy Today, 35*(1), 73–81.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNESCO. (2010). *Intercultural dialogue guidelines*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. (1998). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report* (Vols. 1–5). Cape Town: TRC.

Nigerian National Assembly. (2011). *Freedom of Information Act*. Abuja: Government Printer.

National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC). (2012). *Annual report on hate speech monitoring*. Nairobi: NCIC.

Everyday Peace Indicators (EPI). (2016). *Everyday peace indicators project report: Colombia and South Sudan*. University of Notre Dame.