

Discourse of Violence and Communication Paradigm in John Searle's Thought

Dr. Fatima Zohra Benmadi

PhD in Philosophy, University of Algiers 2, Algeria

Email: fatimazohra.benmadi@univ-alger.dz

Received: 06/02/2024

Accepted: 19/07/2024

Published: 02/08/2024

Abstract:

This investigation delves into the pervasive crisis of violence that characterizes contemporary societies, where violence has increasingly become the predominant method of affirming self-existence. This existence, predicated on the dominance over others, calls for an unequivocal rejection of all manifestations of violence and intolerance. The analysis explores the deliberate marginalization of communication methods, a concern articulated by the contemporary Western philosopher John Searle.

Searle advocates for rational consciousness and adherence to a robust communication paradigm as foundational for cultivating a society devoid of violence and conflict. Consequently, this study poses critical questions: How can the communication paradigm between cultures be solidified to diminish the intensity of violence from John Searle's philosophical standpoint? To what extent can a communicative paradigm materialize in the ontological and ethical relationship between the self and the other? What role does philosophical discourse assume in deciphering the nuances of violence and fostering a culture of non-violence?

Keywords: Violence, Non-violence, Communication, Paradigm, Philosophical Discourse.

1. Introduction:

Philosophy, distinguished by its breadth and interdisciplinary nature, offers significant insights into social dynamics. It facilitates the reconciliation of disparate cultural viewpoints on pressing issues, notably the escalating phenomenon of violence. This threat looms large

over our collective existence, where conflict has become the sole avenue for realizing true self-awareness and existence, achievable only through the confrontation with 'the other.'

Among the myriad dangers we face, linguistic violence stands out as particularly pernicious. Hence, it becomes imperative to dismantle the infrastructure of violence, comprehend its underpinnings, and, if not entirely eradicable, to alleviate its impact. John Searle posits that the clash between language and violence is inherently philosophical. His pursuit of resolutions through the concept of intentionality highlights a significant philosophical breakthrough—developing linguistic strategies aimed at curtailing various forms of violence and oppression. Given that communication historically and ontologically precedes violence, the critical inquiries this paper addresses are: How can we fortify the communication paradigm among cultures to reduce the prevalence of violence? What role does intentionality play in the elimination of violence, and can it be regarded as a definitive resolution to the problem of violence?

2. Concept of Violence:

It is imperative to acknowledge that violence is a multifaceted and complex phenomenon within philosophical discourse, defying reduction to a singular definition due to its varied interpretations across different fields of knowledge.

2.1. Etymology: The term "violence" originates from the Latin "vilou," which denotes acts of violation or rape¹. As detailed in Ibn Manzur's lexicon, violence encompasses the rough handling of affairs and an absence of gentleness. It epitomizes severity, harm, rape, and cruelty, characterizing the use of pressure or force in an illegitimate manner.

2.2. Terminologically: Jamil Saliba, in his philosophical dictionary, articulates that violence stands in direct opposition to gentleness, being synonymous with severity and cruelty². It portrays an individual who, characterized by violence, exercises force illegitimately—this behavior embodies oppression and dominance, which is universally condemned by all legal frameworks for its coercive impact on society members.

¹Ibn Mandour, *Lisan al-Arab*, vol. 4, Dar al-Ma'arif, Cairo, pp. 31-32.

²Jamil Saliba, *Philosophical Dictionary*, vol. 2, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Lebanon, 1982, p. 112.

According to André Lalande's "*Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie*,"³ violence is defined as "the illegitimate or illegal use of force." This definition captures its essence as irrational and aggressive behavior targeted at individuals or groups, manifesting in physical, symbolic, and verbal forms. Notably, verbal violence aims to mislead, deceive, and manipulate interactions, thus posing a significant philosophical challenge, as noted by John Searle.

We are consequently confronted with the dialectic of violence and language, where any statement or expression involving force or threat qualifies as linguistic violence, fostering conflict and animosity.⁴

Irrespective of its manifestations, violence poses a dire threat to our collective human future. The Oxford English Dictionary defines violence as "aggressive behavior intended to hurt or kill someone, encompassing crimes, acts, and threats of violence."⁵

3. Challenging the Discourse of Violence:

Foundational to the discourse on violence is its detrimental effect on social cohesion, shared values, peace processes, and ultimately, human dignity and stability. It is thus imperative to interrogate and challenge this discourse through philosophical tools such as intentionality and the theory of speech acts.

3.1 Violence and Intentionality:

John Searle contends that language not only reflects but can perpetuate violence. He explores the concept of intentionality, a modern linguistic term that focuses on the speaker's intent, which has become a focal point in his philosophical inquiries. Intentionality, as a core concept, may hold the key to addressing the pervasive issue of linguistic violence. Questions

³André Lalande, *Philosophical Encyclopedia*, trans. Khalil Ahmad Khalil, vol. 1, Awidat Publications, Beirut, 2nd edition, 2001, p. 1555.

⁴A.S. Hornby, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 9th Edition, Editors: Leonie Hey, Susanne Holloway, Oxford University Press, p. 1741.

⁵*Dictionnaire Larousse*, Maxipoche editions, Larousse, 2017, p. 1460.

then arise: What is the scope of intentionality? Can it effectively assert itself through speech acts? How might speech acts contribute to dismantling the entrenched discourse of violence?

A. Concept of Intentionality (intentionality):

Jameel Saliba articulates intentionality as "the orientation of the mind towards something it perceives as appropriate," equating it with the notion of intent, which is commonly used to describe a voluntary or purposeful orientation.

This orientation can extend to mental processes, although some philosophers also apply it to broader mental orientations⁶. This definition implies that intention is a deliberate act where the mind purposefully aligns itself with an object to comprehend it. John Searle further refines this concept by stating, "Intentionality is a feature of mental states and events that involves an orientation towards objects of the external world and their conditions or referencing them."

Here, Searle correlates the intentionality of mental acts with that of speech acts, elucidating the relationship that binds the mind to the phenomena it targets in the external realm. Consequently, intentionality is typically purposeful, as it is inherently directed towards a specific object.⁷

A pivotal link exists between intentionality and consciousness; our comprehension of intentionality is constrained within the boundaries of our conscious experience. The sounds—both oral and written—that humans emit are representations of objects in the external world, just as tangible objects are, and thus their expression is intentionally derived from cognitive processes, not from an intrinsic ability.

Searle highlights a critical distinction, noting that not all mental states and events exhibit intentionality. There exist emotions and unjustified anxieties that represent non-intentional states. He clarifies this by stating, "By intentionality, we do not mean consciousness, as there are many conscious states that are not intentional, like the sudden feeling of happiness," thus confirming that not all mental phenomena are guided by intentionality.

⁶John Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*, Cambridge, 1983, p. 163.

⁷Jon Searle, *Sons et Expression*, translation by Joell Brous, Editions de Minuit, Paris, 1972, p. 71.

Non-directed neurological states, which do not carry specific intentions, frequently lead to misunderstandings that can escalate to the enforcement of views and the coercive acceptance of these imposed beliefs. Hence, the absence of intention can become a catalyst for violence.⁸

According to John Searle, violence epitomizes a form of disrupted communication emerging from malicious intent, violating the established norms of speech acts. This disruption is precisely what Searle's expanded notion of intentionality seeks to overcome.

Although the concept of intentionality has been historically explored, Searle has significantly developed it by providing a robust conceptual framework. His emphasis on intentionality stems from its capacity to foster sophisticated linguistic constructs and persuasive discourse that effectively dismantle tyranny and all forms of violence. Consequently, Searle posits that intentionality is the antidote to violence, which he views as a substantial impediment to the flourishing of philosophical discourse.

Intentional states, as defined by Searle, encompass content that signifies something or a subject presented in a distinct psychological form, aligning it with a specific directional intent. Since human discourse inherently embodies intention, it holds the potential to eradicate tyranny, hate speech, and related forms of violence. However, our discourses often lack clarity and directness, with various sentences and phrases failing to convey the intended ideas and meanings.

This ambiguity necessitates interpretations and explanations that frequently deviate from the intended message, leading to what Searle describes as "striking in the desert of meaninglessness." He illustrates this by noting situations where "a speaker might utter a sentence without meaning its apparent content, instead conveying a proposition with a different attributive content." This misalignment between spoken expressions and their intended meanings often seeds conflict among individuals and societies.

Searle's interpretation of intentionality distinctively diverges from that of phenomenologists like Husserl and Heidegger. He clarifies this by stating, "My project in analyzing intentionality is entirely different from Husserl's project... Husserl aimed to articulate the conditions of knowledge and Heidegger sought to outline the conditions of reasonableness, both employing phenomenological methods."

⁸ John Searle :intentionality an essay the phlesaphy of mind combridge , 1983 , p163

In contrast, my theory of intentionality is not concerned with these aims or methods. Instead, I engage in a broader array of projects, akin to the perspectives of analytic philosophers such as Russell, Frege, and Austin." Searle thus aligns intentionality with linguistic expressions—phrases and sounds that must convey meaningful and directed intent towards another party, influenced by the analytic traditions of philosophers like Frege, Russell, and Austin.⁹

His approach to intentionality marks a significant milestone in his linguistic research and his broader philosophical discourse on language. Searle shifts the philosophical focus from the traditional quest for knowledge to more pragmatic inquiries such as analyzing the mind, understanding consciousness and intentionality, and how we use words and sentences to represent reality. This redirection has prompted Searle to underscore the distinctions between his methodologies and those of his philosophical predecessors.

Incorporating the concept of intentionality into the analysis of linguistic phrases and the understanding of a speaker's speech is pivotal for transcending the tragic realities born from the proliferation of violence and the disintegration of intentionality. John Searle's exploration of intentionality introduces new dimensions and forms where it embodies the idea of direction and the intention to undertake specific actions. Intentionality is posited as the mechanism through which we can overcome violence, thus facilitating the flourishing of philosophical discourse by aligning with the speaker's intentions.

The concept of intentionality is central to philosophical discourse, epitomizing the essence of the communicative process—the sender's objective is to ensure the receiver's comprehension. Speech devoid of intention strays from its intended purpose. The degree to which a speaker's speech is imbued with intentionality directly correlates with its capacity to transcend various forms of verbal violence that stem from misunderstandings.

John Searle articulates a distinction and a similarity between the concepts of intent and intentionality, suggesting that intent is simply a manifestation of intentionality and does not possess a unique status. Rather, intent is akin to other mental states, such as belief and hope. He differentiates between the characteristic of intentionality and the state of intent by discussing the scientific meanings of each—intentionality implies a directedness, akin to the

⁹Salah Ismail, *Philosophy of the Mind: A Study in John Searle's Philosophy*, Dar al-Qubaa al-Haditha for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2007, p. 184.

directedness observed in states of love and hate, which are always oriented towards another party.

In contrast, intent assumes a more tangible character. Searle also addresses a common misconception in philosophy that conflates intentionality with ordinary intent, highlighting a fundamental yet often misunderstood connection between the philosophical notion of intentionality and the everyday understanding of intent.

B. Intentionality and Speech Acts: The Theory of Speech Events as a Cornerstone in Pragmatics

The theory of speech events has emerged as a seminal concept in the field of pragmatics, initially conceived as a linguistic philosophical theory in the 1950s from lectures delivered by John Austin, a professor of language philosophy, at Oxford University. These lectures responded to the positivist and logical philosophers who relegated language to a purely informative function that described reality, thereby overlooking its social dimension.¹⁰

John Searle expanded on the structure of intentionality by integrating it with speech acts. In his discourse on intentionality, he applied the foundational principles from his theory of speech acts broadly, articulating this integration by stating, "When I addressed the theory of speech acts, I endeavored to analyze the necessary and sufficient conditions for performing speech acts and uttering sentences. This classical approach in analytical philosophy... I then extended this approach to study intentionality."

However, a clear distinction between intentional states and speech acts becomes apparent in how a speech act is tied to its physical execution. A speech act encompasses a performative action, whereas intentionality is manifested in beliefs, fears, and hopes. This divergence prompts critical inquiries: How can intentionality be attributed to entities that are not inherently intentional, such as signs and sounds? Does intentionality possess the capacity to effectuate a speech act?

¹⁰John Austin, an English philosopher born in 1911, was among the representatives of the analytic school known as the ordinary school. One of his most important works is "How to Do Things with Words," where he established a foundational role for performative language in philosophy and logic. He died in Oxford in 1960. See: George Tarabishi, Dictionary of Philosophers - Logicians - Speakers - Theologians - Mystics, Dar Al-Tali'a for Printing and Publishing, Beirut, 2006, p. 117.

The incorporation of the concept of intentionality into the analysis of a speaker's discourse—interpreting and contextualizing their linguistic expressions—has been championed by philosophers associated with the theory of language use, such as Wittgenstein, Austin, and Searle. These thinkers have endeavored to align spoken words with the speaker's intentions.

This approach to understanding language stems from an acknowledgment of the often palpable tension between the literal words of the speaker and their underlying intentions. This tension, rooted in the inherent complexities of language, can lead to misinterpretations and, consequently, linguistic violence. Thus, it becomes imperative to shift the focus from merely studying language as a structural entity to considering it in terms of intentional acts, which significantly influence its use and interpretation. Such a perspective also guides the sender in choosing strategies that effectively convey their intent and are appropriate for their discourse.

The expressions and sentences crafted by speakers serve as conventional methods for articulating and actualizing their intentions, predicated on the assumption that the speaker aims to achieve a specific outcome through their discourse. When the audience—be it readers or listeners—grasps the speaker's language, words stripped of intent and divorced from meaning reduce to mere verbosity.

The psychological significance of language manifests in the act of intention, and without intent, language loses its essence, weakening philosophical discourse and fostering the conditions for violence. The confluence of intentionality and the speaker's will is pivotal for achieving effective communication and understanding, influencing the recipient and ensuring the success of philosophical discourse while mitigating the phenomenon of violence.

John Searle underscores a profound linkage between intentionality and action. The absence of intent in a speech act creates a vacuum where violence can flourish, compelling the speaker to resort to coercion in order to impose their viewpoints, absent the legitimizing force of genuine intent.¹¹

Therefore, the synergy of intent and speech acts is crucial for circumventing and eradicating violent expressions, as reflected in Searle's assertion: "It is contradictory and abnormal to execute a speech act while simultaneously denying the existence of a corresponding state of intentionality."

¹¹Referring to Salah Ismail's study on John Searle's philosophy of the mind, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

He notes that it is exceptionally rare for linguistic discourses to unfold devoid of intentions, pointing to the occurrence of spurious emotional states and deceptive speech acts. A speech act is only fully realized when the psychological state that it represents is fulfilled. The objective of the speaker's intent is to facilitate understanding by the recipient, which necessitates comprehensive linguistic competence encompassing all facets of language production and discourse generation.

3.2 Violence and the Theory of Speech Acts

Violence, traditionally understood as the exertion of force to impose one's views and coerce others into acquiescence, manifests when philosophical discourse fails. The efficacy of such discourse is pivotal in eradicating violence and its varied manifestations; its failure signals the deterioration and weakening of philosophical engagement.

In response to this challenge, John Searle developed the theory of speech acts, foundational to the creation of meaning. This theory provides a framework to eliminate violence and prevent its emergence by adhering to established rules and conditions.

A. Concept of Speech Act:

The speech act is a pivotal concept within the theory of speech acts, positing that every utterance is part of a formal semantic system with performative impacts aimed at effecting change within a social and institutional context. A speech act is characterized by the interaction between communicative parties, whether the communicative intent is explicitly stated or implied.

It is defined as the minimal unit through which language executes a specific act, thereby transforming speech events into social accomplishments that materialize in reality simply by being articulated. This perspective underscores that language transcends mere representation of the world; it is actively employed in performing actions.

John Searle, reflecting on the evolution of this concept, notes, "This term was initially used by linguists like Bloomfield in the third decade of the 20th century, but its modern meaning was innovated by Austin¹²." This highlights Searle's alignment with his mentor, Austin, who viewed the speech act as an enactment realized by the speaker within a specific context.¹³

¹²John Searle, *Research in the Philosophy of Mind*, op. cit., p. 36.

Consequently, language is recognized not merely as a tool for communication but as a foundational act that, in its performative nature, contributes to the establishment of successful philosophical discourse. This discourse is crucial for challenging and potentially dismantling the discourse of violence.

Thus, the transformation of language into a performative entity raises significant questions: What role does language play within the framework of speech acts? How does it function in addressing the pervasive issue of linguistic violence, which can be mitigated through the very medium of language?

By advancing the philosophical discourse and elucidating the vital link between intentionality and speech acts, John Searle has endowed intentionality with a social dimension. He argues that social contexts significantly influence the performance of speech acts, which serve a pragmatic role by focusing on the mind's capacity to represent reality.

Searle categorizes intentionality into two types: inner intentionality, which encompasses unobservable mental states such as desires and beliefs and consists of mental representations independent of external observation; and derived intentionality, which pertains to the intentionality of language. This delineation suggests that through the mental intentionality of desires and beliefs, the linguistic representation is subsequently derived.

Consequently, sounds and words are directed because the mind imposes intentionality upon them. This type of intentionality holds the potential to resolve the problem of violence by redefining the way language is perceived and utilized within social interactions.

Pragmatics has catalyzed a linguistic revolution, profoundly transforming contemporary perspectives on language. No longer confined to the mere articulation of sounds and vocabulary, language has evolved into an active, performative phenomenon, transitioning from a formal to a pragmatic dimension. Mere proficiency in language proves inadequate unless it can be effectively translated into communicative actions. John Searle, a pivotal figure in this transformation, has extensively explored the dynamic interaction between the speaker and the listener, infusing everyday linguistic exchanges with practical significance.

¹³Salah Ismail Abdel-Hak, *Linguistic Analysis at the Oxford School*, Dar al-Tanweer for Printing and Publishing, 1st edition, 1993, p. 167.

Language functions on two distinct but interconnected levels: the representational and the communicative. The representational dimension emphasizes the expression of mental intentions through language, while the communicative dimension underpins all linguistic interactions. In Searle's framework, the theory of speech acts posits language as a form of behavior—akin to any rule-governed activity. Searle articulates that “speaking a language is engaging in a form of behavior governed by rules, transforming it into an act.” This perspective redefines linguistic acts as behaviors that emerge from the correct and rule-abiding use of language.

The primary aim of establishing rules for speech acts—and insisting on adherence to these rules—is to mitigate the linguistic violence that stems from the improper use of language and the consequent violation of its foundational rules. Linguistic violence, characterized as a deplorable response to communication that can cause speakers to lose control over their language, leads to various deviations in speech. When the authority of language is confined or diminished, and as individuals rebel against its established norms, society drifts toward what may be described as arbitrary and chaotic communication.

Since violence is inherently behavioral, and language constitutes a form of behavior, the parallels between linguistic acts and violent acts become apparent. To counteract this, Searle has established specific rules and advocates for their strict adherence, thus enabling language to powerfully impact the world and alter human behavior through precise interactions. Language's role extends beyond mere communication and the conveyance of facts; it assumes an operative function that actively transforms statements into consequential actions within specific social contexts.

In practice, speakers must adeptly employ their linguistic competence to realize these transformative functions, tailoring their speech acts to suit the varied nuances of their audience—whether addressing an elder or a younger person—aiming ultimately at fostering understanding. By aligning language use with the intentions underlying the statements, the speaker can effectively influence and persuade the recipient without resorting to violence to impose views.

This approach underscores the success of philosophical discourse, which thrives not on the imposition of opinions but on the ability to persuade and influence others effectively. As language evolves into a performative act, its success or failure can significantly influence the

breakdown or sustenance of communicative paradigms, potentially leading to or averting linguistic violence.

John Searle has intricately categorized speech acts based on the functions they perform, underpinned by three methodological foundations: the performative purpose, the direction of fit, and the sincerity condition. His classifications aim to counteract all forms of violent discourse, which he identifies as distorted or pathological forms of communication that spiral out of control due to the violation of speech act rules, ultimately leading to communication breakdowns.

Prior to these insights, Searle made a distinction between two types of acts: transactional acts and impactful acts. He describes transactional acts as "the smallest complete unit in human linguistic communication. When we speak or write to each other, we perform transactional acts." This definition highlights that a transactional act forms the basic complete unit of human linguistic interaction, encompassing all forms of linguistic exchanges, such as questions, requests, or commands.

In contrast, impactful acts may not always be intentional; they can inadvertently upset or convince someone, emerging spontaneously from the discourse. Hence, impactful acts are those outcomes or effects that arise from actions, whether they are transactional or not.¹⁴

Searle further elaborates that distinguishing between transactional and impactful acts necessitates an understanding of the nuances within transactional acts—specifically, the differentiation between the content of the act and its form, and between the factual content of the intentional state and the expression of this state. While transactional acts relate directly to intentionality and linguistic communication, impactful acts are consequential, stemming from the execution of transactional acts. Despite their differences, the integration of both act types is crucial for fostering successful philosophical discourse.

Pragmatics has revolutionized contemporary language concepts, transforming language from mere sounds and vocabulary into actionable expressions by elevating it from a formal to a pragmatic level. Proficiency in language alone is insufficient unless it is effectively transformed into communicative acts.

¹⁴Paul Ricœur, *Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ali Al-Muqallad, Al-Arab Magazine, World Thought, issue 8, National Union Center, 1989, p. 18.

John Searle, a leading philosopher in applying language practically in everyday interactions between speakers and listeners, underscores that linguistic function encompasses two dimensions: the representational, which is amplified through the realization of mental intentions, and the communicative, which underpins all linguistic usage.

In Searle's framework, the role of language within the theory of speech acts is conceptualized as behavior—wherein speaking itself is considered a form of behavior regulated by specific rules that define it as an act. He asserts, "Speaking a language implies committing to a form of behavior governed by rules that constitute it as an act." This delineation suggests that linguistic acts are behaviors arising from the correct application of language, adhering strictly to its rules.

The purpose of establishing and following these rules for speech acts is to mitigate the incidence of linguistic violence, which is a reprehensible reaction to actions or statements that causes the speaker to lose control over language, leading to various deviations in speech.¹⁵

Language thus becomes a vessel of value; when the authority of language is confined to the speaker or is depleted of its intrinsic value, society descends into what could be described as arbitrary and chaotic communication. The intentionality embedded in language serves as a critical mechanism for correctly understanding speech and guiding actions, establishing a vital connection between speech acts and intentional states—indispensable attributes that are essential for coherent and effective communication.

4. Reasons for the Escalation of Violent Discourse in Searle's Thought:

4.1 Non-Intentionality:

Intentionality has opened vast horizons for the mind to create sophisticated language and convincing philosophical discourse, which ultimately eradicates all forms of violence. The theory of speech acts serves as a pillar of intentionality. The absence of intent can be a cause and a factor leading to violence.

When the words spoken by a speaker lose their intended meaning, they hinder the purpose of communication, leading to misunderstandings between speaker and listener and paving the

¹⁵John Searle, *Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World*, op. cit., p. 202.

way for violence, which can harm the other party through the disintegration of the language's value structure.

This misunderstanding leads to a breakdown in the individual's relations with others. The most dangerous threat to humanity's future is linguistic violence, leading Searle to focus on intentionality in his theory of speech acts to eliminate linguistic deviations.

4.2 Functional Disparity in Language:

Language is based on the word that expresses the intrinsic link between language and its value. Therefore, words and expressions must be used within their expressive contexts, according to their rules, because the essence of language is the agreement between the signifier and the signified.

Linguistic violence arises through the value structure of language, such as grammatical rules and articulation points. Speech should positively affect the listener, a goal Searle pursued by defining rules and conditions that speakers must adhere to establish successful communication that is willingly accepted by others without coercion.

5. The Paradigm of Communication from Searle's Perspective:

John Searle's contributions to the philosophy of language have catalyzed transformative discussions in contemporary linguistics, presenting language as a dynamic, evolving entity rather than being confined within prescriptive linguistic structures traditionally used to exert control and dominance through aggressive rhetoric.

In this view, language emerges as a pivotal tool for addressing societal issues and fostering positive interpersonal relationships, thereby enhancing openness and communicative exchange beyond its traditionally insular role. Language acts are fundamentally human acts, underscoring its role as the quintessential medium of communication.

1.5 The Role of Intentionality in Enhancing the Communication Paradigm

Communication, spanning its various branches, is recognized as a vibrant avenue extensively explored and valued by scholars. In communicative exchanges, participants adhere to established norms that facilitate the attainment of intellectual and linguistic consensus, thereby ensuring that all parties are persuaded of the outcomes discussed. Effective

communication hinges on the concept of intentionality; without it, everyday interactions remain fraught with barriers that impede social cohesion.

Intentionality is vital for refining the communication paradigm. This concept is a cornerstone of modern philosophical discourse and plays a pivotal role in deepening our understanding of communicative acts and, by extension, social interactions. Searle specifically distinguishes communicative acts from other types of actions by emphasizing their non-coercive nature; they do not manipulate but rather aim to foster understanding and mutual consent.

This process is underpinned by a clear comprehension of each participant's intentions, which forms the foundation of the communication paradigm. This framework allows for a detailed examination of dialogue mechanisms and the identification of elements that contribute to achieving persuasive communication, ultimately transcending aggressive communicative methods.¹⁶

Discussion forums exemplify this principle, serving as platforms where diverse opinions can be freely expressed and debated. These settings are characterized by their interactive nature and the involvement of multiple participants, enabling speakers to tailor their language to the context and rely on listeners to grasp their intended meanings. The core of effective discussion lies in communicative interaction, which is inherently rich in exchanges among participants.

Communicative interaction integrates the dual concepts of 'interaction'—implying action and response within a defined context—and 'communication,' which refers to the progression of dialogue between at least two individuals. When combined, these concepts enrich the dialogue, providing a robust framework that supports interactive participation. This interaction not only fosters cooperation but also paves the way for overcoming various forms of violence, thereby promoting a globally accessible and open communicative paradigm.

Since dialogue is a review of logic and speech in addressing, it enhances communication pathways. Dialogic discussion requires the presence of a speaker, an addressee, and a subject of address, all interacting to achieve specific goals. For these objectives and ends of the

¹⁶Mohamed Nasif, *Dialogue and Characteristics of Communicative Interaction: An Applied Study in Pragmatic Linguistics*, Afrqiya al-Sharq, Morocco, 2010, p. 15.

discussion to be met, a cooperative framework is necessary to ensure a healthy dialogue free from pressure or coercion.

Discussion is foundational to communication, involving an exchange of words in a manner that does not provoke the other party, characterized by calmness and a distance from fanaticism and contention. The language of discourse should be non-imposing, as it is the only effectiveness that can reconnect the ties between the disparate parts of this world, which has lost all its references and anchors.

Instead of progress and love, tyranny, violence, dominance, and control have prevailed. In dialogic interactions, the discussion should consider several requisites, including the intentions of the discussants, as the answers to such discussions call for the correct response.

Since the discussion involves the exchange of words between two or more people, the success of every dialogic interaction requires adherence to specific rules, foremost among them the abandonment of methods of fear, intimidation, coercion, and violence. These represent obstacles to continuing discussions and do not lead to agreement and understanding.

5.2 Ethics of Discussion in Searle's Thought:

John Searle launched his foundation for successful communicative processes based on the principal idea that intentionality underpins the speech act and intentions play a significant role in shaping the meanings directed at the recipient. The communicative interaction initiated by the sender is not governed by the form of his speech but primarily by the intentions he aims to achieve, through a match between the appropriate linguistic form and the contextual elements. Intentions represent the pulsating heart of discussions according to Searle, as there is no communication through signs without intent behind the act of communication. The intended here is that the speech event is linked to the interaction between the speaking parties, governed by calm dialogue. Every dialogic process carries an intentional character, directed at the recipient with a single goal: persuasion. There is no room for arbitrariness; every aspect of the discussion and its nuances are intended, directing the recipient towards the desired outcome.

Intentions have frameworks in the sender's mind, and when the mind plays a significant role in determining the intentions between communication parties, this is reflected through the

intentions aimed at by the sender and the reactions of the recipient through their engagement with him.

As long as the discussion is based on foundations with an intentional character, it leads to understanding and agreement, which in turn eliminates the violence that arises from misunderstanding and non-intentionality. Thus, Searle focused on the principle of intentionality, affirming in his statement, "We must assume that the sender's production was according to a certain type of intentions."¹⁷

Here, the role of intent in achieving successful communication emerges, as the producer of linguistic discourse must consider the link between intent and the linguistic sign, and the linguistic discourse is nothing but a sign that entails the intentions of the speaker. The dialogic interaction results in a set of speech acts that contain a performative power realized as soon as they are spoken.

The paradigm Searle discusses is intentional communication, or more precisely, purposive communication, which is achieved with intent from both sides—the speaker and the listener. A key condition of communication is intentionality; when the speaker aims to direct their speech, the approach is through persuasion, preparing their directive speech with a persuasive discourse.

Once persuasion is achieved in the recipient, they become ready for guidance or have already been guided. Therefore, persuasion and argumentation become the direct goals pursued by every sender or interlocutor, but this goal hides behind it a broader objective, which is direction in its broad sense. There is an overlap between intentionality and persuasiveness; the interlocutor's statements in persuasive communication have intentional dimensions, directed towards the recipient who awaits from them a performative act.

Thus, the persuasive strategy carries within it a directive strategy, causing a change in the speaker's stance on issues without coercion, force, or imposition of opinion. Persuasion through intent becomes a critical role in the process of satisfaction, which Searle denotes as the intent of communication linked with the process of understanding in his statement: "When I intend to communicate, I mean by that to generate understanding, but understanding will be

¹⁷John Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*, Cambridge, 1983, p. 163.

in the grasp of my meaning and thus the intent of communication is the intent where the listener recognizes my meaning, i.e., understands me." ¹⁸

When we connect with others, we succeed in generating an understanding that makes them recognize my intent in generating that understanding, meaning that communication between people happens through intent to generate understanding among people, making human action successful in all instances with the goal of reaching true knowledge.

6. Conclusion:

John Searle's philosophy underscores the vital importance of fostering communicative interactions between the self and others through the ethics of discussion, dialogue, and understanding as a means to challenge and ultimately dismantle the discourse of violence.

- The inherent contradiction between violence and language threatens to erode the very essence of humanity. Consequently, the success of a communication paradigm effectively extinguishes the existence of violence, whereas the presence of violence signals the demise of philosophical discourse.
- Violence, as a phenomenon, distorts and disrupts the communication between individuals. Searle's communicative rules facilitate a linguistic turn that enables the reconstruction of a community grounded in proper communication.
- The improper use of language—such as the absence of intent in communication—inevitably leads to a breakdown in meaning, rendering the sender incapable of conveying their intent to the recipient. This breakdown fosters the emergence of various forms of violence, which impose opinions and force acceptance upon others. The lack of understanding between individuals often results in domination and tyranny.
- Searle's theory of intentionality and speech acts exemplifies a successful model of communicative discourse, offering the mind the tools to craft persuasive linguistic exchanges that eradicate violence and ensure effective communication. Searle's ultimate objective is to challenge all forms of violent discourse, which he views as

¹⁸John Searle, *Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World*, op. cit., p. 213.

distorted or pathological communication that spirals out of control due to the violation of speech act rules, leading to a rupture in communication.

Thus, the overarching goal we aspire to achieve through Searle's thought, alongside the ideas of other thinkers, is the establishment of a society free from all forms of violence—one that is built upon a sound communication paradigm among its members. Such a society can only be realized through a harmonious integration of language and reason. The world faces a perilous crossroads if it fails to confront and combat the pervasive phenomenon of violence.

References and Sources:

Sources:

1. John Searle, *Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World*, trans. Sa'id Al-Ghanimi, Al-Ikhtilaf, The Arab Cultural Center, Algiers, 2006.
2. John Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*, trans. Ahmad Al-Ansari, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, 2009.
3. John Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*, Cambridge, 1983.

References:

1. Mohammed Nasif, *Dialogue and Characteristics of Communicative Interaction: An Applied Study in Pragmatic Linguistics*, Africa East, Morocco, 2010.
2. Paul Ricœur, *Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ali Al-Muqallad, Al-Arab Journal, Global Thought, No. 8, National Union Center, 1989.
3. Salah Ismail Abdel-Hak, *Linguistic Analysis at the Oxford School*, Al-Tanweer for Printing and Publishing, First Edition, 1993.
4. Salah Ismail, *Philosophy of Mind: A Study in Searle's Philosophy*, Al-Qabaa Al-Haditha for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, Cairo, 2007, p. 184.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias:

1. André Lalande, *Lalande's Philosophical Encyclopedia*, trans. Khalil Ahmad Khalil, Vol. 1, Awidat Publications, Beirut, 2nd Edition, 2001.
2. *Dictionnaire Larousse*, Maxipoche editions, Larousse 2017.

3. George Tarabishi, *Dictionary of Philosophers - Logicians - Theologians - Mystics*, Dar Al-Tali'a for Printing and Publishing, Beirut, 2006.
4. Jamil Saliba, *Philosophical Dictionary*, Vol. 2, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Lubnani, Lebanon, 1982, p. 112.
5. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, AS Hornby, Ninth Edition, Editors: Leonie Hey, Susanne Holloway, Oxford University Press.