

# African Research Review

---

An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia

Vol. 5 (6), Serial No. 23, November, 2011

ISSN 1994-9057 (Print)

ISSN 2070--0083 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v5i6.1>

---

## **The Moral Imperative of Language and Communication in Culture and Society** (Pp. 1-17)

**Aghamelu Fidelis Chuka** - Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria  
Email: [helen.fidelis@yahoo.com](mailto:helen.fidelis@yahoo.com)  
Tel: 08056648120, 08160559569

**Ani, Emmanuel, Ifeanyi** - Department of Philosophy & Classics, University of Ghana, Legon  
Email: [mabrowest@yahoo.com](mailto:mabrowest@yahoo.com)  
+233543499480

### **Abstract**

*The thesis that is presented here shows clearly that the analytic pre-occupation in language represents a deformation of the reality behind language. At best, the analytic preoccupation in language represents a distortion and abuse of the phenomenon of language. As will be observed in the argument of this paper, the analytic position that tends to reduce the role of language as a handmaid of the natural science tends to limit the vast scope of realities that are possible, which man can exploit positively for his fulfilment. One of such realities of language that is threatened by the analytic position is morality. The moral potentials of language as communication is found to be the very foundation of the evolution of true culture and human social order. The repudiation of the metaphysical basis of reality tends to be*

*the greatest handicap of analytic philosophy in general and with particular reference to the phenomenon of language. Language has a moral role and this goes beyond the mere analysis of concepts and propositions of the natural science. There are realms of meaning that are eliminated by this analytic limitation and morality is clearly one of them.*

### **Introduction**

There is always an end, eschatology and a fundamental vision attached to all human, cultural and social phenomena in as much as society remains the ultimate ambient for realization of every aspect of human nature. To this extent, there is always a moral vision attached to all cultural realities as determined by the social nature of man. Language and Communication derive their authentic human dimension specifically by their contribution to the realization of the integral moral foundation that constitutes human sociality.

The human person is at the basis of the realization of all social realities. Language and communication, to the extent they guarantee the realization of the community of persons; fulfil their social and moral function. The human person is the sole guarantee for social stability, harmony, peace and authentic development and progress, and language and communication function as special cultural tools for the attainment of this social objective. Language can therefore, be a positive instrument for the humanization of the social order. The experience of the social realities of our time shows that philosophers, politicians and policy makers have not considerably exploited the enormous potentials of language for addressing positively the very numerous social crisis of our century.

### **Analysis of key concepts of discourse**

#### **Society**

Every human reality as has been pointed out earlier actualizes itself authentically only in the context of society. Society therefore, designates a definite form of realization. As J. Hoffner observes, "...society designates every form of lasting bond between people who jointly strive to realize a value (1982, p.30). Fagothy on his own analysis defines society as "...an enduring union of a number of people morally bound together under authority to cooperate for a common good" (1972, p. 375)

This implies that society is defined in terms of a peculiar type of union or relation that is the one identified by its moral character. It is a union that

leads to a moral end as a consequence of our living together. It is a union that is ordained towards the “common good”.

From the foregoing, it implies that every social reality functions to promote the realization of the human person, and society is only possible as society of moral persons. Society, therefore, presupposes, morality, culture and language, in as much as these social realities contribute to the emergence of an enduring social order aimed at a common goal.

### **Culture**

Culture in its basic description can be regarded as the organizing principle of every aspect of social life. It is that which enables society to organize and order all social and individual activities towards the perfection and attainment of its goal. It is on the basis of this understanding that culture is generally defined as the totality of the way of life of any society. It is culture that is at the basis of society’s determination and ordering of values that safeguard its protection, perpetuation and development. Therefore, ultimately like any other social reality, culture is ordained towards the human person. Mondin has identified three basic meanings and functions of culture relating to its nature and purpose as both human and social reality. These include, “...elitarian, pedagogical, and anthropological” (2005, p.16). However it is the pedagogical and anthropological meanings that succinctly explain the important place and role of culture in society. While in the elitarian sense, culture can be colloquially understood as simply as a vast form of knowledge, the pedagogical and the anthropological meanings address the core of culture as a principle of social order. As Mondin puts it,

In the pedagogical sense culture indicates the education, formation, and cultivation of man ...the progress through which man comes to the full maturation and realization of his own personality. In the anthropological sense ... culture signifies that totality of customs, techniques, and values that distinguish a social group ... a mode of living proper to a social group. (Ibid).

From the above analysis, it signifies that culture is the force or principle of “becoming” that enables a social group to evolve the best possible means of living properly, that is, as humans. It is, therefore, culture that is at the basis of man’s great spiritual and material accomplishments. However, these accomplishments are not ends in themselves, but rather means of making

man more human in the social context. Man is therefore, more a cultural than a natural being, since he makes himself and builds the model of society best suitable for him through the instrumentality of culture. But this is not to suggest that man is not also a natural being, that nature has not given him some natural identity that he makes himself from nothing. Man develops his culture from some naturally given elements of nature inscribed in his DNA.

The classical and modern philosophical understanding of man had interpreted him from two parallel dimensions, namely nature and history or freedom. The contemporary outlook has unified these two opposing visions in the concept of culture. That is, the cultural interpretation of man. What this amounts to is that "...man is capable of cultivating nature and profoundly transforming it, adapting it to meet his own needs. Culture is not accidental for man...but makes up part of his nature, and it is a constitutive element of his essence" (Mondin, p.148)

Culture characterizes man and distinguishes him from animals no less clearly than his other attributes such as reason, freedom and language. It is rather culture that gives these other attributes their proper social and moral color. Culture makes man fully man, he makes himself through culture. Through culture man cultivates and actuates other faculties of his for a fuller living. By this we mean that, "...man, in place of all these things, possesses the reason and the hands, which are the organs of organs, in that with their help man can procure for himself instruments of infinite styles for infinite aims..." (Ibid)

Man is therefore a cultural being in two senses that reflect the pedagogical and the anthropological senses of culture. As John Paul II puts it, he is, first, the artifice of culture, but it is also himself who is the prime receiver and the greatest effect of culture. Therefore, culture, in its two principal accepted meanings, "of formation of the individual and of the society's spiritual form has the goal of the realization of the individual in all his dimensions, in all his capacities". (1986:4)The primary aim of culture is therefore, to cultivate man in as much as he is an individual, of making man a person, a fully developed spirit. But man as a cultural being, implies constructing, making and remaking of himself after a model, after a standard, after an ideal, and the Christian philosophy identifies this model in the "Imago Dei", i.e. the image of God. This places a high moral premium on the concept of culture. In this project of cultivation of man; culture places emphasis on the primacy of spirit over matter, of the soul over body, ...a capital truth, that is, to specify with

exactness the lines of a cultural project tending to the full realization of man's being" (op.cit: 21). Understood as a property of society, "Culture signifies all those things, institutions, material objects and typical reactions to situations that characterize a people and distinguish them from other people". (Ibid).

### **Morality**

The concept of morality is another social and cultural category that is very crucial to our discourse. Generally, morality signifies a society's understanding and experience of the right order of relations. It is the totality of expectations and customs demanded of every member of society which promote and preserve social harmony and equilibrium. Its major focus is therefore on what is a right or wrong conduct of individuals, examined from the perspective of the common good of society. The idea of morality like language and culture is also directed towards the realization of the human person and social order. According to M. Velasquez, morality consists of the standards that an individual or group has about what is right and wrong or good and evil." (1997:456). Morality works towards the realization of the ultimate end of society. Therefore, within a definite context of social life, there are always standards of behaviour for people, expectations, duties and obligations, which enable both the individual and collectivists to sustain the vision of the realization of their ends. Morality therefore, enhances the orderliness, harmony and peace of society. Without some certain moral restraints on conducts of individuals and groups, society will definitely become chaotic and insecure language can only promote a moral ideal by enhancing the attainment of social order.

### **Language and communication**

To bring out very clearly the moral role of language as instrument of communication in society and culture, Mondin distinguishes between language in the generic sense and tongue in the restricted sense. According to Mondin language denotes a general universal characteristic of the human species.

It denotes, "...the function, the capacity with which man is naturally gifted to express himself and communicate with his own peers through the word...an innate capacity which comes to all men in the same way, independently from the nation and the culture to which men belong." (Mondin 2005, p.176)

On the other hand, tongue as a mode of communication refers to a determinate linguistic mode peculiar to a social group. As Mondin puts it,

“The tongue...is a determined system of linguistic signs devised by a social group to realize communication among the members of the social group...” In other words, it is tongue and not language that distinguishes one social group from another. Social groupings occur first of all on the basis of tongue. Also language does not suffice to have a culture, but a tongue is necessary, and therefore, it is the tongue that constitutes the primary fundamental element of a culture. According to Mondin, language is bound to human freedom. It owes its origin and progress to human freedom. However, the tongue as an instrument of the unification and characterization of a social group, is also the source from which cultural development begins.

Like every aspect of culture, language and communication has two aspects, namely, the material or physical aspect and the spiritual aspect. The material, physical aspect is represented by the sound or by the word printed or spoken. The spiritual, symbolic or semantic aspect of language is represented by the meaning. Linguistic meanings are spiritual against the argument of the analytic philosophers that all criteria for linguistic meaning is physical. More than in the physicals, the social group reflects itself, its own soul in the spiritual aspect of language. “...the personality of a social group, more than in the material aspect, emerges in the semantic, symbolic aspect...from the presence of certain determined meanings...of the daily use of the tongue for certain interests and values” (Mondin, p. 151).

Language or tongue realizes itself, its essence and nature in communication. They both therefore, represent the same socio-cultural reality. As language is ordained towards the personhood in the social context, so also is communication. Communication refers to the same end as language. Dialogue is the cumulatively point of communication. Communication itself can be defined as, “...the exchange of meaning between individuals through a common system of symbols...that serves to bind human beings together” (Eyije 2009, p.6).

Philosophically, communication is the process of intellectual intercourse between individuals or groups, resulting in the transmission and interchange of information, experiences, affections, goods and services.

Culture as a social reality has its origin and being in communication, intellectual co-operation and exchange. Communication is only possible and requires cooperation with others to develop its potentialities and achieve perfection. Culture is peculiar to man so also is communication. Man is incomplete by nature and makes himself through the instrumentality of

culture. However it is by communication that he becomes fully human and truly cultural. “By communication ... a growing set of certainties and values, insights, ideas, morals and customs are built up ... on the participation and on a common sharing by the members of the society” (Ibid).

Capability for communication has basis in human nature. Part of the basis of human communication is man’s ability in judging his own experience reflectively and being able to generalize his sense experience by means of concepts and words, being distinct from animals, man. “...is able to accumulate the knowledge and experience from one generation to another”.(Ibid). Another characteristic of man’s communicative ability is rooted in the fact that man has a natural impulse “which obliges him to love and to be loved”, and man’s aspiration and desire towards happiness, informed by man’s power of knowing and desiring in the realm of values, can be realized only by way of communication. A third basis for communication is man’s need for freedom. Communication depends on freedom because a nature that must complete itself through co-operative activity must also be free in its endeavours for self fulfilment through social communication.

### **Language and philosophy**

#### **Language, communication and performance**

One most obvious consequence of the contemporary analysis of language is its moral implication. This moral implication draws from the fact that as a socio-cultural reality, language and communication leads to performing. It leads to some kind of attitude that must be caused from the point of view of the social and cultural reality. Every aspect of human nature reaches perfection in the social context of human existence. As such, they contribute to the building and perfection of the social order. Here lies the fulcrum of the moral consideration of language. Also, every social reality contributes in the evolution of the human person, the ultimate vision of every social structure. To the extent that language and communication contribute in bringing about a conducive social order, it builds a human culture, it leads to social stability, harmony and peace, it makes for justice, it promotes the human personality, it fulfils its cultural function.

This moral role of language as has been observed was undermined by the anti-meta-physical, anti moral and anti religious spirit of analytic philosophy. This tended to deny the inherent true connection between language and morality. Communication induces some form of conduct. “There is a tight

connection between communication and performance,” says Jose Medina (2005, p.1). He continues “We communicate through our act, and the communicative functions of language cannot be carried out and fulfilled in any way than performatively.” According to him, it is this intimate bond between speech and action that Wittgenstein tried to explore in his notion of a “language-game”. As Wittgenstein himself expresses it, “I shall... call the whole, consisting of language and the actions into which it is woven, the language-game”. (1958:72). So what Wittgenstein had in mind was to bring into prominence the fact that the speaking of language is part of an activity, or a “form of life. To speak is to make a move in a language game that is to do something in a normatively structured activity.

Wittgenstein was correct in observing the intimate relation between language and morality through the act. He was also correct in pointing out that this stems from recognized normative order. However, his entire effort to substantiate this relationship was weakened by his non recognition of the existence of an ontological substantive moral norm to which the language game must be subjected. He therefore removed both language and morality from the ambience of culture and society.

### **Two social principles of language and communication**

The analysis of the philosophical foundations of language and communication which has been stated in the preceding section of this article, suggests explicitly the relevance of two fundamental principles of human sociality which seem to be at the centre of the reality of human language as a social and cultural phenomenon. It is by setting human language in the perspective of these principles it consummates and brings to fulfilment the moral challenges of language and communication in our contemporary world context. The principles implied in the analysis of language and communication, that direct human language to the realization of its essence is the principles of “Dialogue and Solidarity”. The relevance of these two principles in the realization of a just, peaceful and stable world order has been profoundly articulated in the humanism of John Paul II.

### **Understanding dialogue in human communication**

In today’s world that is characterized by various forms of pluralism, dialogue seen in the thinking of John Paul II is the only authentic means of attaining social stability justice, peace and progress. It is by the instrumentality of dialogue that the evil tendencies that characterize the competitiveness of our pluralistic world can be positively harnesses to promote the true spirit of



tolerance and corporate existence. To put it the other way, dialogue has become an antidote to today's social evils such as, terrorism, exploitation, conflict and other negative forms of violence that have become characteristic of our world. These evils signify a breakdown in communication, a failure of dialogue. At the same time, it must be pointed out that these stem from human beings wrong perception of self, ignorance, selfishness and disregard for the dignity of the human person. It is from this background that dialogue is designed as a principle of human communication to be at the basis of social stability.

### **Conceptualizing dialogue**

Dialogue according John Paul II can be conceived as, "...reciprocal communication, mutual friendship and respect, ...joint effort for the sake of shared goals in the service of a common search for truth ...in complex of human activities founded upon respect and esteem for people..." (1998, p. 4). This definition points at dialogue as constituting the very end of communication. Dialogue aims at personal disclosure of being in its truth and depth. Because it is underscored by the truth of disclosure, dialogue is opposed to deceit. Dialogue does not originate from any tactical concerns or self-interest, its ontological root is the enrichment of the other persons in communication.

Therefore,

Dialogue does not grow out of the opportunism of the tactics of the moment, but arises from reasons which experience and reflection, and even the difficulties themselves, have depended...a means by which people discover one another and discover the good hopes and peaceful aspirations that too often lie hidden in their hearts. (Ibid).

Dialogue is a means to discovery of the truth about the human condition within the multi-cultural, multi religious, multi linguistic social context. Because dialogue holds the key to the discovery of the truth about persons, it is also indispensable for building a harmonious and peaceful society; it overcomes all human obstacles in the path of peace and justice. It arouses in the human person that conscience for social living; it is at the basis of life and compassion. As John Paul II puts it, dialogue, "...makes the future preservative of mankind's heritage and ensures within the future generation that hope which is the lifeblood of the human heart." (Okere 2001, p.3)

Dialogue becomes a legitimate aspiration of the human spirit, after threatened by corrupting forces of violence. Dialogue offers prospects for overcoming all forms of alienation that compose the contemporary society. The path of dialogue makes it possible to achieve the peace so longed for, which is the foundation of fruitful coexistence among people. It is within this frame work that dialogue sustains the endeavour as observed by Uzoukwu Samuel, (2004, p.146), towards the building and sustaining of justice and peace, and makes possible the promotion of fundamental values for the ordering and development of society. Therefore, dialogue imposes a moral obligation, simply from the fact, that it is a central and essential element of ethical thinking among people, and an indispensable tool for the recognition of the Truth.

Dialogue promotes core social and moral values that guarantee social cohesion and stability. However, experience shows that these human values that are embedded in dialogue have been seriously threatened. The need therefore, arises,

... to resume and intensify dialogue, with that intelligence and creativity which God has given to man in order to build a productive society, for if dialogue is lacking, destruction argument, criticisms and differences are born, tensions give rise to misunderstanding and frustration which inevitably end up affecting the family and societal life (John Paul II 1999, p.5).

Though the prospects of dialogue, "...is weighed down by the tragic heritage for war, conflict, violence and hatred, which lives on in peoples memory" it must of necessity be affirmed and must be promoted since it enriches humanity. In the observation of John Paul II, even when dialogue can be seen to be a slow and difficult, it still remains the best option to solving serious internal and external problems and to obtain positive result. The major presupposition of dialogue according to John Paul II include the following, viz, *Search for truth, Basic respect for the Human person, Respect for diversity, communion*. On the other hand, its aims and aspirations as underscored in Uzoukwu's appreciation of the humanism of John Paul II includes the following,

promotion of the culture of peace, mutual acceptance and enrichment, respect for human rights, suffering

alleviation; recognition of mutual interdependence, recognition of common values, respect for freedom of religion and conscience, fraternal relations, openness to others, unity, creation of one human family and respect for God's name (Uzoukwu. Op.cit:170).

It is obvious that these values are in themselves desirable and cherishable, and that where they exist, they promote the highest possible level of social stability and progress.

### **Dialogue and culture**

Culture and dialogue have natural rapport in as much as culture itself is at the basis of man's interaction and penetration of reality. Culture is a means by *which* man goes beyond himself in search of life in communion with high realms of truth. It is at the foundation of man's transcendence and conquest of natural limitations at all levels of existence. Culture therefore, signifies man's initial encounter, communion and communication with reality, which enhances the positive realization of his being. Culture is therefore, primarily dialogue. The dialogue of culture given by John Paul II, makes more explicit the relation between dialogue and culture, and, highlights the dialogic nature of culture, thereby creating the possibility of a culture of dialogue. For him, culture signifies, "...man's self expression as he travels through history...it is a reality born of self-transcendence, it takes shape from an impulse by which human individuality seeks to rise above its limitations in an interior derive to communicate and share" (1999, p. 5)

Culture presents man's primordial communicative and dialogic instincts with reality, with nature, with fellow humans and with God. It is this primordial instinct that is made explicit by man's social exigencies in language, communication or dialogue. Through culture, the human person reveals his innermost being in dialogue to other persons and to transcendent itself. Because culture aims at the ultimate perfection of man, John Paul II warns that it is not necessary that any culture should lose sight or fail to make reference to the ultimate origin of man. In the same vein, language, communication or dialogue must within the context of any culture, strive to promote the human attributes that attach man to his divine root. Contrary to this culture and dialogue lose their meaning and truth. As John Paul II argues, culture, naturally constituting the "religious soul" of man, "...has its reference point in God who it cannot neglect without losing its soul and its

way as a path to the absolute, and without becoming a culture of death” (2000, p.3).

God is love and the only true basis for the humanization of all cultural and social realities remains that love. Without love, culture and dialogue cannot impact positively on the lives of man and society. Just as culture is indispensable to human existence, so is love, lost man and society will fail to reach their destinies. “A person without culture is lacking in that activity which each person owes his or herself, ... and life without culture is life without spiritual depth, without openness to mystery, life exposed to the risks of superficiality regulated only by needs and consumption” (2000, p.2).

Man’s situatedness in culture implies the vision of values rooted in God. In the contrary, “individuals risk being subjected ... to an excess of conflicting stimuli which could impair their serene and balanced development” (1990, p.7). The role of dialogue in culture is best appreciated from the point of view of diversity of cultures occasioned by historical, ethnic, religious, political and evolutionary antecedents of each culture. Each culture is distinct by virtue of its peculiarities, which makes it a structurally unique, original and organic whole. This is together with its specific end products, which makes culture many and varied. But this variety is not in itself, an invitation to disunity of the human family, this is because beyond this diversities lies the possibility of unity of culture through dialogue. Diversity of cultures should not in essence lead to conflict of cultures.

Dialogue positions itself here as an antidote against these cultural anomalies. Here dialogue is encouraged among cultures. This is in order to sustain the spirit of dialogue to overcome these obstacles and encourage interaction and communion with others while retaining their distinct identities.

The dialogue between cultures emerges as an intrinsic demand of human nature itself, as well as of culture. It is dialogue which protects the distinctiveness of cultures as historical and created expressions of the underlying unity of the human family, and which sustains understanding and communion between them (John Paul II 2000, p. 9).

The first fruit of dialogue among culture is communion and solidarity, which promotes cooperation based on true understanding. It also promotes the culture of mutual respect and recognition of persons. Through the dialogue of

cultures, it becomes necessary that the appreciation for the values in one's own culture be properly accompanied by the recognition of and respect for the cultures of other people because every culture has its own limitations and strength.

Invariably, dialogue among cultures becomes the means to building a culture of civilization, peace and love. This is because; dialogue reveals the fact that there are values which are common to all cultures because they are rooted in the very nature of the human person. These values that are at the heart of the human person include, ... the value of solidarity, peace, the value of education, the value of forgiveness and reconciliation, the value of life..." (Ibid). These values express humanity's most authentic and distinctive features. In fact, in the opinion of John Paul II, it is this dialogue of cultures that today's world most earnestly and urgently needs. Dialogue responds to that specific challenge of today's world that seems to be driven by evil forces of hatred, violence and conflict. To the contrary, dialogue of cultures positions humanity, "to know and respect one another in and through the diversity of our cultures, so that the human family will enjoy unity and peace, while individual cultures will be enriched and received, purified of all that poses an obstacle to mutual encounter and dialogue" (1999, p.2).

Other values are also promoted by dialogue of cultures arising from the rational nature of man and the freedom of his own personality. They underscore the transcendent nature of human rationality and sociality. Therefore,

Since cultures are adequately formed through the involvement of the whole person in the exercise of his or her creativity, intelligence and knowledge of the world and people, are fed by the communication of values, share the dynamics revealed by life experiences, dialogue, ... enables cultures to attend maturity through receptive openness to others, through generous self-giving and through sharing. (Ibid).

Education is also a core value in the dialogue of cultures. Education promoted through dialogue, will not only bring about eradication of ignorance,... "but also leads to the knowledge of other cultures, acquired with an appropriate critical sense and within a solid ethical frame work, leads to a deeper awareness of the values and the limitations within one's own culture."

(Ibid). Education through dialogue also reveals the existence of humanity's common heritage, makes people aware of their own roots, and promotes that authentic and the humanism which respects the ethical and religious dimensions of life, appreciates other cultures, and recognizes the spiritual values present in them.

### **The social principle of solidarity**

Unless language and communication endeavours to achieve social stability, cohesion and unity, underlined by the spirit of solidarity, peace cannot be achieved, and language becomes meaningless. This is because the path of peace is founded on construction of relationship of solidarity. This signifies that it has a function that is ultimately achieved in society by an appeal to morality. It is by this moral appeal is language capable of fulfilling its role as a cultural phenomenon. Solidarity is the essence of this moral imperative of language. Solidarity is rooted in the social nature of man and signifies man's inherent tendency to communion and social cooperation.

The attitude of solidarity is a natural consequence of the fact that a human being exists and acts together with others. Solidarity is also the foundation of a community in which the common good conditions and liberates participation, and participation serves the common good, supports it, and implements it. Solidarity means the continuous readiness to accept and perform that part of task which is imposed due to the participation as member of a specific community. (1983, p.138).

Solidarity can therefore, be best explained as the interior spiritual bond of communion that implies and elicits social and moral obligation to the common good of society. It is the interior actualizing principle of sociality.

### **The social consequences of solidarity**

From what has been stated earlier, solidarity as a function or product of dialogue is ordained towards establishing a peace order.

...the issue of peace which is a noble and demanding task deeply rooted in humanity's vocation to be one family and to recognize itself as such, raises the question of solidarity, since solidarity has its principle rooted in the universal destination of earth's

resources and is itself based upon the awareness that all men and women make up a single human family. The issue of peace so much implicates solidarity that solidarity becomes a new name for peace. (John Paul II 1998, p. 12).

As a consequence of human sociality rooted in the openness of the human person, it implies that solidarity is much more than mere human togetherness, it goes beyond the mere gregarious into the deeper dimension of human solicitude and commitment to the common good, the foundation of justice and peace. It is the dynamic principle of action for the building of true human society. Solidarity based on the fruit of dialogue presupposes peace. It therefore becomes a value to be cultivated and preserved. Language and communication as social realities actualize the social essence of human being simply by creating the propensity for dialogue which guarantees commitment to solidarity. Language therefore, becomes a socio-cultural presupposition for social stability. In this sense, solidarity ceases to be fleeting sensationalism. It designates sincerity of approach to the human condition. Rooted in interpersonal disclosure, solidarity is not

...merely well meaning kindness and compassion, which have their rightful place in human relationship but a firm and persevering determination to work for the common good of the entire human family. It presupposes that one sees things from the point of view of the people in need and of seeking what is good for that people, while considering the people as an active agent of its own development. (John Paul II 2001, p. 24)

Language and communication as social and cultural phenomenon, actualizes the logic of social development by commitment to the moral ideal of the principle of solidarity. Solidarity therefore, becomes a catalyst for peace and development. It elicits the moral sensibility in man, and becomes the affirmation of value about humanity. Solidarity derives from the spiritual contact of all human persons who possess a common origin, common dignity and common destiny. It is by everyone for everyone and looks at the individual in the social context not only as its object but in some way its active subject. The power in human language therefore, works positively in

realizing a world of peace and justice. Language should not work towards the impoverishment of the human person in social relations.

Language realizes itself in solidarity as such. Solidarity is also love; it helps the human family to overcome “evil mechanism” and “structures of sin”. In essence language and communication realizes its social essence simply in promotion of culture of solidarity. This is as John Paul II puts it, that, “God created the world in solidarity, and the world makes use of this solidarity, for better for worse. Yet this solidarity gives us a chance, it will let us reach together.” (Ibid).

### **Conclusion**

Clearly the total rejection of metaphysics by the analytic tradition could not be executed without a rejection of morality as well. This, more than any other factor shows the shallowness of this endeavour. Language is a moral vehicle, as we have seen, and manifests in its communicative functions within the demands of solidarity. With language we reach out and across to the other, and this reaching out takes places along social and moral principles which cannot be relegated. Thus, the moral dimension of language reflects the reality of the indispensability of language to human existence and thus, the shortcoming of the analytic method.

### **References**

- Eyije, S.E, (2009). “Social Communication: A Phenomenon of Human Existence’ in *Gleaner* Vol. I no 12.
- Fagothey, J. (1972). *Right and reason* (ed) Milton Gonslave, Toronto, Merrill publications.
- Hoffner, J. (1983). *Christian Social teaching* Butson and Becker, Kurtzlelaufname Bibliothek.
- John Paul II, (1986), *Message for World Day of Peace*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001). *Message to World Day of Peace*
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). *Message to World of Culture and Learning in Zagreb, Croatia*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999). *Address to 1<sup>st</sup> Group of German Bishops at their ad-Limina, Rome, 15<sup>th</sup> November*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002). *Message for the 37th World Day of Social Communication, Rome*



- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000). Address during the Jubilee of Journalists, Rome, 4th June.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990). Address to members of Focolare Movement at Genfest 31st March.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000). Address to the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart Italy, 24th may.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). Address to marian Servans Ambassador of Solvaks to the Holy See.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001). Address to Mostafa Borujerdi Ambassador of Iran to the Holy See
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1983). Message to World Day of Peace.
- \_\_\_\_\_, (2001). Encyclical Centestimus Amos.
- Medina J. (2005). *Language Key Concepts in Philosophy*, New York, Continuum.
- Mondin. B. (2005). *Philosophical Anthtopology*, Rome, Pontificia Universitas Urbaninan.
- Okere T. (2001). *Commentary on the Pope's Message for the World Day of Peace*, Owerri, Assumpta Press.
- Uzoukw, S.K (2004). *Peace through Dialogue and Solidarity*, Enugu, Snaap Press.
- Wittgenstein L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations*, Oxford, Blackwell