

*USC 14(430) "19" Ю. Габермас*

## **THE CONCEPT OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY OF J. HABERMAS IN THE CONTEXT OF LIBERALISM AND COMMUNITARIANISM DEBATE**

**Snizhana Mamchak**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
Universytetska Str., 1, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine,  
e-mail: snizja@ukr.net*

It is considered the debate between liberalism and communitarianism as two of the most influential trends in contemporary social philosophy. It is established theoretical and methodological limits of liberalism and communitarianism. It is found the specific of the concept of deliberative democracy compared with liberalism and republicanism on the following grounds: concept of a citizen, the concept of law, specific of the process of formation the political will of the citizens. It is stressed on epistemic status of political deliberation.

*Keywords:* deliberative democracy, communitarianism, liberalism, republicanism.

In the current socio-political crisis caused by rising dissatisfaction with the representative model of democracy, increased attention to deliberative democracy as an alternative to the existing political regime. An important contribution to the development of this model made J. Habermas, who formed his own understanding of the content deliberative policy based on comparative analysis of liberalism and republicanism. The contradiction between liberalism and republicanism, which a characteristic feature of the American political culture, sparked a lively debate between supporters of liberal (R. Nozick) and neoliberal (M. Friedman, J. Rawls, J. Berlin, R. Dworkin, F. Hayek) proponents of communitarianism (E. McIntyre, M. Sendel, C. Taylor, M. Volzen, B. Berber, M. Veltser).

The purpose of the article is to analyze Habermas's concept of deliberative model of democracy in the light of debate between liberalism and republicanism.

The beginning of the discussion is considered to be the publication in 1971, "Theory of Justice" J. Rawls, which caused a considerable resonance in international scientific community. In this work the author tries on a new theoretical level rethink the social contract theory, emphasizing that well-ordered social system should not only be able to provide benefits to everyone, and comply with the general principles of justice which:

- Shared by everyone, while being assured that their compliance is mandatory for all;
- Implemented by basic social institutions.

Taking ethical guidance John Rawls claims that his theory is an ideal-typical case and can't be viewed as the sum of specific views and ideas on issues of justice using separate entities. Thinker has attempted justification of principles of justice, equally suitable for all in the so-called initial

situation. This is the theoretically simulated situation within which autonomous actors, facing the choice of principles of equitable coexistence. The condition that selected principles in the initial situation of justice would not be the realization of the interests of certain groups or individuals is the veil of ignorance that hides participants to the concepts of good content to which they are oriented, their social status, preferences and so on. In terms of John Rawls, the absence of such knowledge would make it possible to achieve solutions that are equally reflect the interests of all, because not knowing their own concept of the good, the place in the social hierarchy, each will focus for the maximization of social benefits.

The requirement of a symmetrical distribution of roles between actors of the political process, meet the following two principles of justice, the priority of which reflects the sequence of their presentation:

1. Everyone should have equal rights in respect of the general scheme of basic liberties, which is adjacent to the freedoms of all similar scheme;
2. Social and economic inequalities must meet two basic requirements. Firstly, all the inequalities of social or economic nature are allowed only if they meet the interests of the poorest sections of the population. Secondly, any position or positions should be available to all.

Developed by J. Rawls principles are based on the principles of rational decision and egalitarianism, and therefore have a universal appeal. The thesis of the universal status of moral principles has caused a mixed review in the scientific community that can be defined through different degrees of graduation from approval (J. Habermas) to complete rejection (communitarists). The difference in opinion is due primarily belong to different philosophical traditions J. Rawls, as J. Habermas stands for moral universalism of I. Kant, while communitarists in their scientific quests are guided by Aristotle ethics of good life. Since the difference in approach is paradigmatic character communitarists critique of liberalism should be presented as an alternative view of the nature of morality.

In the book "Is patriotism a virtue?" [4] E. McIntyre cites five features of modern moral philosophy, the most outstanding representatives of which are utilitarians and Kantian:

1. Morality consists of rules that in an ideal situation, each agrees to a rational creature;
2. moral rules restrict competing interests and is the equilibrium towards them, because morality itself does not represent any particular interest;
3. These rules are also in the equilibrium relation to competing views on the subject matter which way of life is the most deserving;
4. Each person is an autonomous unit of moral beliefs and can express only one person;
5. All carriers of morality express the same commitment to its norms, regardless of membership in a particular social group.

This abstract universalism of modern moral theory E. McIntyre opposes their own understanding of morality, provided through communication with the community within which it acquires significance. A broader definition of moral theory offers and Ch. Taylor: "Насправді я хочу розглянути трохи ширший діапазон поглядів, ніж той, що, зазвичай, включають до сфери "моралі". Окрім наших понять і реакцій, пов'язаних з такими речами, як справедливість і повага до життя інших людей, добробут і гідність, я хочу також дослідити, як ми розуміємо підстави своєї власної гідності, і розглянути деякі питання про те, що надає нашому життю сенс і що уможливорює наше самоздійснення... Краще сказати, що йдеться про з'ясування причин, завдяки яким життя є вартим того, щоб його прожити" [7, с. 15].

Morality in its broad sense makes it possible to identify some of the limitations of the theory of Rawls. In particular, the fact that J. Rawls offers a narrowed vision of society as the sum of interest autonomously acting individuals, each endowed with their own life plans and beliefs about the good life, ignoring the existence of a good concept inherent in the community as a whole. “Такий брак ідентифікації, – на думку Ч. Тейлора, – може відтворювати атомістичний світогляд, в якому люди починають розуміти суспільство суто інструментально” [9, с. 96]. In our opinion, the observations presented are appropriate because individualistic liberal perspective can at best offer general rules regulating interpersonal relationships, however, it is unable to provide a sense of community among people. And then there is the possibility, built on the principles of liberal social and political system, to counter real threats to democracy. Will serve as a protection of subjective rights powerful argument to support dictatorial regimes? The answer to this question may be the thought of Ch. Taylor, who believes that: “розумний егоїзм у чистому вигляді ніколи не спонукав достатньої кількості людей, здатних створити реальну загрозу деспотам і путчистам. І, на жаль, завжди бракуватиме людей, що керуються універсальними принципами, без домішок особистих ідентифікацій, моральних громадян всесвіту, стоїків та кантіанців, які могли б зупинити цих злочинців” [8, с. 463].

However, the position of communitarists that links life with a certain conception of the good, that makes individual life stories to a certain telos is not always so convincing. Immediately there is a counter-question. Is a communitarianism that is the basis of analysis of different communities is the concept of Aristotle, the inner conflict caused by the fact that concept that occurs under specific historical conditions play the role of a universal model? In order to be consistent communitarists must at least show that makes this model acceptable under current conditions. At this point, in particular, focuses K.-O. Apel, emphasizing that communitarianism is insufficient to justify regulatives universal human behavior. “Наслідком цього є те, що вони вимушені або відмовитися від будь-якого обґрунтування стандарту раціональності чи принципів, або редукувати обґрунтування цього стандарту – наприклад істинності та нормативної правильності – до партикулярного стандарту раціональності” [1, с. 382]. According K.-O. Apel communitarianism overcome difficulties discourse ethics, which refers not to the particularism of local communities and is based on the recognition of the absolute community of speakers interconnected network of symmetric relations. However, proponents of discourse ethics does not deny the importance of critical remarks addressed to J. Rawls komunitarystamy theory which is a great interest for them.

Acting as a third party in the debate between liberals and communitarists, J. Habermas develops a model deliberative policy that opposed both liberal and republican positions. “Цей вид демократії має наслідки для тієї концепції центрального у державі суспільства, від якого відштовхуються традиційні моделі демократії. Відмінності виявляються як у ліберальній концепції держави-охоронця економічного суспільства, так і у республіканській концепції державно-інституалізованого традиційного суспільства” [13, S. 358].

The presented concept Habermas compares the following parameters: the concept of the citizen, the concept of law, specific interpretation of the process of formation of the political will of the citizens. First of all, the philosopher focuses on differences in the interpretation of the essence of the democratic process. Liberals adhere to strict delimitation of the state as a unit of public administration and the communities they serve in a system structured by market mechanisms, which unites individuals. Thus a policy that represents the political will of the citizens

its main objective is the realization of private interests. “З погляду ліберального індивідуалізму, спільнота – це просто арена, на якій кожен індивід реалізує свою власну самозамкнену концепцію доброго життя, а політичні інституції існують задля того, щоб забезпечити такий рівень порядку, який робить цю автономну активність індивідів можливою” [3, с. 288]. However, the state machine is specialized in achieving collective goals. In contrast, republicanism offers a view, according to which politics play a role determining factor socialization of citizens. Political participation forms to the community feeling of solidarity and mutual respect for each other. Indeed, solidarity appears in this case as another source of social integration, along with the state and the market. . “Сучасні суспільства мають у своєму розпорядженні три ресурси, завдяки яким вони можуть задовольнити свою потребу в управлінні: грошима, владою, солідарністю” [12, с. 107].

Differences in approach led to a different interpretation of the role and status of citizen. From the standpoint of liberalism, the role of the citizen is determined largely subjective rights which are negative in nature, that ensures that no external coercion in relation to the individual. Republican determining the status of a citizen is not limited to guaranteeing rights negative individuals. It also provides national recognition for positive rights such as the right to political participation and communication.

Apart from differences in the interpretation of the status of citizen and specificity legal process liberalism and republicanism also offer different visions of political nature. J. Habermas compares the liberal understanding of the political process with the specific functioning of market mechanisms, focusing on the typical liberal definition of politics as a kind of competition between the actors, the aim of which is to concentrate power in his hands. In contrast republicanism distances itself from such analogies, considering the formation of political opinion and freedom as an independent process, built on the principles of political communication.

Obviously, the position of the Republicans are closer J. Habermas, however, it still takes a critical guidance on it, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses. German philosopher shares the radical democratic enthusiasm of republicanism, which in contrast to liberalism, sees in the community not only situationally created unity in order to achieve a compromise between private interests and self-organizing individuals connected network communication links. However, the philosopher considers republican model is too idealistic, because it makes the democratic process dependent on the virtues of citizens who seek some sort of collective goods, thus narrowing the political discourse to the ethical. J. Habermas, of course, does not deny the fact that the collective self is a part of politics, but he is inclined to think that in a philosophical and socio-cultural pluralism, heterogeneous interests of particular groups and communities can not be represented through correlation with a certain concept of welfare, because none of them is representative of the humanity as a whole. “Ці інтереси та ціннісні орієнтації, які перебувають у межах одного і того самого цілого у стані конфлікту між собою без будь-якої перспективи на досягнення консенсусу, потребують зрівноваження, чого не можна досягнути з допомогою етичного дискурсу...” [2, с. 345]. Resolve the conflict requires a unanimous decision taken in discursive way. Achieving such decisions should be based on a fair procedure to enabled the formation of an inclusive process of political thought and will.

In this regard, J. Habermas proposes a model deliberative policy which normative perspective is weaker than Republican, but stronger than liberal. Deliberative model, designed to be integrated

into a single conceptual structure of decision-making and political communication. Rejecting substance specific life forms, it comes with standard preconditions communication in general.

This makes it possible to rethink the relationship between society and the state. For Republicans exposed to view, according to which society is constituted within a particular state as a whole through the collective practice of self-identification, which allows to introduce democracy through a process of self-organization of society. Formation of society as a separate integrity creates the conditions for its separation from the state bureaucracy on the one hand, and individual privatization – on the other. Dissociation of society and the state can be reduced by increasing of the share of public political functioning which allows to put the work on autonomous society state apparatus in the service of the public. However, according to J. Habermas, normative regulatives that underlie self-organization of society must be supplemented by the rule of law.

The role of law is crucial within liberalism. The leitmotif of liberal theory is not a good implementation of certain concepts and provide efficient rules that allow the interests of (primarily economic) of certain groups or individuals. From this perspective, rule of law plays the role of an arbitrator, designed to enforce the rules. The proposed liberals look at specifics and main tasks of law contrary to the belief J. Habermas that links the development of mechanisms for regulation with the possibility of institutionalization of discursive procedures. This approach helps to overcome the weight of ignoring the rule of law, characteristic of republicanism and to avoid consideration of political associations as macroplayers.

This phrase is evident intention of the German thinker to part with any figures philosophy of mind: whether the Republican concept, centered relative to the state of self-governing social whole, or a liberal interpretation of the state represented in the form of association which operates on the model of the market. According to him, no community of citizens, acting as a collective actor, no functional system in which everyone is considered as the dependent variable, is not able to hold the person to a real choice. Only model deliberative policy establishes the right of every individual to make decisions that can and should be coordinated with the overall ruling.

The theory of discourse represents a springboard for intersubjective decision making that can occur in two ways: either through institutional procedures parliamentary corps, or by bringing the individual into horizontal relations public sphere. Despite the fact that the communicative power exists independently of administrative, if necessary, it can be converted into it. Communication network everyday speech function, according to J. Habermas, as a system of sensors that signal the relevant issues, and point to the ways of their rational solution that allows you to use administrative power in the most appropriate and acceptable to the public way. The difference deliberative democracy from liberal and republican in this case is even more clear. Thus, within liberalism, the political will of the citizens as its primary objective legitimation of domination. Republicanism emphasizes that political thought and its creation will have constitutive value relative to the formation of political society as a whole. Accordingly, the results of each election are not regarded as a kind of license for the use of power that is characteristic of liberal theory, but as an act of re-affirmation of society in the form of political unity. J. Habermas tries to present a more moderate position, arguing that rationalization in the theory of discourse is more than a legitimation of power, but at least its constitution. In his view, the formation of political opinion and freedom is neither something purely external relative power or decisive about it. It is rather the programming power through discursive procedures that serve as a sort of gateway rationalization. “Деліберативна модель розуміє політичну публічність як резонатор, який сприяє вияву проблем у масштабі

всього суспільства, і водночас як дискурсивне очисне устаткування, яке із невпорядкованих процесів формування суспільної думки відфільтровує те, що сприяє узагальненню інтересів, інформаційні роботи, повідомлення на релевантні теми і відображає ці “суспільні думки” на розплавлену публіку громадян, а також передає їх до формального розпорядку для компетентних органів” [10, с. 116].

From the arguments presented above we can conclude rational status of deliberative policy, that allows characterize its place and importance in the structure of political communication. “Від інституалізованого методу інклюзивного формування суспільної думки та інституалізації демократичного волевиявлення всі повинні не без підстав очікувати, що ці процеси публічної комунікації приведуть до обґрунтованої презумпції розумності й ефективності” [11, с. 168].

*Author's translation of the article*

#### LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. *Апель К.-О.* Спрямованість англо-американського “комунітаризму” у світлі дискурсивної етики // Єрмоленко А. Комунікативна практична філософія. К.: Лібра, 1999. С. 372–394.
2. *Габермас Ю.* Залучення іншого: студії з політичної теорії. Львів: Астролябія, 2006.
3. *Макінтайр Е.* Після чесноти: Дослідження з теорії моралі. К.: Дух і літера, 2002.
4. *Макінтайр Е.* Чи є патріотизм чесною? // Сучасна політична філософія. Антологія. К.: Основи, 1998.
5. *Ролз Дж.* Політичний лібералізм // Сучасна політична філософія. Антологія. К.: Основи, 1998. С. 192–238.
6. *Ролз Дж.* Теория справедливости. Новосибирск: Изд-во НГУ, 1995.
7. *Тейлор Ч.* Джерела себе. К.: Дух і літера, 2005.
8. *Тейлор Ч.* Непорозуміння: дебати між лібералами та комунітаристами // Сучасна політична філософія. Антологія. К.: Основи, 1998. С. 544–575.
9. *Тейлор Ч.* Етика автентичності. К.: Дух і літера, 2002.
10. *Хабермас Ю.* Ах, Европа. Небольшие политические сочинения. М.: Издательство “Весь мир”, 2012.
11. *Хабермас Ю.* Догоняющая революция и потребность в пересмотре левых идей. Что такое социализм сегодня? // Политические работы. М.: Праксис, 2005. С. 147–178.
12. *Хабермас Ю.* Кризис государства благосостояния и исчерпанность утопической энергии // Политические работы. М.: Праксис, 2005.
13. *Habermas J.* Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1992.

*An article received by the Editorial Board 30.05.2013*

*Accepted for publication 24.06.2013*