

# Public Wisdom and Pluralistic Management Seeking to Transformation of Power<sup>1</sup>

Özlem Kırılı

Adnan Menderes University  
Aydın, Turkey.

## Abstract

*How to gain legitimacy different views and identities to live together in peaceful, in a political structure for protection of pluralistic and liberal society is an important issue. The thing which the democracy is essential that is to have necessary equipments in providing peace and farewell of the society. In this study it will be emphasized on three different views of the name concerning the legitimacy of power and pluralistic structure of protection. Habermas says the western liberal democratic societies in the crisis of legitimacy resolving of political, economic and cultural problems, in the Communicative Action Theory. This crisis will be dealt with the negotiation. Rawls describes these issues based on the work of fundamental the Theory of Justice. He attempts to show pluralistic democratic society in Political Liberalism and the Law of Peoples. The fact that Rawls described as "a good society" is a pluralistic, democratic and fair society. Rawls explains how different people sight can live with peacefully together and how a common ground may be established. Kukathas enables to imagine that diversity a society which he proposed called "liberal theory". Kukathas explains how a political order may be arranged for people with their differences to live in peace and freely. All of three thinkers of opinions are great importance in manufacturing for Turkey's basic problems of secularism, Islamism, Turkish, Kurdish, Alevi people issues such as democratic, pluralistic, liberal and reasonable solution.*

**Key Words:** Rawls, Habermas, Kukathas, pluralism, constitutional citizenship.

## Introduction

One of the basic issues of political philosophy is to develop a solution about how people could live together in peace with different religious, ethnic, philosophical, political opinion. Each response which is given to these issues will determine the scope and limitations producing power entities and persons.

Since the 1960s, theory and functional developments in political philosophy have description not only unity of the political and social identification, implementation, or in conjunction what is the conceptual but also should be revealed to diversity, pluralism, tolerance, etc. The social movements, spreading and awakening of the enlightenment and modernity the whole world, have embodied the plane of reality new seeking in political philosophy since 1960. Social movements revealed to inadequacy of assessment only power relations within the framework of state and government. These movements showed that power relations in the social and economic life important to related issues freedom, individual, identity. With newly formed political understanding have become important to be explained not only the state effect to society, also the possible of transforming society power to state.

Not directly aiming to "getting power" of anti-war, environmentalist, lesbian, religious, social movements but the desiring to be accepted social and political representation and rights brought up new different discussion topics. With social movements, politics moved away from "state-centered" phenomenon and limiting analysis approach; as a social phenomenon has been evaluated more broadly together with institutions and other fact in society. This new form of politics within political movements and identities sets out an understanding importance group policies and differences in politic life identity differences have been focused on rather than class differences.

---

<sup>1</sup> Özlem Kırılı, Ph D. assistant Public Administration Department, Nazilli Faculty of Economics and Administrative Science, University of Adnan Menderes, Aydın, TURKEY;

*Research Fields:* Political Philosophy, Political Theory, classical liberalism, libertarianism, anarchism, Turkish Political life, Political Structure in Turkey and media;

E-mail: ozlemkirli@gmail.com.

This paper represented in THE IX. INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON KNOWLEDGE, ECONOMY & MANAGEMENT, June 23-25, 2011, Sarajevo-Bosnia&Herzegovina.

With new approach began to chance not just power, but also changed related to governing-governed concepts. Especially multi-culturalism led to changes the idea of a unified nation as a whole cultural and political sense. "Transcendent" character of nation-state become change with development concept of civil society, organized of society by civil society understanding, and this society has become influence of the state decision-making. When these developments are evaluated on politics subject tend "citizen-individual" perception were adopted and defined by the state to "accepted differences and consider of the rights". As a result of the changing understanding began to be questioned current values of democracy.

### **Crisis of Liberal Democracy**

Crisis of representative democracy has been told by many scholars since 1960's. Despite many shortcomings of Habermas's proposal about this issue, it is important in terms of showing and catching the real meaning of democracy. Habermas, in his book called *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, aims to examine public sphere the transformation of the bourgeois democratic capitalist societies. In his book he focuses on importance existence of an institutionalized public sphere that proper and takes into account the basic condition of democratic processes. For Habermas the public sphere is an important concept to explain and criticize structure and function of liberal democratic societies. Public space asserts as a field that outside of the state and the capitalist mode of production and citizens are meeting, discussion, negotiation and meet at a common point (Özbek, 2004: 57).

Habermas, who expressed the public is a historical category, in his work examines transformations of public sphere in history and the different forms of the different periods. Modern meaning of public sphere and the concepts of publicness have gained meaning begin to take shape bourgeois society and public space appear as a separate field in 18 Century. In public place citizens, accordance general interests, comes together for basic issues of community. In the negotiation process especially, mass media have important functions (Habermas, 1997: 62-91).

According to Habermas, a way of the democratic public discourse is to re-create rational-critical public sphere in the environment where the public and private space are exposed to change structurally today. Organizations, mass media, political parties will be stronger democracy when they come into being the idea of publicness inner structure and between political power relations. Habermas, offers , public space as a democratic space, not domain and direct their public by social and political authorities, he presents conventions based on critical and rational to provide a communication space. Public space is a consultation institutionalized interaction area where citizens discursive on common issues. Thus the public sphere is a field which produced different and critical discourses different from the state and against the state itself (Fraser, 2004: 104-105).

Form of communication area makes decisive to public space. Envisaged by Habermas's communication is based on rational and critical thinking. Thus, with public debate, social power becomes neutral and possible to make rationalize political sovereignty. Habermas's critique of rationalism and emphasis on rationalism allows him to make a distinction between communicative action (negotiation-oriented action), and purpose-rational action (rational goal-oriented or achievement-oriented action). Public sphere which is created rational discussion by society, is important to functioning politics healthy. But, this does not mean that public sphere limited only in politics. Model of public space that democratization in the public sphere, aims to revive rational action on the basis of communication. Habermas refers to study or purpose- instrumental rational action either instrumental action, or rational choice or the harmony of the two. In instrumental action, becomes determinant technical rules are based on empirical knowledge. Communicative action is interaction by provided icons. This action defines the mutual expectations of behaviour and adjusts to mandatory norms that must be understood and accepted by at least two subjects (Habermas, 2004: 42-3).

In other words, while the communication-oriented actions give negotiations prominence, rational goal-oriented actions (goal-rational action) are success-oriented actions. Rational goal-oriented actions are divided into strategic actions and the actions of instrumental. Instrumental actions always direct a goal in the physical world and include goal-instrument relationship and a strategic choice. Strategic actions are efforts of compromising on a matter and attempts to mutual understand for achieving certain results. Communicative action is based on a language and is guided by social norms. Rationalization that is realized of institutional framework, have a meaning removal of the limits of communication (Habermas, 2004: 65).

According to Habermas, the aspect danger of irrational power has become the collective life will to be balanced only discussion principle connected formation of political that general and free of power. Also power will be rationalized only based on the thinking of dialogue entering the area of political (Habermas, 2004: 78).

Scientifically society will be possible reconciled to life practice of science and technique. This requires the integration of research and technique, with economy and administration. Also democracy is gained by corporate security general and public communications. In this process communication in conditions of objective forces involved a question where people can live and want to live with how use (Habermas 2004: 75). Thus it will make democracy's and legitimacy's ground when citizens are interested in the issues and discuss about themselves in the public sphere in an equal way (Göle, 2000: 9).

Habermas determined the idea concerning the dimension of differentiated publicity. However, it is difficult to say that public area of Habermas, which he predicted and tried to put the structural features of public area's implementation completely even in developed countries. In addition, public sphere is not perceived as Habermas described himself in many countries in the world. The most important transformation of public space toward private discussions took place in socialist countries. In Socialist countries public sphere have developed to break the structure of ideological conversion (Çaha, 2004: 82).

Other weak point that Habermas envisaged is the assumption of reaching information freely speaking in a healthy way. It is accepted that everybody has right to obtain information and express their every kind of demand. However, everyone's participation in the public sphere and expression of any interest in agenda of public expression includes many of the limitations. In Habermas's observations the presence of different subjects and different interests are considered initially. But these differences are considered as elements that must be overcome. Agreements of interest and differences in reconciliation are expected results. With this aspect, multiculturalism and diversity is presented as a basic condition for a discourse in polyphony, but this perception is as if reached a conclusion as a single voice (Gould, 1999: 246). This point is return to criticize the legitimacy of political power. All activities performed as a form of communication are far from reaching the essence. If the public negotiation participants act in terms of moral respect and egalitarian reciprocity universal principles, will accept each other freedom and equal and the awareness act of a similar rights that in dealing with negotiating issues (Benhabib, 1999: 117).

Although some of the limitations, this perception are important, for identifying the rules of negotiation with the possibility of putting forward high level of ethical standard in society and the individual. However, the information needed for the communication negotiations activities will continue theoretical dilemma how knowledge will be possessed.

With criticism communicate the public domain model show a goal that aimed at overcoming repressive practices contains of inequalities. Target often was considered as utopian, sometimes theologic by critics. Criticism from both sides, public domain model based on the ideal of democratic legitimacy is uncertain to perform how, when, by whom even such as the adoption of the ultimate goal of this model restriction of human action and in the model may be oppressive in dimensions itself. Communicative model of public space and contained in the democratic legitimacy measures are a critical way of the questioning that existing historical criteria social status. We don't primarily focus on how will be implemented the model. We have to focus on for arriving the size of model which should be eliminated, structures of need to eliminate and conceive to restrain of such an ideal state of legitimacy which's political/ social relationships, institutions and practices. Inequalities caused by the nation-state, the groups know of their situation and request to change the consciousness of this information and replace those who come to the surface in any other procedural basis, based on uninhibited public sphere and discursive dimensions in terms of democratic legitimacy will be able to do with criticism. Habermas's importance is ability to query implicitly critical of the despotic practices in the modern world (Köker, 2008: 350-1).

### **Rawls, Reasonable Pluralism and Justice**

Reasonable pluralism which Rawls did not mentioned enough in his book called *The Theory of Justice*, is discussed in detail in later writings. Rawls try to identify the principles of political justice in contemporary democratic societies in Political Liberalism. The determination of the political principles dishonouring comprehensive doctrines and even focused on which in fact they should not be standard.

Because Rawls emphasis that it should be given attention cultural, religious, philosophical and moral differences, existing within contemporary democratic societies. Citizen's differences are inevitable and Rawls try to find ways to live together despite these differences. Peaceful coexistence living requires lack of a comprehensive doctrine (Rawls, 2003: xv).

Problems of the concept of Political Liberalism is investigated whether it is possible to continue stable and fair society that is reasonable but differentiated citizens with incompatible religious, philosophical and moral doctrine or not for a long time. In other words people who are not meet at a common point with each other, but the reasonable doctrines how can be possible to live in coexistence of doctrines and can they approve the political concept of constitutional regime? What should be this political understanding's structure and content? (Rawls, 2007:5).

For Rawls, the question of political liberalism put forth a political justice concept which reasonable doctrines will approve for constitutional democratic system. Rawls is aware of the complexity in political liberalism because of conception of reasonable pluralism. Because when we accept reasonable pluralism, it is assumed that citizens approved both the doctrine of comprehensive and the political behaviour and it is also assumed that citizens established relationship between these. Whereas political understanding is adopted largely by everyone, reasonable doctrines are not accepted by the citizens generally. Thus, the elements concept of political justice should be separated from similar elements of the comprehensive doctrines. Considering reasonable pluralism in democratic culture, purpose of political liberalism's is to reveal the terms of the principle public justification on fundamental political matters. Political liberalism offers reasonable the conception of political justice rather than right (Rawls, 2007: 6-7).

Political liberalism considers to potential conflict that is not possible reconciliation in the core of political justice. Therefore, political liberalism is not a comprehensive liberalism. Is the information, which is about how to behave, is given everyone or a certain group? Is the moral principle source outside from us, or is in human nature itself? Do we tidy up our treatment ourselves according to the task and compulsion from outside or human nature? For these questions, political liberalism does not determine a general attitude, contrary, it leaves answers them to comprehensive doctrines. Political liberalism prefers a sec from and option every issue for political justice of democratic constitutional regime (Rawls, 2007: 13-4).

Political liberalism doesn't rely on philosophical, religious or moral doctrines since it accepts different tendencies of people. Rawls avoids that different views are at decisive point or starting point in the construction of political liberalism. It is assumed that diversities will be reached with a common consensus and overlapping consensus within the framework of political justice. One of the fundamental differences between political liberalism and philosophical liberalism related to social issues such as family, education, health, welfare, market and property matters becomes obvious. Political liberalism accepts that these are important issues (Ackerman, 1994: 365-6).

Rawls regards that it is possible to compromise political liberalism on the idea of political justice. Because the idea of political justice is absent from any limitation of comprehensive doctrine such as religious, philosophical or moral. Rawls, actually believes that political liberalism has moral (ethical) aspect with these ideas of him (Alejandro, 1996: 2-3).

Rawls moves from the original situation and bases his opinion on the "veil of ignorance" conceptualization. In the original case that limited the veil of ignorance people chooses two justices of principle and next stage is the effort of building state constitution of people. In the veils of ignorance stage, people who have no knowledge completely no knowledge about the other members, but, they have a certain level knowledge about social and personal properties in constitutional process. After this stage, parties, who determine two principle of justice, constitute constituent parliamentary. The first principle of justice is a principle that needs to be applied in the phase of a constituent assembly. Political freedoms and freedom of thought are included to the definition of fair political procedure too. Before constitutional order, everyone is equal in the description of case, but with the transition to constitutional order and by opening out veil of ignorance, the equality condition deteriorated. Rawls tries to balance the existing inequalities by putting into practice these two principles of justice. The aim is to approach absolute equality the first/original state (Üskül, 2004: 154-5). Rawls brings forward two concepts in this context; the public political forum and the ideal of public reason. The public political forum expresses that the identifications of issues to be discussed within the framework of public opinion.

Here, high court judges and lawmaker's rhetoric stand out particularly. The ideal of public reason is applied when legislator, who came to the fore in the community, and law enforcement people act accordance with public reason in discussed problems from this framework (Rawls, 2003: 145-7).

Rawls's the idea of public reason which he used concepts political building, refers to a well-regulated the constitutional democratic society. Every political society are based on the way decision-making reasonable and plans of rational subjects to formulate and objectives ranking them in order of their priority. Public reason is one of them and can take place in democracy; because there are people's rights as decision makers in this concept.

Public reason is an attempt to reach idea of a common with discussions for public well-being and public interests. Public reason is intellectual and moral power based on the capacities of its members. Each of reason is not the public mind. For examples, churches, universities and other institutions of civil society is not the public reason. There is no public reason in the aristocratic and autocratic regimes. Because in these regimes decisions are given by managers than public when it is considered the benefit of society. Public mind, are characteristic feature of democratic regimes, sharing the position of equal citizenship, citizen's mind. Here, citizens reason interest of the public well-being. Public reason has a public character due to the mind of citizens. As the issues for the benefit of society, basic justice content and the ideals and principles expressed by society, public reason is public. Public reason is open to everyone's mind and therefore the public opinion is public. Public reason has collective property (Rawls, 2007: 247-250). In a democratic society, as a collective personality, the public reason is a mind of equal citizens which for law-making and changing of constitution have ultimate political and right to use power. In the issue of public reason are who is right to vote, which religions can be seen tolerable, who can obtain a fair equality of opportunity, or who can obtain property etc. creates issues. Other feature of the public mind are the limits imposed about political issues such as personal negotiation and thoughts or the vital elements background of culture such as churches and universities (Rawls, 2007: 247-250).

The basis of the idea of public reason relies on not criticizing and not acquiescing as long as it reverses with public reason, democracy, religious or non-religious comprehensive doctrines. The only condition, which is demanded in thoughts, is to accept reasonable doctrine of reasonable and its constitutional democratic regime and the legitimate laws which the regime brought. The public reason idea examines moral and political depth which determines the relationships with democratic constitutional government and citizens of this government. So, public reason determines how the political relationship is to be understood. In politic life as it covers the whole truth, is incompatible with the idea of public reason containing democratic citizenship. There are five different aspect of the idea of public reason. These are the fundamental political issues, related with political concepts, people, elements determining a concepts of reasonable political justice, use of legitimate laws at the discussion of coercive laws which belong to the peoples of democratic norms, controlling whether citizens of justice meet the criteria the principles of reciprocity principles or not (Rawls, 2003: 149).

Rawls keeps the idea of public reason limited with "the political form of public". Public political form consists of three groups. These are judges especially at high court judges decisions of rhetoric, the rhetoric's of government officials, parliamentary candidate's rhetoric's at their election campaigns. According to Rawls public reason idea is important particularly for judges (Rawls,2003: 145, 149).

Rawls adds public reason to some areas which belongs to the government, parliament, court, and party's policies. Non-public mind is associated with the area of voluntary associations, civil society and universities. Within the scope of the public reason parliamentary debates, legal studies, political associations and related to the policies of the party. As non-public reason shows that churches, universities and scientific association. A non-public mind is consisted of located civil society and the so-called area is "background culture" and these are outside the public political culture (Rawls, 2007: 254-5).

Habermas criticizes the two opinion of Rawls'. The first criticism is related to the original situation which is as a vital the realization of the principles justice and deems important in impartial by Rawls. The second critique is related to the failure of aligning the classical (old) and modern (social) freedom (Habermas, 1995:110).

Rawls responds to Habermas's criticism especially given the eighth lesson: under headings such as "special status of fundamental freedoms", "priority of liberty", "free political speech". Rawls's purpose is to reveal the principles of justice what would be a fair and stable society. Rawls on his own views, emphasizes on distinctness highlights two points which is different from Habermas's idea.

Rawls tells that although Habermas's views are comprehensive views, his own views are limited with political one. This first difference is the basis for the creation of the framework and steps of second difference. Habermas's theory is described which is based on the theory of communicative action. Rawls's theory is based from the original position. According to Rawls, they have different purposes and roles (Rawls, 1995: 132-3).

In conclusion, Habermas is right about that concept of civil society should be dealt with separately in the liberal democratic societies. Public area cannot be explained only as field of action of public authority. Habermas opposes to Rawls's assessment that public space is form of pressure groups which affect the public interest. Rawls says that public reason takes into account a large number of pressure group. Because Rawls is aware that the pluralism in society is irreconcilable (Çelebi, 2004:246).

### **As a Basis of Legitimacy not to Intervene**

Kukathas tells that the purpose of his studies is to explain that moral and cultural diversity are not suppressed, recognized people own lifestyles and how a social order shape with this right. In social order, diversity can not be suppressed and dominated, the most important thing allows individuals to seek their own goals by dominating rules and institutions. This institutions and rules help solving problems and not connecting people with each other contrary to making them acceptable life for people. What needs to do when diversity is disagreement, is one of the main problems. The clear remark to be expressed is the opportunity of leaving the parties from each other who have a different opinion. The idea of the stronger party is dominated or right party should be superior, have to be rejected. Because view of what should be the truth is a discussing issue. Besides, since the one who fulfils the truth will be a strong party, new source of power will arise (Kukathas, 2005:17).

What Kukathas's finds important and revealed difference from Rawls other issue is the priority problem of political philosophy is not justice problem. According Kukathas's, justice may have a high priority problem in homogeneous societies. But in non homogeneous societies that everyone could follow their own objectives, main issues is problem of legitimacy. Rawls asserted that just authority is legitimacy, and also evaluated that justice and legitimacy are the same concept. Kukathas means that justice is not sufficient condition for the use of legitimate authority, even, it is not necessary for justice. Kukathas explains that why justice is not adequate for authority legitimacy even if one knows what would be fair, is difficult to assuming authority would be fair. In Kukathas's views of the best community is not brought together social unity as justice but is treated as a loose structure by required civilization. State can not be considered as a unique position in moral. States are one of the constructions which are struggling for political power; one of the salience only stands out its legitimacy to certain extends (Kukathas, 2005:18).

According to Kukathas, political philosophy, as Rawls's observations, is beyond the scope of consensus perform to sense of justice that only providing to share public basis for justification of social and political institutions or ensuring the stability of one generation to next. For Kukathas a point that mentioning as if political philosophy had a task is a misleading behaviour. The purpose of Kukathas's is tried to explain an order that the world of moral and cultural diversity can not be pressed diversity and individuals can maintain their lifestyles. In addition, the political philosophy should not be a need to address the basic problem of justice, because he thinks that this idea can cause an error in liberal political philosophy. What needs to be explained is how is liberal / libertarian political philosophy evaluating of justice problem at the secondary importance in political philosophy (Kukathas,2005: 17,19).

According to Kukathas's, the general tendency of the central authority is to create legal and political order and standardize it compliance with this purpose. Central authorities have tried to convince that the nations of which they tried to form are significant. Political philosophy usually assumed that saying a word is more appropriate in political order of nation-states. The basis of this understanding is questioned how to deal with diversity in societies which were examined completely (Kukathas, 2005:15).

Although Kukathas proposes of recognition of cultural and national minorities, lifestyles and identities, and not intervention for their expression, this thinking leads to some difficulties. Most of the minority cultures want to access an income, wealth, opportunity and power, as well as the recognition of cultural identities of them. These demands will affect with such elements how an ethno-cultural community and how they live in a political society, what extents integrate or separated from the main society and how the political demands. In other words, the demands of the majority of different groups will contain specific policy regulations. Impartiality can not meet these demands, most of minority cultural group remains marginal level (Tok, 2005:31).

Kukathas's model is a structure which idealized ethno-cultural groups in a sense and these societies are a form that has not intentions to press and they are equal. Such a society that everyone desired is ideal in terms of peaceful relations, as well as being agree morally. But the transformation of this structure into reality is quite difficult. Individuals cannot easily leave in their own ways of life and will demand to continue collective habits that they applied before. Kukathas's model will be applied in the society entity excluding human being. However, this does not mean that it will not be possible attitude or practical mutual tolerance between cultural communities. Cultural groups give an opportunity to live concept of tolerance as the *modus vivendi* where power and sizing close to each other. However, this does not bring mutual tolerance that Kukathas's desired where there are not mutual relations of domination (Tok, 2005:35).

### **Reflections of a Different Political Pluralism; Constitutional Citizenship, Non Discrimination, Impartiality**

States will strengthen their legitimacy as the bodies of the plurality of identities and differences can reflect the proportion of common elements (Gray, 2003:114). There are two types of pluralism. Description of pluralism more sense, is used in political science, in turn, normative pluralism is used in political philosophy. In terms of political science pluralism refers to political power that is shared between the different groups of society in modern state and in democratic political process pressure groups compete to influence national political decision. Normative political pluralism finds valuable more than reality social, institutional and ideological diversity in the modern state (Erdoğan, 2005: 5).

According to Habermas multicultural society means never to take off in the own ghetto in a peaceful life but the citizens have equal rights in lifestyles, every citizens live in a structure that does not have non-discrimination and living in own cultural heritage. This idea refers to maintaining their cultural heritage or transformation or existing or making self-criticism. Habermas thinks that maintaining cultures in their own existence would continue better interact (Habermas, 1996: 130-1).

However the right to leave explicitly was rejected from state which is providing equal rights and peoples of the right self-determination, in compliance with the law. Therefore the right to leave was rejected government that all people represent their race, religion and gender discrimination too (Habermas, 2002:51). Multicultural society considers being sensitive to differences and inclusion in the community. Problems related to multi-cultural life can easily be solved in a democratic and legal state. Problems of discrimination can not be eliminated by being pursue national independence and determination rights, by being sensitive base on cultural individual and class differences and but by including ethnic and national minorities. Minority's problem is significant problem especially in multicultural societies. In democratic state of law different identities can be included with sensitive to differences policies. For example, sharing of authority federal, transferring of state powers of functional or the transfer of decentralization to local government, giving assurance of cultural autonomous, classes and individual rights, equality politics and as long as effective protection of minority necessary regulations will incorporate more healthy (Habermas, 2002:53).

Habermas emphasized that the importance of establishment the common system around equal rights of citizens that will provide to live together in multiculturalism policies. Therefore, he focuses on importance of the rights system through democratic ways of addressing and sensitive to differences means. Universalization of the citizen's rights requires the differentiation of legal system. This differentiation identity shall ensure citizens of identity integrity by seeing equal treatment their life (Habermas, 1996:120).

Habermas says that modern constitutions have many aspects and bases the natural law for foundation of modern constitutions. The constitution laid bare rights that individuals have to ensure each other when citizens, who came together voluntarily, desire to regulate their lives legal ways by positive law. This definition includes individual rights and individual legal entities. While contemporary law creates which is based on relationship at the level of the government, rights which arise from law protect integrity of individuals legal subjects. Integrity of individual depends on remaining stable relations of mutual recognition (Habermas, 1996:113).

Habermas in his views of these issues emphasising is that it doesn't rely on structure that citizens who have same language or ethnic and cultural origins which have constitutional principles of political culture. According to Habermas, the political culture should have common ground function for constitutional citizenship that existing different lifestyles in multicultural society diversity and integrity (Üstel, 1999:49).

Constitutional citizenship is result of effort to identify political identities in modern democratic societies again. Habermas, avoid from ethnic identity or based on ethnicity in multi- cultural perception because it will not have positive effect democratic participation and it will not adapt to multi cultural structure. However, Habermas does not show an effort for questioning nation state in interpretation of multiculturalism. It seems only to target reassuring political process without forcing the nation state boundaries. Even if Habermas's proposal that is more democratic than Kukathas's predicted structure in liberal democratic archipelago, his proposal provides more stringent, exclusive and less freedom. But Habermas's approach is important and it will give a new opportunity to solve problems and interpretation of new citizenship due to more identity-oriented description in Turkey's political structure far from developing freedom and negatively effect social peace (Erdoğan, 1 January 2009 Star newspaper corner article).

Rawls bases reasonable majority not just simple majority in Political Liberalism. Political liberalism aims expressing justice which reasonable doctrines will confirm in order of constitutional (Rawls, 2007:6). Basic feature of liberal democracy is fact of reasonable pluralism. Opposing reasonable comprehensive such as religious or secular doctrines is a result of free institutions culture of liberal democracy. Citizens of pluralistic liberal democratic society aware of reaching an agreement on the basis of comprehensive doctrines is impossible to reconcile with each other and they don't understand each other. Therefore, while citizens are discussing basic problems they do not apply these doctrines, contrary. apply on the political concepts of justice and fairness reasonable political concept and political reasonable that the idea of citizens as citizens (Rawls, 2003:136-7). Rawls's doctrines called "comprehensive" have a decisive influence in the lives of citizens. Different non comprehensive doctrines need free and democratic management for continuing, improving and not being rejected.

In *A Theory of Justice* and *Political Liberalism*, a comprehensive justification is presented for social order. Rawls tried to show agreement with people who agree to accept importance of certain values condition that was created within moral principles and framework of constitutional democracy (Kukathas, 2005:21).

Kukathas rejects Rawls's idea about national prestige or religious unity of goals should be subject to individual goals. But Kukathas accepts that Rawls's political order understanding including individuals and communities larger plans and adds value to them within larger unity. Framework of just constitutional order is accepted broader and richer structure for each person's life. Collective realization of principles of justice is presented as the good experience. This theory offers a description that in human development individuals was carried out his place collective life of society. For Rawls, activity of collective justice is a preceding form of human development. But Kukathas stands the opposite of this approach. In other word, Rawls understanding of political order expresses a meaning desiring a social unity that individuals are not aware of "good things" their own. This understanding is incompatible with modern world diversity, mobility and disputes. Because of this diversity of opinion may result suppressing of diversity or reducing the freedom of travel or suppression of dissenting views. The reason of Kukathas does not accept Rawls's opinion, is to give too much importance union in human development. Also, people actually think differently about justice and morality. The people of society do not know beliefs or religions to interaction with other people (Kukathas, 2005:16).

According to Kukathas, as Rawls said, political philosophy must not aim consensus that is not satisfied with common public foundation to justification for social and political institution but also one generation to the next can be helped to provision of stability by political justice. Political philosophy is not mentioned as if it had a purpose (Kukathas, 2005:17). Rawls's idea of political liberalism is an important example of the concept of non discrimination. Rawls not only rely on neutrality of the state and principle of equal rights for everyone. But Rawls sets out an objective principle for states neutrality. Rawls aims to find a reasonable solution about reasonable but incompatible features in modern societies (Tok, 2005: 40).

## **Conclusion**

Pluralistic elements without suppressing, exclusion are important in terms of protecting social peace and ensuring it within tolerance. In the society, pluralistic and achieving social peace, this issues in particular the discussion of the legitimacy of political authorities are less as well as reasonable levels. In a heterogeneous democratic society is inevitable for race, gender, religion, class, cultural and economic demands. For Habermas, public, conducting mental or rational negotiators community; public area refers to process, vehicle and places by reasoning a matter of common interest to them, by entering into a rational discussion and debate about the issue after the public opinion by private persons.



Habermas's books, examines public area where it is important for capitalist societies democracies, transformations in the historical process, social condition of democracy and its difficulties implementation. Therefore, Habermas's ideas have an important role in the discussion about true meaning of democracy that is toward moving closer public administration. According to Habermas's sense of understanding, public space provides an important expansion for critique of liberal democracy. Importance of the system envisaged by Habermas allows mentally constructed about the public opinion is shaped critical, rational and mutual consent. Habermas give opportunity to us multi-faceted assessment how it practices principle of publicity today and historical process of its transformation and true meaning. If Habermas's provision becomes effective, deliberative democracy will find possibility of applying the most beautiful way.

Public area which Turkey began to debate much in last decades needs to be discussed again as stated by the lines of Habermas. Use of the state of elite in Turkey and their "civilian" supporters the concept of "public" that is evoking physical space reveals differences from thinking of the western intellectual. For example, a real reason that the state elite use "public space" in issue of headscarf ban, in Turkey within the framework of the dominant understanding, is that they aware as qualify "the public", may legitimate reason of expanding the state. The term of public, use meaning of "state-owned" is understood as expanding state space and providing no special, civil or really public space. In the West, unlike the use of in Turkey "public space" is made reference to the citizens participates in public life and is discussed freely public affairs. In the West "public space" discussions aims to expand and deepen democracy. But in Turkey is used for field restriction democracy, pluralism, different life styles (Erdoğan 2010).

Because public sphere in Turkey, ideological and political space have been transferred to only certain groups. A large part of society has been blocked by economic, cultural and political sources benefited and the process continued an inappropriate way to democracy. Ideological public space appears to have committed egalitarian norms in legal level but practice is different. In practice, public interest and ideological public sphere has become synonymous with a dominant group. Ideological public sphere existence of the ideological hardware state performs vital functions to maintain and transform society and it tries to shape (Çaha, 2004b:92-4). Rigidity of the political structure in Turkey has witnessed the most recent constitutional studies. Basic problem in the constitutional studies is lack of healthy negotiation process. In Turkey effort of constitutional basic features change and transformation of community expresses political level to clarification legal secure. For producing negotiation process healthy depends on losing determinants of importance institutions and values of official ideology. Military tutelage which hampers to tradition of civil constitutional is still important reality in Turkey.

## References

- ACKERMAN, Bruce (Jul., 1994). "Political Liberalisms", *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 91, No.7, 365-367.
- ALEJENDRO Roberto, (Feb.,1996). "What is Political about Rawl's Political Liberalism"? *The Journal of Politics*, Vol.58, No.1.
- BENHABIB, Seyla (1999). "Müzakereci Bir Demokratik Meşruiyet Modeline Doğru" (Ed.S. Benhabib), *Demokrasi ve Farklılık*, Numune Maatbası, İstanbul, 101-139.
- ÇAHA, Ömer (2004). "İdeolojik Kamusalın Sivil Kamusal Dönüşümü", *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, Doğu-Batı Yayınları, Ankara, 81-110.
- ÇAHA, Ömer (2004b). "İdeolojik Kamusal Alanın Krizi", *Açık Toplum Yazıları*, Liberte Yayınları, Ankara.
- ÇELEBİ, Aykut (2004). "Kamusal Alan ve Sivil Toplum: Siyasal Bir Değerlendirme", *Kamusal Alan*, (Ed. Meral Özbek) Hil Yayın, İstanbul,237-284.
- ENGİN ÜSKÜL Zeynep Özlem (2004). "John Rawls: "Bir Sözleşmeciler Adalet Kuramı", (Ed. Ahmet Haluk Atalay), *Çağdaş Hukuk Felsefesine Giriş*, Teknik Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (2005). "Çoğulculuk", *Liberal Düşünce*, Cilt 10, No 38-9, Bahar- Yaz 2005, ss.5-12.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa. "Kamusal Alan, Hukuk ve Başörtüsü", <http://www.hurfikirler.com> (Erişim 30.04.2011).
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa. 1 Ocak 2009 star köşe yazısı
- FRASER, N. (2004). "Kamusal Alanı Yeniden Düşünmek: Gerçekte Var olan Demokrasinin Eleştirisine Bir Katkı", *Kamusal Alan*, (Ed. Meral Özbek) Hil Yayın, İstanbul, 103-132.
- GÖLE, N. (2000). "Giriş", *İslam'ın Kamusal Yüzleri- Bir Atölye Çalışması*, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, 7-17.
- GOULD, Carol C. (1999). "Çeşitlilik ve Demokrasi: Farklılıkların Temsili", *Demokrasi ve Farklılık*, (Der. Seyla Benhabib) (Çev. Zeynep Gürata), Numune Matbaası, İstanbul, 244-267.
- GRAY, John (2003). *Liberalizmin İki Yüzü*, (Çev. Koray Değirmenci), Dost Kitapevi, Ankara.
- GRILLO, R. D. (1998). *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference, State, Culture, and Ethnicity in Comparative Perspective*, Oxford Un. Press. Oxford.
- HABERMAS Jürgen, (Mar., 1995). "Reconciliation Through the Public use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawls's Political Liberalism", *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol.92, No.3.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen (1996). "Demokratik Anayasal Devlette Tanınma Savaşımı" Çokkültürcülük ve Tanınma Politikası, (Çev. Mehmet H. Doğan, Yay. Haz. Amy Gutman), Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen (1997). *Kamusal Alanın Yapısal Dönüşümü* (Çev.: Tanıl Bora, Mithat Sancar), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen (2002). "Öteki" Olmak, "Öteki"yle Yaşamak: Siyaset Kuramı Yazıları, (Çev.: İlknur Aka), Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen (2004). *İdeoloji Olarak Teknik ve Bilim*, (Çev. Mustafa Tüzel), Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- KÖKER, Levent, (2008). *Demokrasi, Eleştiri ve Türkiye*, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.
- KUKATHAS, Chandran (2005). "Liberal Takımadaları", (Çev. Mustafa Erdoğan), *Liberal Düşünce*, Bahar- Yaz, Yıl 10, Sayı 38-39.
- KUKATHAS, Chandras (2009). "Ahlaki Evrenselcilik ve Kültürel Farklılık" (Çev. Mustafa Erdoğan), *Liberal Düşünce*, Cilt 14, Sayı 55, Yaz 2009, 7-22.
- ÖZBEK, Meral (2004). "Giriş: Kamusal Alanın Sınırları", *Kamusal Alan*, (Ed. Meral Özbek), Hil Yayın, İstanbul.
- RAWLS, John (2003). *Halkların Yasası ve "Kamusal Akıl Düşüncesinin Yeniden Alınması"*, (Çev. Gül Evrin), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- RAWLS, John (2007). *Siyasal Liberalizm*, (Çev. Mehmet Fevzi Bilgin), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul.
- RAWLS, John (1995, Mar.). Political Liberalism: Reply to Habermas, *The Journal Of Philosophy*, Vol.92, No 3, 132-180.
- TOK, Nafiz (2005). "İki Liberal Kültürel Çoğulculuk Modeli", *Liberal Düşünce*, Cilt 10, No 38-9, Bahar- Yaz 2005, 29-44.
- ÜSTEL Füsün (1999). *Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi*, Dost Yay, İstanbul.