Intl. J. Humanities (2012) Vol. 19 (1): (15- 36)

Investigating the Philosophical Foundations of Habermas' Political Thoughts: A deliberative approach for democracy

A.M. Shahramnia[1], Jalal Hajizadeh[2]

Received: 2010/5/9 **Accepted:** 2011/10/11

Abstract

The investigation of Habermas's political ideas of philosophical perspective and measuring his philosophical principles ratio, which is the deliberative democracy, is a purpose of this study that will be followed. On the one hand, the importance of this issue is this that represents the new readings of democratic standards and on the other hand, consolidates one type of the democracy that has an epistemological distinction with the liberal democracy. Because of this, it is trying to analyze the philosophical foundations of Habermas, and the main components and standards of reinforcing ideas of deliberative democracy to be explained. The findings of present paper suggesting the political views and beliefs of this political philosopher that are arisen from his philosophical thought, has been based on the standards and teachings of communicative action, discourse ethics, rational consensus and public spheres; In addition, the theory of Habermas' democracy with the discourse consensus has a relatively flexible capability to confront the globalization challenges and from one perspective tries to realize the real sovereignty of people over their own fate.

Keywords: Liberal Democracy, deliberative democracy, Globalization , Public sphere - rational consensus , communicative rationality

1. Associat Professor of Science,University of Isfahan,Iran,m_shahramnia@yahoo.com.
2. PhD Student of Political Thoughts,Tehran un,j_hajizade81@yahoo.com,Iran.

Introduction

In comparison and Assessment the ratio with various other governments, can be stated that approximately the discourse of democracy and its very high and substantial models were faced with a significant reception and todays represented as a remarkable international ideal goal. Despite several thousand years of history, yet a comprehensive definition about democracy does not exist in general; with this description of democracy as a characteristic face of that type of political structure is used in which people have a self-government. Namely, members of the community participate "in determining the political policy" directly or indirectly for the entire community(Cohen,1994:27). This situation represents the third dimension of cognitive interests. By considering this attitude, he intended to describe a situation which showing possibility emerging, saving relationship and appropriate human relationship. This situation showing third aspect of interest cognition. Habermas believes that due to this interest, understanding or knowledge is created that causes improving independence and responsibility. Thus, it has liberating nature, basically. So these interests influence to the context and natural bases. Held believes that this aspect and its governed rules is a consequent of interaction and transactional and not-experiential special work, which relate to objective structure of human environment. Therefore, they are considered as the semi-transactional situation or as Habermas belief has quasi-transactional rank (Held,1995:252-254).

According to Joseph Schumpeter'votes(or opinions or theories), the competition and participation are two fundamental concepts (1883-1950) in the process of the democratic method. He provides a new definition in the review about the old concepts of democracy.According to his thoughts, democratic method is an arrangement comprised of institutions(or entities) to reach the political decisions; in this method, the persons compete to attract the people's vote to achieve the power and decide for them. (Schumpeter,1950:250). However, the common and modern pattern of democracy in contemporary years - despite the uncertainties and ambiguities and different meanings and a variety of understandings in both left and right sphere - the representative democracy is based on the majority of people's participation with democratic procedures. Antony Arblaster writes: Today, the democracy is known virtually synonymous with a kind of representative system. (Arblaster,2006:127). The democracy as the political life or as a means to rule is based on a set of principles; political philosophers' approach for democracy has generally focused on these fundamentals. The fundamental, intellectual components and categories of democracy are evaluated in political pundits' theories. According to the researcher's opinion, philosophical – theoretical teachings , such as deliberative and communicative rationality, ideal status of the discourse , public sphere of communicative action, communicative action and methodological epistemological foundations derived from it, including the basic, theoretical preliminaries and principles of political philosophers such as Urgen Habermas, which were analyzed in this study, builds the cornerstone of his political ideas, especially concerning the democracy.

According to Habermas' beliefs in the contemporary capitalism, the positivist rationality has a decisive role in shaping the political thoughts and naturally includes the political action field. The most damaging effects and diseases of the capitalism age and western liberal world is a product of such cognition(Habermas,1995:73). In this regard, reviewing and reconstructing in the technical, cognitive bases which were assumed in the world of capitalism will enable us to be in human interaction with each other in the situation away from any oppression and coercion and force. In this regard, a review in the public sphere and separating it from the system has important political complications, including the attainment of freedom and equality. Reconstructing the rationality and thinking about the cultural and conceptual rationality changes the organizational principles and components of capitalism to the interest of the human ancient ideal. Although, deviation of concepts in social sciences contains democracy too, but most of the scholars insist to this belief that democracy is the most reasonable government form, which it will be due to a wise policy in long – term. Habermas has taught about it, like other political thinkers, and he has drawn his special attitude about this matter (wood,1991:119). Planning and developing relations between people and communities based on communicative action is the other type of changing the status that can cause to be face the recent capitalist societies with a fundamental transformation. The critical interpretation and explanatory reviews approach without any doubt in the reconstruction of human relationships, and interactions is certainly very effective. Thus, this interesting leads to form empirical – analytical sciences. The first type of interesting is technical one, which we are interested to dominate to natural forces and control and using them through it. Habermas calls the second interest as practical interest, which human beings can change his environment by using it. This interest leads to hermeneutic sciences. The third interest is freedom interest. It has a deep relation with language and mutual action between people and their relations forbidden them from any deviation. Our recognition from the nature is a technique or according to Habermas is an usable cognitive rule (Habermas,1996:67). Nevertheless it is very different in social sciences.

All aforementioned, counted cases suggesting the fundamental changes in the depth of human communities that undoubtedly cannot be ignored its consequences on the political thoughts and actions in society. Hence, the scientific, philosophical and epistemic principles reflectivity of Habermas' teachings and ideas on his reading of the policy issues is clear. With this approach, one basic concept of this political thinker's opinions i.e., " democracy " will be theoretically recognized and analyzed and comparatively studied. Therefore, this paper seeks to explain and measure this question that " what is the relation between the philosophical foundations of Habermas and his political ideas and thoughts and how was the effect of his philosophical and theoretical approach in offering the democracy model? "

Research Background

Despite, the poverty of essential works in relation with the comparative studies of philosophical foundations Habermas' political norms and standards, the books, articles and some literatures concerning the theory of democracy, completely separate (not compared with each other), as a case some of the problems were analyzed. Hence, we briefly analyze and study the several existing works that partly dealt with this issue and its results.

Bashiriyeh(2005)in the book of " Political Science Education " has allocated his discussion to the intellectual, historical, philosophical principles and various democracies and their functions. Author of the book after counting the intellectual foundations of democracy, including liberalism democracy, authenticity of contract, human rights and so on, has studied its democracy, development and genesis from the viewpoint of pioneers who are involved in this thought(Bashiriyeh,2005:281). However, the most philosophical thinkers' political thought present, i.e., Habermas has not been paid attention, and his deliberative democracy has not been investigated.

Lesnaf (2001)has investigated in the book of " political philosophers of the twentieth century ", the most prominent ideas in relation to Habermas ethics of discourse (Lesnaf,2001:443). The main advantage of this book that has largely been successful was the relation between ethics of discourse and communicative rationality with the deliberative democracy which already has been discussed by the author. Nevertheless, like many other writings concerning the discourse of democracy, which were based on Habermas' thought, unfortunately their theory of democracy is overshadowed by other ideas of this political philosopher, also in this book to the position of modern democracy in the modern political thoughts has not been paid attention especially from Habermas' thought and vision and our desired democracy are considered as an important and vague issue in connection with other concepts and have been kept in parentheses. This work theoretically has other problems; most important of them is the fluctuations of author between political and philosophical thought of Habermas.

Zamiran (2006) in an article entitled" Habermas' approach to democracy and human rights" after describing the generalization about democracy and reminding the importance of philosophical approach to it, believes that the democracy only with the advent of modernity has been attractive. Despite emphasizing instead of the author on the legitimacy subject and its relation with law and democracy, he has not mentioned the modality and quality of this communication, its foundations and gaining the legitimacy. Furthermore, the ways or in other words, fundamentals and principles to achieve consensus on human rights that is to be confirmed, have been neglected.

Methods

This study has tried to use the descriptive - analytical research method and referring to Habermas' original texts (books, articles and Internet resources) and documentary method on the principles of democracy and literature that the writers, researchers and exegetes of this political philosopher's opinions have written in interpreting, describing and criticizing the contemporary political philosopher's political thoughts to be discussed the study, reflection and representation of his ideas. The author of this paper believes that the comparative study of philosophical thoughts and ideas of the thinker with his political ideas was beneficial to the richness and achieving a reasonable and logical conclusion of it. Thus, the comparative method simultaneously has been used.

Deliberative Democracy and Habermas Discoursive

Deliberative democracy relies on the essence of consultation and the democratic, rational consensus. James Bohman in " Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics," argues that the ideal of democratic participation and rational self-government has formed the foundation of deliberative democracy in the new political theories (Bohman&Rehg, 1997:15). This method is based on the issues of legitimate democracy within the framework of citizens' public deliberation .

According to Bohman and William Rehg Habermas, Joshua Cohen and John Rawls of the most prominent democratic theorists have a same opinion in accordance among free and equal citizens and reasoning development based on the articulation of intellect and politics and this is a quintessential element in the deliberative democracy.(Bohman&Rehg,1997:65,110).

Erikson in the "Understanding Habermas: Communicating Action and Deliberative Democracy" by describing the theory of communicative action of Habermas, have mentioned it as the key to resolve some issues such as the rights, public consultation, law and democracy. He believes that the role and dignity of Habermas in the theories of international relations in how institutions have been organized for facilitating the problems and solving the conflicts in a communicative manner.

Dryzek has mentioned the deliberative democracy for establishment of the inclusive democracy compared to the traditional liberal models which is limited and tied to state institutions. He argues that the democratic theory is now in the domination sphere of deliberative approach .He suggests that criticizing the power must be an essential affair in the democracy and he believes that the transition from national boundaries and dynamic nature of democracy, on the one hand,removes the barriers and on the other hand, is an opportunity for the democratization (Dryzek,2002:195).

Andrew and Rosenfeld, in their comprehensive study:" *Habermas on Law and Democracy*: Critical Exchanges " in the assessment and clarification of complex and comprehensive debates, with some of the most famous thinkers of his era believes that Habermas knows the law as a bridge between rights and democracy.

Habermas succinctly offers his theory as a supporter of " Proceduralist Paradigm of law " and the law can fill the gap which exists between the facts and norms for him.

The codification of citizens' rights by assuming the participation, involvement and pervasive and rational engagement of social activists in the sensible and comprehensive body of law, is the same as democracy(Rosenfeld&Andrew,1998:15,45 ,236).

Knowledge criteria and communicative teachings of Habermas have been generally studied and clarified in his most important work, human, knowledge and interests. There has been reflected the theoretical effort of Habermas for restoration and acquire reliable and practical knowledge as well as his intellectual attachment about epistemology in this book.

He separates three brands of science with titles of the natural–experimental sciences,the historical hermeneutics sciences and the human–social sciences, and then he considers three types of cognitive interests based on this classification, i.e. the tool interests,(natural–xperimental sciences)the hermeneutical or descriptive interests(historical–social sciences)and finally Emancipation critical interests related to the human social sciences(Fleming,1997:12). So each of these three interests represents three special knowledges:the tool knowledge, the hermeneutical knowledge and freedom knowledge. With the little thinking, it can be found that Habarmas criticism from formal democracy (liberal capitalism) and his theory about discoursive (Deliberative) democracy is affected by three dimensions of epistemology.

In the first, the formal type of liberal democracy is based on the two first dimensions, and the second is affected from third dimension of his epistemology. According to "Pusey" in the considered deliberative democracy of Habermas all matters are carried out inside, and through social transaction, i.e. through action which they are really moving toward access to the agreement (Pusey,1987:165). From this perspective discoursive Democracy of Habermas has deep philosophical roots, and it is considered as a dimension of his taught horizon principal about gaining knowledge, but he notes that although these sciences follow understanding a common intellectual world which it constructs transactions of social human beings but understanding the society isn't like understanding a context (described by hermeneutical approach). It is a higher understanding than understanding its language. If fact, it enters to discourse field (Qaderi, 2006:123).

Despite complete defense from the West democracy against right and left enemies and adversaries, Habermas acknowledges that written promise in rules of those democracies haven't been completely implemented for all citizens. He has supported that promise through theory and practice during the past 30 years, and he has tried to implement them (Hoolab,1996:249). The interesting matter in surveying Habermas political thoughts about democracy are criticizing theoretical principles and legitimacy foundation of liberal democracy and other forms of it. Therefore, he wants to restructure democracy base on his theoretical indicators. In advanced capitalism societies, governmental and legitimacy system is as which the government regulates all critical cycles by using the global planning, in one hand; and it provides, conditions which it can be used from investment under these conditions, it the other hand. And government must be legislated in developing sections; this problem will be solved by formal democracy based on mechanisms of public election(Fooladvand,2008:429-430).

Legitimacy of the election mechanisms is based on the constitution; however, Habermas has a new view about the constitution. In other words, a constitution has legitimacy which it is acknowledged and approved by all citizens during the free relations.(Habermas,2008:428) According to Wheatley. Democracy necessitates these laws are considered where there is resulted in consensus after public consulting and reasonable debates among citizens about the matter that should be done. Habermas considers it as a collection of customs and rules, which people try to gain access to agreement through it. And it requires to extend the concept of communication action which it was explained previously(Pooladi,2007:160-161).

To overcome the gap between norms and facts, Habermas appeals to the medium of law, which gives legitimacy to the political order and provides the system with its binding force. Legitimate law-making itself is generated through a procedure of public opinion and will-formation that produces communicative power. In its turn, communicative power influences the process of social institutionalization. Having realized, in his Structural

Transformation of the Public Sphere, that the derivation of the source of legitimacy for Western democracies from the specific characteristics of the political public sphere of late capitalism is too exclusionary and restricting, Habermas has moved towards grounding democratic legitimacy in the institutionalization of discoursive interaction. To achieve this end, he constructs the concept of communicative power as what possesses the best of both worlds (i.e. the life-world and system): it is democratically generated and aimed at reaching an agreement, while exercising *influence* over the processes of political decision-making that giving them legitimacy. Consequently, in aligning communicative power, legitimate law, and state power, Habermas' approach seems to have legitimized the political power as exercised in Western democracies. However, in doing so, Habermas risks robbing us of our critical ability(White,1989:97). For, tying the existing political and legal orders so closely to communicatively generated power as their source of legitimacy seems to immunize the political power to criticism, in seeing the principle of opinion and will-formation as underlying presupposition of both political systems and the life-world by overstepping its boundary. However, if one, like Habermas, believes that "law has a legitimating force only so long as it can function as a resource of justice," (Habermas,1994A:145) then having already attributed legitimacy to political powers of Western societies leaves no room for the test of justice(Shabany,2004:1-4).

Habermas makes the distinctive moral principle from the democracy principle, in legitimacy discussion, because the democracy principle specifies "legitimate legislative process". According to this principle, only rules can have legitimate validity which all citizens agreed them(Outhwaite, 1995:203). Therefore, rationality of the constitution is a necessary condition for its independence. It can't be considered this rationality as formal or procedural rationality, because the constitution is related with moral and politic inside. He also makes distinct two type of action criteria: ethical and legal(Ratzinger&Habermas,2007:68).

According to this principle, two criteria are valid, if all subsidiary persons can agree with them as participants of rational dialogue. Habermas provides ideal speech situation from this perspective. However, there is an important question: how does he carry out the process of an ideal and its focused communication action practically? In fact, how there is tied idealism construe of democratic legislation with an experimental fact of the policy world? To answer these questions, Habermas efforts to identify and list constructor norm elements of potential performance in liberal–democratic political systems, by using a category under name "sociology of democracy reconstruction", instead dealing ideal and fact in an abstract environment.

Therefore, he separates and explains some models of democracy, in chapters7 and 8 of this book. Those democracies which they are decreased toward dominate and express, they can't explain this matter that why people must accept these norm causes, and they must follow democracy rules. Optional democracy model is formed as intermediate private interests as well as republication elements from self–system ethical society.

Although the idea of Habermas deliberative democracy is freedom of human beings from an iron cage of capitalism and retrieval human respect and characteristic from instrumental-like and positivist theories, but summary, critics on philosophical and epistemological principles of Habermas lead his democracy discourse with restrictions and confusions. Some of the barriers against the model of this political philosopher, including, being ideal of establishment tools, his ideal speech situation based on communication action, and suppose Ethics of Discourse and understanding intermediate think of activities. Concept of hidden freedom in Habermas theory is another critical point which it deals with many confusions too. Only participating without any force and mandate participates and meeting them in an appropriate situation and gathering them about considered concepts and categories can't reclaim human beings from any mandatory restrictions. According to Giddenz, relation between mutual action and communication action is a confuse relation, and communication action is a confuse relation, and it is beyond norms which they oriented to it (Giddenz,2008: 280-281). In the other hand, self – thinking and hermeneutic mechanism will approve an inappropriate sequence essentially. From this perspective, discourse of Habermas rational and dialogue democracy will be faced with metaphysical perspective.

Parallelizing Discoursive Democracy with Deliberative Democracy

By considering to comparative study between origins and teachings of Habermas discoursive Democracy with criteria of deliberative democracy of David Miller or speech democracy of Giddenz and their significant closeness, many of thinkers have resulted that they use both of them instead together. But is seems that there is a knowledge distinction between the mentioned models. The term "deliberative democracy" was originally coined by Joseph M. Bessette, in "Deliberative Democracy: The Majority Principle in Republican Government," in 1980, and he subsequently elaborated and defended the notion in "The Mild Voice of Reason" (1994). Deliberation aims at a rationally motivated consensus: it aims to find reasons acceptable to all who are committed to such a system of decision-making. When consensus or something near enough is not possible, majoritarian decision making is usedJoshua Cohen, a student of John Rawls, most clearly outlined some conditions that he thinks constitute the root principles of the theory of deliberative democracy, in the article "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy" in the book *The Good Polity*. He outlines five main features of deliberative democracy, which include:

1. An ongoing independent association with expected continuation.
2. The citizens in the democracy structure their institutions such that deliberation is the deciding factor in the creation of the institutions and the institutions allow deliberation to continue.
3. A commitment to the respect of a pluralism of values and aims within the polity.
4. The citizens consider deliberative procedure as the source of legitimacy, and prefer the causal history of legitimation for each law to be transparent and easily traceable to the deliberative process.
5. Each member recognizes and respects others members' deliberative capacity(Bessette,1994:155).

Deliberative democracy rests on the core notion of citizens and their representatives deliberating about public problems and solutions under conditions that are conducive to reasoned reflection and refined public judgment; a mutual willingness to understand the values, perspectives, and interests of others; and the possibility of reframing their interests and perspectives in light of a joint search for common interests and mutually acceptable solutions. Deliberative democracy thus often referred to as an open discovery process, rather than a ratification of fixed positions, and as potentially transforming interests, rather than simply taking them as given. Unlike much liberal pluralist political theory, deliberative democracy does not assume that citizens have a fixed ordering of preferences when they enter the public sphere. Rather, it assumes that the public sphere can generate opportunities for forming, refining, and revising preferences through discourse that takes multiple perspectives into account and orients itself towards mutual understanding and common action.(Elster,1998:45)

Kohen as one of the most important theorecians in deliberative democracy, and by introducing Habermas as father of deliberative democracy, defines it as the following:

Deliberative democracy is a society that its affairs are administrated through public consultation between members (Mirahmadi, 2005:192). In such a situation, consensus is very important. Miller believes that idea of deliberative democracy starts with this matter that political preferences are conflicted with together and objective of establishing democratic institutions must be for solving this conflict. By considering to Habermas approach, he believes that conflict must be solved democratically through an open and non-imposed discussion about the considered matter and in order to access an agreed law (Giddenz,2008:183). According to follower of this type of democracy access to consensus is possible through different mechanisms and methods. Miller believes that deliberative democracy emphasizes on a method that during it, a process of free discussion legitimate the debate which it can be heard all viewpoints, because this result reflects a discussion that it has been carried out previously. This type of democracy emphasizes on thinking toward exploring a trend, in order to find the most powerful correct answer. Julia Block has summarized condition of deliberative model of democracy as the following:

Same and without force participation of all people about all matters which they must be discussed. All opinions must be expressed in a same condition and without especial group dominant. Process of decision – making must be conditioned will of participants in order to access consensus, without force or risk of force. For this purpose, each of them must provide their reasons which the others can accept them with reasoning and they can reject suggestions based on this matter that there haven't been provided enough reasoning for them. Therefore, the only implemented effects is power of the best reasoning. This model of democracy is used in all societies involved independent and equite people. From this perspective, there isn't a clear answer for this question that who is responsible for which work? Reasoning of deliberative model is that process of free and reasonable discussion between independent and same participants leads to consensus about matter which it must be carried out in a legal, fair, and logical method(Wheatley, 2003:508). For this reason, the first condition of deliberative democracy is a free political agenda which all people participate in it. If members of larger societies object with how to access to especial agreements or approved policies based on these agreements, it can be used from conventional election approaches in order to preserve possibility of pragmatics (Wheatley, 2003:523). Also deliberative democracy is an appropriate method for democratic supervision.

Anthony Giddenz emphasizes that concept of deliberative democracy of Miller is limited to formal political field. But in the current century, we require mechanisms and possibility of techniques for establishing and extending democracy potentially. For example, institutionalizing democracy in general field of society based on free relationship of citizens or other social groups is very important. Therefore, Giddenz understanding about establishing democracy, like its extend (real and potential) is focused on dialogue democracy(Giddenz,2008:185-187).

Without debt, deliberative democracy and its types are related to detailed discussions of Habermas, as which dialogue democracy of Giddenz and /or deliberative democracy of Miller are considered as one of forms of Habermas discoursive Democracy , which they have been established based on their political foundation and sociological approach, not on philosophical and epistemology principles. In deliberative model, democracy is a governmental system, which every citizen has equal share in it. Essentially, democracy necessitate that laws are considered where there is consensus between citizens about a matter that should be carried out, after public consultation and reasonable debates(Wheatley,2003:509). According to situation of this model, necessity of democracy is process of angoing discussion and debate.

Giddenz admits that his understanding about establishing this type of democracy isn't philosophical type. Therefore, his potential possibility of dialogue democracy is hidden in developing social rethinking as condition of daily activities as well as continuing group organized wider types.

In one hand, dialogue democracy necessarily isn't going to access consensus. It suppose that discussion in a public sphere is a way to coexist with laxity in transaction with others. He believes that it must be considered discussion as capacity of active trust through considering to trust others. Trust is a tool for regulating social relations in extent of time and place(Giddenz,2008:186). In fact, Giddenz uses social capital by relying honest and trust of activists in field of social discussions. From this perspective, it seems that the best type of forming social capital is achieved in ideal speech situation of Habermas. **Habermas** asserts that democratic deliberati**on** involves moral, ethical, pragmatic, and negotiated matters, while Nino reduces **democracy** to moral deliberati**on**. **Habermas's** theory thus is more complex and takes more seriously the possibility that **deliberative democracy** may vary across societies(**Oquendo, 2002:189).** By considering to the previous discussions, although there is achievable common point between discoursive Democracy and two other types, but there is deep separation knowledge which they must be taken account. It means that origin of discoursive Democracy is rotating toward discourse category and thinking hermeneutic of Habermas, in order to access consensus focused on freedom. From this perspective, there has been provided main theory of Habermas as discoursive Democracy .

Liberal Democracy and Habermas's views

Mac Pherson believes, the liberal democracy is the product of the capitalist society based on the market that has successfully passed the stages of development(*Mac*Pherson,2003:90). Anthony Giddenz sees also a deeper relationship between the liberal democracy and capitalism and insists that slow transformations in the field of human society and democracy should change direction to the liberation policy(Giddenz, 1994:104).The capitalism has not any political liberal democracy system with itself. Hence, Habermas by criticizing the capitalist societies and teachings of liberalism wants to reconstruct the capitalist societies. From this perspective, he seeks to recreate some issues such as freedom, legislatures, and public participation process and the right to vote.

Likewise, according to Jurgen Habermas, liberal democracy has the fundamental deficiencies. Liberal democracy is based on the fundamental gap between the government and society and this relationship only is established through the democratic process. Liberal democracy is also unaware of understanding the intersubjective nature of policy and has replaced the instrumental rationality instead of the communicative rationality. According to Habermas,the policy in terms of the nature is very different from the market and economy and thus the policy enters the discursive sphere of human relations, while the liberal policies continue to be trapped in the instrumental rationality. Such an approach fundamentally causes the way of Habermas to be separated from the liberal viewpoint. As we said, proposing the theory of Habermas's public sphere is an attempt to critique the democracies which are now available(Ansari,2005:67).In explaining the differences of Habermas' deliberative approach compared to the democracy with the liberal approach , we can indicate the following:

1) According to the liberal theory, the citizenship status mainly is determined by the individual rights that has compared to the government and other citizens and the government while the people keep and follow their own private interests within the legal rules, protects their civil rights.

Habermas, however, believes that political rights-mainly the participation right in the political society – are positive Liberties.

These rights guarantee the feasibility of participation in a public action and they should act as the responsible, equal and free subjects and the political process of government activities are not under the supervision of citizens. According to Habermas, " The essence of government includes the formation of opinion and will " where the citizens freely and equally reach an understanding which, the goals and norms based on it are equal in favor of all people (Habermas, 1994B: 43).

2) The liberal market structure exactly matches the political structure and it can be said that the relationship between seller and buyer is ruling the relationships between voters and politicians.

Instead, the republican theory believes that the formation of opinion and will in the public and parliamentary sphere, does not comply with the structure of market, but it is based on the public communication structures that these structures are oriented to mutual understanding. The *dominant policy paradigm is not the market, but it is the dialogue. From this perspective, a structural difference exists between the communicative and administrative power that* even the parties which compete for achieving the government positions should commit themselves to the deliberative style.

Habermas judges about each of these two liberal and republican point of views. According to Habermas, the advantage and usefulness of republican democracy theory is due to maintain the radical democratic meaning of a society that organizes itself through the citizens who have been unified in terms of communication and does not lessen the collective goals to the conflicting private interests.

Habermas distinguishes his point of view from the liberal and republican attitudes by emphasizing on three factors:

1. Habermas in his theory of democracy, gives priority to the process of consultation and the results as a theory of republicanism are not measured based on the ideal of common interests and emphasis on the common interest is more limiting and repressive than being democratic.
2. Many republican views of democracy - for example, based on *Hannah* Arend's view – are experiencing a kind of nostalgia compared to some of the communities that reach convergence only based on the deliberative actions. While, the theory of Habermas believes that the deliberation is only one element of convergence and besides it, the rights and markets also are the non-discursive forces of convergence.
3. All these services and relations are not naturally common and public and the political conflicts are mainly based on this that many of the goods aren't common, for example, the goods or public demands or the inner sphere of the people's life. This means that the democracy in his view not merely follows the republican consequentialism and not merely is an attempt for reconciling the conflicting interests in form of the liberal democracy.

The Legitimacy or illegitimacy of government consistently is related with the support or non-support of citizens that simultaneously are checked. The government for confirming the legitimacy of itself, should allow the decisions and laws to be measured by the public opinion(Habermas,2009:51-88). Habermas knows his own theory as consolidating the special meaning of democracy that is very participatory and based on a broad public sphere that often it is referred as the rational or deliberative democracy. According to Habermas, the democracy is the institutionalization of argument and debate theory through the system of rights that guarantees the equal participation right for everyone in the legislative process. Habermas's interest in democracy and establishing on its procedural principles to achieve the general free consensus is in an attempt to legitimize the laws of human in a healthy and well society and in terms of epistemology also is a goal-oriented reading, i.e., the emancipatory, of the argumentative and deliberative democracy in the range of his thought. He conceptualizes the rational democracy in a wide public sphere, relying on the discourse ethics, according to the superior reasoning (worthy)with a critical reading of the modern rationality as the communicative rationality.

Democracy dilemma

Most modern democracies are as indirect and representative.The election of representatives in the direct democracies, generally is based on the idea that they are representatives of the public interest, and this is the same claim that almost all the elected rulers seek to resort thereto. Obviously, the public interest opinion has a vital role in the political theory and as a " government for people " creates the main, basic and ideal element for democracy. However, how is possible the recognizing of private interests and the public interests? Andrew Heywood in the book of " Political Theory: An Introduction "interpreted from the conflict between the interests to"the democracy dilemma"(Heywood, 2004: 357).and obviously, this conflict can be generalized to the public sphere and personal interest and the interests of minority and majority. Qaderi suggests that the person is involved in relation to others and in various facets of social life. The point of interest in these relations is that the problem within democracy as an aggregation of individual rights and opinions with individual, liberal self-foundation is in what status and the problem is in finding a mechanism to maintain the balance between collective interests and individual interests has always continued(Qaderi, 2006: 28).

As it was mentioned in the previous content, the balance between private interests and public interests in the democracies was one of the major and serious concerns in types of democracies, and some of the democracy models seek to resolve or reconcile between these two that the welfare state democracy has been one of these models. Guy Hermet has considered properly the contrast and dilemma of democracy and writes: Reconciliation dilemma and agreement between part and whole, always has been a major concern of the democratic idea(Gey,1997:70).

The process of reconciliation between teachings and personal authenticity principles with collective teachings is a dilemma, which is compiled by the nature of democracy and is the same dilemma that the democracy has always grappled with it. Hence, Habermas knows as a solution, the possibility of understanding and consensus on the demands and interests in the public sphere by suggesting the ideal speech situation in an intersubjective situation.

Discoursive democracy: Offered Approach toward bidirectional Democracy

As researcher's opinion, proposed model by Hobermas improved two major challenges which faced with democracy, in fact it directed it to positive outlook. First problem is being paradoxical in context of real government by human. Second is democracy crisis in globalization. In this view, it must be discussed about dimension of Habermas democracy.

First issue is about latent contradiction in democracy by mean of government of the people. Often, in democracies sovereignty will be referred to people and their destiny. But human destiny was faced with theoretical challenges and contradictions. While democratic legitimacy is relating to satisfaction and demand of people who are ahead. Thus, sovereignty is based on political equality. Basic principals of democracy means "equality", "democracy" in which usually considered confliction and "individual rights" against "desire of people"(Wheatley,2003:508).

Certainly, majority of people can not govern, but it was governed. Rousso declare principle of democracy and defends open – democracy for everyone (Hermet, 1997:50). Gladeston remember that "the number of people who can be called a nation, they never can govern at themselves." It is important to people that elect their own rulers (Cohen,1994:23), however ability of revocation and dismiss the rulers indicating a real democracy. According to article (21), universal Declaration of Human Rights, desire of people is base of governmental power (Beetham1995:122). According to the concept of sovereignty, Hobermas model include positive achievement. (Bartelson,2008:16). Cohen believes that "universal democracy idea" is usually unrealistic ideal by considering major problems in realization it. Furthermore, realization of universal democracy is almost irrational and also it has less possible for separating national fanaticism and authority (Cohen,1994:415). Barteselon listed number of impasses and problems in his article as title " Globalizing The Democratic Community ", resulted from crisis of legitimacy. It is necessary to globalize democracy and then creating model of democratic legitimacy in other levels.

Habermas offers a negative idea about universal, but he argues that these phenomena started to challenge whole of weakened capacity of government – nation as a model of political organization. "Universal is herald end of government – nation universal domination considered as main pattern of politicized" (Habermas, 1999:10). He believes that process of fundamental changes and governmental – national decrease challenges the basis of governmental legitimacy. Besides in universal era, there must be principles and functions which pass from legitimacy crisis. Habermas proposed that if democratic process considered as post – national legitimacy basis, governmental structure and market mechanism cannot provide such conditions. It is possible through collective making processes, only. Simply efficient public sovereignty – sovereignty derived intentional communication nets, expanding integrated public field at international level etc. – able to create a pattern of public legitimacy. Through this way, international, regional and universal regimes provide possibility of necessarily decision and it must be having possibility of implanting necessarily social policies. He believes that in exchangeable conditions of international collection, government – nation cannot retrieve their previous power by returning to their pericarp(Habermas,1999:122).

International community will not return back and also traditional methods will not revived. What is important for government is open and close environment – world and governments can found new position by considering dialectic process. Based on his viewpoint, "networks" are reason of order in social actions and they have interaction with environment – different world. Political human fate is resulted by these interactions. If worlds based on mutual understanding and common norms, it can be a desired result for this interaction. Habermas believes that necessity of developing forms of self– statesmanship democracy is rational interacting with globalization challenges (Habermas,1999:132). Theory of "ideal speech situation" has high flexibility for adapting with these conditions. Andrew Cooper believes that the content of global justice and democracy due to the democratic ethos pressure, through institutional reforms are correlated with the theory of globalization and cultural diversity.

He writes:"The multiplicity of institutions as a basis for the global governance in comparison and contrast with other outdated national assumptions is interpreted." (Kuper, 2006:102). He suggested that by evaluation and revision of international institutions like the International Court of Justice, United Nations and design and development of the global campaign and, etc. the democracy which is focused on the global justice can be made consistent with the supranational requirements in the sphere of globalization. He believes that the globalization challenges will lead to deepen the democracy, and the democratic norms and teachings are in the forefront of global actors' formation and a new generation of political thought (Kuper,2006:225).

Public Sphere and its Effect in Processing Deliberative Democracy

Habermas defines the public sphere as a key element for the emergence of democracy. In the public sphere, what is important is the continuous process of discussion and conversation and no matter the outcome, and therefore it is important that the process of deliberation and debate and the rationality ruling on it, to be the democratic. He believes that identified rationality and action types are inappropriate matters. Therefore, he wants to provide the detailed rationality by description communication action and its relation with rationality. He considers continuous problems and crisis of the latter capitalism societies in dominating instrumental rationality on cultural rationality and conceptual consensus. Communication rationality model shows wider vision and extent of rationality concept which it is focused on reasoning speech (Habermas,1973:186). Habermas, considering the social structure of modern and separated societies, offers the proceduralist form of democracy as the best form, and as we shall see, this will be successful only when, as a kind of lifestyle in communication of the citizens is converted. In the following, the concept of public sphere and the rise and fall of it will be discussed(Ansari,2005:53-59).

Emergence of public field was resulted of clear separation of private field and public power. Mutual influence both of them destroy public field. Distorting public thoughts in the manipulated field of Bourgeoisie is one of the distortion fields. Habermas strategy about public thoughts is that he links it to its historical roots in the frame of a public field idea, with this hope to gain access to systematic understanding of our society from one of the main categories perspectives. In this regard, Habermas writes:

Public opinion has different meanings; it depends on whether it is provided as a critical reference and in relation with normative necessities which implementation of political and social power are followed by all people, or it is provided as a matter which it must be patterned in relation with a scene show or advertising manipulation of all people(Young,1995:43). Habermas believes that concept of public opinion in its historical completion received to a step that it didn't require its expression trough words and sentences, and it was quite expressive; now this concept contains not every habit and behavior which they are found in the frame of some imagery and ideas- for example, different thoughts resulted from religion, customs, ethics, …- but represents or includes all behavioral techniques. Only the matter which changes this type of opinion to public opinions is its relation with group processes(Nowzari, 2002:503).

Habermas describes his purpose from the public sphere as the following by affecting from Hegelian idea as well as the considered pluralist civil society of French thinkers:

Our purpose from "public sphere" is the realm of social life whom, something close to public opinion can be formed in it. When citizens express their problems in a way without any limitations – i.e. by warranting group freedom and cooperation and freedom of expression and release their opinions – they behave like a public body … term of public opinion demonstrates duties of control criticism which public body of citizens carries out against the ruling class informally (Habermas, 1974:49-51).

The public sphere is an area in social life where people can get together and freely discuss and identify societal problems, and through that discussion influence political action. It is "a discoursive space in which individuals and groups congregate to discuss matters of mutual interest and where possible, to reach a common judgment." (Hauser,1998:86) The public sphere can be seen as "a theater in modern societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk" and "a realm of social life in which public opinion can be formed".(Asen,1999:56-80). The public sphere mediates between the "private sphere" and the "Sphere of Public Authority". The public sphere 'is also distinct from the official economy; it is not an arena of market relations but rather one of the discoursive relations, a theater for debating and deliberating rather than for buying and selling. These distinctions between "state apparatuses, economic markets, and democratic associations are essential to the democratic theory(fraster, 1990:57). The people themselves came to see the public sphere as a regulatory institution against the authority of the state. The study of the public sphere centers on the idea of participatory democracy, and how public opinion becomes political action.

The basic belief in public sphere theory is that, the public sphere steered the political action, and that the only legitimate governments are those that listen to the public sphere. (Benhabib,1992:87). "Democratic governance rests on the capacity and opportunity for citizens to engage in enlightened debate". (Hauser, 1998:83). Much of the debate over the public sphere involves what is the basic theoretical structure of the public sphere, how information is deliberated in the public sphere, and what influence the public sphere has over society.

General field is a range in which political life and participation in political activist are possible for all citizens and during it with rational way, thinking and reasoning, we argue about its political issues. It is required to retrieval of live – world. Live – world as infrastructure of the world view and an identifying factor in quiddity and modality of thought ,beliefs and human discussions affected at the way of thinking, evaluation of human and their communicational rationality (Fishkin, 2009: 187). Habermas assumes intellectual and social sphere in which awareness activities create a field for social and critical discussions, and it results to the emergence of what he considers fundamental to democracy.

In his idea, freer information (democracy oxygen) processes in this large and freer and rationality leading to more realistic and impressive democracy. General field is a social space in which people criticize social condition freely and listed problems and affected on decision making in political issues. Habermas believes general field is the origin of public thoughts. It acts as intermediation between public and private area, and if it was freer and thoughtful, social relations will be humane and wisdom(Wikipedia, 2008:2).

From this perspective, Habermas stimulus for designing public field in present and future is its importance as criticism of society based on democratic principles. In other words, the matter which has got attention of Habermas to the public has been importance of this subject as a basis of criticism of society based on democratic principles. Public field is an extent that people are gathered, in order to cooperate open and in public discussions. According to Habermas reasoning, it shouldn't be considered cooperation as in itself value,but Its value depends on conditions which it is carried out in them (Outhwaite, 1995:17). Habermas considers conditions for discussion, which its most important is to provide an environment without every power field. Citizen public fields or extent can be a basis for this action, which it can provide the discussion and relation environment, if it is released from any limitation.

As it can be seen, a principle of Habermas democracy is based on free participation and without domination of conceptual consensus in an ideal situation. This extent is policy and society fields which public opinions can discuss freely in it. According to Habermas, civil social in a modified public extent has a high degree. Apparently, the recreation manipulated public field and strengthening communication components and human mutual actions provide an appropriate field for discoursive Democracy. The public sphere is an arena in which the political life and participation in political activity are open to all citizens and the public in which they discuss rationally about the related affairs specially their issues and evaluate them with the help of arguments and understanding.

In contrast, while Habermas as a critical theorist contributes with Foucault in opposition to control and incarcerate, argues in favor of the public and democratic sphere in which the emancipatory understanding forms can be effective(Benton, 2007: 101). According to Habermas, the partnership should not be considered per se a value, but its value depends on the circumstances in which it occurs(Outhwaite,1995:17).

Distorted human relationship conflicts with the essence of democracy. According to S.Fishkin, the revolutionary practice of democracy contains the debate and conversation between the citizens who are accountable and committed to a better world. When there is the general background to exchange views and ideas, people's view is being broader and the way is exposed to the realization of true democracy through consultation (Fishkin,2009:115).

Conclusion

The researcher has concluded by measuring and explaining Habermas' philosophical ideas and thoughts that, there was a logical relationship between his theoretical principles and political ideas,and most important political opinions of Habermas have been based on his philosophical-theoretical reflections. Generally, his political ideas and thoughts have the fundamental necessity and convergence with cognitive interests and relevant actions, which were correlated with those interests. On the one hand, adopting the survey of critical interpretation about the pathology of recent capitalist societies, and his critical approach about the knowledge and positivist interactions, and on the other hand, Habermas' attempts to rebuild and rethinking the concepts and components of numerous experts, altogether focused on the ideal of emancipation, and are resulted from the third species of cognitive interests. The researcher has concluded from measurement and readout of the Intellectual foundations and components of Habermas that the logical relationship exists between his theoretical and political ideas. In other words, the main thoughts of Habermas rely on his political-philosophical reflections.

The system of democracy in the horizon of liberal capitalism, on the one hand, is faced with inconsistent strains and on the other hand, in the process of its increasing development and evolution always faces with serious challenges, including the globalization and this issue was evaluated and studied, emphasizing on the opinions and ideas of Habermas. Habermas smartly makes firm his epistemology and methodology on his scientific and philosophical foundations and generalizes its contents to the other political issues, including the democracy.

The basic finding is that the expression of Habermas' democracy, and its expansion in the modern technocrat society, has a high status in the reconstruction of human relationships and interactions and maintaining their true rights and also the capacity for realizing the people's sovereignty over their own destiny, especially in the era of globalization. According to Habermas, the democracy now on the one hand, and, the communicative action on the other hand, based on Understanding Ethics, have capacity for blocking the absolute power and realizing the people's true sovereignty over their own destiny.He used the concept of reconstruction for rethinking the ideas that are fundamentally based on cognitive interests. The critique of positivism and instrumental rationality that relies on the first and second level of these interests, pointed him to the people's interest in the critical aspect. Hence, he tries to provide the desirable foundations of democracy by offering the major theoretical alternative.Insisting on the legitimacy deficit in the recent democratic systems of capitalist societies and challenging the mechanisms of democracy based on liberal ideas will lead him to create a particular ideal situation that requires the special communicative in the public sphere action which was reconsidered;A situation in the public range based on the communicative action and participation free of any domination and compulsory, on the one hand can provide the field of normative stable consensus and on the other hand assuming the participation of all activists in a free debate and negotiation , obtain the required legitimacy. The researcher believes that habermas' model relieved two major challenges facing the democracy and in fact, has led to a positive outlook. Here, the first problem is the inconsistency in the real rule contradictory aspects of people and government on them and the second problem is the crisis of democracy in the globalization sphere.A brief comparison of Habermas's theory of democracy with the deliberative democracy indicates the epistemological distinction between them; especially with the linguistic turn of Habermas and reflectional hermeneutical debates, has become more evident. Moreover, his reading from the principles and teachings of the democracy with a liberal approach compared to the democracy principles has a major difference, and this is due to Habermas' philosophical attitude to the democracy and the role of proper human actions in an ideal, moral and theological situation. According to Habermas, the liberal democracy mainly is affected by the rationality of insufficient capitalism and its expansion to the sphere of social and human relations. The remarkable point in his thoughts is the resolution of conflict between the private interests and public interests, then the attunement between interests of the groups and activists in the public spheres with the public interest of society indicates this issue.

References:

[1] Ansari, Mansour (2005), **Deliberative Democracy:The democratic features of Mikhail Bakhtin and Yurgen Habermas' ideas**, Tehran: Markaz Publication.

[2] Arblaster, Anthony (2006)، **Democracy, Translated by translation Hassan Mortazavi**, 2th edition, Tehran:Ashtian Publication.

[3] Asen, Robert (1999), "Toward a Normative Conception of Difference in Public Deliberation",**Argumentation and Advocacy 25** (Winter) :115–129.

[4] Bashiriyeh,Hosein(2005) ,**Teaching of Political Knowledge** ,Tehran:Negaheh moaaser.

[5] Bartelson,Jens(2008),"Globalizing the democratic community",Citation:**Ethics &Global Politics**.Vol.1,No.4,159-174.

[6] Beetham,David(1999),**Democracy and human Rights**,Cambridge:polity prees.

[7] Bessette, Joseph (1994),**The Mild Voice of Reason: Deliberative Democracy&American National Government,** Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[8] *Benton, Ted,and Ian* Craib(2007) ***Philosophy of Social Science*: Philosophical Issues in Social Though**,Translated by Shahnaz M. Parast and mahmood Mottahed,2th Edition,Tehran: Agah Publication.

[9] Benhabib, Seyla (1992), **Models of Public Space**:**Habermas and the Public Sphere**, Cambridge Mass: MIT press.

[10] Bohman,James&William Rehg(1997), **Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics,** The MIT Press.

[11] Cohn,kalr (1994), **Democracy**, trans by Fariborz majidi, Tehran: khwarazmi.

[12] Dryzek,John S.(2002),**Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations**,USA:Oxford University Press.

[13] Elster,Jon(1998),**Deliberative Democracy,Cambridge** [u.a.]:Cambridge Univ.Press.

[14] Erikson,Erik Oddvar **(2004), Understanding Habermas:Communicating Action and Deliberative Democracy,**Editor Jarle Weigard,Continuum.

[16] Fraster, Nancy (1990)**Rethinking the Public Sphere:A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy**, Social Text, Duke University Press.

[17] Fleming,Marie(1997),***Emancipation and Illusion: Rationality and Gender in Habermas's Theory of Modernity,*** Pennsylvania State University Press.

[18] Fishkin,James S. (2009), **When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation,** New York:Oxford University Press.

[19] Gey,Eremeh(1997), **Culture and Democracy**,trans by morteza saqeb far,Tehran:qoqnus pub.

[20] Giddenz,Antony(1994), **Beyond left and Right :the future of Radical politics**, Cambridge: polity press.

[21] Giddenz, Anthony(2008**), policy, sociology, social theory**, Tehran, translated by Manoochehr Sboori,fourth print.

[22] Fooladvand, Ezatollah (2008), **philosophy and society and policy**, Tehran, Samt Pub.

[23] Habermas, Jurgen (1970), On Systematically Distorted

Communication", "Towards On Theory of Communication", Inquiry, no.13, pp.205-18.**critical sociology**, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Kamal Pooladi, Tehran, Markaz pub., fourth print.

[24] Habermas, Jurgen (1973), **Communication and the Evolution of Society**, trans. T.MacCarthy, Boston, Beacon Press.

[25] Habermas, Jurgen (1974), **The Public Sphere: An Encylopedia Article,** originally appearing in Lexicon Staat und Politik,new edition,Frankfort am Main,1964,pp.220-226.

[26] Habermas, Jurgen (1994) A,"Three Normative Models of Democracy", **in Constellation**,Vol. I, No: 1, pp.8-20.

[27] Habermas, Jurgen (1994) B,**knowledge and Human Interests**,Tr. J.Shapiro, Cambridge: polity press.

[28] Habermas, Jurgen (1995),**The Theory of Communicative Action**,Vol.1: Reason and The Rationonalization of Society, Tr.T. ,Mc Carthy , Cambridge: polity press.

[29] Habermas, Jurgen (1996), **Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law Democracy,tr**. William Rehg, Cambridge, MIT Press.

[30] Habermas, Jurgen (2008),"legitimacy issues in the current capitalism", **critical sociology**, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Kamal Pooladi, Tehran, Markaz pub.,fourth print.pp. 425-454.

[31] Habermas,Jurgen(2009), ***The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a*** **Category of Bourgeois Society**, Translated by Jamal Mohammadi, First Edition, Tehran: Afkar Publication,

[32] Hauser,Gerard(1998)."Vernacular Dialogue and the Rhetoricality of Public Opinion".**Communication Monographs** .pp. 83–107.

[33] Held,David(1995),**Introduction to Critical Theory**: Horkheimer to Habermas ,Cambridge:Polity Press.

[34] Heywood,Andrew(2004),**Introduction of Political Theory**,trans by abdoul rahman alam,Tehran: qumes pub.

[35] Hoolab,Robert(1996),Jurgen Habermas, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran, Ney Pub., first print.

[36] Kuper,Andrew(2006),**Democracy Beyond Borders: Justice and Representation in Global Institutions**, Oxford University Press.

[37] Macpherson,C. B.(2003) **The Real World of Democracy**،Translated by Majid Madadi, First Edition, Tehran:Dighar Publigcation.

[38] Mirahmadi,Mansour(2005),**The Islam and Democracy**,Tehran: nay pub.

[39] Nowzari,Hossein–Ali (2002),**Reconsidering Habermas:review opinions and thoughts of Jurgen Habermas**, Tehran, Cheshmeh pub., first print.

[40] Outhwaite,William(1995),**Habermas: An critical introduction**,Standford University.

[41] Pusey, Michael (1987),**Jurgen Habermas**,London,Tavitock.

[42] pooladi,Kamal(2007), **history of political thought in 20th century**, collected articles, Mah pub.,first print.

[43] Ratzinger, Jpseph and Yurgen Habermas(2007), **The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion,** Ignatius Press.

[44] Rosenfeld,Michel and Andrew Arato(1998), **Habermas on Law and Democracy: Critical Exchanges,** 1edition, University of California

Press.

[45] Lesnaf,Michel. ch. (2001), **political philosophers in 20th century**, translated by Khashayar Dayhimi, Koochak pub., first print.

[46] Qaderi, Hatam (2006), **political thoughts in 20th century**, Tehran, Samt Pub.

[47] Shabany, Payrow. Abdollah (2004),"Habermas' Between Facts and Norms:Legitimizing Power?",**Political Philosophy,** University of Ottawa,pp.1-15.From:www.bu.edu/wsp/Mainpoli.htm

[48] Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1950), **Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy**, New York.

[49] Wikipedia (2008), From: (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_sphere)

[50] White, Stephen, K. (1989),**The Recent Work of Jurgen Habermas:Reason, Justice and Modernity,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[51] Wood,A.W(1991),"Habermas's efense of Rationalism",**New German critique**, No35, pp.105-122.

[52] Young, I.M. (1995),"Communication and the other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy", in M.Wilson and A.Yeatman(ed)**, Justice and Identity**, willington: Bridget Williams Books.

[53] Zamiran, Mohammad (2006) "Democracy and human rights in Habermas' view", **Etemad Daily**, from: (http://www.etemaad.comt/?type=dynamic&lang=1&id=36)

بررسی مبانی فلسفی اندیشه‌های سیاسی هابرماس: رویکرد رایزنانه به دموکراسی

امیر مسعود شهرام نیا[1]، جلال حاجی زاده[2]

تاریخ دریافت:۸۸/۲/۱۲ تاریخ پذیرش:۹۰/۱/۲۸

برررسی اندیشه‌های سیاسی هابرماس از دیدگاه فلسفی و سنجش نسبت مبانی فلسفی او با دموکراسی مشورتی هدفی است که در این پژوهش دنبال می‌شود. اهمیت این موضوع از یک سو بیانگر خوانش نوینی از موازین دموکراسی است و از سوی دیگر قوام بخش سنخی از دموکراسی است که با دموکراسی لیبرالی تمایزی معرفت شناختی دارد. از این حیث سعی بر آن است تا ضمن تجزیه و تحلیل منظومه‌ی فلسفی هابرماس، مهم‌ترین مؤلفه‌ها و موازین اندیشه‌های مقوم دموکراسی رایزنانه ایضاح و تبیین گردد. در این راستا از روش توصیفی– تحلیلی بهره‌گرفته می‌شود و تلاش می‌گردد تا با کمک رهیافت تطبیقی این مسیر پی گرفته شود. یافته‌های نوشتار حاضر حاکی از آن است کـه آرا و عقاید سیاسی این اندیشمند سیاسی که برخاسته از تفکر فلسفی‌اش می‌باشد بر موازین و آموزه‌های کنش ارتباطی، اخلاق گفتمانی، اجماع عقلایی و حوزه‌ی عمومی استوار شده است؛ به علاوه نظریه‌ی دموکراسی هابرماس با اجماع گفتمانی، از قابلیت به نسبت منطقی برای مواجهه با چالش های جهانی شدن برخوردار است و از یک منظر تحقق حاکمیت حقیقی مردم بر سرنوشت خویش را وجه همت خود قرار داده است.

واژگان کلیدی: دموکراسی رایزنانه، جهانی شدن، حوزهٔ عمومی، اجماع عقلانی، عقلانیت ارتباطی.

۱. دانشیارگروه علوم سیاسی دانشگاه اصفهان

۲. دانشجوی دکتری علوم سیاسی دانشگاه تهران