


CIVIL SOCIETY, NEGOTIATIONAL PARTICIPATION AND PLURALISM: "DEMOS," WHERE ARE YOU?¹

Gökhan AK² 

Abstract

Democracy has been a political phenomenon for human societies for almost 2500 years. Perhaps one of the main reasons for this is that human societies act hypocritically in accepting and applying a phenomenon, and that the phenomenon in question is used by certain segments of human societies to protect and maintain political power and power. There are many examples of this argument in history. On the way to eliminate this thesis, perhaps the most important socio-political elements in human societies in the name of democracy can be described with the concepts of civil society, deliberation, participation, deliberative participation and pluralism. Because without these, neither the continuity of democracy, nor the healthy applicability of democracy, nor the basic principles of democracy such as free elections, freedom of the press, freedom of thought-expression-conscience, the right to choose and be elected, etc. will remain meaningful. Therefore, in the absence of civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, the democracy practiced in that society will be a "fake and so-called" democracy. The aim of this study is to examine the relationships and interactions of these three phenomena, which shed light on and realize the existence of a real and democratic democracy in a society, in a social context. The importance of this study is to draw attention to the fact that democracy comes to life and is applicable in societies and the political regimes that govern them, with advanced democratic understandings and attitudes such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, rather than basic principles and principles. In this research, which has mainly adopted the qualitative research methodology, scientific books, articles, theses, reports and papers are used to obtain scientific data; scientific research methods such as document analysis, content analysis and hermeneutics are benefited from.

Research Article in English

Article History

Received: 07.05.2024

Accepted: 30.06.2024

Keywords:

Democracy, society,
civil society,
negotiation
participation,
pluralism.

¹ This essay is the revised, extended and English version of the book-chapter titled as; "Gökhan Ak, "Sivil Toplum, Müzakereci Katılımcılık ve Çoğulculuk: DEMOS Neredesin?", Tacettin Gökhan Özçelik and Levent Börklüoğlu (Eds.), (Teoriden Uygulamaya) Yerelde ve Merkezde Siyaset, (pp. 1-28), Dora, Bursa, 2020"

² Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Topkapı University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations (English), İstanbul – Türkiye, gokhanak@topkapi.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

2500 years ago, ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle (1941: 1113, 1129) dictated socially; "Man is by nature a political animal; [because] he has the ability to perceive good and evil, just and unjust." In a time-travel, thus today, when we investigate the democratic deficits of the 21st century, since "republic" is a political regime and "democracy" is its form of implementation, official state governments such as the People's Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Congo and even the Democratic People's Republic of Korea appear to be republics. Without even taking into account the states where democracy is barely visible - USA, EU, UK, Germany, France etc. It should be clarified according to which criteria modern secular-secular liberal democracies such as these should be evaluated. Because it is not possible to understand the basic essentials of democracy, such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, in which we look for demos in our title, in any other way.

As a matter of fact, even in the liberal republics of Europe today, there are two problems in the implementation of national democracy models adopted and implemented by the governments: First, the existence of a nationalist and normative mentality. This mentality, which is very prone to making irreversible decisions, is inadequate in transparency, and prioritizes resource equipment, allocation and expenditure that only appeal to its interests, ignores or tries to ignore the democratic rights and interests of the societies and citizens of modern secular-secular liberal republics. However, there is a second problem, which is the main problematic of our study: If the increasing number of democratic weaknesses are to be prevented, the existence of democratic methods such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism used in national governance models and their effectiveness in practice, if any, need to be urgently questioned (Oberndorfer, 2012: 39). Otherwise, as Vaneigem (1983: 176 cited in Miessen, 2013: 61) emphasizes, nothing will remain but implicit/moderate totalitarianism instead of liberal democracy; "The show is over. The audience gets up to leave their seats. Time to grab your coats and go home. They turn their backs... There are no coats or houses anymore."

Or we can perceive this as a rebellion of "the scarce mind that constantly collects all evils into a bag, starting from the smallest ones" (Misik, 2005: 17). However, according to Oberndorfer (2012: 53), it seems that such an intellectual rebellion is necessary for a new enlightenment age of criticism, in a period when the international neoliberal understanding is becoming more and more widespread and is becoming more prevalent in societies. So, "Demos, where are you?" or "Which Demos?" questions also bring about the following question: Are the democratic elements of a public service in a position to transform people's "longings and discontents" into a political vision?

As it is known, social movements gained momentum especially in the 20th century and continue to increase today with the influence of neoliberalism, modern exploitation policies and globalization (Gönenç, 2007). In addition, global changes/transformations in global economy and international politics and developments in information, communication and transportation technologies have deeply affected political ideas and structures since the 1980s. Especially in Eastern Europe, following the "guided and controlled" popular movements such as the Color Revolutions based on the Greater Middle East Project and the Arab Spring, the transformation from dictatorial and authoritarian governments to "so-called" democracy, the dissolution of the USSR, the crisis of socialism and the developments in information technology. Dizzying developments have made concepts such as "democracy", "civil society", "deliberative participation" and "pluralism", which are the key concepts of Western political science, popular again all over the world (Kaynar, 2005: 339). In this context, it is seen that the more democratic, more participatory, more deliberative, more civil and more pluralist policies adopted towards both locals and immigrants in Western Europe, which has developed democratic regimes and states, lead to the further development of Western democratic culture and are more inclusive and tolerant. For instance, since the 1970s, when immigrants from southern Europe, the Middle East, the Balkans and Asian countries began to come to Sweden, which is the stronghold of social democracy understanding and policies in Europe, the need for integration began to become more visible. This need has become more certain with the increase in immigrants from different cultures in

Swedish society and this creates dissatisfaction in Swedish society; Therefore, the main aim of the immigrant integration that was tried to be developed in this period was to create a multicultural society in which the immigrant and local population could live together without any problems. In this context, the discourse and policies of this period were based on the goal of creating a multicultural, solidaristic and egalitarian society and creating equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for everyone, regardless of ethnic and cultural base (Akarçay, 2019a: 441-442).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Within the scope of the literature review of the research, which adopted qualitative research methodology, secondary data sources were mainly used in terms of resource usage within the framework of obtaining scientific data. In this context, scientific (e-)books, scientific (e-)articles, scientific (published e-)dissertations, scientific proceeding (e-)books, and scientific (e-)reports of international organizations, NGOs, and think tanks that were obtained from public and university libraries and/or virtual environments related to the subject had been given priority in terms of references, and accordingly included in the research as for the scientific data. Following obtaining, the aforementioned sources were scanned, found in related databases, and examined thoroughly. In this way, the main and secondary sources that would support the findings of the research were obtained properly and read entirely and accurately; then, the information in the sources was classified following the tentative outlines of the research; later, it was subjected to an analytical review and was included in the research under ethical publication rules.

3. METHODOLOGY

Within the scope of the methodology of the research, this study mainly adopted qualitative research methodology and was based on a deductive approach. In this study, while "*descriptive*" explains the concepts and relationships and deals with the subject within the conceptual framework of the research, "*causal*" tries to find the facts behind the events, "*theoretical*" extracts principles from the events that have occurred, "*historical*" examining the effect of a past event and the effects of this situation today will be referred to; in this vein, accordingly, scientific research methods such as document analysis, content analysis,

discourse analysis, grouping and comparison were used in the study, and additionally, advanced research methods such as hermeneutics was also utilized in the secondary methodological context. Scientific studies based on information obtained from sources such as libraries, archives and the internet e-sources related to the problem of the research.

4. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1. From "Ancient Demos" to "Modern Society": Good Community of Phenomenal Democracy

As a matter of fact, in today's modern world, it is essential to argue that societies - together with those who govern them - must develop healthy, understanding, consistent, rational and, perhaps more importantly, honest and fair "policy-making" mechanisms, methods, forms and structures based on mutual good will and respect. It is accepted as a very logical view to argue that this is at least one of the indispensable solutions to achieving sustainable democratic development and prosperity, and thus sustainable social peace. Because the modern world we live in is now a multicultural, multi-ethnic, multi-faith, multi-lingual, multi-identity world due to the incredibly rapidly developing information, transportation, communication and social media networks and international - forced and irregular - migration flows - and in parallel with the speed of these reasons. becomes; "Adopting does not mean closing in on oneself and closing in on the other. 'To embrace the other' means to open social boundaries to everyone - even and especially to those who are strangers to each other and want to remain strangers to each other." (Habermas, 2002: 9)

Therefore, it is seen that the homogeneity and majority in societies are rapidly evolving towards heterogeneity and pluralism at a similar pace today - and perhaps because of the developments that force this. It is possible to see this situation more especially in societies whose level of homogeneity is decreasing day by day due to the rapidly increasing forced and irregular migration flows in the international arena after the 1990s. As a matter of fact, every society, no matter how homogeneous it is, has had to develop some pluralistic moral and political theories, albeit to different extents, due to having different cultural foundations and democratic understandings. In fact, this situation is essential for every society; Because every society has to some extent adopted the view that "good

life", "being oneself", "being able to express oneself freely", in short, "maximum contribution to social policy making" in a social peace can be equally respectable in different forms and It has developed socio-political mechanisms, structures, methods and procedures. The point we want to emphasize at this point, although it may be like stating the result in advance, is that to the extent that these adopted mechanisms and structures and the methods and procedures implemented resulting from them are established, rational, deep-rooted and fair, societies will also be developed, developed, democratized and internally pacified. It is the fact that their level and levels are also high at that rate.

Therefore, to the extent that a person who is a citizen in the state and an individual in society can benefit from civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, and to the extent that he/she is provided with the opportunity to benefit from these modern "policy making" methods, the person, as a citizen and individual, can have a "good life" in that state and society. The longer it lasts, the higher the rate. This is essentially what we see in developed democratic Western countries... A community of happier people living a better life... This situation is accompanied by the understanding of social democracy dating back more than a century, the policies and political party formation developed in accordance with this understanding, and modern, strong and democratic-secular state structures. , again with the understanding of social democracy based on the principles of freedom, equality and solidarity, and developing reforms and policies that highlight union and other civil society memberships, individual, social and economic rights and freedoms, equality and income justice (Akarçay, 2019b: 21). It should not be surprising that Scandinavian countries or some developed Western European countries such as France, Spain, Italy and Germany are at the top of the surveys of the countries where people want to live.

As a matter of fact, although the formal and official understanding that democracy only occurs with equal voting rights for all citizens, in other words, such basic concrete deficiencies of democracy (Oberndorfer, 2012: 39-40), is still considered democratic, egalitarian, libertarian and The main point common to all pluralism-based policies is the right of the individual to live as he wishes. It is the right to be oneself, to be an equal and free social

individual. However, it is ignored that even most of today's developed Western European and North American societies are still socially, sexist and racist divided and exposed to inequalities in the distribution of power (Demirović, 2004: 475). However, for example, the gender equality policies of Sweden, one of the Scandinavian countries we have highlighted and exemplified above, are intertwined with the social, democratic, pluralist and participatory state ideology implemented over the past 50 years. These implemented policies made significant contributions to Sweden being known as a country based on gender equality and paved the way for the production of new policies to improve gender equality in the economic, social and political fields (Akarçay, 2019c: 1).

Because it is possible to say that a state is democratic, participatory and pluralistic to the extent that it adopts and implements sexist policies. As a matter of fact, in KA-DER (2005: 6); "A true democracy cannot exist without women. Giving women only the role of voters and excluding them from decision-making responsibility turns 'democracy' into a 'men's democracy'. The most famous historical example of this, as we know, dates back to B.C. It is the "Athenian Democracy" in the 5th Century. It is sad that, after 25 centuries, at the beginning of the 21st century, no democracy in the world has gone beyond being a 'men's democracy'. The closest thing to true democracy is today's 'Swedish democracy'." By saying this, she once again draws attention to the position of Sweden, which is known in the literature as a feminist country that carries out constructive policies towards women (Daly, 2000: 35). As stated by Akarçay (2019c: 3-4), the data obtained and scientific studies on this subject reinforce this information. As a matter of fact, scientists working in this field have determined that there is a cause-effect relationship especially between the social state (welfare state) ideology and gender equality results. For example, the welfare state's aim at women's employability; Encouraging policies such as giving maternity/parental leave at the same rate to both mothers and fathers or developing policies that transfer funds and duties to social security units regarding the care of children have increased the effectiveness of women in business life. In this sense, what clearly distinguishes Sweden from other European countries is the intertwining of the social state understanding and gender equality

policies. Therefore, the social state ideology had a great influence on Sweden's transformation regarding gender equality.

However, although Western states have such democratic development, civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism structures and are an example to other geographies of the world with these, it is seen that they cannot demonstrate sincere and realistic will to establish these in other states of the world that lack or lack these. As a matter of fact - for example - the famous Italian political philosopher, rhetorician, historian and legal advisor Giambattista Vico (who is one of the important founders of the philosophy of history and divides human history into three main periods: "Age of Gods", "Age of Heroes" and "Age of Men", 1668-1744) (Arslan, 2017: 222); "...even though there are different cultures in the world, the ideas and prejudices that the superior culture is the European society and culture and that it should rule other societies..." (Parekh, 2002: 72) have been increasing from past to present.

However, we cannot pass without making an important criticism on the subject here. That is to say, although philosophers such as Vico, Montesquieu, Herder, Marx and Toynbee, who stated and defended that "pluralism is an inevitable idea by emphasizing the diversity of culture" since the 17th century, Western civilization in general, perhaps in its own continent, perhaps in its own country. Although it has adopted this pluralism in its intra-state structures and implemented it to the maximum extent, it is seen that this understanding and attitudes of pluralism are not widely adopted and implemented in inter-state relations. Therefore, with the implementation of the understanding of pluralism instead of majoritarianism in domestic structures, the West, which does not adopt a socio-political pressure and hegemony attitude and policy both politically and culturally and thus gives a very democratic, civil society and pluralistic appearance within its own culture, is able to achieve a better understanding of the subject states. It is quite ironic to see him abandoning this attitude when it comes to international relations and the international arena, and engaging in hate speech, discrimination and opposition based on politics, geography, belief and culture.

Here, through the efforts, initiatives and studies that include supranational-based, but sincere and

realistic social, political, cultural and financial support and guidance among the states in the global context by powerful and global international organizations such as the UN and the EU, constitutional democracy, democratic culture, liberal To support states whose parliamentary political system, secularism (contemporariness) and rule of law norms are relatively undeveloped, weak, incomplete and/or fragile, in adopting a developed and sustainable constitutional liberal-democratic civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism understanding and culture. It is important; However, instead of USA, UK, France, RF etc. Global powers and/or supranational organizations such as the EU are bringing fire, blood, tears and cruelty instead of democratic development to such geographies with weak democracy and underdevelopment, with a policy nourished by old colonialist roots and codes. We are against such an imperialist system that looks democratic but involves modern exploitation. However, these issues must of course be the subject of another comprehensive study and therefore will only be touched upon here.

In this context, this study, based on the acceptance that capitalism, which controls and hegemonizes the whole world as a universal economic system, will not end for a long time, aims to adopt it in states with different political regimes and management styles in today's modern world, in order to ensure at least domestic sustainable development and prosperity. It aims to demonstrate that the development of international social peace can be achieved to the extent that domestic social peace can be strengthened by creating new social-democratic policy-making mechanisms and forms such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism. Likewise, today, modern forms of ensuring a rational, fair, peaceful and reliable life in peace, at least within societies, are possible through the active, effective and rational provision of civil society, deliberative participation and political pluralism, and to the extent that their areas of activity are expanded, social peace and security are achieved. It seems quite logical to claim that the sustainability of developmental welfare can also be achieved.

However, although it is a practice implemented today, especially in the developed democratic countries of the West, unfortunately it does not

seem possible to say that modern policy-making methods such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, which are the subjects of this study, are expanding their field of activity day by day. It would not be wrong to say that the main reasons for this lie in the fact that the development and development levels of the international community are not similar and close to each other, and in fact, this situation is desired wholeheartedly, so to speak, due to neo-colonial phenomena such as capitalism, neoliberalism and globalization, in order to maintain modern exploitation policies. and will not be exaggerated. However, these issues will not be discussed in detail here, as they go beyond the main purpose of this study and are the subject of another study.

In this sense, it is possible to say that creating and developing politics locally and at the center has always involved great difficulties from ancient times to the present. There are different reasons for this, beyond social, in fact they are primarily political. As a matter of fact, this situation, which is related to the abstract and relative theoretical concepts of political theory such as "power", "power", "sovereignty", can be understood as the result of a person who - for example - wishes to rule (government) in society for political, regime and ideological reasons. It is directly related to the motivations of a group, a group of elites, a privileged-elite group or a political party not to give up or lose their power and power to govern the state and the people. Therefore, it is possible to say that their political, regime and ideological supporters will not display the will and attitude to give up the power they have somehow seized.

The basic fact and parameter that affects the dosage of this will and attitude is one of the very important abstract and relative concepts of political theory called democracy. Why is it so important? Because the phenomenon of democracy, as the main factor in this struggle for power and power that we are talking about, is the ability of the rulers elected locally and at the center to adjust the dosage of their desire, desire and attitude to be politically powerful and to have power, and to ensure that the elected rulers get the most votes from the society in the political elections at the local and center. It has a very important place in the context of showing interest and concern for the rights, law, wishes and demands of those who exhibit minority status with

political, regime and ideological motives (in other words, by gaining the majority), taking into account, listening-learning, negotiating and ultimately realizing. For this reason, the phenomenon of "democracy", which is one of the implementation methods of the Republican political regime, is a very important concept in terms of ensuring social peace at the highest level, closest to perfection, in the context of identity, gender, race, belief, culture, rights and freedoms.

However, in our opinion, it is one of the most prominent phenomenal concepts of the 20th and 21st centuries, which generally means "government of the people" (Demos-kratein: sovereignty of the people, exercise of power) (Schmidt, 2002: 13), and its basic principles in the literature are equality, The definition and explanation of the phenomenon of "democracy", which can be counted as freedom, political representation, political participation, political party formation, free press and fundamental rights and freedoms, freedom of thought, expression and conscience (Demir, 2010: 597), is actually that easy for us. In our opinion, democracy, in addition to the theoretical and practical principles and principles written in the literature, actually includes love, respect, good will and tolerance, which should be present in all segments of society and on all sides. It consists of five basic principles that can be described as empathy and empathy. In this context, it is possible to say that the phenomenon of democracy is actually a matter and understanding of "mentality", just like secularism. Because, as has been simply accepted and defined for decades in Turkey, secularism is neither simply "separation of religion and state affairs" nor democracy easily "general, free and equal right to vote, competition between parties, healthy access to information, thought, thought, freedom for all citizens." It is a form of government in which administrators have the opportunity to come and go by election regularly, thanks to the freedom of opposition and coalition and the right to vote (Schmidt, 2002: 21).

4.2. On Relations between Democracy, Civil Society, Negotionalism and Pluralism

On the contrary, as it found its meaning in Habermas (2002: 23-24) and is directly related to the five basic democratic principles we accepted above, democracy is not only the principles listed by Schmidt, but also the principle of "rule of law" of

the democratic management bureaucratic modern state. It should not mean that it is controlled through At the same time, deliberative participation in political decision-making processes at the local and central levels, which provides supervision, control, balance and pressure from the bottom up, in other words, vertically from the public sphere to the political sphere, and horizontally within both the public and political spheres, through civil society and NGOs. The existence of a "public communication space" that will realize communication is a necessary condition for a democratic administration to be established between the state and society (Demir, 2010: 600). However, civil society and its organizations must be independent and autonomous from the state and political authority. This is the most important condition for formation of NGOs. As a matter of fact, as contemporary Slovak thinker Slavoj Žižek (Quoted in Diez and Roth, 2010: 60) emphasizes, "One of the most disgusting situations is when what you secretly dream of is imposed on you from outside by force. A dream come true has a beautiful name: nightmare." What is emphasized here is that civil society and its institutions are dictated to the demos by the ruling classes from above and from outside. In this case, both civil society and the independent, autonomous and democratic participation that it envisions and dreams of will turn into a complete paradox. Thus, it is seen that this participation paradox deeply affects many independent non-governmental organizations, in short, democratic mass organizations, which form the ecology of the crises in democratic practices observed today even in highly democratic Western countries (Weizman, 2013: 13).

As a matter of fact, the ultimate legitimacy of the modern state power, which implements pluralistic, rational, rational, fair and honest legal authority and provides legitimacy through these, is achieved not only through laws, but also through normative principles established on a framework of rationality that envisages deliberative participation based on "dialogue and communication". should also be evaluated. In this sense, the legitimacy crisis of the liberal democratic understanding of government arises from its style of action limited to the principle of "rule of law" (Demir, 2010: 601). As a matter of fact, in this sense, as emphasized by Habermas (2002: 24), in order for the democratic process to develop in real terms, the people of the state

"...must have the opportunity to express, within a legal framework, what belongs to them as a group in relative proportions, spiritually, socially and politically."

Therefore, elected officials represent the three indispensable democratic phenomena that lie between the private spheres of individuals in a society and the local and central political spheres of the rulers - both horizontally and vertically - in other words, civil society, deliberative participation and their natural result, pluralism can accept and adopt democracy to the extent of the importance they attach to it, the faith and respect they show for it, and the extent to which they comply with it wholeheartedly and fairly, and thus, they can keep under control, balance and suppress the power and power to rule and govern, which they so passionately want to possess. In order for the elected administrators and political regime in a society to be democratic, they must fully comply with the tendencies of the entire people (Erdoğan, 1999: 205).

In this manner, we should put forth 3 basic fields in the today's modern-democratic societies: first layer at the bottom of the pyramid is "*Private Area* (encompassing individuals' private living spaces)". Above that is the second layer which is "*Public Sphere* (encompassing civil society, civil participation, deliberative participation, the area where pluralism exists locally and at the center). And above this, at the top point of the pyramid stands the third layer which is "*Political Field* (encompassing the area where elected political and bureaucratic administrators exist locally and at the center). Then, this is exactly why the extent of being democratic for politicians and administrators at the local and central levels in a state can be easily measured by the respect and importance they give to civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism. Therefore, from past to present, political decision-makers in some countries have sometimes used civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism without taking them into account or respecting them; Discourses such as "I did it to anyone, it happened", "I will do it to anyone, it happens", "I will do it whether they want it or not" show how unhealthy and unhealthy the democratic culture in those countries and societies, in other words, civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, is. It shows that you are weak and fragile.

For this reason, democracy has been one of the most beautiful, but also one of the most troublesome concepts of the phenomenal phenomenon known as “politics”, which has been one of the world’s biggest headaches for almost 8000 years. Because politics, as a social phenomenon, is a paradigm that must always produce solutions to all problems, conflicts, disputes and conflicts that arise due to the ever-changing society, and therefore can change at any time. This paradigm, which we have seen going bankrupt from time to time in history, in other words, the phenomenal phenomenon called “politics”, has been one of the most important and effective factors of the social from the moment it first emerged approximately 8000 years ago in the period of humanity known as barbarism in the history of civilization (Şenel, 2019) until today. has been. The main reason for this is, as Heywood (2006: 21) defines it, the phenomenon of politics, which is interesting and has a sole focus on people because people are in conflict with each other, and therefore includes all individuals, families, groups, communities, states, interstate organizations, etc. In this way, it essentially deals with, and in fact has to deal with, “society” and all kinds of events, conflicts, problems and conflicts of the society. Therefore, politics (politics), as a word that came into Turkish from Italian (politica), is included in the Dictionary of Western Origin Words in Turkish by the Turkish Language Association; Although it is defined in its classical contexts such as “The art of organizing and conducting state affairs, politics, policy”, “Method”, and figuratively, “Carrying out one’s business by means such as flattering the emotions of others, taking advantage of their weak points or disagreements in order to achieve a goal” (TDK, 2015). In fact, politics is primarily and absolutely a social phenomenon. In other words, since politics is about everything that concerns society, it is a phenomenon that we cannot actually eradicate from our daily lives; especially in this age of information and technology that modern societies have reached today.

Today, because of the information, communication and transportation technologies available to most of us living in modern societies, it is not possible for us to remain insensitive, unaware or unresponsive to social events, developments, problems, controversies, disputes and conflicts. However, the main problem here is about what kind of situational awareness we develop against them or how we

react to them. For this reason, as described by Aristotle (1941: 1113, 1129) about 2300 years ago, human beings, who are “a political animal” - as a part of society - must be directly involved and related to every problem of society, so that one day, to prevent a negative situation from the very beginning if possible... What we mean is that people in modern societies have three basic areas: private sphere, public sphere and political sphere. Today, due to representative democracy, which liberal-democratic parliamentary and secular (contemporary) societies adopt and accept as a form of political administration both at the center and at the local level, citizens generally become members of parliament, congressmen, senators, etc. They cannot find a place for themselves in the political arena where they elect and send their representatives.

For this reason, the individual, who is the main subject of the public sphere, can have the ability of politics to create social policy by ensuring his relationship with the political sphere in two basic ways. The first of these is civil society and its healthy existence in a state and a political regime. Because the stronger the civil society phenomenon, which is directly linked to the democratic development and democratic culture of a society, is in a state, theoretically it can be said that democracy is strongly established and implemented in that state. Likewise, civil society is directly related to social contract and representation. In this context, the social contract envisaged by the famous British political philosopher John Locke can be given as an example of the “representative” type of social contract understanding (Hampton, 1986: 256). As a matter of fact, in Locke, the transition to civil/political society also means the transition to a life with political power, that is, a transition to social life (Cohen and Arato, 1992: 88-89). Adam Smith, criticizing mercantilism and starting from the point that a market in which the state does not intervene is a more effective way to ensure national welfare and the wealth of nations, defines civil society as an area separate from the state and organized by the market (Ehrenberg, 1999: 97). Therefore, the tendency to define civil society as a field outside the state, which started with Locke and continued with Smith, reaches its end with Hegel (Gordon, 2000: 85). Hegel completely separates family, state and civil society from each other and treats civil society

as the theory of a differentiated and complex social order (Pelczynski, 1984: 1).

As a matter of fact, Hegel foresees three different ethical areas: family, civil society and state, each of which establishes and affects the life of the individual on different levels: While love, respect and tolerance direct the relationships in the family, personal interest directs civil society. The state is the organic unity of political life; It is the synthesis of thesis (family) and antithesis (civil society) (Hyppolite, 1969: 109). In Hegel's scheme, civil society is defined as a network between the state and the family that covers all relations in this area, and as a system of social relations in which individuals participate as economically free and independent persons (Kortion, 1984: 198). The main motivator of relations in this field is the "need" that makes mutual relations between people mandatory (Kaynar, 2005: 348). Therefore, it is important to emphasize the following point at this point. Civil society is a very important social-public layer that must take place between the individual-family and the state (political sphere) in a democratic society. And more importantly, the more healthy and intense this requirement can be met, the more healthy it is possible to talk about the state-individual relationship. In other words, civil society is a multi-transitive special social layer where the individual can establish relations with the state living in the political sphere, communicate his problems, make his voice heard, convey his demands, control, suppress and balance the political sphere (state) when necessary. Civil society is a fluid-permeable transparent layer, almost jelly-like, playful and flexible, existing between individuals, families, groups and the state. Therefore, the more this layer can exist, the more useful it will be for individuals, families and groups in their work of balancing, suppressing, controlling, pushing towards what is right-good, what is for the benefit of the people, accountability, accountability and public transparency against the state. So, in a state, all kinds of NGOs, associations, confederations, unions, chambers, etc. The stronger and more numerous the civil society, which consists of public benefit structures, is, the more it is possible to talk about democracy and its practices in that state. However, the most important point here is that non-governmental organizations must be autonomous and have no financial-political-financial ties with the state. Otherwise, in

accordance with the aphorism "he who pays calls, calls the whistle", if the financial resources of an NGO are somehow supported by the state, that is, from the political sphere, that NGO cannot be expected to act independently and autonomously within civil society. Thus, individuals, families and groups are not able to protect their rights and interests against the political sphere, nor are they able to try to balance, suppress and keep the political sphere under control.

In democracies, on the horizon of the concept of "participation" lies its absolute extreme, in other words, cooperation. In general, in most democracies today, "elected" ruling elites, political decision-makers and politicians do not think of the concept of cooperation as the alignment of one's actions with the goals and actions of governments, whether by force or beauty, whether that power is political, military or economic, or a combination of all of them. They are inclined and accepting. The historical reminders here are clear: This empirical "democratic" situation has been presented to us as the best for the demos in democracies from past to present. This citizen alignment of democracies is often justified by arguing that it is a tragic, yet commonsensical solution to any border problem. Therefore, the participation/cooperation impasse in democracies is a sign of a closed system in which the options available and those offering the options cannot be challenged. As a matter of fact, a series of options to force the subject to submit can be presented in such a way that "free-subjects" who make their choices aiming to mitigate the harm can ultimately serve the purposes of the government. Therefore, since participation raises a series of political and ethical dilemmas, it is necessary to examine with an open mind the alignment of forces around the arena in which participation is called. It is possible to say that the participation paradox deeply affects many independent non-governmental organizations that form the ecology of today's crisis. In fact, there is a tactical compromise at the heart of participation paradoxes; However, this compromise often breaks down and becomes a structural impossibility; Thus, it intertwines the state and the opposition, mostly the minority (in other words, those with more than 50 percent of the votes and those with fewer votes) in a mutual embrace, and turns non-governmental organizations into de facto participants of a

widespread and expanded governance system (Weizman, 2013: 13-14).

However, Miessen (2013: 15) states that sometimes a democracy that includes everyone should be avoided at all costs; It also suggests that the main reason for this is that overcoming problems, conflicts and conflicts of interest in any collaborative structure, network or institution and moving to a peaceful and collectivist practice can ultimately only be possible if someone takes responsibility. This is true, of course, in constitutional-parliamentary democracies based on representation, the demos elects its own representatives in democracy, wants them to take all kinds of political responsibilities in the context of political governance in central and local governments as political decision-makers, and temporarily gives this responsibility to those who will govern by proxy. However, the main problem at this point stems from the fact that the entire demos does not want to give this political management responsibility to the elected majority representatives. Because, when the demos, which sees itself as the majority, and the political decision-making elite and appointed bureaucrats, who see themselves as representatives of this majority demos, take the responsibility of management, they can overcome problems, conflicts and conflicts of interest in any collaborative structure, network or institution on the way to solving social problems. and stays close to the desires, desires, opinions, demands and feelings of the majority in order to transition to a peaceful and sharecropper practice; This situation eliminates the "innocence of participation", which starts from the first step of general or local elections and is indispensable for democracy.

As a matter of fact, Miessen (2013: 33-34) points out that participation is often presented and defended as a false nostalgic desire. Because participation styles can also be populist and can be used in this way. For example, referendums not only strengthen democracy; It is also possible to erode. In the current ideological crisis, referendums have been favored by established parties who fear making unpopular decisions. Politicians and elected representatives postpone the moment of taking responsibility for their own actions through referendums, while they are expected to decide on behalf of the demos, which gives them the power to

decide. They don't even need to have a vision or idea about an issue they ask everyone about. Unfortunately, referendums do not generate ideas either. It just follows exactly the relationship between the majority and the minority. The erosion of democracy starts from within, the fuel of the erosion is false consensus - which eliminates the innocence of participation. Such dilution of the democratic model is very dangerous and enables - and to some extent even supports - the rise of hegemonic, authoritarian and majoritarian political extremism of the "I did it and done it whether they wanted it or not" type.

However, in many democracies today, participation has become a radical chic; It is a very fashionable chic among politicians who want to ensure that the tool itself is considered critical rather than producing critical content. In such a context, participation becomes a mode of generating vitality. It acts as a social pacifier, not in terms of the potential of the decisions that the demos can take, but in terms of withdrawing the ground for actively criticizing the actions of decision-makers and representatives. This leaves us with the intuition that the concept of horizontal organization, although it is presented as something valuable today, is mostly used as political capital by those who propose it. What seems most problematic is the politically correct tolerance that permeates even people who consider themselves critical - people often do not speak out so as not to jeopardize their carefully planned career plans; exactly in lines 4-6 of WB Yeats's (1963) poem titled "Memory". As he describes in his verses; *"Because the grass on the mountain has no choice but to preserve the shape of the place where the mountain hound lies."* (Quoted in ATTAC, 2012: 22) The purpose here is not to attack or criticize political correctness per se. However, participation has become such an absolute will to a practice of unconsciousness that the active actor, who should be criticized for his decisions, has become the representative of the tastes and decisions of a hypothetical majority. In such a regime, almost no one can muster up the courage to break the line and say, *"Wait a minute, there is something strange here, let's think again!"* cannot say (Miessen, 2013: 35).

5. CONCLUSION

For all these obvious reasons and detections, deliberative participation at the local and central

levels is one of the indispensable rules of democracy in order to break the hegemony and pluralistic ego of the majority over the minority - no matter what - and to ensure social peace and consensus by minimizing social conflicts and problems. Because in local governments, generally elected politicians, appointed bureaucrats and technocrats, in any administrative action they take within the boundaries of the municipality's area of responsibility, assume political superiority as the administration and with the attitude and claim that we know best, the local people living there (in fact, the voters who elect them) will not be able to do anything that the municipality plans to do. They never consult the opinions of the people living and residing in that area for a local government activity. This is not the case in northern European countries such as Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark and Germany. In the geographies in question, local administrators communicate and negotiate with the local people to the maximum extent with the laws, regulations and directives dictated to them from the center, and put great pressure on the local people living in that region to ensure maximum participation in the unilateral decisions that are wanted to be taken by the municipal politicians, bureaucrats and technocrats. They feel and thus try to implement deliberative participation at the highest level so that local people can take part in the decisions to be taken in local governments and civil administrations; because they are already legally obliged and responsible for this (For details on the subject, see Akarçay, 2020; 2019d).

At the same time, this situation constitutes another of the sharpest images of democracy as the possibility of living together. In addition to many rights for the individual, such as the right to be himself in society, to have the right to live as he wishes, to have all the rights due to his lifestyle and not to be excluded, the public and political decisions to be taken in society about himself are also included in both local governments (NGOs, negotiators). participation and pluralism) as well as in the central government (again, likewise through NGOs, deliberative participation and pluralism), to be able to influence, pressure and control them, in short, to make a decision in one's own interest through a "general consensus" and a "common public mind". You also have the right to ensure that it can be received through, as Kocaoğlu (2017: 29) emphasizes, democracy is a more successful

management practice and form in terms of being defined to enable individuals with different lifestyles to live together, compared to other forms of government. In democracy, the guarantee of human rights and freedoms and the deliberative participation and dialogue processes that involve the interaction of individuals with conflicting values make it possible for individuals with different lifestyles and ideas to live together in social peace.

Going back to Aristotle, as he stated, since humans cannot meet all their physiological and social needs alone, they have to live with other people. This is actually an essential situation. Therefore, man is a political animal, as Aristotle put it. The fact that man is a political animal, living together with others, dictates the choice of a form of government. This has always been the case throughout history. However, people and societies have been subjected to totalitarian, authoritarian, fascist or dictatorial management options from time to time; These have brought nothing but pain, tears, cruelty, terror, terror, oppression, cruelty and even genocide to societies. Because the fascist forms of government we have mentioned have theories and practices that destroy people's differences with their qualities.

However, history has always shown and proven that the form of government in which people can live together with their differences is only possible with a government system and a political regime that accepts people as the goal in the Kantian sense. It should not be forgotten that, in anarchism, which adopts an anti-state ideology, the existence of a minimal state mechanism with the authority to use legitimate force for the defense of individual rights cannot be denied (Nozick, 2006: 23). However, what will be done if the state, while defending individual rights, increases the dose of its power and power - with different ideological motives - and attempts to restrict individual rights? Now this question does not come to mind... At this point, what should be remembered is that every form of government that is concerned about the coexistence of differences benefits from the anarchist tradition that tries to minimize power relations. The phenomenon of democracy, as a form of implementation of the republican political form of government, also benefits from the aforementioned legacy of the anarchist tradition (Kocaoğlu, 2017: 29-30). However, what makes democracy superior to other

styles and forms of political regime implementation is that it enables people to live together with their social, ethnic, identity, gender, racial, religious, cultural and ideological differences.

In this context, the issues we need to emphasize in the last word are as follows. When looking at the term “participation” in the English Wikipedia, two main definitions stand out. The first defines participation as “an umbrella term encompassing the various ways in which the public participates directly in political, economic or managerial decisions.” In the second definition, there is an interesting phrase: “Participation can mean sharing something in common with others.” (For details, see <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participation>) In this context, as Miessen (2013: 41) emphasizes, “participation” is a hypothetical form that supports participatory planning processes or user-participation. It should be understood not as a means of conscious orientation and intrusion into a territory, system, discourse or practice of which one is not usually a part. In other words, participation is a “war”, a “struggle”. Therefore, any struggle for participation is also a conflict between the concepts of “majoritarianism” and “pluralism” or between the “majority” and “minority”, that is, a struggle to seek the democratic rights of the minority somewhere.

Therefore, any society can, in theory, have mechanisms, structures, methods and procedures that can enable differences to live together through democracy. However, it is clear and undeniable that a “good”, “peaceful”, “living well”, “self-confident and healthy” society can exist in practice, in other words, to the extent that democratic principles and principles can be adopted in local and central real politics and reflected on citizen-individuals. It stands before our eyes as a truth. Therefore, today, in some states that are experiencing increasing social and political divisions, conflicts and unrest every year, and where violence, harassment and rape are increasing day by day against sections and sections of society and life that need to be more sensitively observed and protected, such as women,

the elderly, children and nature, social peace is at stake. It is observed that love, respect, tolerance, goodwill and empathy are decreasing day by day.

In addition, this situation results in the absence or very incomplete existence of civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, which are normative policy-making methods and which constitute the main elements of modern democracy today, no matter how strong the economic, military, population, people, geography and political national power elements of the relevant state become. It should not be ignored that it will leave negative effects on social peace that will be difficult to repair by wearing out and weakening the psycho-social and socio-cultural elements, which have become the most important elements of national power today. Therefore, in the context of today’s basic and modern social policy making methods such as civil society, deliberative participation and pluralism, a real democratic order based on good will and respect in society, provided honestly and fairly - at the maximum level - is inevitable and undeniable in ensuring the unity and solidarity of the nation. It should never be forgotten by the ruling elite classes, both local and central, that it will act as a glue. Because in a democratic state that “purposes people”, the real elite is not the “elected-appointed people”, in other words, the representatives, but the nation itself that elects them. This is what the elite sociology of a modern and real democracy requires. Otherwise, perhaps the last word will find the meaning and spirit of its time in the contemporary Slovak thinker Slavoj Žižek (2005: 75); “It is a monument to how incapable people are of expressing their aspirations and discontents and applying them to political visions. They treated people like retarded students who could not comprehend the lessons taught by teachers. Their self-criticism is similar to that of teachers who admit that they cannot educate their students adequately.” (Quoted in Oberndorfer, 2012: 38).

REFERENCES

- Akarçay, Pınar. (2019a). Göçmen Entegrasyonu Sorunlarının Kamu Güvenliğine Yansımaları: İsveç Örneği. Hasan Acar (ed.). *Kamu Güvenliği Politikaları*. (s. 441-474). Ankara: Nobel.
- Akarçay, Pınar. (2019b). Güçlü İsveç'in Arka Planı: Sosyal Demokrasi ve Yansımaları. Tacettin Gökhan Özçelik (ed.). *Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkilerde Seçme Yazılar*. (s. 21-40). Bursa: Ekin.
- Akarçay, Pınar. (2019c). İsveç'te Cinsiyet Eşitliği Politikaları. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 12(1), 1-27.
- Akarçay, Pınar. (2019d). Is More Participatory Governance Possible? A Closer Look At Sweden. *Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(1), 86-114.
- Akarçay, Pınar. (2020). Communicative Planning and Participation in Sweden through Planners' Perspective: Case of Ulleråker Region. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(37), 657-684.
- Aristotle. (1941). *Politics*, in The Basic Works of Aristotle. (Richard McKeon ed., Benjamin Jowett trans. New York: Random House.
- Aristoteles. (1944). *Politika, Cilt I-III*. (Niyazi Berkes, Çev.). İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.
- ATTAC (The Association for the Taxation of financial Transactions and Citizen's Action). (2012). *Kimin Avrupası?: Halkın Avrupası ile Şirketlerin Avrupası Arasında*. (Deniz Banoğlu, Çev.). İstanbul: Metis Siyah Beyaz.
- Cohen, Jean ve Arato, Andrew. (1992). *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Daly, Martin (2000). A Fine Balance: Women's Labor Market Participation in International Comparison. F.W. Sharpf, V.A. Schmidt (eds.). *Welfare and Work in the Open Economy*. (s. 467-510). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Demir, Nesrin. (2010). Demokrasinin Temel İlkeleri ve Modern Demokrasi Kuramları. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 10(2), 597-611.
- Demirović, Alex. (2004). Der Zeitkern der Wahrheit. Zur Forschungslogik kritischer Gesellschaftstheorie. Joachim Beerhorst, Alex Demirović ve Michael Guggemos (eds.). *Kritische Theorie im gesellschaftlichen Strukturwandel*. (s. 475-499). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Diez, Georg ve Roth, Chtistopher. (2010). *What Happened? The 80*81 Book Collection: Part One*, Zürich: Edition Partick Frey.
- Ehrenberg, John. (1999). *Civil Society: The Critical History of the Idea*. New York: New York University Press.
- Erdoğan, Mustafa. (1999). *Anayasal Demokrasi*, 2.b. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Gordon, Robert H. (2000). Kant, Smith and Hegel: The Market and the Categorical Imperative. Frank Trentmann (ed.). *Paradoxes of Civil Society: New Perspectives on Modern German and British History*. (s. 85- 105). New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Gönenç, Özgür. (2007). Küresel Dünyanın Yeni Sömürü Silahı. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 79-91.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (2002). "Öteki" Olmak, "Öteki"yle Yaşamak: *Siyaset Kuramı Yazıları*. (İlknur Aka, Çev.). İstanbul: YKY.
- Hampton, Jean. (1986). *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heywood, Andrew. (2006). *Siyaset*. İstanbul: Liberte.
- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participation>
- Hyppolite, Jean. (1969). *Studies on Marx and Hegel*. (J. O'Neill, Trans.). New York: Basic Books Inc.

- Kaynar, Mete Kaan. (2005). Sivil Toplumun Kavramsal Tarihi ve Sivil Toplumla İlgili Güncel Tartışmalar. *H.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(1), 339-369.
- KA-DER (Kadın Adayları Destekleme ve Eğitim Derneği). (2005). *Eşit Temsil İçin Cinsiyet Kotası: Erkek Demokrasiden Gerçek Demokrasiye*. İstanbul: Acar Matbaacılık.
- Kocaoğlu, Mehmet. (2017). Birlikte Yaşamın İmkânı Olarak Demokrasi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(1), 29-39.
- Kortian, Garbis. (1984). Subjectivity and Civil Society. Zbigniew A. Pelczynski (ed.). *The State and Civil Society: Studies in Hegel's Political Philosophy*. (s. 197-210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miessen, Markus. (2013). *Katılım Kâbusu*. (Bülent Doğan, Çev.). İstanbul: Metis.
- Misik, Robert. (2005). Rettung in der Not. *Taz die tageszeitung*, 7 Haziran. (<https://taz.de/!597989/>)
- Nozick, Robert. (2006). *Anarşi, Devlet ve Ütopya*. (Alişan Oktay, Çev.). 2.b. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Oberndorfer, Lukas. (2012). Kurumlar, Anayasa ve Demokrasi-Demos Neredesin?. ATTAC. *Kimin Avrupası?: Halkın Avrupası ile Şirketlerin Avrupası Arasında*. (s. 38-53). (Deniz Banoğlu, Çev.). İstanbul: Metis Siyah Beyaz.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. (2002). *Çokkültürlülüğü Yeniden Düşünmek: Kültürel Çeşitlilik ve Siyasi Teori*. (Bilge Tanrıseven, Çev.). Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.
- Pelczynski, Zbigniew A. (1984). Introduction the Significance of Hegel's Separation of State and Civil Society. Zbigniew A. Pelczynski (ed.). *The State and Civil Society: Studies in Hegel's Political Philosophy*. (s. 1-13). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. (2002). *Demokrasi Kuramlarına Giriş*. (M. Emin, Köktaş, Çev.). 2.b. Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.
- Şenel, Alaeddin. (2019). *Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi*. 7.b. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Tanilli, Server. (1981). *Uygurluk Tarihi-Çağdaş Dünyaya Giriş*. 5.b. İstanbul: Say.
- Tekin, Arslan. (2017). *Felsefeye Giriş*. 24.b. Ankara: BB101.
- TDK. (2015). *Türkçede Batı Kökenli Kelimeler Sözlüğü*. Haz.: Şükrü Halûk Akalın. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Vaneigem, Raoul. (1983). *The Revolution of Everyday Life*. (Donald Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). London: Rebel Press.
- Weizman, Eyal. (2013). Önsöz-İşbirliği Paradoksu. Markus Miessen. *Katılım Kâbusu*. (s. 13-14). (Bülent Doğan, Çev.). İstanbul: Metis.
- Yeats, W.B. (1963). *The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats*. New York: Macmillan.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2005). Nein? Aber Jal. *Profil*. 6 Haziran (June).

To Cite

Ak, G. (2024). The civil society, negotiational participation and pluralism: "Demos", where are you? *Journal of Sustainable Equity and Social Research*, 1(1), 01-14.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13334648>
