



The discourse theory of democracy and public sphere in Habermas's ideas

Amir Masoud Shahramnia
University of Isfahan
Jalal Hajizadeh
Tarbiat Modares University

Received: 15 April 2016 ; Accepted: 15 June 2016

Abstract: Research and scientific explanation about discourse democracy theory of Jurgen Habermas and studying and evaluating reflection and generalization of his philosophical and epistemological principles are objectives which the researcher follows in this research. From this view, there is studied representation of concepts and categories such as cognitive interests, communication action, discoursing ethics, an ideal situation of the speech, and public sphere as the most prominent components and principles of his democracy. These concepts were chosen and studied, because of their importance and situation of this topic in order to represent the logical relations between epistemology principles of Habermas and its resulted criteria and teaching with his democracy model. Therefore, it is tried that by searching thoughts and representing Habermas theoretical collection, there is clarified and identified democracy principles and criteria and its distinctive and theoretical components, besides analyzing discursive Democracy model of Habermas and its capabilities in analytical–descriptive perspective and library studying. The researcher believes that the considered discourse democracy of Habermas has the deep philosophical roots, and it is considered as a part of knowledge foundation and a methodology focused on emancipation. He processes discursive Democracy in a wide public sphere, by relying to Ethics of Discourse, considering higher reasoning and by critical reading from modern rationality in the frame of communicative rationality concept, as which its objective and nature is a emancipation idea. Findings of this research show these political opinions and thoughts of Habermas have been resulted and affected from principles of his philosophical frame. Therefore, epistemological strong tracks of Habermas have been reflective in his appropriate democracy.

Keywords: Deliberative Democracy, public sphere, communicative action, ideal speech situation, Ethics of Discourse

Introduction

Dignity and mission of democracy and its

principles and teachings as "the major political idea" is clear for all people in the contem-

*Email: j_hajizade81@yahoo.com

porary societies. This matter is more important when democracy teaching is considered as one of the oldest governmental forms in political thoughts, which it has been researched by political philosophers. 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). His structured efforts for establishing philosophical & political cornerstone of democracy must be paid attention. Many of the criteria and teachings considered by this political thinker, including action and communicative rationality and ethics of discourse provide a particular dimension of policy from this perspective. Habermas efforts to establish discourse consensus through optimizing rational debate in public field and by relying to the higher reasoning. According to epistemological approach of Habermas, legitimacy of any consensus requires free participation of all citizens in public sphere and without any force & mandatory (Habermas, 1985:84). However, Jurgen Habermas as one of the most famous remain philosophers of the Frankfurt School has carried out increasing efforts for restructuring concepts and theories which he believes the contemporary societies are involved with them. The reconstruction is his theoretical tool in this field. The democracy is considered as one of these reviews for this purpose.

It is tried to consider the philosophical and epistemological principles of Habermas by relying to theoretical identifications and

then his deliberative democracy and their effects are a representation and evaluated beyond that findings. So the scholar efforts to guide to a correct and logical result by a philosophical – political attitude, relying to documentation studies as well as by using a descriptive analytical method. For this reason, the following theory which it is considered as a cornerstone of this writing has been provided by this question: What is the basis of democracy in Habermas political thoughts and how was his philosophical – epistemological approach effect in providing the deliberative democracy model?

" Researcher believes that:"Philosophical approach of Jurgen Habermas and his theoretical principles (such as a communicative action, ideal speech situation, public sphere, ...) have formed and extended the deliberative democracy theory. "

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.

Habermas Discursive (or Deliberative) Democracy

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 – experimental 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 knowledge's: the tool knowledge, the hermeneutical knowledge and freedom knowledge. With the little thinking, it can be found that Habermas criticism from formal democracy (liberal capitalism) and his theory about discursive (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, 2005: 165). From this perspective discursive 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. In 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, in 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.

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 discursive 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.

There fore, he separates and explains some models of democracy, in chapters 7 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 much confusion 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 Giddens, 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 (Giddens, 2007: 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.

Typology of Triple Cognitive Interest Theory

According to Habermas perspective, human beings create and discover the world with their thought and action simultaneously. Like Horkheimer, Habermas believes that cognition is a creator of historical thought, and it is limited by the human interests and advantages (Habermas, 1994B:59).

Relation of cognition with human action has been designed and, provided in the form of cognitive interests and in knowledge constitutive interests in his two important works, i.e. human cognition and interests as well as theory and practice. In this respect, the distinction between three types of interests is very important in cognition viewpoint in Habermas opinions:

1. The first interest is a human interest to control the nature. He takes it in natural sciences or empirical – analytical field. Habermas confirms that in this field, our attitude is an instrumental attitude essentially. Monitoring and dominating on the nature toward our interests and advantages are goals of all scientific researches even in the field of theoretical sciences. Such an attitude is considered for experiences classic schools.

2. The second cognitive and total interest of human is hidden in the process of mutual understanding from routing life trend. Understanding this matter requires ignoring pre-justice, and prejudices resulted from philosophical tradition of liberalism (English), which human beings are considered with natural events, and they are understood by using an united epistemology.

3. The third type of cognitive interests is originated from thoughts of German philosophy, especially Hegel and Marx philosophy. Reliant hermeneutics based on thinking and

critical hermeneutic is affected by this matter. (Habermas,1995:282-286)

Relation of triple science and their related

epistemological in the different existing field based on social interfaces can be shown in chart1:

Chart 1:

Triple cognitive interests in diverse existing fields.

| Cognitive interests and advantages | Science type | Recognition | Social interface | Field / domination |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Technical supervision | Natural sciences (empirical – analytical) | Instrumental knowledge | Work | Nature |
| Operational | Historical – hermeneutic | Science knowledge | Language | Society |
| Freedom | Critical sciences | Freedom knowledge | Power | History |

(Habermas, 1995:285)

According to the above chart, final goal of Habermas from the freedom characteristic of dialogue democracy and effort to create an ideal speech situation coordinate with a third level of his epistemology. It is a critical attitude and hidden basis which it is represented in democracy. In this situation, there is eliminated attitude of positivism to human society and democratic and fair relations of social players. Decreasing human knowledge and interests to positivist level provide a serious problem. Therefore, Habermas tries to save human knowledge from domination of capitalism logic, by providing relation action theory and ideal speech situation category.

Reconstruction of Distorted of Public Sphere and, Providing its Special Democracy

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 system-

atic 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 through 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 that, 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 discursive 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 discursive 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 (Faster, 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 it's 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 discursive Democracy.

Communication Action and Deliberative Democracy

Habermas 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 talks about the process of rationality in civilization, cultural rationality and instrumental rationality, and he wants to provide a new description about culture in the Marxism School. A Description which it doesn't decrease the culture and knowledge to economic processes. In addition, the culture field isn't a secondary reflection of production dimension, but it has the special internal logic. Habermas introduces three theories and believes that they are useful for developing human kind. These three theories are based on cognitive interest. In other words, Habermas believes that human rise the knowledge level, in order to gain access to a special objective, and these objectives show human interesting to the special knowledge, and its path in the future will provide interesting.

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.

In this regard, Habermas makes a distinct between two action types:

1. Strategic action, 2. Communication action. The first type is a targeted – rational action; while the communication action wants to receive an understanding. It can be used from communication action as a tool, but when there is created on an equal. This action will be non-instrumental. For example, in a transaction, when parties don't impose any matter to each other, the opposite side can select "yes" or "no" as action, based on his calculations. If there is used communication action as a tool for imposing to the other party, we can see instrumental type of communication action. Aim of strategic action is to receive to objective; but aim of communication action is that access to a communication understanding. Habermas distinct between rationality of social system and rationality of the life world. While social rationality requires to institutionalize a normative system, rationality of the life world require to this matter that human beings access to a fair agreement, not they gain access to this agreement under external powerful forces. According to Habermas, it is possible that one or more claims will be problematic. (Tompson, 1987:89) Therefore, there is possible to question claims of consensus background. It is a type of Communication action theory and it wants to discover human relations. Habermas calls this type of sciences reconstructor as a public pragmatic. One main base of communication action is its relation with a type of rationality which Habermas calls it as communication action. (Habermas, 1995:100-102). This type of action will be studied wider than instrumental rationality which all people can select this type of discourse. In this regard, rationality is related to an agreement. Habermas relates the rational action to communication one and

then relates both to discourse consensus. According to Habermas, access to an agreement is an inherent objective of human self – discourse (Lessnaff, 2001:445). Developing field of communication rationality requires developing vocal and communication abilities. Habermas access to an ideal speech situation from here, which there is implemented necessary vocal and communication abilities to create a rational world. Therefore, field of political activity in a capitalism system is without any domination. Discussion about philosophical – political thoughts of Habermas is very important, even when the agreement is imminent always.

Role of the Epistemology of Discourse Ethics in Deliberative Democracy

One of the most important worries of Habermas was to evaluate results and consequences of communication action and discourse ethics in public fields of capitalism democracy.

The democracy resulted from discourse ethics based on communication rationality in public field is the major concept logic of Habermas. 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). According to his reasoning, creating dialogue ethics requires two theories: a) claims of normative credits with cognitive means which it can be considered them as a fact – word claims, b) creating norms and guides require to pull them from an actual dialogue, and it isn't possible in a single way, i.e. as a form of a process of reasoning which it flows as supposed in the mind. Therefore, dialogue ethics don't have any identified direction about content, but it is a process: practical dialogue (Outhwaite, 1995:86). And in the same time, it focuses on

access to consensus. His major question was that how it is possible to rational discussion and understanding about the public affairs and democratic decision – making. Finally, eliminate domination of activist relations requires to develop an ethical process. His ethical theory doesn't provide a solution for ethical problems (Fishkin, 2009:65). The result of his ethical theory is that he has ignored the idea of ethical facts in values, and considers it as obtainable knowledge and intra-finding abilities of the process of human being's social completion.

Relation of Ideal Speech Situation and Habermas Deliberative democracy

Availability reason and property of social criticism in thoughts are objective about access to development. From completion communication action theory, social development is observed in finding conditions and situations which every member of society participates in social affairs equally, i.e. temporary finding which communication doesn't deviate in it. Here, Habermas explains the ideal speech situation. Appropriate situation of talking and hearing is the origin of equality and participation, thus its providing leads to the possibility of criticism from inequalities and in justices resulted in inappropriate distribution of power in society. Philosopher and social theorist Jurgen Habermas argued that the idea of achieving a “rational consensus” within a group on questions of either fact or value presupposes the existence of what he called an “ideal speech situation.” In ordinary speech situations, people commit themselves to the truth of the assertions they make; in particular, they implicitly claim that their assertions can be vindicated in an “ideal speech situation”—a dialogue that is completely free and uncorked, in which no force

prevails but that of the better argument (White, 1989:185).

In such a situation, participants would be able to evaluate each other's assertions solely based on reason and evidence in an atmosphere completely free of any non-rational “coercive” influences, including both physical and psychological coercion. Furthermore, all participants would be motivated solely by the desire to obtain the rational consensus, and no time limits on the discussion would be imposed. Although difficult if not impossible to realize in practice, the ideal speech situation can be used as a model of free and open public discussion and a standard against which to evaluate the practices and institutions through which large political questions and issues of public policy are decided in actual democracies. (Elster, 1998:45).

Creating an ideal speech situation which can provide expression freedom, writing freedoms, and other civil freedoms for society, transform using criticism as a weapon for fighting with force and money. Furthermore, in a society which social inequalities have been balanced by establishing justice, deviation of communications will be decreased. It means that criticism access to a normative performance as safeguarding civil achievements and developing social freedoms and laws (Young, 1995:114). This mutual action is ideal speech situation and social / modernism development which it guarantees majority participation facilities in administrating the public affairs and decreasing the main inequalities. Habermas lists lack of freedom and mean about systematic risks for communication infrastructure, which there is carried out complex process of regeneration through it. Two trends which thread this communication infrastructure, and they reinforce each other include: a) implemented thing-like systemat-

ically, b) cultural sterile (Wheate, 2001:184). Habermas enters to democracy territory by providing ideal speech. This theory is more generalized than other theories of Habermas. He believes that the current society is a sick society which it is resulted from lack of understanding or distorted communication (Habermas, 1970:25).

He considers the root of this sick exactly and explains that field of power and wealth, which is resulting from instrumental rationality, dominates the field of mind, consensus, and understanding, i.e. cultural rationality. By this attitude, he wants to explain a situation which it can provide saving human health communication. 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).

Since intending to freedom requires obtaining not distorted knowledge (regardless of ideology) in "dialogue without sovereignty", at least possibility of negotiate should be available in community even though it has a damaged ideology. However, methodology's rules cannot be distorted rather it is related to

its applications. As Habermas argues, intending to autonomy, responsibility and freedom not considered as an impression simply, because it can be understood as a prediction.

Language is a thing that motivates us above of nature, and also we can understand its nature. Through the structure of languages and interaction, we can achieve freedom (Pilot,2008:540).It is necessary to mention that discussion in foundation of philosophical – political thoughts of Habermas play an important role, even the agreement remains imminent.

It is remarkable that discussion has the importance and fundamental role in Habermas philosophical – political thought, even if the agreement remains imminent always. For beginning and continuing the discourse, language should be used in a way that field, subjective, intra-subjectivity and objectively to be distinct of each other (MacCarthy, 1973:85-89). All parties who engaging in discourse should be able to recognize the distinction between them and identify and limit it. Furthermore, they should resolve their distinctions their disagreements by a discourse performed in terms of critical reflection which Habermas called discourse speech debate situation show rupture of normal interactions; as an ideal aspect, it is required to delay the restricts of action and postpones all motives except the desire to achieve understanding and cognition(Habermas,1994A:59-64). Habermas believe, communication linguistic action put that default on four credit causes. That what we say is the understandable, correct and true, background consensus of speaker and listener, including the fact that they have these causes implicatively and if necessary, they can justify. In other words, every communication action means that we can receive an agreement about credit of causes. Finally,

Habermas claims that we can recognize the true consensus from the false consensus, if we can get an unrestricted discourse and all actors had equal access to it, in fact, Habermas called this matter "ideal discourse situation" (Outhwaite, 1995:63-64). If necessary, this situation is required to assume from social life that communication created this way. Habermas believes the deliberative democracy is the ideal way. Thus, democracy is a type of political society, which increasing human freedom and perhaps achieves it at the end. When human autonomy will be implemented, democracy occurred, but in the modern states, the idea of sovereignty was forgotten and its gravity is transferred to management and parties from parliament. A total interest of heterogeneous is possible and extendable in consensus. Habermas wants a formal ideal of the situation that differences resolving with the rational manner and through a free communication which the force of reasoning can overcome in his desired pattern (Pusey, 1987:95). Based on Habermas idea, maintaining consensus and cohesiveness is depending on cultural context basically, in which world views can justify it. Habermas believe including formal conditions for admission of backgrounds and arguments, which cause legitimacy of institutions able to create consensus and motivations (Habermas, 1995:184). This level of justification is essential for supporting from traditional and pre-modern societies, which have to regulate the structure.

As it can be seen, Habermas theory relies on the concepts and theoretical basis of his intellectual range that means it is related to the ideal discourse situation. Activists have an agreement in the ideal situation without any coercion and domination towards freedom interests. It is estimated as consequent result and discursive Democracy.

Conclusion

Habermas believes that the solution of solving problems in the current sick society is to provide understanding and extending communication action between human beings, meanwhile he confirms to provide exact and valid evaluations and solutions against shortcomings in the agreement capitalism societies.

It means that understanding based on cultural rationality and consensus in ideal conditions of appropriate dialogue actions can form the foundation of his democracy theory. From this viewpoint, the central matter in philosophical thought of Habermas is performance method of modern democracies and available problems for its deepening. By using the reconstruction concept, he wants to rethink opinions which they are essentially based on cognitive interests.

Positivism criticism and instrumental rationality which they are relying to the first and second levels of these interests pay his attention to a critical dimension.

Therefore, he tries to provide principles of his best democracy by providing a total and theoretical alternative. Insist on shortcomings of rationality of democratic systems in capitalism societies and challenging their mechanisms takes him toward creating the special ideal situation. A situation which it can provide that field of normative permanent coordination, in one hand, and provide necessary legitimacy by considering participating all activists in a fair discussion. Essentially, this pattern has a discursive dimension, and it has knowledge distinction with consultative democracies and dialogue democracies from this perspective. Evaluating and, considering to components of Habermas thought system provides this conclusion for the researcher that there is the logical closeness between his

theoretical principles and political thoughts. In other words, the most important political matters of Habermas rely on his philosophical – theoretical thoughts. Main point to consider here is that deliberative democracy discourse of Habermas as the most important political category is resulted from his knowledge objectives. According to the obtained results from discussion in the present article, it is clear this fact that beyond ideal deliberative (discursive) Democracy of Habermas it can be considered two points: first, providing conditions of political participation for all human activists based on critical cognitive interests and effort for access the permanent consensus; the second point represents this matter that his democracy discourse and its extending in a society based on different approach has an important place in reconstruction of human relations and transactions and maintains their actual rights. By considering to explanation and evaluation of opinions and thoughts of Habermas, it can be resulted clearly that his democracy theory has been established based on his theoretical and philosophical principles. Clearly this model has uncertainties and limitations, in addition to its appropriate with obstacles and challenges faced on democracy which they have been considered by thinkers. It's ideal properties and metaphysics of principles, and categories are critical considerations which they have been.

References

- Asen, Robert (1999), "Toward a Normative Conception of Difference in Public Deliberation", *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25(winter):115–129.
- Benhabib, Seyla (1992), *Models of Public Space, Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge Mass: MIT press.
- Elster, Jon (1998), *Deliberative Democracy*, Cambridge] u.a. [: Cambridge University. Press.
- Fraser, Nancy (1990) *Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy*, Social Text, and Duke University Press.
- Fleming, Marie *Emancipation and Illusion: Rationality and Gender in Habermas's Theory of Modernity*, Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fishkin, James S. (2009), *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fooladvand, Ezatollah (2008), *philosophy and society and policy*, Tehran, Samt Pub.
- Gidenz, Anthony (2007), *policy, sociology, social theory*, Tehran, translated by Manouchehri Sboori, fourth print
- 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.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1973), *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, trans. T. MacCarthy, Boston, Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1974), "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article, originally appearing in *Lexicon Staat und Politik*, new edition, Frankfurt am Main, 1964, pp.220-226.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1985), "Reason and the Rationalization of Society", in the *Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol.1, Translator by Thomas, Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1994) A, "Three Normative Models of Democracy", in *Con*

- stellation, Vol. I, No: 1, pp.8-20.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1994) *B, knowledge and Human Interests*, Tr. J.Shapiro, Cambridge: polity press.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1995), *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol.1: Reason and The Rationalization of Society*, Tr. T. McCarthy, Cambridge: polity press.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1996), *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law Democracy*, tr. William Rehg, Cambridge, MIT Press.
- 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.
- Hauser, Gerard (1998). "Vernacular Dialogue and the Rhetoricity of Public Opinion". *Communication Monographs* .pp. 83–107.
- Hoolab, Robert (1996), *Jurgen Habermas*, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran, Ney Pub., first print.
- Held, David (1995), *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McCarthy, T.A (1973), "Theory of Communication Competence", *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol.3, pp.56-135
- Nowzari, Hossein Ali (2002), *Reconsidering Habermas: review opinions and thoughts of Jurgen Habermas*, Tehran, Cheshmeh pub., first print.
- Outwait, William (1995), *Habermas: An critical introduction*, Standford University.
- Pusey, Michael (2005), *Jurgen Habermas*, translated by Ahmad Tadian, Tehran, Hermes Pub., second print.
- Pusey, Michael (1987), *Jurgen Habermas*, London, Tavitock.
- Pooladi, Kamal (2007), *history of political thought in 20th century*, collected articles, Mah pub., and first print.
- Pilot, Herald (2008), "philosophy of Habermas history", *critical sociology*, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Hassan Chavoushian, Akhtaran pub., second print
- Ratzinger, Jpseph and Jurgen Habermas (2007), *the Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion*, Ignatius Press.
- Lessnaf, Michel.ch.(2001), *political philosophers in 20th century*, translated by Khashayar Dayhimi, Koochak pub., first print.
- Legitimizing Power?", *Political Philosophy*, University of Ottawa, pp.1-15. From: "www.bu.edu/wsp/Mainpoli.htm"
- Qaderi, Hatam (2006), *political thoughts in 20th century*, Tehran, Samt Pub.
- Shabany, Payrow. Abdollah (2004), "Habermas' *Between Facts and Norms*: Wikipedia (2008), From: (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_sphere)
- Wheate, Steven (2001), *wisdom, justice and modernism: current writings of Habermas*, translated by Mohammad Hariri Akbari, Tehran, Qatreh pub., first print.
- White, Stephen, K. (1989), *The Recent Work of Jurgen Habermas: Reason, Justice and Modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, A.W (1991), "Habermas's Defense of Rationalism", *New German critique*, No35
- 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.