

Public Sphere as Democratic Sphere

Ziba Faeedfar & Yasin Lotfata

Middle East Technical University

E-mail: a.lotfata@gmail.com

Received: November 24, 2018 Accepted: December 12, 2018 Published: December 21, 2018

doi:10.5296/iss.v6i2.14082 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/iss.v6i2.14082>

Abstract

Political public space is more conflicted and stressed. Process of black-balling other actors is dominant here. Other civilian public spaces mean mutual learning and opinion improvement. These two spaces try to affect each other. Civilian public spaces try to affect political public space with political discourses. The only way to determine the willpower of the society is participation. Planning is conducted through this participation which brings democracy concept with. Planning is the participation of the folk in the decision phase. It puts communicative rationality instead of instrumental rationality in decisions to be taken for the community. This newly existing planning concept is based on the principle of consensus creating. All these let the planning turn into a democracy project. Handling the planning in such a concept and bringing together new spatial representation form in transmitting information by regarding spatial changings must be concept of planning of today. This study conducted a brief review on constructing democratic public space.

Keywords: **Key words:** Public sphere, NGO, private space, democratic space

1. Introduction

Separation of private sphere and public sphere emerged as a result of the development of capitalism and strengthening of bourgeoisie. There was historically a separation of private and public in classic Greece society. But, then there is no such a separation in the feudal society. Will of monarch and will of society are equivalent in absolutist regimes. In this case, emergence of the separation of private and public sphere starts with impersonalization of state authority. Emergence of this separation occurred by the efforts of strengthening in bourgeoisie in the post-enlightenment era, ability of protecting and securing its own sphere from arbitrary interventions. Firstly, the private sphere protected against state intervention should be defined in order to better evaluate this development. Bourgeoisie attempted to ensure protection of private sphere from external interventions in four aspects. They include comprehensive right of property, freedoms in commodity and labour markets, religious and ethical beliefs and privacy of family or individual. These are personal rights of privacy which secure private sphere. This sphere was secured by means of civil laws, liberal property style and institutionalization of market mechanism (Dean, 2001).

Activities of individuals in the secured private sphere are gathered in two subsets. Individuals are included in the first subset called as civil society with their individual economic initiatives and labour supply and the second subset is the privacy area of humanitarian and emotional relations of individuals and families (Lotfata, 2014; Duncan, 1989).

Possibility of falling into chaos or anarchy is so high in a society just composed of the actors of private sphere. Mechanisms which would guarantee functioning of the system could not be established. It may not be said that privacy of private sphere is secured in the absence of such mechanisms. This function shall be fulfilled by the public authority, more specifically by the state. The state shall ensure security of private sphere, hold the monopoly of using violence for this purpose and perform the works which may not be fulfilled by the actors of private sphere.

Even though the public authority has some functions superior to private sphere, it is not considered independently from individuals and private sphere. Considering the actions of this public authority requires that it should be grounded by being elected by individuals. If this public authority starts to consider itself as independent, monarchy period would be returned back. A public sphere must exist in order to talk about the existence of a public authority based on individuals and private sphere.

Public sphere is a space of openness (publicity). Individuals express themselves and their opinions in this space of openness (Lotfata, 2008). Individuals must have equal participation in this sphere. Inequalities of individuals shall be put in parentheses and excluded as far as possible in this sphere. Function of this sphere is that it is a space in which critical-rational discussions are made. If individuals fail in establishing such a mutual interaction, public sphere could not accomplish the function of realizing a critical-rational discussion in the subjects concerning the whole society. Gaining a rational orientation in selections of the society would be just possible in this situation. The way of transition from selections of individuals to selections of the society known in practice is to make voting and accepting the

majority vote as a social selection. If a critical-rational discussion is not made in public sphere before this process, so if individuals did not get the opportunity of re-determining their preferences by being influenced by this discussion, then it could not be argued that voting process would reveal selections of the society.

In order to ensure public sphere to gain the character of a space of openness, institutions and organizations which would ensure this must have been developed in the society. They have emerged in different forms and been diversified in time (Ambinakudige et al. 2017). These diversified institutions constitute the public sphere of a society together. They include the parliament, coffee houses, saloons, newspapers and other media etc. Organizations developed to supervise public authority or obtain political power like political parties try to be effective in this public sphere. To have a power in society in such a system is substantially possible by supervising the public sphere. Development of this system occurred under the leadership of bourgeoisie and considerably remained under the control of bourgeoisie. This supervision was established by different ways in the history. They include restriction of the entrance in public sphere with proprietorship at the beginning, the formation of public sphere under its supervision as an organ of state and eventually establishment of a hegemonic supervision not in an authoritarian way but discursively.

The facts that different ways were found in supervision of public sphere and it was formed under the supervision of bourgeoisie may be seen as an indicator that this sphere would be a subject of political struggle (Lotfata, 2012). Effects of this struggle were not just limited by the public sphere, private sphere and public authority changed in character eventually. This change is multi-dimensional. Right to vote was popularized in the whole society and so public sphere was opened to all individuals of society on one hand. On the other hand, economic inequalities emerged in functioning of society forced development of measures against inequality by the state. Intervention of public authority in private sphere occurred. Development of social welfare state began to blur the separation between private and public. Political power started to gain autonomy substantially in nation states compare to the civil society. State began to shape public sphere. While family is mostly made a sphere of privacy, business sphere as another item of the private sphere was concerned in the regulation of public and considerably became a sphere between private and public (Lotfata, 2013; Dewey, 1924).

Transition from a culture discussing on itself to a culture contented with consumption occurred in societies. Public sphere was turned into a propaganda platform that ensures continuance of production of politics and business segments from a platform in which a critical rational discussion is made. This facilitated the determination of public sphere by the state. Public sphere was no more a space of competition and influence but turned into a sphere of conflict of interests. Public sphere started to lose the character of being a platform in which critical-rational discussions are held to the extent that it became conflictual and undertook the function of reconciling the interests (Dunsire, 1973).

Political parties were no more effective instruments which ensure formation of public political will within this transformation and were turned into the mechanisms of providing

benefits for delegates. Protectionism became widespread in the political practice. It removed the role of public sphere of being a critical rational area of discussion for equals, made a sphere in which various protectionism systems are conflicting with to acquire political power and derive benefits (Lotfata, 2013).

Changes in the character of political parties and the loss of the function of public sphere confronted the representative democracy with a significant crisis. This democracy practice was reduced to a process that determines who will use the political power rather than democratizing the formation of political power. After the political power is acquired with this process, it is not possible to name the form of being used in current political party structures democratically (Gofman, 1963).

New ways of searching started to emerge in societies upon changes in private sphere, public sphere, public authority relations and insufficient position of representative democracy. However, transformation being experienced by the nation state phenomenon in globalizing world should also be discussed in order to assess these searches and subject to a more sufficient resolution (Estlund, 1993).

2. Globalization and Pluralism

Nation state phenomenon remains under pressure in two aspects today. One of them is globalization. Borders of countries considerably fail to control knowledge, information, commodity and capital movements now, even though they still have the function of controlling displacement of labor (Ambinakudige et al. 2017). As a result of this, instruments of nation states lost their effectiveness in orienting the national economies. Control established over territory is no more sufficient to establish a control on society. Possibility of determination of identifies by hometowns is gradually declining. The second important development is that the meaning of pluralism started to change. Pluralism having a meaning of compromise of different powers in political field started to fail to satisfy and demands for cultural pluralism began to have a significant position in the agenda of societies. Recognition of different identities, improvement in demand for authenticity by different groups created great doubts in the approaches of nation states in homogenizing the society (Lotfata and Lotfata, 2018). Failure in recognizing an individual or group or recognizing them in a distorted way means to imprison them into a lower degree of existence in the society and creates a form of pressure. Permission for living of differences together started to come to the forefront rather than the functioning of representative process in definition of democracy. These developments in the issue of nation state are as significant as requiring a review in the concept of public sphere. It started to be noticed that talking about multi public spheres for a nation would be appropriate instead of talking about a single public sphere. If the effectiveness of a single public sphere is accepted in society, it would be easier to supervise the public sphere and identify with it for the state. This would lead the democracy to fail in responding to pluralist demands in the society. It does not allow socialization of public sphere (Lotfata, 2015).

NOG's have clearly come to the forefront in the world. NGO's may be interpreted as the increase in the number of public spheres in scope of the analysis we made until here. Each

NGO may be considered as a small public sphere. Individuals or other actors having similar concerns and passions in the society come together in order to actualize a wish they reached a consensus on. They gather their own resources, thoughts and efforts for the subjects they have reached a consensus in this small public sphere they created and try to realize it. It may not be thought that these individuals having the freedom of spending their income for private consumption goods would not have the freedom of spending their income for a collective consumption they defined by their own through coming together. Namely, NGO's receive their legitimacy from private sphere. Actually, public authority created with representative democracy has to receive its resource from private sphere (Fishkin, 1997).

The public sphere that ensures functionality of representative democracy enclosing the whole society may be named as political public sphere shortly. Creation of a number of small public spheres by NGOs in addition to the political public sphere in a society results from the fact that functioning of political public sphere fails in satisfying individuals. Individuals in the society realize what they cannot individually realize in small public spheres they create by influencing the political public sphere and present this for the use of society. Let us name the mosaic of small public spheres formed by a number of NGOs in addition to the political public sphere in a society as the civil public sphere in short. Actors of the civil society would enable the realization of differences by allowing the actualization of a number and a variety of demands. It cannot be said that development of civil society sphere would no more necessitate political public sphere in the long run by starting from this point. A number of small civil society spheres and subjects realizing their actions would not fulfill the functions expected from them and would create an environment of chaos or impositions in the absence of a political public sphere and a public authority based on this, namely the state (Lotfata and Lotfata, 2018). For this reason, civil society public sphere and political public sphere and subjects of them would improve the quality of democracy only if they exist together and give more satisfactory results for people living in this society.

3. Conclusion

These descriptions come up with governance let new actors except for state such as non-government organizations occur in leading a society. Governance system anticipates that there are actors with action capacity. They have capacity acting when they detect their problems and building partnerships. Therefore, the functionality of the administration depends on their capacity of precepting their problems, claiming their rights and taking responsibilities. That means they must be citizens who have self-ruling capacity.

Nation-state cannot rule its soil borders and here is a homogenous society impossible after the existence of cultural pluralism in societies. In this sense public space is shaped through cultural diversities and global network relationships. Public space turns not only into a structure in which political powers are all together but also a multi-structure in which different social groups experience themselves. New actors in public space appear in public space. One of them is non-government organizations. Non-government organizations are these multi-structured public spaces. And they get their legality from private space. Public space of representative democracy takes its legality form private space, as well but we can

say its public space is political public space. These new existing public spaces are indicator that individuals cannot express themselves in these political public spaces and create their own public spaces.

References

- Ambinakudige, S., Parisa, D., Cappello, G. C., & Lotfata, A. (2017). Diversity or Segregation? A Multi-decadal Spatial Analysis of Demographics of Atlanta Neighborhoods. *Spatial Demography*, 5, 123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40980-017-0034-z>
- Dean, J. (2001). Publicity's secret. *Political Theory*, 29 (5), 624–650.
- Dewey, J. (1924). *The public and its problems*. New York: Holt.
- Duncan, H. D. (1989). *Culture and democracy: the struggle for form in society and architecture in Chicago and the Middle West during the life and times of Louis* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Dunsire, A. (1973). Administrative doctrine and administrative change. *PublicAdministration Bulletin* 15 (December), pp. 39–56.
- Estlund, D. (1993). Making truth safe for democracy. In Copp, D., Hampton, J., & Roemer J. E. (ed.). *The idea of democracy* (pp. 71–100), New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishkin, J. S. (1997). *The voice of the people: public opinion and democracy* (2nd ed.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: Free Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). In McCarthy T., *The theory of communicative action*. (Trans.) Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lotfata, A. (2013). Transformation of Urban Spaces through Time-Space Politics towards Ethical Developing Urban Spaces in Turkey Context. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Political Science*, 13(4).
- Lotfata, A. (2013). Epistemological Differences in Tactical and Strategic Spatial Planning. *Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology Neural & Artificial Intelligence*, 13(1).
- Lotfata, A. (2015). Urban Diversity in the Middle East: A Case Study of Tehran. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijch.v2i1.7887>
- Lotfata, A. (2014). The Role of Sociocultural Practices in the Transformation of sociocultural Practices in the Transformation and Re-structuring of Streets: A Case Study of Bagdat Street in Istanbul, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Lotfata, A. (2008). Effect of Environmental Factors on Behaviors and Learning, in Educational Spaces (Especially Elementary Schools), *Modiriyat Shahri*, No.21.

Lotfata, A. (2012). Socio-Spatial Resilience Strategic Planning Through Understanding Strategic Perspectives on Tehran and Bath. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 6(11).

Lotfata, Y., & Lotfata, A. (2018). Effect of Physical Changes on the Spatial Structure of Historical Area, the Historical District of Urmia City as a Case Study. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v11n4p174>

Lotfata, Y., & Lotfata, A. (2018). Resiliency of Open Public Space (Streets) through Transferring Memory “Graffiti and Wall Arts in the Tehran Streets. *International Journal of History and Scientific Studies*, 1(3).

Lotfata, Y., & Lotfata, A. (2018), Street as Common Space. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijch.v5i2.1347>