

Armagan Öztürk | Ayhan Bilgin [eds.]

The Transformation of Public Sphere

An Interdisciplinary Debate about
the Recent Development of Publicity in Turkey



Nomos

Politics, Society and Culture in Turkey
Politik, Gesellschaft und Kultur in der Türkei

edited by

Dr. Ayhan Bilgin

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Armagan Öztürk

Volume 1

Armagan Öztürk | Ayhan Bilgin [eds.]

The Transformation of Public Sphere

An Interdisciplinary Debate about
the Recent Development of Publicity in Turkey



Nomos

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

ISBN 978-3-8487-4413-8 (Print)
978-3-8452-8630-3 (ePDF)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-4413-8 (Print)
978-3-8452-8630-3 (ePDF)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Öztürk, Armagan / Bilgin, Ayhan

The Transformation of Public Sphere

An Interdisciplinary Debate about the Recent Development of Publicity in Turkey

Armagan Öztürk / Ayhan Bilgin (eds.)

322 p.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-4413-8 (Print)
978-3-8452-8630-3 (ePDF)

1st Edition 2017

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2017. Printed and bound in Germany.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to "Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort", Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the editors.

The Transformation of Publicity in Turkey: Introduction

This study aims to bring the publicity forms within the recent history of Turkey into question by taking rather the conjuncture after the year of 1980. As it is known, the concept of publicity points to the social interaction spheres which operate on different levels such as visual and printed press, urban spaces, political parties and social movements. The embodiment of public sphere materializes within the (economical, political, cultural, etc.) interventions of different power forms. "Subjectivity" and "Collectivity" are produced and maintained within the public sphere. In capitalist modern society, the public sphere both diversifies as far as possible and transforms into an intense struggle spaces. As it is known, the publicity has an important weight within the deepening process of the pluralist perspective of the concepts of public sphere and civil society towards politics. Public sphere is both a reference point for criticisms towards liberal-capitalist system and analysis framework for social movements and ideological envisagement and an irreplaceable component in the building process of a more pluralistic social-political instance.

Our articles which bring the publicity into question have concentrated in three aspects. These aforementioned publicity paths which each of them correspond to a subtitle are, respectively, violence and neo-liberalism, ideology and historical transformation, and institutions and daily life. First chapter of the book rather consists of the articles which are devoted to the concept of public sphere and the relationship of the publicity with violence and neo-liberalism. It can be said that there is serious relationship between the existence and the characteristics of public life and the fact of violence. Violence restricts the public life by annihilating the actions of organization and speech. In the countries like Turkey in which the repressive apparatus is strong and in which the state and the violence are in a decisive position within the relationships between the state and the society, the non-dynamic and non-active characteristics of the public life is related to the level of this violence in use. The organization of the state in terms of neoliberal principles within the post-1980 conjuncture reveals the political-economic background of the relation of violence-publicity.

First article of both this chapter and the book is written by Murat Satıcı. This article emphasizes primarily on the meaning of the publicity. Accord-

ing to the writer, discussing the publicity means to discuss the characteristics, principles and the practice of a sphere in which the citizens ensure political participation in modern societies, negotiate their common problems and in which the critical discourses apart from and towards the public which implies the state find an opportunity to get into mediation, in short, to discuss the democracy. The writer argues that the publicity is facing both with the consequences which are created by the acceptance of liberal policies and with serious limitations under the negative influence of the perception towards pluralist democracy.

The second article of the chapter belongs to Esin Hamdi Dinçer. The article named "*Lie, Obedience, Violence and Arendt: Political Life in Turkey After 2011*" analyzes the recent era political life of Turkey based on the categories and the conceptualizations of Arendt. According to Dinçer, as it is clearly seen in some political actions such as Gezi events, there is a natural connection between the power and the lie. The deterioration of the public sphere also means something of a deterioration of the truth.

The article of Ali Rıza Taşkale which contextualizes neo-liberalism, violence and public sphere together brings the bio-political control processes within the society under the neoliberal conditions into question. The article which matures with the references to the works of the thinkers such as Simmel, Foucault and Agamben provides clues to its readers about the characteristics of the neoliberal Islam in AKP Turkey.

The last article of the chapter belongs to Ayhan Bilgin. Bilgin who problematizes the relationship between the state, security and the publicity interrogates the dominant point of view which defines the public sphere as the sphere of the state. The article which embraces the relationship between the state and the security with reference to the conceptualization of liberal administration and security of M. Foucault at the first stage focuses on the transformations of approaches the liberal administration towards the security. The article which puts the interaction of the market and the civil society in the center of its analysis within this context, addresses the expansion of the market by redefining of this relationship within the neo-liberal period and the repressive-punitive neo-liberal political administration techniques which feature the controlling and the supervision of the civic public sphere. Finally, the article focuses on the relationship between neo-liberal policies and security in Turkey and reveals the formation course of the neo-liberal security state in AKP era.

The second chapter of the book approaches rather the ideological and the historical transformations. Publicities reflect the social-political envi-

agements and the ideals (ideologies) of the groups who have different daily life experiences. These actors create their own publicities in different forms, for instance, by producing ideologies/ideals of "we" and public spaces. Modern society features the publicity projections and practices of various actors with their conflict/rivalry dimension in it. Ideologies reflect the plurality and the conflictual aspects of these relations within the political sphere in their purest form. In this context, the historical transformation of some ideologies in Turkey also characterizes the transformation of publicity. Besides, there are certain parallelisms between the ideological differentiations that determine the public life and the historical evolution of Turkish modernization. A sociological examination on the centralized power and the periphery reveals the details of this aforementioned transformation.

The first article of the second chapter which is about ideology and the modernity is written by Armağan Öztürk. In his article about civic Atatürkism, Öztürk brings two topics into question: The first matter which is expressed by the writer is the sociological, ideological and the historical problems within the criticisms towards Kemalism. The lack of a critical attitude towards Islamism that is similar to one towards Kemalism caused to the extinction of the secular characteristics of the public sphere and the Islamic transformation which is proceeding today by name of New Turkey. The other topic is about the changing characteristics of Atatürkism. Atatürk-based stance is characterizing a socialistic, democratic and civic opposition focal point against the state for a long time.

The article of Yavuz Çobanoğlu is about the envisagement for publicity of Islamism which wins its hegemony struggle with Kemalism. While Islamist social engineering is transforming the public sphere, the establishment of new moral codes and norms constitutes the ideological background of this aforementioned process.

The third article of the chapter is opened up for discussion by Özlem Denli with the title of "*Hosting the Nation: Populist Themes in Erdoğan's Muhtar Meetings*". The writer aims to analyze populism on the basis of the speeches of Erdoğan with neighborhood representatives. Neighborhood representative meetings have an exclusive position within the power *realpolitik* of recent era as the embodiment ground of populist themes. This study is followed by two articles which analyze the historical adventure of Turkish world of thought and Turkish modernity within the focus of power elites and space. First of these articles is written by Doğançan Özsel with the title of "*Turkish Modernization and the Public Space*:"

Emergence, Expansion and Recent Demise". The writer argues that Turkish modernity did not cause a lasting transformation in the establishment and maintaining forms of the political power relations by contrast with it is assumed in many studies, thus the thesis which claims that "the guardianship administration of bureaucrats and intellectuals beginning from 19th century up to 20th century" is not true. While Özsel points to the differences between the 19th century publicity and the 20th century publicity concerning proving this claim, he thinks that the public sphere deepened and diversified rapidly during the republican modernization process so as to absorb other publicities. However, this process is interrupted with the right-wing hegemony of Erdoğan. The public sphere is becoming arid and monotype gradually.

The article of Efe Baştürk reviews the issue of modernity through a focus as the building of the publicity in periphery. The discursive building of the periphery is actually a kind of alternative publicity creation. The claim of the writer is in the direction of that the periphery did not obtain its qualification of being political by political discourses. The thing that makes the periphery political is the relations, discourse and the identity structures which take place in a completely a-political plane. The experience ground of traditional role patterns of the social sectors those had not been invited to the sphere of modernity and had been excluded as a means of "recognition" and self-conscious comprehension is always the periphery or peripheralized spaces.

The last chapter of our study is about institutions and the daily life practices. While institutions determine the public life, the daily life corresponds to the factors which reproduce the publicity on the level of actions and discourses. The article of Funda Çoban examines the influence of the shopping malls to the diversification of public life by analyzing the publicity in Anatolian cities through shopping malls. This topic involves remarkable outcomes especially in respect to woman publicity.

Arslan Bayram brings the relation of education-publicity into question and expresses that the access to education which is one of the fundamental human rights is no longer a right because of the applied neo-liberal policies. According to the writer, globalization and neo-liberalism privatized the educational system; this situation decreased the level of publicity. In the article studied on football by Yavuz Yıldırım, an argument similar with the sensibility emphasized in the article of Bayram. The writer eloquently underlines the capacity of football fan groups for taking public roles politically and socially. However, this tribune culture which is available to give

political reactions has been transforming into a less public instance by force of the post-industrial conditions.

The study of Hakan Serhan Sarıkaya which analyzes the relation of art and publicity in Republic Turkey is quite considerable in helping us to comprehend the cultural background behind the public sphere. The writer thinks that the transition from a more statist line in terms of the guidance and financing of art events to another perception in which the private sector and bourgeois class become influential, summarizes the Republic era art history in its most general terms. This transition has negative sides as much as positive sides. Finally, while the article brings the artistic actions in Gezi events into question within the context of their public characteristics, it defines the AKP era art policies as a regression compared to past.

Last two studies of our book are devoted to the articles which analyze the relationship between the administrative and political order and the public sphere. The article of Bağçe-Demir comparatively examines the differences between presidential, semi-presidential and parliamentary systems in terms of political rights, democratic culture and freedoms. When it is considered that a constitutional amendment that provides a transition from parliamentary system to presidential system is approved through a referendum, The analyze framework used in the article of Bağçe-Demir becomes much more informative and meaningful.

Finally, we can mention the article of Kutay Aytuğ titled "*Institutional Transformation of Turkey in the Negotiation Process: The Case of Ombudsman*". The writer analyzes the formation and establishment process in terms of both European Union-Turkey relations and the democratization process of the country. The article also emphasizes the fact that the aforementioned institution is an opportunity for a democratic constitutional state.

Armağan Öztürk & Ayhan Bilgin

Content

Violence and Neo-liberalism

- A Debate on Publicity and Turkey's Democracy Notion 13
Murat Satici
- Lie, Obedience, Violence and Arendt: political Life in Turkey after 2011 31
Esin Hamdi Dinçer
- Under Siege: Neo-Liberalism and the Militarisation of Public Space 49
Ali Rıza Taşkale
- Neoliberal Security and the Public Sphere 63
Ayhan Bilgin

The Ideological and The Historical Transformations

- Civic Atatürkism in the Dissolving Process of Post-Kemalism 87
Armağan Öztürk
- Transformation of the Public Sphere in Turkey and Islamism: An Introduction to the Hegemony, Power, Morality and Legitimacy Struggles 103
Yavuz Çobanoğlu
- Hosting the Nation: Populist Themes in Erdoğan's Muhtar Meetings 135
Özlem Denli

Content

Turkish Modernization and the Public Space: Its Emergence,
Expansion and Recent Demise 149

Doğancan Özsel

Epic against Politics: Rejection of the Notion of ‘Public Sphere’ in
the Conservative-Nationalist Ideology 177

Efe Baştürk

Institutions and the Daily Life Practices

Structural Transformation of Anatolian Publicity after the Rise of
Shopping Malls in the Provincial Cities 195

Funda Çoban

Analyses of Right to Education, Privatization of Education and
State’s Education Expenditure in Turkey within the Concept of
Globalization 219

Arslan Bayram

The Stadiums and Football-Supporters as the Reflection of Public
Thought in Turkey 239

Yavuz Yıldırım

Economy-Politic Approach to Artistic Activities in Public Sphere in
Turkey 253

Serhan Sarıkaya

Democracy in Parliamentary and Presidential Systems and the
Choice of Turkey: A Comparative Analysis 285

Emre Bağçe & Fatih Demir

Institutional Transformation of Turkey in the EU Negotiation
Process: The Case of Ombudsman 309

H. Kutay Aytuğ

A Debate on Publicity and Turkey's Democracy Notion

*Murat Satici**

Publicity is one of the complex conceptions that focused on by Social Sciences. Especially Jürgen Habermas's analyses of publicity and public sphere have impacted on the considerations of modern liberal and representative democracy and their boundaries. These are also starting points of debates on contemporary social movements and limits of the political institutions. He tried to find resolutions to issues which exist between citizens, citizenship and state, right-freedom and system of law, individual and collective demands, ideologies and present economic-politic-legal structures. According to his definition, "*by 'the public sphere' we mean first of all a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens*" (Habermas, 1974: 49). In short, publicity is a metaphor as above mentioned:

It's a metaphor for thinking about how individual human beings come together to exchange ideas and information and feelings, about how large-scale communities manage themselves when too many individuals are involved to simply list the issues that affect them all and have each one explain, face to face, their position. It's a metaphor which keeps us focused on the distinction between individual, personal forms of representation- over which we have a large degree of control- and shared, consensual representation- which are never exactly what we would like to see precisely because they are shared (public). It's a liberal model which sees the individual human being as having an important input into the formation of general will- as opposed to totalitarian or Marxist models, which see the state as ultimately powerful in deciding what people think. This is the public sphere (McKee, 2005: 204).

Thus we can say that debating on publicity and the public sphere is a debating on democracy in which citizens participate in the deliberation of their common problems. And this sphere is which distinct from a state and a public which represents images of the state.

Nevertheless, with Nancy Frazer's warning, the publicity can be read as a story of regression of modern democracy and politics. We can see this

* Manisa Celal Bayar University, Department of Philosophy.

story in the subtitle of Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* which is "An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society". In this subtitle, the emergence of bourgeois public sphere explains grounds of the liberal public sphere, but according to Habermas, it might be instrumentalized. To him, because of submission to a passive consuming and self-interests, the public is ruled by economic, political powers and their methods. Now to him,

Beyond influencing consumer decisions this publicity is now also useful for exerting political pressure because it mobilizes a potential of inarticulate readiness to assent that, if need be, can be translated into a plebiscitarily defined acclamation. The new public sphere still remains related to the one rooted in civil society insofar as the latter's institutional forms of legitimation are still in force. Even staged publicity generates political efficacy only in the measure that it can credibly suggest or even cash in on a capital of potential voting decisions. This "cashing in," to be sure, is then the task of the parties (Habermas, 1989: 201).

In that way, this regression story of publicity is of vital importance for considering of contemporary politic issues around the World.

The way of debating on publicity and the public sphere in Turkey has linked to the positive and the negative characters of them. Hence it is necessary to trace the effort to democratization which included Turkey's modernization idea. Especially we need to focus on the last decades that liberal policies dominated Turkey's political culture after 1980 military coup which destroyed democracy and publicity. The liberal policies in Turkey such as free market, privatization policies, etc. embraced the economic liberalism. But liberal democratic process which are essential elements in the conception of contemporary democracy such as politic participation, the right to demonstration and freedom of thought and speech and non-governmental organizations and their economic or political demands have been ignored and criminalized by governments for decades. In 2000's, although liberal and Islamic-conservative governments seem to like to consider publicity and the public sphere, they focused on these issues with limited perspective regarding "turban" and the public area which symbolized public institutions. In parallel with that matter, the definition of the modern public sphere has been incarcerated in the discussion of "turban," and this precluded the debate about how to establish the democratic free public sphere which included intercultural, pluralistic political life. This approach created a conflict of taking part in state institutions and public areas which were bureaucratic agencies such as education, army, parlia-

ment, etc. Thus this kind of definition on the public sphere not only compressed conceptions of the democratization and the democratic public sphere into the small ground but also it raised the propensity to criminalize the criticisms raised against liberal and Islamic-conservative governments which restricted freedom of speech and the right to assembly and demonstration. These showed that the prejudice that the acceptance of liberalism automatically could establish the liberal political principles, rights, and freedom, was a delusion.

Hence we need not forget that story of publicity in Turkey has dual characters which impacted on Turkey's political culture and history and that democracy has been the center of them. For that reason, while this work looks at the main preferences of publicity and the public sphere, it focuses on the boundedness in theory and practice in Turkey's political culture. We also consider representative democracy which has been transformed a plebiscitary form of democracy in Turkey. At last, we will look for the possibility of rethinking the concepts of democracy and publicity that are impossible to categorically exists under conditions of "the state of emergency" exceeding a year.

Idea of Publicity and Conflicts of Present Democracy

Publicity, as Habermas described it, is indispensable regarding a critical social theory and democratic policy practices. Habermas imposed the obligation on the publicity is clear from the following quote:

A portion of the public sphere comes into being in every conversation in which private individuals assemble to form a public body. They then behave neither like business or professional people transacting private affairs nor like members of a constitutional order subject to the legal constraints of a state bureaucracy. Citizens behave as a public body when they confer in an unrestricted fashion—that is, with the guarantee of freedom of assembly and association and the freedom to express and publish their opinions—about matters of general interest. In a large public body, this kind of communication requires specific means for transmitting information and influencing those who receive it (Habermas, 1964: 49).

The concept of the public sphere, which Habermas emphasized in early modern Europe, is a concept that we cannot discuss politics and democracy today without reference to it. By McCarty definition: *"In its clash with the arcane and bureaucratic practices of the absolutist state, the emergent bourgeoisie gradually replaced a public sphere in which the ruler's power*

was merely represented before the people with a sphere in which state authority was publicly monitored through informed and critical discourse by the people" (McCarty, 1989: XI). The emergence of the public sphere rests on the rational and critical debate of the literary communities that publish groups, newspapers, and magazines that come together in cultural settings, in halls and dinner invitations, and in publicly accessible places. But the political public, which can develop outside the state, becomes able to convey the needs and interests of the society to the state by forming public opinion. Thus, the family with special interests and interests is a mediator between the private sector, such as the workplace, and the state power. According to Kellner,

Habermas's concept of the public sphere thus described a space of institutions and practices between the private interests of everyday life in civil society and the realm of state power. The public sphere thus mediates between the domains of the family and the workplace -- where private interests prevail -- and the state which often exerts arbitrary forms of power and domination (Kellner, 2000: 263-264).

The element that fills the interior of the sphere is the emergence of a structure based on the principle of publicity that activities of the state become open to public access, that is to say, Kant¹. This public sphere "later, it meant transmitting the considered "general interest" of "bourgeois society" to the state via forms of legally guaranteed free press, and free assembly, and eventually through the parliamentary institutions of representative government" (Frazer, 1990: 58). So as above mentioned:

The bourgeois public's critical public debate took place in principle without regard to all preexisting social and political rank and in accord with universal rules (...) At the same time, the results that under these conditions issued from the public process of critical debate lay claim to being in accord with reason; intrinsic to the idea of a public opinion born of the power of the better argument was the claim to that morally pretentious rationality that strove to discover what was at once just and right (Habermas, 1989: 54).

Publicity, in general, is seen as a way for the inequalities to lose their power stemming from their statutes and to form a strong consensus on the common good as a result of the debate that discussions can be regarded each other as equal. The consensus seems to be able to respond to the

1 Kant, Immanuel (1784), "An Answer to the Question: 'What is Enlightenment?'" , http://library.standrews-de.org/lists/CourseGuides/religion/rs-vi/oppressed/kant_what_is_enlightenment.pdf (21.08. 2017).

question of “modern normative and political legitimacy”. At the same time, this replay reveals the idea of modern bourgeois publicity. But according to Frazer,

According to Habermas, the full utopian potential of the bourgeois conception of the public sphere was never realized in practice. The claim to open access, in particular, was not made good. Moreover, the bourgeois conception of the public sphere was premised on a social order in which the state was sharply differentiated from the newly privatized market economy; it was this clear separation of “society” and state that was supposed to underpin a form of public discussion that excluded “private interests”. But these conditions eventually eroded as nonbourgeois strata gained access to the public sphere. Then, “the social question” came to, therefore; society was polarized by class struggle; and the public fragmented into a mass of competing interest group (Frazer, 1990: 59).

This point will be an opportunity for us to evaluate publicity in Turkey because publicity has become apparent in all historical variants of parliamentary democracy experienced in for a hundred years to realize the modernist political utopia for the solution of the problem of political legitimacy in Turkey. These modifications make it possible for us to evaluate how Turkey close to the idea of publicity both regarding the practice of modernization and regarding the legitimacy and democratization of political institutions. Turkey's political history shows that Turkey has experiences of modern state and parliamentary democracy. But when we look at the framework of the idea of publicity, especially the 80s and 90s are tough times for debating on publicity and democracy. It would not be wrong to say that we have been stuck in the discussion of the viability of publicity regarding the conceptualization of publicity, even though the multiparty parliamentary system and representative democracy have been performed long ago. According to Toker and Tekin, it is a matter that political thought in modern Turkey was a stranger to what called ‘liberating dimensions of modernity’, because of ignoring links between philosophy, think over thinking Enlightenment, criticism, jurisprudence and capacity to become citizens (Toker and Tekin, 2007: 84).

As a matter of fact after 1960-72 and lastly 80 military coups, “the 1982 Constitution” stands in front of us as the main problem. The fact that “the 1982 Constitution” that was prepared by a military junta does not include the first and categorically to democracy, negotiation and public expression of publicity. In this character, “the 1982 Constitution” which placed in the security of state against its citizens is incompatible with Habermas's view that publicity is a legitimation of state, constitution, and law. Although

“the 1982 Constitution” defined fundamental rights and freedoms and human rights, this does not mean anything other than a *ghost in the shell*.² For as long as there are restrictions on the right to life, the freedom of thought and expression, the free debate, and the right to action-gathering, such constitutional texts are far from being texts which based on liberty and democracy. Moreover, the elections, with the 10% voting threshold and the shadow of political bans, have been articulated in Turkish political culture for many years. While such restrictions injury equal, free and participatory representation, negotiation and publicity, citizenship does not emerge as a liberating category, but as citizenship, a state and a constitution and an authority that restricted in the principle of state’s continuation. This result reveals that the utopia of the modernization of Turkey has not taken place, on the contrary, it shows a liberal dystopia regarding publicity and democracy because of the 1980 coup d’etat and the “1982 Constitution”.³

At this point, the problem is a question other than the definition and qualifications of publicity. It is the democratization issue of the public sphere. Along with the 80s in Turkey, the recognition that the liberal economy will bring about political liberalism spontaneously has reduced publicity and the public sphere to mass democracy by adding to the idea of the welfare state. The problem is a tension that exists between the potential for realization of the bourgeois public sphere and the existing normative and political potential. The results of this stress are evident: “*Finally, with the emergence of ‘welfare state mass democracy,’ society and the state became mutually intertwined; publicity in the sense of critical scrutiny of the state gave way to public relations, mass-mediated staged displays, and the manufacture and manipulation of public opinion*” (Frazer, 1990: 59). By reducing democracy especially to an election activity, politics becomes a populism-centered activity sphere that centers on the efficiency of providing the majority. Particularly in the definition of democracy and election, it is clear that only majority will not be related to publicity. Whereas,

The popularity index is a government’s measure of how much it has the non-public opinion of the population under its control or of how much publicity

2 Inspired from the movie “Ghost in the Shell” (1995).

3 For detailed explanation, Satici, Murat, (2016), “On the Dimensions of Turkey’s Welfare Utopia”, Armağan Öztürk and Ayhan Bilgin (Ed.), *Political Culture of Turkey in the Rule of the AKP*, (Baden-Baden, Nomos): 226-240.

that can be translated into popularity its team of leaders must additionally obtain. Popularity is not as such identical with publicity, but it cannot be maintained in the long run without it (Habermas, 1989: 218).

The idea of publicity suggests that the source of the legitimacy of laws or policies is not the sum of the wills which depends on the results of elections but is the sum of the negotiations. But it is clear that Habermas's idea of publicity cannot be realized in an equally participatory manner, because of its structural problems⁴. In the idea of publicity, it was necessary to bracket the status inequalities to enter into a genuinely common negotiation, but this action has not always succeeded in overcoming these biases. As a result, dominating an integrative statist view in the negotiations doesn't remove inequality in legislation and politics, and also different and diverse groups in decision-making and practitioners cannot include in the process.

In stratified societies, unequally empowered social groups tend to develop unequally valued cultural styles. The result is the development of powerful informal pressures that marginalize the contributions of members of subordinated groups both in everyday life contexts and in official public spheres. Moreover, these pressures are amplified, rather than mitigated, by the peculiar political economy of the bourgeois public sphere (Frazer, 1990: 64).

These pressures always carry with the potential to insist on the demand for democracy, centered on diversity and pluralism, as well as a substantial majority. In this perspective, Turkey has gained an experience during "Gezi Movement". According to Göle

The Occupy Gezi movement has been a staging ground for the creativity of micro-practices, and it embodies the importance of the politics of everyday life. As a public square movement, it opened up a new arena of experience and democratic opportunities growing and resonating from Istanbul, Turkey. (...) The movement represents a new threshold for democracy where old cleavages between authoritarian secularism and Islam are surpassed, and new forms of citizenship are rehearsed (Göle: 2013: 7).

4 "Habermas's account of the bourgeois conception of the public sphere stresses its claim to be open and accessible to all. Indeed, this idea of open Access is one of the central meanings of the norm of publicity. Of course, we know, both from there visionist history and from Habermas's account, that the bourgeois public's claim to full accessibility was not in fact realized. Women of all classes and ethnicities were excluded from official political participation precisely on the basis of ascribed gender status, while plebeian men were formally excluded by property qualifications. Moreover, in many cases, women and men of racialized ethnicities of all classes were excluded on racial grounds" (Frazer, 1990: 63).

During June 2013, citizens claimed to free participate in city policies and the decision-making process in spite of growing economic data. After the outrageous intervention of police, protestation expanded all over the country. From that moment it was understood that these protestations were resists against social, sexual, cultural discrimination and exclusion, the conservative intervention of lifestyles and against hindrances before freedom and free participation in politic decision-making.

The secularist “reaction” contained in itself a plurality of reactions from all walks of society, who participated in the protests by raising a plurality of demands. Below is a list of the most visible forms of this discontent, identities and demands, in their relationship to the Gezi protests, including the labor movement; ecological movement; the urban poor youth activism; middle-class youth activism; Alevi identity; soccer fans; women; the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transvestite, transsexual (LGBTT) movement; and the Kurdish movement (Vatikiotis and Yörük, 2016: 4).

As Benhabib said that *“Gezi created an urban consciousness that brought environmentalists, feminists, LGBTQ activists, Kurdish groups together in searching for an institutionalized cultural and political voice which is not contained within the existing political structures”* (Benhabib, 2013, as cited in Örs, 2014, 497). However, after this experience, the attitude of the political power which criminalized the demands of the democratization and participation in the decision-making process in Gezi Movement, has shown us that the perception of the liberal right view of publicity in Turkey hasn’t changed. At the end of the process, looking at the Constitution referendums and parliamentary elections in Turkey, we can say that political power ignored the democratic publicity which has bonded between publicity and democracy. Elections and Plebiscites are seen as an only way of legitimation of decision making and ruling. In this view, the legitimacy principle is sought in parliamentary elections and referendums which based on the majority of will alone. On the contrary debates and negotiations are of vital importance in emerging the new demands of rights and freedoms which are the reason of the constitutional and political changings. However, in Turkey, especially in the determination and implementation of the content of the constitutional amendments, it is necessary to obtain a sufficient number of majority approval in parliament, otherwise referendum. As seen in 2007-2012 and 2017 the constitutional amendments were prepared and presented by the political parties. It is clear that the participation to the negotiations was insufficient and that the approval is only subject to the majority in the parliament and the referendum is a

clear indication that the publicity is reduced to a plebiscitary process. The process of negotiations carried out both legally and de facto, and there is no established negotiation process on the social, sociological and political equality of the content of the amendments. In the course of a vital constitutional amendment included the system change, the meetings made by political parties are considered legitimate and sufficient regarding the justification, contents, and results of the changes. At the same time, in the case of a referendum held in under conditions of “the state of emergency”, the fact that the equal participation in any democratic negotiations cannot be established in an actual situation in which by the definition of the state of emergency the state can partially or wholly remove the fundamental rights and freedoms. From this perspective, it is clear that the question of the legitimacy of the state and the constitutional system is about public consensus versus majority, publicity versus manipulation, political action versus security practices, and legalism which has monologic character and status quo versus justice. This process of deterioration which was included theoretically and practically by the bourgeois public sphere draws upon the problems on general qualities of the public sphere and realization of it, while at the same time it is a structural transformation *that we will take lessons to enable the achievement of the public sphere. As a matter of fact “Habermas wants to make explicit the meaning of these normative ideas and to reflect upon how they contribute to the essential informal core of a democratic society”* (Pauline, 2006: 20). For Habermas, the reason of the breaking up of the public sphere is that the non-bourgeois sections gain access to the public sphere and the rise of class struggles.

The structural transformation came about, however, as private organizations began increasingly assume public power on the one hand, while the state penetrated the private realm on the other. State and society, once distinct, became interlocked. The public sphere was necessarily transformed as the distinction between public and private realms blurred, the equation between the intimate sphere and private life broke down with a polarization of family and economic society, the rational-critical debate gave way to the consumption of culture (Coulhon, 1996: 21).

It is not possible to have a reasoned discussion aimed at reaching a common good among groups that are almost in opposition to each other. Moreover, the press organs, that have played a significant role in the emergence of the public sphere, and that have been obligatory in public debate and the transmission of information are now technologies that manage the social consensus and support the consumption culture.

By means of these transformations, the public sphere has become more an arena for advertising than a setting for rational critical debate. Legislators stage displays for constituents. Special-interest organizations use publicity work to increase the prestige of their own positions, without making the topics to which those positions refer subjects of genuine public debate. The media are used to create occasions for consumers to identify with the public positions or personas of others. All this amounts to the return of a version of representative publicity, to which the public responds by acclamation, or the withholding of acclamation, rather than critical discourse” (Coulhon, 1996: 26 and Katz, 2000).

Those above mentioned mean that a simple reconciliation which obtained through the non-public path takes the place of publicity.

Publicity once meant the exposure of political domination before the public use of reason; publicity now adds up the reactions of an uncommitted friendly disposition. In the measure that public relations shape it, the public sphere of civil society again takes on feudal features. The “suppliers” display a showy pomp before customers ready to follow. Publicity imitates the kind of aura proper to the personal prestige and supernatural authority once bestowed by the kind of publicity involved in representation (Habermas, 1989: 195).

This transformation is also what Habermas called “refeudalization of public sphere”:

One may speak of a refeudalization of the public sphere in yet another, more exact sense. For the kind of integration of mass entertainment with advertising, which in the form of public relations already assumes a “political” character, subjects even the state itself to its code. Because private enterprises evoke in their customers the idea that in their consumption decisions they act in their capacity as citizens, the state has to “address” its citizens like consumers. As a result, public authority too competes for publicity (Habermas, 1989: 195).

Of course, the greatest critical point here is primarily that political parties define their electorates heteronomous and promote a representation that based on ideological engagements and self-interests. Such the conception of representation gives the numerical superiority to sovereign political parties while centralizing the economic welfare, religion and a particular group. But it won’t include various sides and opponents in society. On the other hand, institutions and tools of mass media and social media do not reflect the public itself. On the contrary, we can see that media owners, editors, general publishing directors or columnists manipulated citizens’ political tendencies, self-interests, and ideological belongings. It shows that the press does not represent the public, but rather reflects a simulation of the public as the purpose of establishing an artifactual public representa-

tion instead of the real public. In other words, the relationship between media and society doesn't differ from that of citizens and political parties. This situation perfectly meets the conception of "refeudalization of publicity" above-mentioned in Turkey. Because in the elections and referendums that have taken place in Turkey over the last few years the issue that emerges through the mass media and the media mentioned above also exposed through questionnaires or public opinion polling companies. We see that many survey companies announced the numerical results in favor of some political lines. In general, research results that several of the companies have guessed are published in the media, although the success rates are low. Despite this failure, these research results are of importance regarding manipulation of a political tendency in elections. However, it is technically impossible for these investigations to reach correctly every social line. So it can not be said that the survey companies that produce small numerical representation rates could show an equal genuine participation. Taking into consideration the relations between the public and the media, a pessimistic public opinion and publicity, this shows up the publicity and public sphere that reversed the bourgeois idea of publicity. "Beyond influencing consumer decisions, this publicity is now also useful for exerting political pressure because it mobilizes a potential of inarticulate readiness to assent that, if need be, can be translated into a plebiscitarily defined acclamation (Habermas, 1989: 201). In this pessimistic view, according to Habermas, there is a surrendering to passive consumption and self-reliance rather than common good and democratic participation of citizens.

"Rescuing the Publicity" and Conclusion: An Attempt to Rethinking the Turkey's Democracy Notion

Habermas tries to get out of the pessimism of publicity again by returning to his remarkable determination of modernity. Emphasizing the dialectic of publicity Habermas stresses the continuity of the process of structural transformation of publicity, just as his modernity defense that he claimed that modernity is an "unfinished project" (Habermas, 1997).

The outcome of the struggle between a critical publicity and one that is merely staged for manipulative purposes remains open; the ascendancy of publicity regarding the exercise and balance of political power mandated by the social-welfare state over publicity merely staged for the purpose of acclamation

is by no means certain. But unlike the idea of the bourgeois public sphere during the period of its liberal development, it cannot be denounced as an ideology. If anything, it brings the dialectic of that idea, which had been degraded into an ideology, to its conclusion (Habermas, 1989: 235).

Similar to Habermas's definition of modernity, publicity has turned into a fundamental concept for him to underpin the realization of dialogic and deliberative democracy, even though it has entered the pessimistic paths. The political public is well-suited to become the core concept of a normative democracy theory as a tool for conditions of communication of a civil society that established by citizens that based on negotiation (Habermas, 2007: 43) This definition confronts us as an indispensable legitimacy category of the publicity for a deliberative model of democracy. While defending the idea of deliberative democracy, Habermas inevitably connects the concepts of publicity and public space. Because according to Habermas,

the source of legitimacy is not the pre-determined will of the individuals but rather than formation of this will, the process of deliberating personally. The legal decision does not represent the general will, but it is a result of the deliberation of the public as a whole, and we should assume that legitimate law is not the expression of general will, but a result of extensive discussion (Habermas, 2007: 43).

The public sphere, united with the deliberative and procedural democracy models, has now a different dimension. In *Between Facts and Norms* Habermas also consider the idea of the public sphere in concerning theory of democracy. Up to now, Habermas has dealt with the public sphere as a communication structure rooted in the lifeworld through the associational network of civil society. In *the Structural Transformation of Public Sphere*, Habermas presented public sphere as a possibility of rational and dialogical communication and normativity, avoiding the domination. Namely, "the political public sphere also definites as a sounding board for problems that must be processed by the political system because they cannot be solved elsewhere. To this extent, the public sphere is a warning system with sensors that, though unspecialized, are sensitive throughout society" (Habermas, 1996: 359). But as in *Between Facts and Norms*, in addition to the communicative and deliberative dimensions of publicity, it gains another dimension in relation to the theory of democracy within the political system. The new aspect of the publicity is clear:

From the perspective of democratic theory, the public sphere must, in addition, amplify the pressure of problems, that is, not only detect and identify problems but also convincingly and influentially thematize them, furnish them

with possible solutions, and dramatize them in such a way that they are taken up and dealt with by parliamentary complexes. Besides the "signal" function, there must be an effective problematization. The capacity of the public sphere to solve problems on its own is limited. But this capacity must be utilized to oversee the further treatment of problems that take place inside the political system (Habermas, 1996: 359).

In the hands of Habermas, the publicity became a guide to the democratic political thought. Because Habermas now uses the publicity to meet the need for the institutionalization of norms and justice not for the measure of legality of law and fairness. If he did not attach this democratic dimension, he would remain in the modern tradition that investigated for a universal legal and political legitimacy principle in modern natural law doctrines. In particular, this return would imply a return to the principle of "public use of the reason"⁵ that Kant described as a principle of practical reason. Habermas, however, has dialogically redefined the public in intersubjective point of view. For this reason, Habermas reinterpreted the principle of the rational legitimation in the way of an intersubjective and public version of it. For meeting the dialogic necessity for the validity of social norms tested in the actual discourse, the discourse ethic has gained a qualification that can meet the need for Habermas to realize the institutions that establish a de facto and healthy public sphere in his interpretation of publicity. The norms, however, are valid only because of the discussion in which everyone concerned as participants in the practical discourse so that the theory of law and democracy can be institutionalized in an efficiently functioning public sphere. Thus "*the general social conditions which are necessary for effective participation in practical discourse are seen as a matter of justice and rights concerning claims of legitimacy of all individuals*" (Baynes, 1992: 7).

As a result, publicity which has been becoming a guide for the thought of a democratic politics by Habermas indeed is not an independent theory of law or politics. He has focused on law, politics, and democracy as important parts of his project. In fact, Habermas has examined that what the

5 "Though Habermas rejects Kantian epistemology and its corollary ahistorical exaltation of philosophy as arbiter and foundation of all science and culture, in his recent work he nonetheless argues that something remains crucial from the Kantian view of modernity. Above all else, this is a notion of "procedural rationality and its ability to give credence to our views in the three areas of objective knowledge, moral-practical insight, and aesthetic judgment." This procedural rationality is fundamentally a matter of basing judgment on reasons." (Calhoun, 1996: 2).

nature and function of law, politics, and democracy should be in his project of democratic society, criticizing the places that they occupy in modern societies.

Critiques on that the potentials of the idea of publicity could not be realized and that this idea must be democratized are extremely useful for Turkey. In modern political institutions, principles and political actions that are only interested in the legitimacy of the state and the law publicity can not be visible all dimensions. Especially in Turkey's multicultural and highly fragmented society, publicity does not interpret inclusionary way. The primary element for the visibility and democratization of publicity is to ensure that claims of different parties, which are essential to publicity, are seen as legitimate and democratic demands, not as threats. This can occur by the medium of recognition of the criticality of publicity.

The democratic public sphere and processes of deliberation and contestation which occur in them are doubly contingent: on the one hand, it is a historically contingent process of development which allows the formation of such a sphere in some polities and not in others; secondly, it is also contingent whether individuals in a polity have the cultural and moral resources to become full participants of a discursive or deliberative public sphere. No matter how counterfactual and contingent these processes may be, without the institutionalization of some form of free public sphere successful democracies are inconceivable. For in a world without metaphysics, identity-formation, constitutional sovereignty, and democratic legitimacy require processes and channels of deliberation, contestation, argument, and subversion which only the interlocking net of many public spheres can allow" (Benhabib, 1994: 23).

Thus the deliberation could overreach the discriminatory (economic, social, cultural and sexual) public definition in every sense of equal participation.

On the other hand, after the July 15 2016 coup attempt in Turkey and "state of emergency" announced afterward, it is impossible to speak of a publicity and public sphere categorically. We have confronted with a political structure which has been turned over security-centered politics by delegated legislations for more than a year. While delegated legislations completely close the questioning and criticism of the legitimacy of the politics, the pressure on society is increasing day by day. In such cases, it is impossible to talk about the critical, deliberative, and democratic features and criticism of publicity. In Turkey's politics has problematic experiences of publicity and democracy in this process debating democracy is not considered enough to solve the problems. What is urgently needed is to remove

the state of emergency and then immediately rearrange the publicity for going beyond the plebiscitary way of democracy.

Indeed, in the twentieth century, central political discourses which focused on welfare and political participation have left their places to political discourses to political forms of struggles that emphasize environmental, LGBT rights, cultural and ethnic differences and diversity. Along with the new ways of political struggles, it has long been seen that politics is not only possible as being a member of a political party. Now new political actors are not just party members, but women, different ethnic groups, LGBT, environmental groups and social media users. It is the new media that is providing the space for these new political struggles. Of course, for this reason, the democratization of publicity will necessarily involve mass communication, media, social media and new media regarding the dialogic nature of it.

The importance of the public sphere lies in its potential as a mode of societal integration. Public discourse (and what Habermas later and more generally calls communicative action) is a possible mode of coordination of human life, as are state power and market economies. But money and power are nondiscursive modes of coordination, as Habermas's later theory stresses; they offer no intrinsic openings to the identification of reason and will, and they suffer from tendencies toward domination and reification. State and economy are thus both crucial topics for and rivals of the democratic public sphere (Coulhon, 1996: 6).

The media which provide financial support for the circulation of views in this public domain, are private property and operates for profit. "Consequently, subordinated social groups usually lack equal access to the material. Thus, political economy enforces structurally what culture accomplishes informally" (Frazer, 1990: 64-65).

Indeed, although the power of the media to influence the masses is unquestionable, it is certain that it can be transformed into manipulation and propaganda tools by certain interest groups. The public opinion polling or research activity by the survey companies and media, whether they represent real public and publicity or not must be urgently debated. It is a matter of discussion how the media should be shaped to establish a publicity includes diversity and variety participants. The Internet, social media, video channels, smartphones, new media and a new communication that differs from traditional media has become widespread for so long. Contrary to the modern political subject, the participants of this new media and communication have established the public sphere which includes the

faster and more moving political subjects. As a result, social media and its users have become founding subjects of dialogical deliberation.

It is the question how the media in Turkey and the Turkey's democracy that established in grounds homogeneous nation state, religion, language, and race can respond to these diverse, multicultural and postmodern rights, freedoms and general policies. Asking this question is the first step for realizing democratic politics that have a dialogically equitable publicity and able to include differences in deliberation.

Bibliography

- Baynes, Kenneth (1992). *The Normative Grounds of Social Criticism: Kant, Rawls and Habermas*, (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Benhabib, Seyla (1994). "Democracy and Difference: Reflections on the Metapolitics of Lyotard and Derrida", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Volume 2, Number I: 1-23.
- Benhabib, Seyla (2013). "Gezi Park Protestoları: Küresel Bağlam ve Türkiye'de Siyasetin Geleceği" (Trip to Gezi Park Protest: The Global Context of Turkey's Political Future), *konusakonusa.org* (02. 08. 2016).
- Calhoun, Craig (1996). *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, (Massachusetts, The MIT).
- Mckee, Alan (2005). *An Introduction to the Public Sphere*, (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Habermas, Jürgen (1989). *The Structure Transformation of the Public Sphere*, (Translated by Thomas Burger), (Massachusetts, MIT Press).
- Habermas, Jürgen (1974). "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)", *New German Critique*, No. 3: 49-55.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1997). "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," M.P. D'Entreves and Seyla Benhabib (Ed.), *Habermas the Unfinished Project of Modernity*, (Massachusetts, MIT Press): 38-55.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1996). *Between Facts and Norms*, (Translated by William Rehg), (Massachusetts, The MIT Press).
- Habermas, Jürgen (1997). *Kamusallığın Yapısal Dönüşümü*, (Çev. Tanıl Bora-Mithat Sancar), (İstanbul, İletişim).
- Frazer, Nancy (1990). "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," *Social Text*, No. 25/26: 56-80.
- Göle, Nilüfer (2013). "Gezi-Anatomy of a Public Square Movement" *Insight Turkey*, vol. 15, No. 3: 7-14, <http://insightturkey.com/gezi-â%C2%80%C2%93anatomy-of-a-public-square-movement/articles/353> (21.06.2017).
- Johnson, Pauline (2006). *Habermas Rescuing the Public Sphere*, (Oxon, Routledge).

- Kant, Immanuel (1784). "An Answer to the Question: 'What is Enlightenment?'" http://library.standrews-de.org/lists/CourseGuides/religion/rs-vi/oppressed/kant_what_is_enlightenment.pdf (21.08. 2017).
- Katz, E. (2000). "Media Multiplication and Social Segmentation", *Ethical Perspectives*,7(2-3): 122-132, http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/161 (21.08. 2017).
- Kellner, Douglas, (2000). "Habermas, the Public Sphere, and Democracy: A Critical Intervention", Lewis Edwin Hahn (Ed.) *Perspectives on Habermas*, (Chicago, Open Court): 259-287.
- McCarthy, Thomas (1989). "Introduction in *The Structure Transformation of the Public Sphere*," (Translated by Thomas Burger), (Massachusetts, MIT Press): VI-XIV.
- Örs, Romain, İlay (2014). "Genie in the Bottle: Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and the Realignment of Democracy and Space in Turkey", *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, Vol.40 (4-5): 489-498.
- Toker Nilgün ve Tekin Serdar (2007). "Batı Siyasi Düşüncenin Karakteristikleri ve Evreleri: Kâmusuz Cumhuriyet'ten Kâmusuz Demokrasi'ye", Tanıl Bora ve Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Cilt 3, *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, (İstanbul, İletişim): 84-106.
- Vatikiotis, Pantelis and Yörük, F. Zafer (2016). "Gezi Movement and the Networked Public Sphere: A Comparative Analysis in Global Context", *Social Media+Society*, July-September: 1-12.

