Full Length Research

Explanation of deliberative democracy in philosophical thoughts of Jurgen Habermas

A. M. Shahramnia

No. 12, 2nd Floor, 2nd Entrance, Boostan Ketab Complex, Nateq Noori (Zomorrod Street), Golnabi Street, Pasdaran Avenue, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: m_shahramnia@yahoo.com., amin.afsahi@gmail.com. Tel: +982122858474, Ext: 102. +989121955014. Fax: +982122858474, Ext: 101.

As democracy has a generative nature, there is a continuous discussion and study about its principles, teachings, objectives and conceptual development. The current article follows theory research and scientific explanation of effect and reflections of theoretical – philosophical foundation of Jurgen Habermas (born in June, 18, 1929) for making his consultant democracy discourse. In other words, research on discourse democracy theory of this political scientist and studying and evaluating reflection and generalization of his philosophical and epistemological principles are objectives which the researcher follows in this work. According to Habermas' conceptual reading, democracy of welfare liberal states in modern capitalist societies has similar dimension and it s essentially based on unidirectional and inappropriate teachings of instrumental rationality. Therefore, Habermas has established his democracy theory based on his thoughts and principles in theoretical and philosophical field. Recovery of epistemology principles and a method resulting from his thoughts are very important. From this view, there is representation of concepts and categories such as epistemology interests, communication action, discoursing ethics, ideal situation of speech, and general field as the most prominent components and principles of his democracy. These concepts were chosen and studied, because of their importance to and situation of this topic; they represent logical relation between epistemology principles of Habermas and its resulted criteria and teaching with his democracy model. For this reason, by searching the thoughts and representing Habermas' theoretical collection, there are clarified and identified democracy principles and criteria and their distinctive and theoretical components. The analyzed discursive democracy pattern of Habermas and its capabilities in analytical – descriptive perspective and library studying is also added. Researchers believe that the considered discourse democracy of Habermas has a deep philosophical root and it is considered as a part of knowledge foundation and a methodology that is focused on freedom. He processes discoursive democracy in a wide public sphere, by relying on discourse ethic. This he did by considering higher reasoning and critical reading from modern rationality in form of communication rationality concept, in which its objective and nature is a freedom idea. The true matter is identified by considering the obtained results. That is, by searching Habermas' thought scope and horizon in all of his works and resources on idea of necessity relation between thinking and providing ideal situation that focuses on freedom teaching in his democracy theory. Therefore, findings of this research show that political opinions and thoughts of Habermas have emerged and are affected from principles of his philosophical frame. For this reason, epistemological strong tracks of Habermas have been reflective in his appropriate democracy.

Key words: Discoursive democracy, public sphere, communicative action, ideal speech situation.

INTRODUCTION

Dignity and mission of democracy and its principles and teachings as "the major political idea" is clear for all

people in the contemporary societies. This matter is more important when democracy teaching is considered as one of the oldest form of government in political thoughts, which has been researched by political philosophers. Although deviation of concepts in social sciences contains democracy too, most scholars insist on this belief that democracy is the most reasonable form of government, because of its long term wise policy. Habermas has taught it, like other political thinkers and has drawn his special attitude about this matter. His structured efforts for establishing philosophical and political cornerstone of democracy must be paid attention to. Many of the criteria and teachings considered by this political thinker include action and communicative rationality and ethics discourse. They provide particular dimension of policy from this perspective. Habermas made efforts to establish discourse consensus by optimizing rational debate in public field and by relying on 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. However, Jurgen Habermas, as one of the most famous remaining philosophers of the Frankfurt School, has made efforts for restructuring concepts and theories, which he believes the contemporary societies are involved with. Reconstruction is his theoretical tool in this field. Democracy is considered as one of these reviews for this purpose.

Efforts have been made to consider philosophical and epistemological principles of Habermas by relying on theoretical identifications and his deliberative democracy, whose effects are represented and evaluated beyond those findings. So, the scholar efforts to have a correct and logical result by a philosophical – political attitude rely on documentation studies as well as on descriptive analytical method. For this reason, the following theory which is considered as cornerstone of this writing has been provided by this question: *what are the basis of democracy in Hobermas' political thoughts and the effects of philosophical – epistemological approach in providing deliberative democracy model?*

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

HABERMAS DISCOURSIVE (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. The theoretical effort of Habermas for restoration, and acquiring reliable and practical knowledge as well as his intellectual attachment to epistemology in this book are reflected. He separates three brands of science with titles: natural – experimental sciences, historical hermeneutics sciences and human – social sciences; and then he considers three types of cognitive interests based on this classification: tool interests (natural – experimental sciences) hermeneutical or descriptive interests (historical – social sciences) and finally freedom critical interests related to human social sciences. So each of these three interests represents three special knowledge: tool, hermeneutical and freedom knowledge. With a little thinking, it can be found that Habarmas' criticism from formal democracy (liberal capitalism) and his theory about discursive (deliberative) democracy is affected by three dimensions of epistemology, completely. The first, the formal type of liberal democracy is based on the two first dimensions and the second is affected from the third dimension of his epistemology. According to Pusey (2005), in the considered deliberative democracy of Habermas, all matters are carried out inside and through social transaction, that is, through actions which are really moving toward access to agreement (Pusey, 2005; 165). From this perspective, discoursive democracy of Habermas has deep philosophical roots and it is considered as a dimension of his taught horizon principal about gaining knowledge. He notes that although these sciences follow understanding a common intellectual world which constructs transactions of social human beings, understanding the society is not like understanding a context (described by hermeneutical approach). It is a higher understanding than understanding its language. If fact, it enters discourse field (Qaderi, 2006:123).

Despite complete defense from the West democracy against right and left enemies and adversaries, Habermas acknowledges that written promises in rules of those democracies have not been completely implemented for all citizens. He has supported those promises through theory and practice during the past 30 years and has tried to implement them (Hoolab, 1996: 249). The interesting thing in surveying Habermas' political thoughts about democracy is criticizing theoretical principles and legitimacy foundation of liberal democracy and other of its forms. For this reason, he wants to restructure democracy based on his theoretical indicators. In advanced capitalism societies, governmental and legitimacy system is where the government regulates all critical cycle by using the global planning, on the one hand; and provides conditions which can be used for investment under these conditions, on 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 election mechanism is based on constitution; however, Habermas has a new view about constitution. In other words, a constitution has legitimacy which is acknowledged and approved by all citizens during free relations (Habermas, 2008: 428). According to Wheatley, democracy necessitates that laws are considered where there is resulted consensus after public consulting and reasonable debates among citizens about what should be done. To overcome the gap between norms and facts, Habermas appeals to the medium of law, which gives legitimacy to 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 it 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 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 aims at reaching an agreement, while exercising *influence* over the processes of political decision-making, 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. But in doing so, Habermas risks robbing us of our critical ability. He ties 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. The principles of opinion and will-formation underlie the presupposition of both political system and the life-world by overstepping its boundary. However, if one, like Habermas, believes that law has a legitimate force only as long as it can function as a resource of justice, (Habermas,1996: 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 distinctive moral principle from democracy principle in legitimacy discussion, because democracy principle specifies "legitimate legislative process". According to this principle, only rules can have legitimate validity, which is accepted by all citizens (Outhwaite, 1995: 203).

Therefore, rationality of constitution is a necessary condition for its independence. It cannot be considered that this rationality is a formal or procedural rationality, because the constitution is related with moral and politic inside. He also distinguished two types of action criteria: ethical and legal. 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. But there is an important question: how can he implement process of ideal speech situation and its focused communication action practically? In fact, how is there tied idealism construe of democratic legislation with experimental fact of policy world? In order to answer these questions, Habermas made efforts to identify and list constructor norm elements of potential performance in liberal – democratic political systems, by using a category under the name "Sociology of Democracy Reconstruction", instead of dealing with idea and fact in an abstract environment. For this reason, he separates and explains some models of democracy in chapters 7 and 8 of this book. Those democracies that decrease in terms of domination and expression cannot explain this matter. That is why people must accept the causes of the norm and follow democracy rules. Optional democracy model is formed as an intermediate private interest as well as republication elements from self – system ethical society.

Although idea of Habermas' deliberative democracy is freedom of human beings from the iron cage of capitalism and retrieval of human respect and characteristic from instrumental – like and positivist theories, summary, critics on philosophical and epistemological principles of Habermas lead his democracy discourse with restrictions and confusions. Some of the barriers against model of this political philosopher include his idea of establishment tools, his ideal speech situation based on communication action, and supposed discourse ethics and understanding intermediate thought of activities. Concept of hidden freedom in Habermas' theory is another critical point which deals with much confusion too. It is only participating without any force, meeting in an appropriate situation and gathering because of considered concepts and categories that cannot reclaim human beings from any mandatorily restrictions. According to Giddens, relation between mutual and communication action is a confused one, and communication action is a confused relation that is beyond norms, with which it is oriented (Giddens, 2007: 280-281). On 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.

RECONSTRUCTION OF DISTORTED PUBLIC SPHERE AND PROVIDING ITS SPECIAL DEMOCRACY

Emergence of public field was as a result of clear separation of private field and public power. Mutual influence of both of them destroys public field. Distorting

public thoughts in manipulated field of bourgeoisie is one of the distortion fields. Habermas' strategy for public thought is by linking it to its historical roots in framing public field idea, with this hope to access systematic understanding of our society from one of the perspectives of the main categories. 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 implement political and social powers that are followed by all people; or it is provided as a matter which must be patternized in relation with a scene show or advertising manipulation of all people. Habermas believes that concept of public opinion in its historical completion receives a step that requires its expression through words and sentences and it is quite expressive. Now this concept does not only contain habit and behavior which are found in the frame of some imagery and ideas – for example, different thoughts resulting from religion, customs, ethics- but represents or includes all behavioral techniques. Only matter which changes this type of opinion to public opinions is its relation with group processes (Nowzari, 2002: 503).

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

Our purpose in "public sphere" is to create a realm of social life, in which something close to public opinion can be formed in it. When citizens express their problems in a way, without any limitations – that is, by warranting group freedom and cooperation and freedom of expression and releasing of their opinions – they behave like a public body. Term of public opinion demonstrates duties of control criticism which public body of citizens carry 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, 1990: 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 dis-cursive 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 for democratic theory (Fraster, 1990: 57). The people themselves came

to see the public sphere as a regulatory institution against the authority of the state. The study of the public sphere centers on the idea of participatory democracy, and how public opinion becomes political action.

The basic belief in public sphere theory is that political action is steered by the public sphere, and that the only legitimate governments are those that listen to the public sphere (Benhabib, 1992: 87). "Democratic governance rests on the capacity of 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 is possible for all citizens and with rational way, thinking and reasoning, we argue about its political issues. It requires retrieval of life – world. Life – world, as an infrastructure of world view and identifying factor of quiddity thought beliefs and human discussions, affects the way of thinking, evaluation of humans and their communicational rationality. Habermas assumes intellectual and social sphere in which awareness activities create a field for social and critical discussions and results to the emergence of what he considers fundamental for democracy. In his idea, freer information (democracy oxygen) and rationality lead to more realistic and impressive democracy. General field is a social space in which people criticize social condition freely and list problems that affect decision making in political issues. Hobermas believes general field is origin of public thoughts. It acts as intermediation between public and private area and if it was more 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, what has attracted Habermas to public field in the present and future has been the importance of this subject as basis of criticism of society based on democratic principles. Public field is to the extent that people are gathered, in order to cooperate in open and public discussions. According to Habermas reasoning, cooperation should not be considered as value in itself, but its value depends on conditions which are carried out in them (Outhwaite, 1995: 17). Habermas considers conditions for discussion, as most important for providing an environment without any power field. Citizenry public field or extent can be a basis for this action, which can provide discussion and relational environment, if it is released from any limitation.

As it can be seen, 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 where public opinions can be discussed freely. According to Habermas, civil social in a modified public has a high degree. It is clear that recreating manipulated public field and strengthening communication components and human mutual actions provide an appropriate field for discursive democracy.

COMMUNICATION ACTION AND ITS EFFECT IN PROCESSING DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Habermas believes that identified rationality and types of action are inappropriate matters. Therefore, he wants to provide a detailed rationality by description of communi-cation 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 indicates wider vision and extent of rationality concept which is focused on reasoning speech (Habermas, 1973: 186).

Habermas talks about 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 does not decrease culture and knowledge to economic processes. In addition, culture field is not a secondary reflection of production dimension, but it has a special internal logic. Hobermas 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 humans raise the knowledge level, in order to access a special objective, and these objectives show human interest in a special knowledge, and its path in future.

Thus this interest leads to forming empirical – analytical sciences. The first type of interest is technical one, which involves dominating natural forces and control.

Habermas calls the second interest as practical interest, in which humans can change their 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, which forbid them from any deviation. Our recognition from the nature is a technique or according to Habermas is a usable cognitive rule (Habermas, 1995: 126). But it is very different in social sciences.

In this regard, Habermas distinguished two types of action: 1) Strategic action and 2) communication action. The first type is a targeted – rational action; while the communication action has to do with understanding. Communication action can be used as a tool, but when there is an equal relationship, this action will be non-instrumental. For example, in a transaction, where parties do not impose any matter on each other, the opposite side can select "yes" or "no" as action, based on his calculations. If communication action is used as a tool for imposing on the other party, we can see instrumental type of communication action. Strategic action is objective; but communication action is access to understanding communication. Habermas distinguished between rationality of social system and rationality of life world. While social rationality requires institutionalizing a normative system, rationality of life world requires that human beings have a fair agreement on any matter, and not being under external powerful forces. According to Habermas, it is possible that one or more claims will be problematic (Taompson, 1987: 89). Therefore, there is the possible to question claims of consensus back-ground. Communication action theory is a reconstructor type that wants to discover human relations. Habermas calls this type of reconstructor sciences as public pragmatic. One of the main bases of communication action is its relation with a type of rationality, which Habermas calls communi-cation action (Habermas, 1995: 100-102). This type of action will be studied more widely than instrumental rationality, where people can select this type of discourse. In this regard, rationality is related to agreement. Habermas relates rational action to communi-cation one and then relates both to discourse consensus. According to Habermas, access to agreement is inherent objective of human self – discourse (Lessnaf, 2001: 445). Developing field of communication rationality requires developing vocal and communication abilities. Habermas sees ideal speech situation as where necessary vocal and communication abilities are implemented to create a rational world. Therefore, field of political activity in capitalism system is without any domination. Discussion about philosophical – political thoughts of Habermas is very important, even when agreement is always imminent.

RELATION OF IDEAL SPEECH SITUATION AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY OF HABERMAS

Availability of reason and property of social criticism in thoughts is objective to access development. From completion of communication action theory, social development is observed in finding conditions and situations in which every member of society participates in social affairs equally. That is temporary finding in which communication does not deviate from it. Here, Habermas explains ideal speech situation. Appropriate situation of talking and hearing is the origin of equality and participation; thus its provision leads to possibility of criticism from inequalities and injustices, which result in inappropriate distribution of power in society. Philosopher and social theorist Jürgen 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 not coerce, in which no force prevails but that of the better argument.

In such a situation, participants would be able to evaluate each other's assertions solely on the basis of 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 a 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 ideal speech situation can provide expression freedom, writing freedom, and other civil freedoms for society; transforming using criticism as a weapon for fighting with force and money. Also in a society where social inequalities have been balanced by establishing justice, deviation of communications will be decreased. It means that criticism is a normative performance that safeguards civil achievements and develops social freedoms and laws. This mutual action is ideal speech situation and social / modernism development which guarantees majority participation facilities in administrate public affairs and decreasing main inequalities. Habermas lists lack of freedom and communication infrastructure that results in complex process of regeneration. Two trends which thread this communication infrastructure and reinforce each other include: a) implementing things systematically, b) cultural sterile (Wheate, 2001: 184). Habermas enters 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 due to lack of understanding or distorted communication (Habermas, 1970: 25)

He considers the root of this sickness and explains that field of power and wealth, which is a result of instrumental rationality, dominates field of mind, consensus, and understanding, that is, cultural rationality. By this attitude, he wants to explain a situation that can save human health communication. This situation represents the third dimension of cognitive interests. By considering this attitude, he intended to describe a situation that can save relationship and appropriate human relationship.

This situation shows the third aspect of cognitive interest. Habermas believes that due to this interest, understanding or knowledge is created that causes improvement of independence and responsibility. Thus, it has liberating nature, basically. So these interests influence context and natural bases. He believes that this aspect and its governed rules are a consequent of interaction and transactional and not-experiential special work which relate to objective structure of human environment. Therefore, they are considered as semi-transactional situation or as Habermas believes, have quasi-transactional rank (Held, 1995: 252-254)

Since freedom requires knowledge that is not distorted (regardless of ideology) in "dialogue without sovereignty", at least possibility of negotiation should be available in community, even though it has a damaged ideology. But methodology's rules cannot be distorted rather it is related to its applications. As Habermas argues, referring to autonomy, responsibility and freedom are not considered as an impression simply, because they can be understood as a prediction. Language is a thing that motivates us above nature and also we can understand its nature. Through language structure and interaction, we can achieve freedom (Pilot, 2008: 540).

It is necessary to mention that discussion in foundation of philosophical – political thoughts of Habermas plays an important role, even if the agreement remains imminent.

From the beginning to the end of the discourse, language should be used in a way that field, subjective, intra-subjectivity and objective are distinct from each other. All parties which engage in discourse should be able to recognize distinction between them and identify and make limit. Also, they should resolve their distinctions and their disagreements by a discourse performed in terms of critical reflection which Habermas called discourse speech debate situation, indicating rupture of normal interactions; as an ideal aspect, it is required to delay restricted action and postpone all motives, except desire to achieve understanding and cognition (McCarthy, 1973: 59-64).

Habermas believes communication linguistic action puts default on four causes of credit. That what we say is understandable, correct and true; has background consensus of speaker and listener, including the fact that they have these causes implicatively and if necessary, can be justified. In other words, every communication action means that we can receive an agreement about causes of credit. Finally, Habermas claims that we can recognize true consensus from false, if we can get unrestricted discourse and all actors have equal access to it; in fact Habermas called this matter "ideal discourse situation" (Outhwaite, 1995: 63-64). If necessary, this situation requires social life that is created by communication.

Habermas believes deliberative democracy is an ideal

way. Thus, democracy is a type of political society which increases human freedom and perhaps achieves it at the end. When human autonomy is implemented, democracy occurs, but in modern states, the idea of sovereignty was forgotten and its gravity is transferred to management and parties from parliament. Total interest of heterogeneous is possible and extendable in consensus. Habermas wants a formal ideal situation that resolves differences in a rational manner and through a free communication, which force of reasoning can overcome in its desired pattern (Pusey, 1987: 95). Based on Habermas' idea, maintaining consensus and cohesiveness is depending on cultural context basically, in which world views can be justified. Habermas' beliefs include formal conditions for admission of backgrounds and arguments which cause legitimacy of institutions that is able to create consensus and motivations (Habermas, 1995: 184). This level of justification is essential for supporting traditional and pre-modern societies which have regulated structure.

As it can be seen, Habermas' theory is relying on concepts and theoretical basis of his intellectual range. That means it is related to ideal discourse situation. Activists have agreement in an ideal situation without any coercion and domination towards freedom interests. It is estimated as a consequent result of discoursive democracy.

Conclusion

Habermas believes that the solution to problems in the current sick society is to provide understanding and extending communication action between human beings. Meanwhile he confirms provision of exact and valid evaluations and solutions against shortcomings of the agreement capitalism societies. It means that understanding based on cultural rationality and consensus in ideal conditions of appropriate dialogue actions can form 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 reconstruction concept, he wants to rethink opinions are essentially based on cognitive interests.

Positivism criticism and instrumental rationality rely on the first and second levels of these interests, paying attention to critical dimension. For this reason, he tries to provide principles of his optimum democracy by providing a total and theoretical alternative. Insisting on shortcomings of rationality of democratic systems in capitalism societies and challenging their mechanisms take him toward creating special ideal situation. It is a situation which can provide field of normative permanent coordination, on one hand, and provide necessary

legitimacy by considering participating activists in a fair discussion. Essentially, this pattern has a discursive dimension and knowledge distinction with consultative democracies and dialogue democracies. Evaluating and considering the components of Habermas' thought system provide this logical conclusion for the researcher. There is a 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. The main point to consider here is that deliberative democracy discourse of Habermas, as the most important political category, resulted from his knowledge objectives. According to the obtained results from discussion in the present article, it is clear this fact goes beyond the ideal deliberative (discoursive) democracy of Habermas, which can be considered from two points: first, providing conditions of political participation for all human activists based on critical cognitive interests and effort to access a permanent consensus; the second point represents that his democracy discourse and its extension in a society based on different approach has an important place in reconstruction of human relations, transactions and maintenance of their actual rights. By considering the explanation and evaluation of opinions and thoughts of Habermas, it is clear that his democracy theory has been established based on his theoretical and philosophical principles. It is clear that this model has uncertainties and limitations, in addition to the obstacles and challenges faced by democracy which have been considered by thinkers. Its ideal properties and metaphysics of principles and categories are critical considerations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Asen R (1999). "Toward a Normative Conception of Difference in Public Deliberation", Argument. Advocacy 25: 115–129 .
Benhabib S (1992). Models of Public Space, Habermas and thePublic Sphere, Cambridge Mass: MIT press.
Elster J (1998). Deliberative Democracy, Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge Univ. Press.
Fooladvand E (2008). Philosophy and society and policy, Tehran, Samt Pub.
Habermas J (1974). The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article, originally appearing in Lexicon Staat und Politik,new edition, Frankfort am Main., 1964, pp 220-226.
Habermas J (1979). Communication and the Evolution of Society, trans. T. MacCarthy, Boston, Beacon Press.
Habermas J (1994). "Three Normative Models of Democracy". Constellation 1(1): 8
Habermas J (1995). The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and

The Rationonalization of Society, Tr.T. ,Mc Carthy , Cambridge:1, polity press.

Habermas J (1996). Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law Democracy. William Rehg, Cambridge, MIT Press.

Habermas J (1970). "On Systematically Distorted Communication, Towards On Theory of Communication". Inquiry 13: 205-18. Critical sociology, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Kamal Pooladi, Tehran, Markaz pub. Fourth print.

Habermas J (2008). "legitimacy issues in the current capitalism", critical sociology, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Kamal Pooladi, Tehran, Markaz pub., 4th print: 425-454.

Hauser G (1998). "Vernacular Dialogue and the Rhetoricality of Public Opinion". Comm. Monographs. pp 83–107.

Hoolab R (1996). Jurgen Habermas, translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran, Ney Pub., first print.

Held D (1995). Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas ,Cambridge : Polity Press.

Lessnaf M (2001). Political philosophers in 20th century, translated by Khashayar Dayhimi, Koochak pub., First print.

McCarthy TA (1973),"A Theaory of Communication Competence", Philos. Soc. Sci., 3: 56-135

Nowzari HA (2002). Reconsidering Habermas; review opinions and thoughts of Jurgen Habermas, Tehran, Cheshmeh pub., first print.

Outhwaite W (1995). Habermas: An critical introduction, Standford University.

Pusey M (2005). Jurgen Habermas, translated by Ahmad Tadian, Tehran, Hermes Pub., Second print.

Pusey M (1987). Jurgen Habermas, London, Tavitock.

Pilot H (2008). "Philosophy of Habermas history", critical sociology, editor: Paul Conerton, translated by Hassan Chavoushian, Akhtaran pub., 2nd print. pp 517-547.

Qaderi H (2006). Political thoughts in 20th century, Tehran, Samt Pub.

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

Wikipedia (2008). From: (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_sphere)

Wheate S (2001). Wisdom, justice and modernism: current writings of Habermas, translated by Mohammad Hariri Akbari, Tehran, Qatreh pub., First print.