Deliberative democracy, a post-classical theory, is contrasted with electoral democracy, focusing on public discourse as a key legitimacy source for legislative acts. The paper delves into the historical origins of deliberation and deliberative democracy, crediting political scientist J. Bessette with coining the term. It discusses the critical elements of deliberative democracy, including public dialogue, rational discourse, and institutionalized exchange of opinions for decision-making. The model incorporates elements of representative, direct, and participatory democracy, highlighting its basis in public consultation and discourse.

The article also examines various forms of the deliberative process, including open public discussions and behind-closed-doors exchanges, underscoring the importance of information, argumentation, and persuasion. It critiques the liberal interpretation of democracy and stresses the need for citizen involvement in governance, spotlighting the role of political civil society organizations in fostering democratic deliberation.
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Statement of the problem.

Political modernisation is a permanent process of improving the country’s political system through the implementation of the most relevant ideas, mechanics and tools. A democratic political regime creates the most fruitful conditions for the implementation of political modernisation measures, which is explained by the simplest democratic imperative – “everything that is not prohibited is allowed”.

Civil society is the second most important element of society after the state. It is a source of influence on the authorities and exercises control over their activities, constantly increasing its influence, acting as an intermediary to strengthen social capital. The deliberative model of democracy, which originates from the communicative philosophy, is the most reasonable universal response to the contradictions that arise in a multicultural democratic community as a result of social and political transformations.

The model of deliberative democracy belongs to the post-classical theories of democracy and explains that public discourse of the public becomes a meta-instance of the legitimacy of the government and, in particular, its political decisions. And the functioning of the power mechanisms of interaction between civil society and deliberative democracy is an important dimension that exists as a certain system of active political position of citizens, and makes it possible for them to participate directly in political life, as well as ensures the full exercise of their rights and freedoms.

Analysis of publications.


The purpose of the article.

To clarify the essence of deliberative democracy as a mechanism of civil society’s influence on the state, as well as to analyse and systematise the scientific foundations of conceptual studies of deliberative democracy in the processes of realising the power potential of civil society in Ukraine and the world.

Summary of the main material.

At all stages of its formation, civil society has been part of a complex mechanism of relations between a citizen and the State. The format of these relations has transformed from the dominance of the state in the very process of forming the concept of “civil society” to the parity of relations between the government and civil society institutions, since they have acquired self-management properties. Scholars not only categorised the concept, but also tried to find out the factors of its influence on the peculiarities of the political system, as well as the functioning of the power mechanisms of interaction between civil society and deliberative democracy, and to assess their effectiveness.

Modern conceptions of civil society have developed as a result of a long evolution of views that reflected changes in social relations and political systems. P. Rzaev notes that various definitions of civil society can be reduced to two main
approaches. According to the first one, civil society is seen as a special sphere of society that exists outside the state and comprises a system of non-state relations, structures and institutions. According to the second, it is a certain state of society that correlates with a state of a certain type, in which all rights and freedoms of a person are legally secured and protected, which is the basis for the formation of the rule of law [Rzaiev 2014].

At the present stage of its formation, civil society is defined as a civilised process in which democratic relations between the society itself and its members, between the state and the individual, are simultaneously developing. The condition for such development is balance, equality of responsibilities, rights and freedoms, and the main elements of civil society – the citizen, society and the state. Civil society, together with its institutions, ensures a strong relationship between an individual and the legal provisions of citizens, i.e. the integrity of social and legal relations between an individual and the state and society.

Thus, R. Darendorf in his work “In Search of a New Order” draws attention to the fact that civil society develops independently of state influence in such a way that there is a danger to the liberal order in democratic states. In Western democracies, freedom is threatened by democratic decision-making, stemming from globalisation and a new illiberal regionalism, but also from political authoritarianism and citizen apathy. In the post-communist world, societies may begin to doubt democracy because of its excesses. In the Third World, this situation can provoke dangerous countermeasures to religious fundamentalism and the processes of modernisation of terrorism [Medvedska 2021].

In other words, the author of the term “deliberative democracy” should be considered the political scientist J.Bessette, who first used this concept in 1980 in his book “Deliberative Democracy: The Majority Principle under Republican Rule” [Bessette 1980].

In contrast to the modern democratic process, where voting (electoral democracy) is the central element of democratic practice, theorists of deliberative democracy argue that the true legitimacy of legislative acts can only arise through their prior public discussion, openness, tolerance of other people’s opinions, and readiness to adjust their initial position if a “better argument” emerges in the course of the discourse than the one previously articulated. Deliberative democracy is seen as a public dialogue (discourse) between state institutions and citizens, civil society institutions and the government in the process of developing the most important and necessary ways of developing society as a whole.

The deliberative model of democracy combines elements of representative democracy, direct democracy, and participatory democracy. Deliberative democracy is a type of democracy that consists of an institutionalised dialogue between the government and civil society institutions, a certain rational discourse, discussion, persuasion, argumentation, and compromise in its non-partisan version.

This model of democracy is based on the belief that every person has the opportunity to become a citizen who is able to remain non-partisan, is inclined to compromise and can even abandon his or her own preferences if they prevent agreement. American political psychologists from the University of Minnesota, D. Johnson and R. Johnson, noted that political discourse is a formalised exchange of motivated opinions about which of several alternative courses of
action should be taken to solve social problems [Daimond 2005].

Deliberative democracy exists to involve all citizens in the decision-making process, to persuade others (through reliable information and logic), and to clarify which actions will be most effective in solving social problems. Political discourse is a method of decision-making in a democracy. Decision means agreeing that some of several options prevail, being the most desirable to achieve the goal. Political discourse is a kind of institutionalised exchange motivated by opinions about which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve social problems. It is intended to involve all citizens in decision-making, to persuade others (through reliable information and logic), and to clarify which actions will be most effective in solving social problems. Political discourse is a method of decision-making in a democracy [Daimond 2005].

The Latin word “deliberatio” comes from the dictionary of Roman law and means “to consult”, “to discuss”, “to reason”, “to hold consultations”, “to weigh the pros and cons”. The ancient Roman poet Publius Severus (1 century BC) is credited with the legal “deliberative” principle “Deliberandum est diu quod statuendum est semel”. It means the following: “What is intended to be established for a long time, almost forever, must be thought about in the same way, for a very long time” [Mustafaieva 2018].

Referring to history, A. Romaniuk noted that in 1774, in his famous speech to the voters in Bristol, Edmund Burke called the British Parliament a deliberative assembly of the nation, describing that parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile states whose interests they are obliged to protect; the parliament is a deliberative body of the nation with common interests, where it should be governed not by local problems and local prejudices, but by the general welfare of the country, which comes from the common mind of the people [Romaniuk 2008].

In modern Anglo-American usage, the term deliberation is etymologically based on the Latin word “deliberare” – to consider, listen, consult or deliberate. In English, the word deliberation is also understood as a kind of discussion or debate. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines deliberation as follows: “It is a certain act of reflection, weighing and studying the reasons for a choice, it is careful discussion and examination, prudence and caution in the process of choosing the most acceptable and effective solution”.

John Dewey is the forerunner of the universal model of democracy, according to which democracy was not primarily interpreted as the dominance of the majority position, but it was important for him to consider the mechanisms of achieving power by the majority. J. Dewey paid great attention to public discussions and debates, which can lead to “agreement” with different social strata [Dewey 2000].

Deliberative democracy, or deliberative politics, is a model of social order in which the formation of public opinion and political will in the public sphere and the country’s parliament is not subject to the structure of market processes or imposed ideology, but rather to the original initiative of social communication of citizens focused on achieving mutual understanding and protecting their own interests.

At the same time, J. Bessette clearly distinguishes between the concepts of political discourse and political deliberative process. “In defining the deliberative process, it is important to explain what it is not, because political discourse is not just any reasoning in the course of the political process”, writes Bessette, “The political deliberative process involves reflections on the essential benefits of public policy, reasoning about the common good – that is, the good that is closed to those who can make decisions” [Bessette 1980].

The deliberative process can take different forms. For example, “it can be an open public discussion”, “direct debate”, but it can also be “an exchange of views behind closed doors”. At the same time, none of the varieties of the deliberative process can do “without three elements: information, argumentation, and persuasion” [Bessette 1980].

Developing the theory of deliberative democracy, John Dreisek primarily criticises the liberal interpretation of democracy, considering this model a form of simple aggregation (combination) of political interests. From his point of view, one of the fundamental problems of
democratisation is the involvement of citizens in the governance process. As J. Dreizeck notes: “Democratisation is, by and large, a question of the growing inclusion of different groups and categories of citizens in political life”. J. Dreizeck argues that his analysis of the history of democratisation has shown that: “the demand for greater democracy almost always comes from opposition civil society, rarely and almost never from the state” [Dreizek 1996].

Therefore, J. Dreizek focuses mainly on political civil society organisations (rather than numerous free associations of citizens), arguing that these organisations can make the greatest contribution to ensuring political dialogue (democratic deliberation) and strengthening the democratic foundations of society, primarily through maintaining their independence from the state and their ability to stimulate political discussion. The problematic field is concentrated in the theory of democracy and political theory, on the basis of which this concept is built.

Representatives of the deliberative approach seek to separate the normative, ideal project of a democratic system from the practical implementation of democracy. Thus, J. Dewey writes that since state and governmental institutions are rather tools, mechanisms that provide a way for this idea to function effectively, it is necessary to return to the normative idea of democracy to clarify and deepen the understanding of it and use this deepened understanding to criticise and transform its political embodiments [Dewey 2000].

The widest opportunities for the implementation of the power resources of interaction between deliberative democracy and civil society exist in the rule of law, since it is the state that ensures the normal functioning of civil society institutions and facilitates the resolution of issues facing its members. The legal framework creates an opportunity for the formation and development of civil society, which can be implemented by the initiative from below, an active and constant position of active ordinary citizens [Kosiâlova 2007].

According to V. Medvedska, among the common mechanisms by which deliberation is carried out are public councils at public authorities, appropriate public consultations, certain public examinations, specific mechanisms of public control, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary debates, public discussion in the media.

Deliberative mechanisms should be distinguished by the following features:

- Deliberative mechanisms that are carried out in the formal political sphere. They include: electronic consultations, parliamentary debates; public consultations (opinion polls, public hearings), public councils; open meetings of state bodies; deliberation in local self-government bodies;

- Mechanisms of deliberation carried out in the informal political sphere. These include: informal ones that can be transferred to the formal political sphere (public expertise, public control); those that are considered purely informal (public discussion in the media, public forums, advocacy campaigns) [Medvedska 2021].

The mechanisms of public consultation policy cover the first two groups. The mechanisms of the first group include institutionalised processes, the systematic implementation of which is ensured by the current legal norms and the relevant activities of public authorities and local self-government bodies. The mechanisms of the purely informal political sphere include public discussion in the media and at public forums. These consultative mechanisms also have a significant impact on the development of civil society.

Most often, they are an indicator of the development of civil society rather than a means of development. The prerequisite for their effectiveness is the development of civil society institutions.

Forms of state deliberative policy are formalised and partially formalised processes of deliberation that affect the functioning of civil society. The key point here is that the functions of civil society and the state have a lot in common, but a rather significant difference between them is that the state performs functions aimed at regulating the life processes of societies as an integral socio-political system, while civil society has a number of functions that relate to the state as a political institution and a social entity. The functions of civil society can be divided into two general groups: internal and external, depending on the scope of their implementation.
A. Matiychyk argues that at the present stage of the rise of civil society in Ukraine, there is a formation of self-organisational potential, which is revealed through increased active participation and public position, especially in moments of criticality, which is the key to a complex political system in stability and sustainable development [Matiychyk 2016].

In particular, in Ukraine, civic initiative is defined by the events of the Maidan in Kyiv (2013-2014) – the Revolution of Dignity. The events that took place during the Euro-Revolution with the Ukrainian society left an imprint on the history of Ukraine. This episode is important for Ukrainians, as well as for Ukraine itself, because the sphere of mass consciousness, ethical and moral norms in the Ukrainian tradition reflects certain revolutionary manifestations through the direct realisation of the power potential of civil society. It was then that patriotism gained particular importance as an affirmation of Ukraine’s own national consciousness and dignity.

The immediate manifestation of the deliberative mechanism of civil society in Ukraine is caused by the confrontation of citizens with representatives of the authorities as the main subject of the state. Researchers define this event as follows: “The state came into conflict with a critical number of people, whose condition did not suit them. A simple thing that united, if not 99% of the participants in the revolution, then the vast majority, is quite important in this sense: these citizens managed to find the strength to live without the state, which at one point appeared as a certain barrier and obstacle. It became clear that it was even better without the state. However, since it is still impossible to do without it, it should be changed. The paternalistic form of the state is a “macabre post-Soviet formation”, made up of elements of the Soviet-style “welfare state”, cynical populism and nostalgia. The Maidan did not stand for a “strong state”. On the contrary, its main pathos was the desacralisation of state power, which was confirmed by many significant events.

Deliberative discourse contributes to the strengthening of civil society, which, in turn, acts as a kind of trigger for political modernisation. After all, a consolidated community is better aware of its own interests, properly formulates common demands and communicates them to the state and other political institutions. Deliberation offers a new interpretation of rationality, legitimacy, publicity, community, etc. It forms a common awareness within civil society of the need to constantly change the social order on a rational and legal basis, which would contribute to the mutual enrichment of society and its constant renewal [Rozanvalon 2009].

One of the key advantages of deliberative discourse is that it balances the positions of the majority and the minority, because they are represented on an equal footing, and their words have equal force. The minority’s beliefs, if properly substantiated, can become a manifestation of the general opinion. This transition is commonly referred to in the research literature as the “deliberative turn”. Nowadays, the legitimacy of a democratic decision is gained exclusively through public communication, which is determined by rationality; the democratic process depends on the collective will. Deliberative discourses contribute to the analysis of socio-political reality, the transformation of a sensual perception of a particular situation into a rational position, the generalisation of experience, and thus the realisation of civic status as a subject endowed with rights, opportunities to influence state institutions, freedoms, etc. In this way, political activism in the context of deliberation revitalises the development of a citizen’s political consciousness. The absence of such experience may result in political indifference, which over time has every chance of turning into its extreme form – political absenteeism [Meliakov 2014].

There is an obvious connection between the internal processes taking place within civil society and the process of transformation of the political system. It can be argued that the acquisition of new qualitative features by civil society institutions, on the one hand, affects the overall process of democratisation of the political system. On the other hand, democratic transformations of the political system open up new boundaries and opportunities for the accelerated development and institutionalisation of civil society. The dilemma of determining the place of civil institutions in the
system of political and power relations, although interpreted in favour of the autonomy of civil society, excludes its complete alienation from the state [Pasisnychenko 2010].

Conclusions.

The result of theoretical and methodological research of our time can be considered the recognition of civil society as a political phenomenon, which is concretised, in a certain way, through the purposeful political activity of its subjects and institutions, and is reflected through the adjustment of public policy and participation in the distribution of power resources, while determining their general orientation towards the establishment and protection of the main priorities, values and directions of democracy.

In contrast to modern democratic practice, where voting is the central element of the democratic process (electoral democracy), theorists of deliberative democracy argue that the true legitimacy of legislative acts can only arise through their prior public discussion. Representatives of the deliberative approach also sought to develop a certain communication procedure for discussion between citizens that would serve to reconcile different points of view and shape public opinion.

The model of deliberative democracy serves as a basis for implementing an effective system of strategic communications. It introduces changes and additions to the sphere of public administration, in particular, the humanitarian and social component, shapes a new approach to the analysis of good governance, which becomes an effective, open and accessible framework for the realisation of the power potential of civil society, and shows a certain empathy with all the requirements of citizens and their basic needs and demands.
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