International Journal of Political Studies

Peer Review   **Indexed**   **Refereed Journal**

Quarterly International Research Journal

Hannah Arendt Ve Jürgen Habermas's Public Sphere

Edemealem Mekuriyaw Tegegne

Debre Markos, Ethiopia

Email: edmexlibanon@gmail.com

Abstract

This article focuses on examining Hannah Arendt's and Jürgen Habermas's public sphere. It employed a qualitative research method and used secondary sources of data to successfully address this objective. It also used document review techniques to collect the necessary data and employed thematic data analysis tools to analyze the gathered data. Arendt advocates for public sphere in ancient Greek, which endorses inclusion, consensus, accountability, and transparency. It promotes the empowerment of citizens in the identification of common problems and issues. A public sphere, according to Arendt, is not the uniformity of the people, but one that promotes equality, speech, action, and freedom. In other words, she believes in engaging in politics to achieve true humanity. On the other side, Habermas's public sphere emerged in the 18th century, which connects culture, politics, and the economy through media. It encourages rational critical debate or communicative discourse with the aim of achieving common understanding and consensus. Arendt and Habermas endorse openness, equality, diversity, and communication based pluralism. However, in modern society, the media has blurred the distinction between public and private spheres, distorts information, creates false impressions, and diminishes transparency and openness. In general, Arendt and Habbermas believe that public space enables individuals to discuss their different matters and to achieve consensus and common understanding despite the challenges of the modern age.

Keywords: *Hannah Arendt, Jürgen Habermas, Public Sphere*

1.1. Introduction

Erdoğanö (2002) highlighted that the public sphere is a public space for public debate, action and negation, which was central for 20th century history, sociology, communication, and political thought. The

debate on the public sphere highly associated with the debate on democracy in 1990s that developed as a result of the collapse of socialism and the dominance of neo-liberalism. The public sphere allows the people to exchange opinions and to form opinions on public affairs, which promote free information, expression and debate. In this regard, Habermas (1991) explains that public sphere is vital factor in shaping the public opinions and legitimizing state and democracy in various societies.

Arendt (1958) explains that public sphere based on established norms from historical perspectives or ancient Greece. Timur (2012) and Fuchs (2015) highlight that Habermas focused on bourgeois sphere model which evaluates the 18th century public sphere whereas Arendt tried to show it depending on the ancient Greek that views public space as perquisite of freedom. Habermas (1991) and Zabci (1997) argue that the public sphere emerged in the 18th century because of the transformation of the private sphere and mounting subjectivization. He asserts that individualism emerges due to the desire to express oneself, which acts as an intermediary between the private and public spheres. In addition, the relation between the bourgeois family's private sphere and the literary public sphere is shaped by urban life's public spaces.

Habermas (1989) explains that the public sphere as a space that allows citizens to freely debate and negotiate matters of public concern without any restriction. It is a normative ideal that arises from rational public debate and shows transparency, equality, diversity, and pluralism. Habermas separates the private and public spheres to prevent the colonization of the life-world and to mitigate the negative impact of the economy and administration on society. He promotes the morality of procedures to maintain social integration and democratic politics. He, for instance, suggests that self-interested individuals should pursue their interests outside the public sphere. However, Benhabib (1997) asserts that Habermas's public sphere focuses on legitimacy in capitalist society. In this regard, Habermas (1989) notes that in the mid-19th century, mass culture dominated the public sphere and blurred the distinction between the public and private spheres. Commodified relations, advertisements, and propaganda can affect the public sphere and eventually lead to interest-based politics and actions.

Ingram (2019) articulates that Habermas views that the face-to face discussions, letters, and public opinions were a critical check on the government in the 18th century bourgeois public sphere in Northern Europe. On the other side, Arendt (1958) introduced labor, work, and action as

the fundamental activities of mankind. As for her, the public life and freedom are vital for the political development of society. Pertaining to this, the public sphere comprises various aspects of reality, including speech and persuasion. Winter (1989) and Madanipour (2004) highlighted that Arendt's ancient Greece has good experience in the public sphere, which emphasizes on freedom, public action, and identity disclosure, whereas the private sphere is dominated by violence and need. The public sphere, in the Greek city states, was dominated by men, while women and slaves were limited to the private realm or domestic economy.

Benhabib (1996) and Mansbridge et al. (2019) stated that Arendt's public sphere encouraged equal societies and participatory democracy, which promotes ethical and inclusive decision making as the core democratic rule. In this regard, Arendt (1958) recognizes that the political discourse in the public sphere also comprises aesthetic, self-presentation, and emotional aspects in addition to the rational political debates.

Therefore, this article focuses on examining the origin and characteristics of Hannah Arendt's and Jurgen Habermas's Public Sphere.

1.2. Arendt's and Habermas's Perspectives on Public Sphere

1.2.1. Arendt's Public Sphere

1.2.1.1. The Public Sphere in Ancient Greece

Benhabib (1996) stated that Arendt's public sphere traces back to the ancient Greece. The private sphere focuses on the centers of production and consumption, such as eating, drinking, reproducing, dressing, and non-political necessities, which are necessary for life's necessities because necessity and life are interconnected. In ancient Greece, people who lived the private sphere were considered slaves or barbarians and ignored because private sphere led to deprivation. Moreover, Arendt (2012) mentioned that in ancient Greece culture, a unique political organization, created two spheres of life: i.e., the shared space of free citizens (the koine) and domain of individual households (the oikos). As to ancient Greece, privacy was viewed as a lack of human quality and considered as foolish and depriving. Therefore, to them living in private sphere was an implication of incomplete human beings; i.e., slaves or barbarians. Public sphere was essential for political actions and controlling one's life and freedom. Freedom was seen as meeting necessities and entering politics. In this regard, Benhabib (1997) in ancient Greek city states, public life was found in spaces like agoras, courts, and war and athletic games. However, the polis is not merely a physical location but rather a form of institution coming from people's

actions and conversations or among people who live together and engage in action and speech.

Arendt (2012) everyone is considered equal in the public sphere, where there is no distinction between the rulers and ruled. The distinction is only seen in a pre-political sphere or in the household sphere. The polis was reserved for free men, and equality in the polis goes beyond equal rights, which involves active participation in public affairs. Those who do not participate are excluded from political rights and this exclusion is considered as a severe punishment. Mulgan (1990) described that the Plato's society is the gathering of many people for survival and species continuation, which arises from the inability of individuals to be self-sufficient. Additionally, humans were animals before becoming political animals in the Aristotle's point of view..

Arendt (1958) argues that ancient Greece requires meeting urgent needs to achieve freedom and being free in the polis requires dominating one's private life. According to her, public space encompasses all places where action and speech can occur, which shows the readiness for a public sphere because it is not limited to agora or court. Public sphere was a place where everyone shows and expresses its uniqueness; and where people perform their actions and speak.

1.2.1.2. **Public and Private Spheres**

Benhabib (1997) points out that Arendt distinguishes public life and private life, which are vital to understand public happiness. Arendt believes in the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In other words, she promotes public life and public happiness, determined by plurality and collective action. In this regard, Arendt (1958) argues that politics emphasizes the common world where everyone is equal rather than the individual interests.

Garnham (2005) asserted that the private-public division is Western post-Enlightenment thought. In this regard, Fuchs (2008) show that the division between the private and public realms, where the private realm related to family and the economy whereas the public realm connected with space, where the individuals discuss their common problems and issues. Arendt (1958) described the public sphere as the symbol for enlightened dialogue and peaceful negotiation, allowing the communicative and connoted development of shared meanings within the world. In this sense, Warren (2017) observed that the public sphere plays an important role in offering alternative ideas, information dissemination, empowering the citizenry, promoting inclusiveness, and upholding accountability and transparency in a representative democracy. Moreover, Benhabib (1997) and White and Ypi (2016)

argue that public sphere enables citizens to identify and understand their common problems, interests, and issues. In other words, it is essential to have an inclusive and effective political system, and just society. In this regard, Young (2000) also articulated that public sphere allow every citizen to state his or her own interests in the debate, and finally leads to collective preference formation and action.

Arendt (2012) asserts that the public sphere enables people to achieve their highest level of fulfillment and allows them to be visible in the world. This space indicates that persuasion prevails in citizen interaction, which is based on speech without physical violence. In this regard, she argues that the ancient Greece is a political community that ensures the survival of actions, speech, and stories and is responsible for the actions of all citizens and governments, or that it is the act of imposing laws on others and the act of expressing emotions and opinions. Life without political organization will be vulnerable to violence and lack meaning and honor. As a result, ancient Greece city states are spaces for mortal beings to achieve immortality. Grimes (2013) and Achen and Bartels (2017) also articulated that the citizens must publicly criticizes the government to prevent abuses of power and to ensure effective representative democracy. In this regard, Chambers (2009)

asserted that public sphere enables voters to understand their preferences and evaluate the performance of the government, and to ensure accountability and transparency of government officials.

Arendt (2012) criticizes that modern individuality, which focuses on personal successes and goals over public engagement and collective action. In this regard, the private sphere comprises economic concerns, bodily functions, and species reproduction, which is regulated by necessity, wants, and life. In addition, Benhabib (1997) and Allen (2012) asserted that the private realm is criticized because women are confined to the household. In this regard, feminists raise the issue of gender equality and criticizes that privacy underestimates women and overestimate men.

1.2.1.3. Plurality and Appearance in the Public Sphere

Arendt (1958) points out that in the public sphere, the realm of the world is not the sameness of people, but it shows their actions and interests in the same subject. In the modern world, forgetting differences leads to movements like totalitarianism, which abolishes plurality and freedom, and finally, this, can lead to its collapse. The ancient Greece avoids these problems by promoting equality, speech, action, and freedom. It enables humans to discuss issues and problems on an equal footing with

others and to find solutions. In this regard, humans should first meet their necessities and then engage in political actions in the public sphere. In this regard, action and public space are essential to ensuring human existence and contributing to human interaction and freedom. Moreover, Calhoun (1992) stated that public spaces provide a sense of performance and durability to human life through actions. In other words, the public space enables individuals to make the subject visible and to construct a public self or a unique identity, which makes public action indispensable for individual identification and self-discovery within a shared space. In this regard, Arendt (2010) noted that political equality is a crucial condition of interaction in public spaces, and the exclusion from a community of action can result in a denial of agency. Moreover, Wolin (1990) stated that Arendt's idea of freedom is usually seen as a separation between freedom and necessity, and the public sphere aims to prevent totalizing and self-erasing.

Curran (2000) and Keane (2000) argue that in the Arendt's view, the ancient Greece was replaced by state modernity, which is the notion of political modernity, and opened up space for political freedom. The American Revolution and the Students' Movement, for instance, inspired future quests for freedom, action, and political spaces. Political space and action, such as agency, allow for complex thinking about action and agency in contemporary spaces. In this regard, Arendt (1958) shows that in the modern form of equality, the relationship between the householders and household head shows that the common interest and right opinion are represented and ruled by one man, which leads to the decline of true and ideal politics. Arendt (1951) maintains that due to the denial of uniqueness and the universality of uniformity and sameness, modern society is not the right condition for plurality. Benhabib (1997), on the other hand, says that plurality, a concept of thinking written by Arendt, is to be contested as the brilliance of unique identities is curtailed by the plurality of people who are marginalized in or not given the chance to express themselves in the public sphere. Individuating differences, where uniqueness is derived from, also limits the idea of political equality and differences. However, Arendt (1958) argues that the ancient Greek models are idealized example of public sphere, though the critics disagree due to the exclusion of some people from the public sphere.

1.2.1.4. The Importance of Action and Speech

Arendt (1958) states that labor, work, and action are the three basic human activities. Labor shows the repetitive activities such as eating, clothing, and

sheltering, which are necessary for survival or biological necessities to sustain and reproduce life. On the other hand, work focuses on building a lasting legacy through creating durable objects and structures, which shapes the world of human artifice. In other words, it is an instrument to achieve a particular goal, which often involves routine and repetition.

Benhabib (1997) articulated that action corresponds that the human condition of plurality, i.e., the condition of political life. Equality is a crucial issue for individuals in the public sphere to understand each other. In this regard, in ancient Greece, the public sphere was the space of freedom, which was essential for human survival. Arendt's concept of action focuses on activities that create shared world meanings. In this regard, the ancient Greece was considered as a model because polis was a space for mutual engagement, debates and inter-subjectivity.

Arendt (1958) argued that identity and plurality are formed through action, which is the highest and best form of human activity. Action is spontaneous, revelatory, and exemplary of human power. Compare to labor and work, action is public and comprises genuine freedom, which needs an audience or takes place in a collectivity. Moreover, action and speech are vital to reveal individuals' identities in the public sphere. These identities are fluid and unpredictable, which are mainly shaped through action and speech. Moreover, Anowai and Chukwujekwu (2019) asserted that Arendt's action and speech are important as means of being together.

Honig (1993) highlighted that plurality is the basic condition of action, speech, thought, and politics or it is the condition of all political life. Agonism, viewing power as pervasive in human interaction, is the base for identity and plurality. In other words, identities reveal uniqueness within the context of human power and potentiality, which are shaped agonistically in the public realm. Arendt (1958) affirmed that action is essential to form a common world, institutions, standards of judgment, and contracts. In this regard, due to the emergence of a new public way of life, Arendt praised the American revolutionary actions. Politics is the sphere for human freedom. Political action on the basis of common good is less essential without public realm.

Benhabib (1997) highlights that Arendt's public sphere as expressive action (agonistic public sphere), which tells of individual uniqueness, shared moral and political greatness, and reflects human distinction and equality. Arendt (2012) and Mouffe (2013) point out that power arises from collective action of equal individuals or equal relationships. In other words, this view is against inequality and unequal

relations. Calhoun (1997) states that it was not only power, division, or distribution of goods, rather, it was also a realm of self-creation and creating a space between people through discourse and mutual recognition through voluntary action. Barber (1984) highlighted that despite democracy ignores the participation of minority groups in politics, direct democracy helps to address public disputes and conflicts of interest through deliberation, decision, and action.

1.2.2. **Habermas on Public Space**

1.2.2.1. **The Emergence and Characteristics of Bourgeois Sphere**

Habermas (1989) articulated that the development of media and the public community became a means of mediating agreements for the structural disruption during the shift from feudalism to capitalism. In the 18th century, the formation of the public was impacted by a new form of privatization, which focuses on self and subjectivity. The public sphere, therefore, was born within the bourgeois to function as the mediator between the state and private individuals. In 18th- and 19th-century Germany, France, and Britain, it found grounding in social changes precisely described as the separation of political authority from everyday life. This space created middle class people who engaged in free and rational debates. However, Wang

(2008) highlighted that pubic spheres are merely not confined in the Western world but in China, Japan, Iran, and Turkey, public teahouses are cultural practices and common places for the people.

Calhoun (1992) also states that Habermas introduced an ideal bourgeois public sphere that used the media without fear of censorship or political prosecution, and issues were debated in parliament. The rise of private property and the distinction between the state and society contributed to the emergence of the ideal public sphere. Publicness in the Middle Ages was thought of as a status attribute and as rulers displaying their authority towards the people. The advance of national states and the development of capitalist economies caused the separation of state and society and the definition of a new separate sector, private and public—thus being important for the development and consolidation of the public sphere. The bourgeois public sphere institutionalized critical discourse, which enhanced critical reasoning in the early 18th century. However, today's public participation is known for sporadic acts of acclamation through general elections rather than arguments. This public sphere focuses on the physical presence of the ruler and symbols. In connection with this, Kahraman (2019) asserted that the emergence of modern nation-states and the rise of capitalism, which led to a separation of state

and society, played a vital role in the formation of the bourgeois public sphere. The state represents public authority, and society represents private interests. However, these distinctions were not observed in the middle ages because private individuals and institutions carried out private functions. In addition, Calhoun (1992) highlighted that the economic development of the class and its social practices, market requirements, false consciousness of the bourgeois and audience-oriented subjectivity, and intimate experiences also influenced the bourgeois public sphere. In addition, Habermas (1991) stated that the family and the economy are considered as the private realm in pre-modern society. However, in the modern society, due to the rise of the capitalist economy, the economy detached from the family. In this regard, the public sphere mediates between the family, economy and state.

1.2.2.2. Communicative Rationality and Deliberation

Luhmann (1996) pointed out that communication is a social relation. Civil society and the public sphere connect culture, politics and the economy through the ideas circulated through media. Habermas (1989) notes that the public sphere provides a space for individuals to discuss social norms and influence their formation which views state intervention

negatively. In this regard, the idea of unrestricted communication and the public sphere, a platform for individuals to discuss social norms and influence their formation, are against the modern state.

Habermas (1991) points out that the public sphere is a neutral social space that is vital for critical debate among private individuals. The bourgeois public sphere emerged as a neutral social space in the 18th century and allowed the private citizens to come together and talk about common interests. It, therefore, ensures that all citizens have access to discuss common interests in a free and rational manner. Increased participation of citizens and rational critical debate plays a crucial role in enhancing an ideal public sphere. In other words, the public sphere places emphasis on the quality of communication and the active participation of citizens. Furthermore, Benhabib (1997) noted that stated that Habermas advocated rational-critical debates among private individuals. The 18th and 19th centuries, Habermas's bourgeois sphere was an elitist process, where highly educated classes had political and leadership influence. The debates and discussions among the intellectuals in salons, coffee houses, and secret societies led to the emergence of public opinion. In this regard, the press played a crucial role in democratizing rational and critical thinking, which expressed the legacy of the

enlightenment. Habermas (1988) argues that the public opinion was partly motivated by bourgeois elites' interest to get political power and free markets.

Dewey (2012) noted that infrastructures in public sphere shape participants and connections, where the public communication is determined by conscious choices and settings. Clark (2017) and Calhoun (2012) asserted that the public sphere regulated debates and openness, which allows access to information. Furthermore, Gardiner (2004) argues that Habermas introduced an optional democracy approach, uniting republican and liberal perspectives, which promotes liberal self-interested individuals to participate in collective action and transforms them into self-governing people through communication and deliberation in the political public sphere. Strong intellectual understanding and interaction with genuine consensus are very important.

Garnham (2005) noted that the public sphere focused on political and cultural communication, which ignores the materiality and political economy. For instance, this perspective does not focus on the ownership of public spheres such as internet and social media, which influences the formation of public opinion. Habermas (1988) affirmed that public sphere allows critical public debate and media access, which is open to all and independent of economic and political power. In other words, it is free from state censorship and private ownership. Fuchs (2008 and 2015) stated that the economy, politics, and culture are the distinct spheres, which are determined by the accumulation of money, power, and status in modern society. However, civil society media, which are owned by citizens, play a crucial role in examining and opposing the capitalist economy and governments. They challenge the profit oriented stance of the capitalist corporations and explain alternative cultural and economic perspectives.

Crossley and Robberts (2004) explain that Habermas's perspective in the 18th century, art and literature played a vital role in the self-cultivation of the bourgeoisie. They became a center of public discussion and debate, and big coffee houses and salons were the centers for critical and rational discussions, which led to political publics. In other words, participatory society helps the presence of genuine public sphere. According to Benhabib (1997), bourgeois public was crucial to stabilizing rationality and providing room for social transformation. However, during the 19th century, the bourgeois public sphere was mainly male and middle class. The state is often intervening in people's lives; the state/public and the private have become so blurred that the residence of the public sphere has moved from private individuals

to professionalized politicians where discourse and opinion are manipulated, not genuinely debated. This distorted public sphere makes politics insignificant for many individuals. In addition, the media mainly focuses on economic markets and profits rather than true political debates. Similarly, Ingram (2019) points out that the bourgeois public sphere was open to all, regardless of status and was known for equality, freedom, openness, and public mindedness. However, the purpose of parliamentary discussion, in the expanded public sphere, shifted from reaching consensus on common interests to negotiating compromises between opposing interests, particularly politicians focused on class warfare in their programs and propaganda to maximize votes and popular support. In this regard, Europe, for instance, focused on class compromise through the idea of a welfare state in the first half of the 20th century, which deteriorated the distinction between state and society or private and public spheres and everything was made and negotiated by the techno-politicians or special groups.

Schudson (2012) argues that in the bourgeois public sphere, demanding equal participation is a little bit difficult because it gives more priority to the educated people or elites, which leads to an exclusionary character and a deterioration of the discourse or communication quality. Habermas (1989) also notes that mass consumption and commodification of culture, reinforced by media, are causes for the decline of the public sphere. These have diminished the interest and readiness of the public for critical debates and active participation, which eventually leads to the decay of critical discourse. Moreover, Curran (2000) goes on to note that the ideal character of public sphere could sometimes not play a role in the society as a result of the influence of the media. Even though having the potential to contribute to the public sphere by delivering information or issues to debates, the reality is that media distorts information as a result of the influence of powerful interests or because of its partial stance. It creates a false impression on the people regarding various aspects. Habermas (1989) argued that the distinction between public and private blurred due to the rise of corporate power and state penetration, which lead to a refeudalization of society.

Habermas (1988) also criticizes the commercialization of the press, which are controlled by powerful actors because the commercialization of press leads to the expansion of undemocratic public spheres. He argues that in the US, great corporations colonized the public sphere, while, in Europe, representative state broadcasting organizations dominated. Now, globalization blurred the lines, but public broadcasting per se remains important to

public interest communication. Besides, Splichal (2007) also found that duel relation in media concentration commercialized content, unequal access to media, and power inequalities can restrain the public sphere as well as a tool for legitimation either by legitimating the dominant opinion or the opinion of the elites. Moreover, Curran (2000) argues that the public sphere cannot play the ideal role in the society, which is free from the influence of the media. Although the media has the potential to contribute to the public sphere by bringing necessary information on public debates, in reality, the powerful interest and partial stance of the media distorted the information. Turow and McAllister (2009) also stated that private media ownership, aiming to maximize profit, also influences the contents in the public sphere and harms public visibility in society.

Calhoun (1992) criticize that Habermas's public sphere gives emphasis to the bourgeois class and ignored other social classes and movements. Moreover, Kluge and Negt (2016) articulated that the public sphere was dominated by white and property-owning males, despite promoting diversity and tolerance. Fraser (1992) also noted that Habermas's public sphere was criticized for its exclusionary nature with respect to gender, ethnicity, race, religion, and cultural style. Schudson (2012) also contends that politics constitutes the part of

the public sphere. However, this public sphere is criticized for overlooking the gendered nature of the modern society that is commanded by men. Similarly, Ryan (1992) criticized that the public sphere postulated by Habermas ignored women's involvement during the time of women's political power and activism. Schudson (2012) asserted that there should be multiple public spheres rather than a unitary public sphere. In this regard, Fraser (1992) argues that a single consensus or public sphere is hard to achieve due to the existence of multiple culturally institutions or multicultural society. Whatever, Mouffe (1995) and Roberts and Crossley (2004) point out that the inclusiveness of ownership and decision making are critical. As a result, the struggle against the oppression should be from various dimensions rather than a unified sphere because there are multiple public arenas in the postmodern world.

1.3. Comparing Habermas and Arendt's Point of Views on Public Sphere

Alexey (2018) suggests that like Habermas, Arendt's public sphere is distinguished by the public-private sphere. Like Arendt, Habermas asserts that the public sphere is a tool to eradicate private and specific issues. Arendt, unlike Habermas, focused on a space where individuals demonstrated their unique identity and promoted a competitive arena

for persuasion. Furthermore, Benhabib (1997) points out that the public sphere is a place, where participants exchange opinions and make decisions for both Habermas and Arendt. In this regard, Arendt (2012) endorses the physical presence and visibility of participants. She advocates for face-to-face communication, which can happen only in specific places. On the other hand, Habermas (1989) believes that participants can engage in the public sphere in different ways, including communication through the media.

Benhabib (1992) notes that both Habermas and Arendt focus on historical processes and draw normative conclusions from historical analysis. Arendt focuses on the ancient Greek public sphere, whereas Habermas emphasizes the bourgeois public sphere. Arendt's concept of the public sphere interprets the way of life and political thought of Ancient Greece, and politics occurs among plural individuals who can initiate new activities. However, the household and economic activities are necessity areas belong to the private sphere. According to Habermas (1989), public sphere emphasizes the unity of citizens and the importance of education and wealth. As to him, daily newspapers and books are used to connect the literary and political public spheres. The press, which emerged in the early 18ᵗʰ century, is very essential to rational-critical reasoning, which

contributed to the emergence of public opinion and rational-critical discourse on political matters. Moreover, Calhoun (1992) notes that Arendt's approach of the public sphere relied on ancient Greek experiences and recognized its decline with modern society and the state, whereas Habermas's approach is modern and impacted by modern society and the state. Historical developments and modern civil society features influenced Habermas' public sphere. The unique identity of individuals is formed within the family. However, the economy is outside the family and state. However, Gür-Şeker (2015) stated that Arendt is criticized for idealizing and abstracting the ancient Greek model in the level that it disassociates from its historical context. In addition, she is criticized for the uncertainty in scrutiny of how her republican model inspired by the ancient Greek model could adapt to modern societal conditions.

Bernstein (2012) stated that Arendt focuses on the significance of collective action and distinguishing political judgment from enlarged mentality, while Habermas emphasizes the rational and free arguments needed to form public opinion. Accordingly, both scholars believe that right to express views shape the public sphere. In addition, Arendt (2009) believes that political action needs political speech or discourse, which is carried out by individuals, requiring the

public sphere. Moreover, Benhabib (1997) and Zabcı (1997) explain that the essence of politics relies on freedom and action in open public space. Political thought is like storytelling and aiming to examine the future by exploring the past.

According to Zabcı (1997), Arendt's public sphere model is more predominantly philosophical fiction, whereas Habermas's approach provides more realistic and progressive solutions to solve the dilemmas of modern society. However, both Habermas and Arendt's approaches to the public sphere provide important ideas for democratic participation and social integration. However, Habermas's concepts on the transformation of the public sphere are utopian, and they lack clear regulation of private interests and state relations. Pertaining to this, Habermas (1989) asserts that a lack of local ground and clear boundaries between private and public spheres diminished transparency and openness in the public sphere. In this regard, political parties and parliaments have also played a significant role in the decline of transparency and openness in the public sphere.

Conclusion

Arendt understands and supports the public sphere in ancient Greece; she distinguishes between private and public life and supports the availability of life, liberty, and happiness. The public sphere is essential for the public life and freedom. Arendt's public sphere supports inclusion, accountability, and transparency by empowering citizens and enabling them to find common problems and issues, which makes a political system inclusive and effective. To her, the public sphere is not the sameness of people; rather, it promotes equality, speech, action, and freedom, which enables equal discussion and problem solving. On the other hand, Habermas argues that the media and the public community mediated agreements during the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The public sphere emerged within the bourgeois to mediate between the state and private individuals in the 18th century. It promotes rational and critical thinking and connects culture, politics, and the economy through the media.

Arendt's public sphere focuses on the ancient Greek city states, or polis, where the private space was both family and economy. Arendt, referencing the agonistic nature of the ancient Greek states, argues that the public sphere is a communicative and competitive space. On the other hand, Habermas's model emphasizes the 18th century's public spheres, which emerged following the emergence of the printing press in modern times.

Habermas and Arendt's public sphere is characterized by rational reasoning and collective action respectively, which share

common features such as openness, equality, diversity, and communication-based pluralism. Arendt believes that engaging in politics and producing political thoughts help to achieve true humanity. Both Habrmas and Arendt argued that the public sphere informs, debates, and creates opinions between people, to a certain extent, in choosing power holders, in legitimizing politics, or in making politics visible as it allows openness and equality among its participants.

Habermas practices subjective public opinion and influence on decision making, where the weak publics on rational discussion are. His view, however, differs from that of Arendt, who feels that the public sphere presents not only the rational discussions that would take place but also where individuals get to show their natal identity. Hence, it is a place of many opinions with no superior and inferior ideas concerning their proximity to the truth. She further advocates plural opinions, which create competition for many perspectives of the public sphere.

In modern society, however, the absence of clear demarcation between the public and private spheres has diminished transparency and openness in the public sphere. Arendt believes that totalitarianism dismantles the public sphere by removing the distinction between the private and public realms. Arendt and Habermas stated that the media has blurred the private and public spheres. The public sphere declines due to mass consumption, and commodification of culture, and the commercialization of the press, which expands undemocratic public spheres. The media distorts information and creates false impressions by blurring the distinction between the public and private spheres.

References

Achen, C. and Bartels, L. (2017). Democracy for Realists: Why Elections do not Produce Responsive Government. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Alexey, S. (2018). Hannah Arendt, Jurgen Habermas, and rethinking the public sphere in the age of social media, Sociological Review, *17*(4), 88-102.

Allen, A. (2012). The Public Sphere: Ideology and/or Ideal? *Political Theory*, 40(6), 822-829.

Anowai, E. and Chukwujekwu, S. (2019). Hannah Arendt on the Destruction of Public Realm in Modernity: A Case with Modern Democracy, Journal of Social Service and Welfare, 1(1), 21-28.

Arendt, H. (1951). The Origins of Totalitarianism, London: Penguin.

Arendt, H. (1958). The Human Condition, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Arendt, H. (2012). İnsanlık Durumu, Çev. Bahadır Sina Şener. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Barber, B. (1984). Strong Democracy, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Benhabib, S. (1996). The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Benhabib, S. (1997). The Embattled Public Sphere: Hannah Arendt, Juergen Habermas and Beyond, *Theoria,* 44 (90):1-24.

Bernstein, R. J.(2012).The Normative Core of the Public Sphere. *Political Theory*,40(6),767-778.

Calhoun, C., 1992: Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere, in: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Calhoun, C. J. (1997). Plurality, Promises, and Public Spaces. In Calhoun, Craig J. & McGowan, John, *Hannah Arendt & the Meaning of Politics.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Calhoun, C. (2012). Roots of Radicalism: Tradition, the Public Sphere and early 19th century Social Movements, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chambers, S. (2009). Rhetoric and the public sphere: Has deliberative democracy abandoned mass democracy? *Political theory*, 37(3), 323-350.

Clark, W. (2017). Activism in the public sphere: Exploring the discourse of political Participation, New York: Routledge.

Curran, J. (2000). Rethinking Media and Democracy, in: J. Curran and M. Gurevitch (eds.) *Mass Media and Society*, London: Arnold.

Dewey, J. (2012). The Public and Its Problems: An Essay in Political Theory. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Erdoğan, M. (2002). Kamusal Alan ve Hukuk, Radikal.

Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. In Calhoun, C. (Ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (109–42). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Fuchs, C. (2008). Internet and Society: Social Theory in the Information Age. New York: Routledge.

Fuchs, C. (2015). Social Media and the Public Sphere, In Culture and Economy in the age of Social Media. New York: Routledge.

Garnham, N. (2005). The Role of the Public Sphere in the Information Society, In Regulating the Global Information Society. London: Routledge.

Gardiner, M. E. (2004). Wild Publics and Grotesque Symposiums: Habermas and Bakhtin on Dialogue, Everyday Life and the Public Sphere. *The Sociological Review*, 52(1), 28-48.

Grimes, M. (2013). The Contingencies of Societal Accountability: Examining the Link between Civil Society and Good

Government, *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 48, 380-402.

Gür-Şeker, D. (2015). The Language of Right-Wing Populism and its Perception in Public Sphere, A Linguistic and Multimodal Analysis of Pegida in German Online Media, Unpublished Manuscript of a Lecture from 31(15).

Habermas, J. (1988). Theory of Communicative Action. Vol II. Boston: Beacon.

Habermas, J. (1989). The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1991). The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, Cambridge: MIT press.

Honig, B. (1993). The Politics of Agonism: A Critical Response to "Beyond Good and Evil: Arendt, Nietzsche, and the Aestheticization of Political Action" by Dana R.Villa, *Political Theory*, 21(3), 528-533.

Ingram, D. (2019). Contesting the Public Sphere: Within and against Critical Theory, Philosophy: Faculty Publications and Other Works, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316160879.021 , accessed on 1 June 2024.

Kahraman, M. D. (2019). Kamusal Alanın Dönüşümü ve Kentsel Mekânın İletişimsel Niteliği Üzerine Düşünmek. Planlama, 29(3), 195-201.

Keane, J. (2000). Media and the Public Spheres–European Idea and Ideal, Media Research: Scientific and Professional Journal for Journalism and Media, 6(2), 55-60.

Kluge, A. and Negt, O. (2016). Public Sphere and Experience: Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere, New York: Verso Books

Luhmann, N. (1996). On the Scientific Context of the Concept of Communication. *Social Science Information*, 35(2), 257-267.

Madanipour, A. (2004). Marginal Public Spaces in European Cities, *Journal of Urban Design*, 9(3), 267-286.

Mansbridge, J., Castiglione, D., & Pollak, J. (2019). Recursive Representation. Creating Political Presence: The New Politics of Democratic Representation, 298-338.

Mouffe, C. (1995). Politics, Democratic Action, and Solidarity, *Inquiry*, 38(1-2), 99-108.

Mouffe, C. (2013). Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically, London: Verso.

Mulgan, R. (1990). Aristotle and Political Participation, *Political Theory*, 18(2), 195-215.

Roberts, J. M. ve Crossley, N. (2004). Introduction. *In* John Michale Roberts ve Nick Crossley (Eds.), *After Habermas, New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ryan, M. (1992). Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in 19th Century America, *In* Calhoun, C. (Ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Schudson, M. (2012). The Public Sphere and Its Problems: Bringing the State (Back) In, *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics & Public Policy*, 8(2), 529-546.

Splichal, S. (2007). Does history matter. Grasping the Idea of Public Service at its Roots, *In* G. F. Lowe & J. Badoel (Eds.), *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media, RIPE*, 237-56.

Timur, T. (2012). *Habermas'ı Okumak.* İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Turow, J. & McAllister, MP (eds.) (2009). The Advertising and Consumer Culture Reader, UK: Routledge.

Young, I. M. (2000). Inclusion and Democracy. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Warren, M. E. (2017). A Problem-based Approach to DemocraticTheory. *American Political Science Review*, 111(1), 39-53.

White, J., & Ypi, L. (2016). The meaning of partisanship, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winter, R. (2009). Forms of Digital Resistance. The Internet and the Constitution of a Transnational Public Sphere. *Political Campaigning on the Web*, 37 (53).

Wolin, S. S. (1990). Hannah Arendt: Democracy and the Political. *In* Garner, R. *'The Realm of Humanitas- Responses to the Writings of Hannah Arendt'*. London: Peter Lang.

Zabcı, F. Ç. (1997). "The Problematic of the Public Sphere in Political Theory: Habermas Arendt," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Ankara: Ankara University.