

National Research University
Higher School of Economics

As a manuscript

Savin Nikita Yurevych

**THE CONCEPT OF THE POLITICAL IN DELIBERATIVE
DEMOCRATIC THEORY**

SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Political
Science HSE

Academic Supervisor:
Doctor of Sciences, professor
Boris Kapustin

Moscow, 2019

Research design

Statement of research problem and literature review

In 2000 Australian political theorist John Dryzek described the current state of affairs in political theory as «deliberative turn»¹. Indeed, in 1990s and in following decades, deliberation became the main topic in democratic debates and attracted attention of crucial political theorists of the XX century. Particularly, Jürgen Habermas, John Rawls, Robert Dahl, Benjamin Barber, Richard Rorty, etc. extensively participated in these debates². Moreover, the ideas of deliberative democracy have extended to empirical studies and political reality.

In general, deliberative democracy could be defined as a theoretical approach, which central issue is «whether democratic processes and institutions should be built around the actual or empirical will of those engaged in politics, or whether it should be built around what might be called ‘reasonable’ political judgment»³. Though deliberative democracy remains the most popular political theory, there is a growing attention to an opposite school of thought – agonistic democracy. The ideas of agonistic democracy are extensively elaborated in works of Chantal Mouffe⁴, William Connolly⁵, James Tully⁶ and Bonnie Honig⁷. Agonistic democrats state that politics should be understood in a conflictual rather than consensual way and highlight the significance of antagonism and power as opposed to reason and consensus. Based on this idea agonistic democrats maintain that deliberative democracy cannot recognize genuine problems of political life,

¹ Dryzek J. Deliberative Democracy and Beyond. Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. P. 2.

² For instance: Democracy and Difference: Contesting boundaries of the Political / ed. S. Benhabib. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996; Deliberative Democracy / eds. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Massachusetts and London: the MIT Press, 1997.

³ Held D. Models of Democracy. 3rd ed. Polity Press, 2008. P. 232.

⁴ Mouffe C. The Democratic Paradox. London, New York: Verso, 2000; Mouffe C. On the Political. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

⁵ Connolly W. Identity/Difference. Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

⁶ Tully J. Public Philosophy in a New Key. Vol I: Democracy and Civic Freedom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008; Tully J. Strange Multiplicity. Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

⁷ Honig B. Emergency Politics: Paradox, Law, Democracy. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009.

for instance, the rise of right wing parties and the reinforcement of populism in political life.

According to agonistic democrats, such theoretical «blindness»⁸ is the consequence of an inadequate assessment of the nature of politics in deliberative democracy. Chantal Mouffe highlights that only acknowledging the paradoxical nature of modern democracies enables to grasp their specific dynamics and suggest solutions for contemporary political challenges⁹. Bonie Honig adds that instead of the recognition of fundamental political controversy between the multitude and the people deliberative democracy focuses on two secondary issues – the paradox of constitutional democracy and the paradox of democratic legitimacy¹⁰. Unlike the genuine political paradox, these two paradoxes, in her opinion, are amenable to solution. The paradox of democratic legitimacy is resolved by revealing the moral position of universalization¹¹. The paradox of constitutional democracy is the contradiction between the constitutional regime and genuine democracy. This paradox is resolved, for example, by Jürgen Habermas through the establishment of an internal connection between the rule of law and democracy¹².

Aspiring to overcome all political contradictions deliberative democracy becomes not only politically blind, but also politically dangerous conception. Various versions of deliberative democracy contain the idea of a reasonable consensus on the rules of common living (John Rawls) or procedures of legitimate decision making (Jürgen Habermas). James Tully highlights that there is always a probability of a reasonable disagreement within the established consensus, and any policy consensus will always be agonistic by default¹³. While deliberative democracy does not recognize the reasonable character of disagreement, it remains an instrument for political oppression. James Tully distinguishes his own ideas on democracy from «normative political theory» and identifies his works as a

⁸ Bächtiger A., André Bächtiger Niemeyer S., Neblo M., Steenbergen M.R., Steiner J. Disentangling Diversity in Deliberative Democracy: Competing Theories, Their Blind Spots and Complementarities. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*. Vol. 18, №2. P. 32-63.

⁹ Mouffe C. Op. cit. 2000. P. 4.

¹⁰ Honig B. Op. cit. 2009. P. 16.

¹¹ Ibid. P. 25.

¹² Ibid. P. 29.

¹³ Tully J. Op. cit. 2008. P. 129.

tradition of practical philosophy (public philosophy), which focuses on critical analysis of extant practices of government, rather than on the abstract universal *ought*¹⁴. If deliberative democrats build positive projects on the basis of certain metaphysical or normative prerequisites, Tully follows the tradition of critical theory, considering the present in the context of history as a field of struggle between social forces. For him, history becomes not just a prologue to the present, but is regarded as a laboratory of the present¹⁵. Such an approach makes it possible to contrast the deliberative position with a view of the surrounding reality as a non-deterministic product of power struggles in the midst of an ocean of other contingent possibilities¹⁶.

Chantal Mouffe goes even further, arguing that the politics of right-left consensus in European countries, which is largely inspired by the ideas of deliberative democracy, is the authentic reason for the growing influence of far-right parties¹⁷. Debating with Rawls and Habermas, Mouffe refers to the late works of Wittgenstein. According to Wittgenstein, agreement in opinions is derived from agreement about language, which, in turn, is derived from agreement about forms of life¹⁸. In this logic, such ideas as the veil of ignorance and the ideal speech situation are problematic. Procedures cannot exist in the form of abstract principles; the way of their existence is concrete practices inseparable from forms of life. Procedures always include a substantial ethical component. The desire to justify ideal democratic procedures is a theoretically insoluble task. Instead, democratic theory should raise the question of the conditions for the existence of a democratic individuality, practices and language games¹⁹.

According to Mouffe, only the diversity of institutions, discourses and forms of life that share democratic values contributes to the survival of democracy and the reproduction of democratic citizenship²⁰. Values per se cannot be

¹⁴ Ibid. P. 16.

¹⁵ Tully J. Op. cit. 1995. P. 25.

¹⁶ Tully J. Op. cit. 2008. P. 130.

¹⁷ For instance, Mouffe C. Op. cit. 2005.

¹⁸ Mouffe C. Op. cit. 2000. P. 67.

¹⁹ Ibid. P. 68-69.

²⁰ Ibid. P. 96.

conceived as a mediator of political communication within the framework of deliberative democratic theory. In the Rawls approach they exist in a sphere of private life, while in Habermas version they are amenable to rational justification. Reducing political communication to the exchange of arguments unduly diminishes the role of passions and affects in politics. Just as the absence of friction prevents movement on perfectly smooth ice, the removal of passions and affects from political communication undermines the very possibility of such communication²¹.

The defensive argument of the deliberative theory is built mainly in a pragmatic way, namely, in the form of a demonstration of the advantages that the advocated point of view provides for detecting and solving political problems faced by democracy. Deliberative democrats emphasize that the presence of a normative guideline makes it possible to give critical and at the same time balanced judgments on the democratic process²². Most authors who respond to criticism limit themselves to clarifying questions about the practical feasibility of principles of deliberative democracy²³. Such steps cannot provide an exhaustive answer to the questions posed, since they do not discuss the central question of agonistic criticism about the specifics of political theory as a style of thought on politics. All authors continue to share the idea that the goal of political theory is to develop political projects based on the achievements of moral philosophy²⁴.

The problem of the study is the lack of clarity in the issue of what preconditions should underlie the political-theoretical reflection on democracy. Such prerequisites largely determine the direction of reflection, determine the possibility of understanding political processes and are reflected in the meanings of the concepts being formulated. The problematic nature of the understanding of

²¹ Ibid. P. 98.

²² Benhabib S. Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jurgen Habermas // Habermas and the Public Sphere / ed. C. Calhoun. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: the MIT Press, 1992. P. 85-95.

²³ Gutmann A., Thompson D. Why Deliberative Democracy? Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004; Dryzek J. Op. cit. 2000; Dryzek. Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010; Fishkin J., Parkinson J. Deliberating in the Real World: Problems of Legitimacy in Deliberative Democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

²⁴ Benhabib S. Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy // Democracy and Difference: Contesting Boundaries of the Political / ed. S. Benhabib. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996. P. 70.

politics and the very *understanding of understanding* politics in a deliberative democratic theory leads to the concept of the political²⁵.

The nature of the problem refers rather not to the content of the theory, but to its shadow²⁶. Clarification of the prerequisites underlying the deliberative democratic theory is an intrinsic move. Shared by supporters of this trend, the idea of the decentralization of reason and the open nature of the theory makes possible such a fundamental rethinking of the key premises of this theory²⁷.

Research question

How does the integration of the concept of the political into the deliberative democratic theory allow to overcome the lack of receptivity of the current problems of political life?

The aim and objectives of the study

The aim of the study is to define political deliberation as the central concept of deliberative democratic theory.

Objectives of the study:

1. to reconstruct the concept of the political within the framework of deliberative democratic theory;
2. describe the formation of the concept of the political in the political theory of the XX century;
3. clarify the epistemological possibilities of political theory in relation to the political through the definition of the specifics of its subject and perspective;
4. critically recognize the concept of the political in the deliberative democratic theory in the light of the specifics of the political theory's view of this concept;

²⁵ Freedon M. What Should the ‘Political’ in Political Theory Explore? // The Journal of Political Philosophy. 2005. Vol. 13, №2. P. 113-134.

²⁶ Dahl R. Demokratiya i eyo kritiki. M.: ROSSPEN, 2003. P. 10-11.

²⁷ Habermas J. Filosofskiy diskurs o moderne. M.: Izdatel'stvo «Ves' mir», 2003.

5. formulate a political understanding of deliberation;
6. determine the limits of the capacity of the deliberative system in relation to the production of political deliberation.

Justification of study boundaries

This study is devoted to clarifying the “shadow” component of deliberative democratic theory as the most authoritative direction in democratic theory today. The boundaries of the study are determined by the boundaries of the very deliberative democratic theory. It was noted above that the rethinking of its premises is an intrinsic characteristic of the deliberative theory. Therefore, *the border* here should be understood as a subject of problematization and, then, overcoming for the purpose of more accurate demarcation. The current state of the deliberative democratic theory is determined by the influence of two philosophical projects - the discursive ethics of Jürgen Habermas and the political liberalism of Rawls. Both of these projects define the boundaries of the deliberative theory today, and they are challenged in this work.

It should be also clarified what this study is not about. First, this study does not propose a fundamentally new theory of democracy, but develops a conceptual apparatus to strengthen the deliberative theory. This imposes its own limitations on the methods of constructing arguments. In the second chapter the notion of political event is developed in a critical debate with neo-Kantianism in the versions of John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas. The negative effects of media in the third chapter are also considered in the context of the implementation of the ideas of deliberative democracy in political life.

Secondly, this is not a philosophical treatise dedicated to the heritage of John Rawls or Jürgen Habermas. Both authors did not limit their philosophical investigations to the topic of democracy and laid the foundation to whole directions in modern philosophy. Tens of thousands of pages of literature are devoted to each of these authors, which discuss issues of justice, social action, international law, etc. This work aims to critically examine the deliberative

democratic theory as a theory of democracy, which has been greatly influenced by these two philosophers.

Thirdly, it is not a work about the concept of an event. Second chapter contains the notion of event only as a relevant category for political theory, when it raises the question on the political. Deeper questions about the relationship between social events must be a subject for further research.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study

The theoretical and methodological basis of the research is the conception of essentially contested concepts with a number of critical clarifications. The meaning of political concepts is closely related to the specific political reality in which these concepts are used. Being articulated in philosophical texts, used in political disputes, existing in everyday speech concepts have a complex character, not reducible to reflection or construction of reality. The recognition of such a dual conditioning overcomes the opposition of nominalism and realism and allows us to consider concepts as dynamic elements of reality²⁸.

Political concepts are often considered as essentially contested. The idea of essentially contested concepts was proposed in 1956 by Walter Bryce Gallie. “There are disputes..., which are perfectly genuine: which, although not resolvable by argument of any kind, are nevertheless sustained by perfectly respectable arguments and evidence,” said Gallie²⁹. Gallie identified seven criteria by which the concept can be classified as essentially contested:

1. «is must be appraisive in the sense that it signifies or accredits some kind of valued achievement;

2. this achievement must be of an internally complex character, for all that its worth is attributed to it as a whole;

²⁸ On limitations of realism and nominalism see.: Marchart O. Post-Foundational Political Thought. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. P. 57; Zizek S. Schekotlyvyi subject: otsutstvuyuschiy tsentr politicheskoy ontologii. M.: Izdatel'skiy dom «Delo» RANHiGS, 2014. P. 248.

²⁹ Gallie W.B. Essentially Contested Concepts. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society // New Series. 1955-1956. Vol. 56. P. 169.

3. any explanation of its worth must therefore include reference to the respective contributions of its various parts or features;

4. the accredited achievement must be of a kind that admits of considerable modification in the light of changing circumstances;

5. each party recognizes the fact that its own use of it is contested by those of other parties;

6. the derivation of any such concept from an original exemplar whose authority is acknowledged by all the contestant users of the concept;

7. the probability or plausibility of the claim that the continuous competition for acknowledgement as between the contestant users of the concept, enables the original exemplar's achievement to be sustained and/or developed in optimum fashion»³⁰.

Gallie's conception questions the usefulness of discussions around such concepts within philosophy. Instead, philosophy should be engaged in clarifying concepts and determining the limits of their use³¹.

The concept of political deliberation can be considered as essentially contested. It contains a non-reducible value component (1), which is complex (2) and can be described differently (3). Political changes change the very meaning of the concept of deliberation, which is articulated differently in various historical and geographical contexts (4). The specific meaning of the concept of deliberation depends on the context and purpose, which determines the appeal to this concept (5). The authority of Antiquity as the birthplace of politics, which revealed hitherto unknown ways of common life, and the starting point of the formation of the modern world is practically not questioned within political thought (6). The critical mode of political thought in relation to extant capitalistic relations allows it to contextually rethink the political deliberation and the benefits that it generates (7).

The well-known relativism of the conception of essentially contested concepts leads to political metaphysics³², namely, to the notion of the political as

³⁰ Ibid. P. 171-172; 180.

³¹ Ibid. P. 197-198.

opposed to the notion of politics. The use of this kind of substantive adjectives is common place in the XX century social and political thought. It can be found, for example, in the works of Walter Benjamin (life and living)³³ and Paul Ricoeur (justice and just)³⁴. In contemporary political theory, the concept of the political is also extensively used to emphasize the open possibility of political re-interpretation of the works of the classics of social and political philosophy³⁵.

The politics-political conceptual paradox arises from the increasing temporalization and ideologization of political concepts³⁶. The concept of the political appears as a reflection of the incomplete nature of politics, the unstable and contingent grounds of political objects or phenomena, as well as the inability of privatization of politics by reason (including communicative). The transformation of political concepts is part of the complex modernization processes: strengthening the contingency of social life disembody politics and makes it impossible to talk about it as an area or sphere with clearly fixed boundaries. The need to rethink political concepts in this regard was repeatedly emphasized in political science and reflected in discussions around the growing “expansion on politics”, understood as stretching the spectrum of political objects³⁷, and “mistakes of inputism” as a tendency of the system theory to a rigid separation of political and non-political phenomena³⁸. In this regard, political deliberation should be considered as a mechanism of politicization-depoliticisation, which preserves the open character of politics, but at the same time does not deny politics in favor of the political.

³² This term is used in a Heideggerian sense. For more information see the essay «What is metaphysics?» in Heidegger M. Vremya i bytiye: Stat'i i vystupleniya. M.: Respublica, 1993.

³³ See: Benjamin V. K kritike nasiliya // V. Benjamin Ucheniye o podobii. Mediaesteticheskiye proizvedeniya. Sb. Statey. M.: RGGU, 2012. P. 65-99.

³⁴ See: Ricoer P. Spravedlivoye. M.: Izdatel'stvo «Gnozis», Izdatel'stvo «Logos», 2005.

³⁵ See: «Thinking the Political» издательства Routledge: Beardsworth R. Derrida & the Political. London and New York: Routledge, 1996; Caygil H. Levinas & the Political. London and New York: Routledge, 2002; Hammer E. Adorno & the Political. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

³⁶ Marchart O. Op. cit. 2007. P. 52-55.

³⁷ Sartori J. Concepts Misformation in Comparative Politics // The American Political Science Review. 1970. Vol. 64, №4. P. 1034.

³⁸ Macridis R. C. Comparative Politics and the Study of Government: The Search for Focus // Comparative Politics. 1968. Vol. 1, №1. P. 84-86.

Contribution to the discussion of the problem in existing literature

There are several attempts of critical rethinking of the “shadow” prerequisites within the deliberative democratic theory. Among the most striking are the works of William Rehg³⁹ and James Bohman⁴⁰. The former carries out a critical revision of the model of discursive ethics in the light of communitarian criticism. The latter carries out a critical reworking of the vocabulary of deliberative democracy in the light of the problems of inequality and social complexity.

In the last decade, there have been virtually no attempts of fundamental rethinking of deliberative democratic theory, despite the increased relevance of such a reassessment for political science⁴¹. This study contributes to contemporary democratic theory by relieving the tension between deliberative and agonistic approaches to democracy in the new understanding of political deliberation. By clarifying the epistemological possibilities of political theory toward the political, this study provides a new definition of political deliberation and provides deliberative democratic theory with the necessary conceptual apparatus for a critical assessment of the current state of the political world.

Statements to be defended

1. The current state of the deliberative democratic theory is due to the implicit victory of Jürgen Habermas in a discussion with John Rawls around the concept of the political. The basis of most studies of deliberative democracy is the model of discursive ethics, which does not recognize the autonomous nature of political knowledge.
2. The concept of the political in the XX century is consistently revealed in three aspects: as dissociation, as association, as incompleteness.

³⁹ Rehg W. *Insight and Solidarity: a Study in the Discourse Ethics of Jurgen Habermas*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.

⁴⁰ Bohman J. *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1996.

⁴¹ On deliberative democracy in empirical political science see: Thompson D. *Deliberative Democratic Theory and Empirical Political Science* // *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2008. Vol. 11. P. 497-520; Ryfe D. Does Deliberative Democracy Work? // *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2005. Vol. 8. P. 49-71; Mutz D. Is Deliberative Democracy a Falsifiable Theory? // *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2008. Vol. 11. P. 521-538.

3. The political should be considered by political theory as an unpredictable event arising on the basis of pre-political situations.
4. Necessary conditions for a political event are denial, publicity and problematization of the deep level of association / dissociation of people.
5. Political deliberation should be conceived by political theory as a macro process unfolding in the light of the detected probability of a political event in which the cooperation of the parties is achieved on the basis of mutual recognition, individualized interaction in the public sphere with immanently changing preferences.
6. The deliberative system in the conditions of the new media environment turns out to be focused on the production of political poverty and intensification of protest against itself. The solution of this problem becomes possible through the constant overcoming by democracy of its systemic nature.

Papers

1. Savin N., Kashirskikh O. N., Mavletova A. M. Fragility of Strong Media Effects in Authoritarian Environment (Evidence from Russia) // European Journal of Communication. 2018. Vol. 33, No. 5. P. 471-488.
2. Savin N. Breaking with Carl Schmitt: the Concept of the Political in Deliberative Democratic Theory // Philosophical-literature journal “Logos”. №6(108). 2015. P. 163-179.
3. Savin N. Political Theory and the Concept of the Political // Politiya: Analiz. Hronika. Prognoz. №1(92). 2019. P. 6-21.
4. Savin N. Between Substance and Procedure: Two Traditions in Deliberative Democratic Theory // Polis. Politicheskiye issledovaniya. №4. 2019. P. 26-39.

Conferences

1. Midwest Political Science Association 74th Annual Conference (Chicago, 07.04.2016-10.04.2016⁴²). *Breaking with Carl Schmitt: the Concept of the Political in Mouffe's Agonistic Pluralism.*
2. Midwest Political Science Association 76th Annual Conference (Chicago, 05.04.2018-08.04.2018). *Fragility of Strong Media Effects in Authoritarian Environment (Evidence from Russia).*
3. Workshop “Contemporary social theory”, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow, 16.04.2019). *Demokratiya i politicheskiye sobytiya.*
4. International symposium on communication research history, Higher School of Economics (Moscow, 08.12.2018). *O mediynykh I politicheskikh sobtyiyah.*

Thesis summary

Today, the deliberative democratic theory, on the one hand, is in its prime. The accumulated baggage of empirical research and the implementation of practices that embody the principles of deliberative democracy in political life makes it possible to state the deliberative turn not only in theory, but also in positive social research. On the other hand, deliberative democratic theory is increasingly confronted with the inability to respond to current political challenges, such as the growing popularity of far-right parties, populism, and increased confrontation between nation states. In particular, deliberative theory is experiencing difficulties for describing trends and processes in the project of European integration inspired by it.

This problem actualizes a return to the theoretical origins of deliberative democracy, in which the issue on the political was a central topic. Outlining the boundaries of the political realm, John Rawls limits his claims only to the

⁴² Here and further: DD.MM.YYYY

theoretical framework of the process of adopting the political conception of justice. In contrast to the philosophical mentoring of the “Theory of Justice”, in “Political Liberalism” the conception of justice as fairness becomes one of many possible political conceptions of justice. For Habermas, the idea of special epistemic status of political theory is the product of the incorrect dichotomy of metaphysical-political and the imprisonment of philosophy within the first. Instead, Habermas relies on the morality of many pictures of the world, from which the conception of discursive ethics is derived.

In the 2000s and 2010s, the deliberative democratic theory followed the path suggested by Jürgen Habermas rather than the path of John Rawls. Theoretical discussions have given way to a series of new directions: institutional, systemic, practical. The institutional turn in deliberative democratic theory revealed the limitations of well-structured mini-publics in which decisions are made, and brought to the agenda the question of the external environment of these publics. As part of a systemic turn, the very notion of deliberation has already gone beyond the mini-public, becoming a characteristic of the political decision-making system, combining the parliamentary-party complex and weak public spheres around it. This view on deliberation led to the decoupling of this concept from the philosophical anchor of discursive ethics, which delays this theory in the direction of moral philosophy, and actualized a new wave of debates on the concept of deliberation. A pragmatic turn allows to emphasize this agenda in the form of a question: what problems should the deliberative system solve in order to be considered democratic?

To answer this question, Chapter 2 deals with the concept of the political. There are three particularly independent ways of thinking about this notion in political thought. They have consistently received their articulation in the works of Carl Schmitt, Hannah Arendt and French authors, conventionally combined under the umbrella of post-fundamentalism: (1) the political as dissociation, (2) the political as association, (3) the political as incompleteness.

If the concept of the political also includes the peculiarities of understanding politics, then the articulation of these three ideas must be tied to the specifics of the form of knowledge in which this articulation takes place. Political theory as a way of knowing about politics is characterized by (1) the existential nature of the questioning, (2) orientation to the future through the identification of its contingent scenarios hidden in the present moment. These features determine that political theory should consider the political as an unpredictable event that may arise on the basis of pre-political situations. If the essential interpretations inevitably reduce the political to certain aspects of it, ultimately causing the condition of the “ontic blindness”, then understanding the political as an unpredictable event, on the contrary, sharpens the focus on finding pre-political situations here and now. Thus, the three lines of thinking about the political gain their articulation in the form of three necessary (but not sufficient) conditions for the occurrence of political event: denial, publicity, problematization of the deep level of association / dissociation of people.

Chapter 3 defines political deliberation as a macro-process unfolding in the light of the discovered possibility of a political event, in which the cooperation of the parties is achieved on the basis of mutual recognition, individualized interaction in the public sphere with immanently changing preferences. This understanding is presupposes that the task of political deliberation is to anticipate and prevent political events through a preventive resolution of pre-political situations. To resolve a pre-political situation, political deliberation converts denial into recognition, replaces the public opposition of the parties with individualized discussion in the public sphere, and rationalizes experiences at the deepest level of association / dissociation of people.

Nevertheless, the very ability of the deliberative system to produce such a deliberation is significantly limited by mediatization processes. On the one hand, the new media environment contributes to the multiplication of pre-political situations due to the scandalization of the public sphere, its fragmentation and distribution of niche media, and the political fetishization of various publics. On

the other hand, by multiplying pre-political situations, today's media environment aggravates the systemic nature of deliberative democracy and makes it self-contained. This contradiction leads to increased political poverty, understood as the inability of groups of citizens to effectively participate in the democratic process⁴³. To solve this problem, deliberative democracy must constantly overcome its systemic nature, (1) recognizing itself as a problem, (2) removing restrictions on public debates, (3) shaking the reasonable universality of the institutional framework through the integration of practices based on, for instance, the principles of the draw.

Such a view on deliberative democracy overcomes its moral and idealistic character, inherited from Kantian motifs in the projects of Rawls and Habermas. The primacy of morality, so explicitly expressed in the Habermas project and, to a lesser extent, in the Rawls project, is being replaced by the recognition of the political foundations of particular morality and particular reason. Unlike models of discursive ethics and political liberalism, the political version of deliberative democracy does not contain a taboo on revising the basic constitutional principles or dogmatic adherence to the procedures and techniques of discussion.

⁴³ Bohman J. Op. cit. 1996. P. 110.