

UDC 130.1:316.776(321.4)R. G. DRAPUSHKO^{1*}^{1*}Dragomanov Ukrainian State University (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail ronadr1502@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-3089-5349**Communicative Dimension of Human Freedom under Deliberative Democracy**

Purpose. This article aims to analyse the ways of free communicative solution of civil society problems as a basis for the development of deliberative democracy on the example of the activities of volunteer organisations. **Theoretical basis.** The conceptual basis of the study is Immanuel Kant's philosophical understanding of individual obligations as the basis for the institutionalisation of social communication. This concept is developed by Jürgen Habermas in the direction of deliberative democracy. Max Weber, Quentin Skinner, and other theorists give a special status to language communication in the functioning of social institutions. Contemporary Ukrainian researchers analyse the volunteer movement as the basis for the communicative implementation of human freedom. **Originality.** Practices of political performance in society contribute to the specific and contextual solution of the tasks of communication theory and provide answers to questions about sustainable human needs, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, contribute to solving the political problems of everyday life. Grassroots socio-political movements, and especially volunteer movements, practice free discussion of various social problems, which is the basis of the deliberative democracy. **Conclusions.** Overcoming value differences between members of society is more effective in deliberative practices as the core of social communication in a democratic society. The substantive way to find new forms of communication is to use deliberative practices of implementing freedom to improve the functioning of social institutions. The formal way is aimed at attracting the experience of volunteer organisations in using the minimum necessary forms of bureaucratisation of social institutions in a democratic society.

Keywords: human freedom; political communication; deliberative democracy; volunteer organisations; social institutions

Introduction

The classics of modern political theory recognise the communicative nature of man as the natural basis of democracy, and democracy itself, with all its partial shortcomings, is seen as the most adequate political form of meeting the needs of the communicative nature of man (Pateman & Smith, 2019). Thus, the question of the success of democracy's political practices receives its philosophical and anthropological justification, focused not on technocratic solutions to social problems, but on their humanistic analysis (M. I. Boichenko, 2021).

Immanuel Kant (1788) called for a public justification of institutional forms of democracy and outlined in his philosophy the distinction between the formal and substantive sides of the motivation for political commitment. The formal side represents a categorical imperative for an individual, and public law for society. In the communicative philosophy of Karl-Otto Apel and Jürgen Habermas, both the formal and substantive aspects of motivating people to fulfil their obligations are rethought. Both provide a philosophical and anthropological justification for this pragmatic situation: Apel (1988) – in the line of transcendental pragmatics, which sets the limits of meaningfulness of human communication, and Habermas – in the mode of "historical a priori", revealing the fundamental grounds of procedural possibilities of using reason. The fundamental plurality of practical embodiments of reason is that anthropological basis on which Habermas (1992) studies communication: "a worldview in which the particular is immediately enmeshed with the particular, one is mirrored in the other" (p. 118). Habermas is referring here not only to different individuals, but also to different social practices that can not only coexist within the same worldview, but are based on very different and possibly very contradictory values.

The Ukrainian researcher Maria Zakharchenko (2014) has already analysed the evolution of philosophical arguments used by philosophers to justify the deliberative nature of modern democracy. The Ukrainian philosopher Denys Kiryukhin (2020) has studied how these philosophers used the theory of deliberative democracy to explain and resolve situations of disagreement in order to reach consensus. The Ukrainian philosopher Natalia Fialko (2022) analysed the importance of deliberation for the legitimation of social institutions.

However, these authors did not show the essential connection between the communicative dimension of human freedom and deliberative democracy.

Purpose

The purpose of this article is to analyse, on the example of the activities of volunteer organisations, the ways of free communicative solution of civil society problems as a basis for the development of deliberative democracy.

Statement of basic materials

Formalisation of deliberative procedures in communicative philosophy

First of all, the founders of communicative philosophy emphasise the much more formal nature of the correctness of following the procedure for reaching consensus, compared to Kant's philosophy, and, accordingly, they often consider it not only conditionally independent of the ethical views of an individual (Apel), but also institutionally independent (Habermas).

In the former case, an individual must submit to a rationally justified and jointly agreed decision, even if he or she is not satisfied with it in some way, provided that he or she has participated fully in the discussion and has not found or proposed a better alternative. Here, Apel puts forward a somewhat idealised demand that all basic institutional norms should be tested in such an open discourse – all of them without exception. This is an attempt to carry out a communicative restructuring of all social institutions. Even if this does not happen immediately and not in everything, it is worthwhile to base their functioning on the decisions made by an ideal communicative community (Apel, 1988). Thus, Apel, on the basis of communicative theory, seeks to apply all the foundations of Kant's idea of the fulfilment of individual obligations.

In the second case, individual citizens find themselves more and more distanced from the functioning of the main formal institutions of society, which Habermas defines as money and administrative power – what constitutes the basis of systemic integration of society. Citizens are left with only the possibility of influencing social integrations that grow on the basis of social solidarity. It is to the study of such solidarity and the possibility of institutionalising its communicative practices that Habermas devotes his main works.

The normative implications are obvious: the integrative force of solidarity, which can no longer be drawn solely from sources of communicative action, should develop through widely expanded autonomous public spheres as well as through legally institutionalized procedures of demo-

cratic deliberation and decision making and gain sufficient strength to hold its own against the other two social forces – money and administrative power. (Habermas, 1998, p. 249)

What are these "widely expanded autonomous public spheres" in which, according to Habermas, changes should take place simultaneously with "legally institutionalized procedures of democratic deliberation and decision-making"? These are the spheres of collective and communicative implementation of freedom, in contrast to liberal ideas about its individual implementation. Here, too, a certain minimum and specific level of formalisation of communication is required.

The problem of freedom in the modern theory of deliberative democracy

The British researcher Marit Hammond (2019) draws attention to the significant conceptual influence of the critical theory of the Frankfurt School of Social Research on the emergence of the concept of deliberative democracy (it is not a coincidence that one of the key representatives of this concept is Jürgen Habermas), but at the same time notes the opposite influence of this concept on the development of the Frankfurt School itself, which rethinks "the necessity for critical activism to be emancipatory in way that is enabling rather than imposing, and inclusive rather than 'enlightened'". From this point of view, Hammond proposes to consider the very concept of deliberative democracy in its communicative embodiment as a democratic critical practice – first of all, self-critical, reflective and inclusive, open to constant change.

Thus, turning to the classic theme of personal emancipation in critical theory opens the way to rethinking the problems of freedom in the context of communicative possibilities for ensuring the freedom of citizens in a deliberative democracy.

These ideas are confirmed by researchers of contemporary political communication practices: in an interview with Selen A. Ercan, the German political scientist André Bächtiger testifies that not only the role of the concept of deliberative democracy is growing in modern democracy theory, but also the importance of "deliberative practice within and beyond parliaments" is increasing in political communication itself, and the concept of deliberativeness can be used to both promote political populism and oppose it (Ercan & Bächtiger, 2019, p. 97).

Indeed, freedom in its political dimension implies both possibilities – the use of freedom for the public good and for its detriment. Freedom alone is neither a panacea, nor deliberativeness. Only their combination provides better opportunities for a common position to gradually prevail in a free discourse, and for negotiations not to turn into a dictatorship of a stronger minority over a weaker majority.

The fewer obstacles to negotiations, the more free they are, the more likely it is that every point of view will be taken into account and the voice of the less wealthy, powerful and knowledgeable will not be ignored (Ercan & Dryzek, 2015). And vice versa: the more we trust negotiations, the more we tend to be inclusive, respectful of the individual, his or her rights and freedoms – because only a free person can fully express his or her cognitive, value and volitional potential in a discourse.

The British political scientist Jonathan Benson (2019) emphasises the political power of language, which is best implemented in discourse, because "deliberative democracy gives a privi-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

leged position to linguistic communication and therefore excludes tacit forms of knowledge which cannot be expressed propositionally" (p. 76). This researcher emphasises the need to defend the autonomy of the political from the encroachments of the market, and recommends opposing the tacit pressure of material interests with the power of trust in testimony.

Indeed, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of honesty of all participants in political communication, but the issue here should also be broader – political responsibility for false testimony. This aspect was once studied by the German sociologist, philosopher and political theorist Max Weber (1926). However, it seems no less appropriate to complement the concept of honest testimony in the concept of deliberative democracy with the doctrine of the importance of eloquence for successful political communication, which was studied by the British political philosopher Quentin Skinner (2018) on the example of early Renaissance democracies.

All of these expectations of free forms of communication, as opposed to administrative and strictly regulated forms of communication, are most easily seen in the volunteer movement and its organisations.

Implementation of communicative freedom in the activities of volunteer organisations

On the one hand, many features of the volunteer movement can be easily observed in the activities of most youth organisations (R. G. Drapushko & N. A. Drapushko, 2022; Gorinov & R. Drapushko, 2022b). In Ukraine, even within the activities of the relevant Ministry, a significant diversity of youth behaviour is recognised:

Youth policy is characterized by diversity, which covers various spheres of society's life and is within the competence of the Ministry of Youth and Sports of Ukraine, which determines its relationship to politics, taking into account certain strategies, directions, priorities that are responsible for its implementation. (Gorinov & R. Drapushko, 2022a, p. 166)

On the other hand, it is in volunteer organisations that new forms of communication are often born, and in any case, it is here that they receive the best conditions for their free development (Iliuk, 2023; Osadcha, 2022; Sokalska, 2019). In times of war, it is volunteer movements that prove to be the most flexible, both in revealing multiple identities (Shevchenko & Fialko, 2022), when a person volunteers in parallel with work or study, and in applying them to extremely complex tasks, including rescuing the wounded (N. M. Boichenko & Fialko, 2023).

Volunteer organisations have minimal membership requirements and therefore give free rein to both personal and communicative freedom.

Originality

The study of the activities of volunteer organisations leads from the development of a general concept of communication to field research of specific practices of political performance in society, which is a contextual solution to everyday political problems and a pragmatic response to persistent human demands. Deliberative democracy manifests itself not so much in political de-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

bates and the search for coalition agreements between political parties as in grassroots social and political movements that freely discuss acute social problems. The most promising of these movements is the volunteer movement.

Conclusions

Deliberative practices as the core of social communication can help communication participants gradually but steadily overcome any value differences. The search for new deliberative forms of communication has two main ways: substantive and formal. The substantive way is to use deliberative practices of exercising freedom to transform existing social institutions in society in the direction of their greater communicative efficiency. The formal way is to use the example of volunteer organisations to identify and engage the minimum necessary formal parameters that can be applied to most social institutions in a democratic society.

REFERENCES

- Apel, K.-O. (1988). *Diskurs und Verantwortung: Das Problem des Übergangs zur postkonventionellen Moral*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. (in German)
- Benson, J. (2019). Deliberative democracy and the problem of tacit knowledge. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 18(1), 76-97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594x18782086> (in English)
- Boichenko, M. I. (2021). Human Evolution: the Limits of Technocentrism. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (19), 15-22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235956> (in English)
- Boichenko, N. M., & Fialko, N. A. (2023). Legitimation of Euthanasia Decisions: A Philosophical Assessment of the Assisted Life Termination. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (24), 18-26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295295> (in English)
- Drapushko, R. G., & Drapushko, N. A. (2022). Youth as a Representation of Essentialities of Human Being. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (21), 54-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260322> (in English)
- Ercan, S. A., & Bächtiger, A. (2019). Deliberative Democracy. *Democratic Theory*, 6(1), 97-110. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2019.060106> (in English)
- Ercan, S. A., & Dryzek, J. S. (2015). The reach of deliberative democracy. *Policy Studies*, 36(3), 241-248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2015.1065969> (in English)
- Fialko, N. (2022). The significance of deliberation for the legitimation of social institutions. *Filosofska Dumka (Philosophical Thought)*, (3), 185-197. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.03.185> (in Ukrainian)
- Gorinov, P., & Drapushko, R. (2022a). The role of youth in youth policy and realization of youth work in Ukraine. *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*, 53(4), 164-176. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/5319> (in English)
- Gorinov, P., & Drapushko, R. (2022b). *Volonterska diialnist v Ukraini: sotsialno-pravove doslidzhennia: Monohrafiia*. Kyiv: Derzhavnyi instytut simeinoi ta molodizhnoi polityky. (in Ukrainian)
- Habermas, J. (1992). The Unity of Reason in the Diversity of Its Voices. In *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays* (W. M. Hohengarten, Trans., pp. 115-148). The MIT Press. (in English)
- Habermas, J. (1998). *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory* (C. Cronin & P. De Greiff, Eds.). The MIT Press. (in English)
- Hammond, M. (2019). Deliberative democracy as a critical theory. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 22(7), 787-808. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2018.1438333> (in English)
- Iliuk, O. Y. (2023). Freedom as a Key Value of the Volunteer Movement. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (24), 27-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295308> (in English)
- Kant, I. (1788). *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*. Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch. (in German)
- Kiryukhin, D. (2020). Deliberative democratic theory and "the fact of disagreement". *Filosofska Dumka (Philosophical Thought)*, (5), 73-86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2020.05.073> (in Ukrainian)
- Osadcha, L. V. (2022). Personal identity in the space of virtual culture: on the example of geek and glam subcultures. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (22), 90-98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271341> (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Pateman, C., & Smith, G. (2019). Reflecting on Fifty Years of Democratic Theory. *Democratic Theory*, 6(2), 111-120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2019.060210> (in English)
- Shevchenko, Z. V., & Fialko, N. A. (2022). The normativity of multiple social identity: from motivation to legitimacy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (22), 58-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271328> (in English)
- Skinner, Q. (2018). *From Humanism to Hobbes: Studies in Rhetoric and Politics*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316415559> (in English)
- Sokalska, E. (2019). The Development of Deliberative Democracy and Post-Communist Polish Experience (some Remarks). *Actual Problems of Law*, (4), 55-60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/app2019.04.055> (in English)
- Weber, M. (1926). *Politik als Beruf*. München: Duncker & Humblot. (in German)
- Zakharchenko, M. S. (2014). Deliberative democracy in the context of the problems of democratic legitimacy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (6), 82-88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2014/35744> (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Apel K.-O. *Diskurs und Verantwortung: Das Problem des Übergangs zur postkonventionellen Moral*. Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp, 1988. 488 s.
- Benson J. Deliberative democracy and the problem of tacit knowledge. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*. 2019. Vol. 18, Iss. 1. P. 76–97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594x18782086>
- Boichenko M. I. Human Evolution: the Limits of Technocentrism. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2021. No. 19. P. 15–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235956>
- Boichenko N. M., Fialko N. A. Legitimation of Euthanasia Decisions: A Philosophical Assessment of the Assisted Life Termination. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2023. No. 24. P. 18–26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295295>
- Drapushko R. G., Drapushko N. A. Youth as a Representation of Essentialities of Human Being. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 21. P. 54–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260322>
- Ercan S. A., Bächtiger A. Deliberative Democracy. *Democratic Theory*. 2019. Vol. 6, Iss. 1. P. 97–110. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2019.060106>
- Ercan S. A., Dryzek J. S. The reach of deliberative democracy. *Policy Studies*. 2015. Vol. 36, Iss. 3. P. 241–248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2015.1065969>
- Фіалко Н. Значення деліберативної легітимації соціальних інституцій. *Філософська думка*. 2022. № 3. С. 185–197. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2022.03.185>
- Gorinov P., Drapushko R. The role of youth in youth policy and realization of youth work in Ukraine. *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*. 2022. Vol. 53, No. 4. P. 164–176. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/5319>
- Горінов П., Драпушко Р. *Волонтерська діяльність в Україні: соціально-правове дослідження : монографія*. Київ : Державний інститут сімейної та молодіжної політики, 2022. 240 с.
- Habermas J. The Unity of Reason in the Diversity of Its Voices. *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays* / trans. by W. M. Hohengarten. The MIT Press, 1992. P. 115–148.
- Habermas J. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory* / ed. by C. Cronin, P. De Greiff. The MIT Press, 1998. 352 p.
- Hammond M. Deliberative democracy as a critical theory. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*. 2019. Vol. 22, Iss. 7. P. 787–808. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2018.1438333>
- Iliuk O. Y. Freedom as a Key Value of the Volunteer Movement. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2023. No. 24. P. 27–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i24.295308>
- Kant I. *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*. Riga : Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1788. 292 s.
- Кірюхін Д. Теорія деліберативної демократії та "факт незгоди". *Філософська думка*. 2020. № 5. С. 73–86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2020.05.073>
- Osadcha L. V. Personal identity in the space of virtual culture: on the example of geek and glam subcultures. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 22. P. 90–98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271341>
- Pateman C., Smith G. Reflecting on Fifty Years of Democratic Theory. *Democratic Theory*. 2019. Vol. 6, Iss. 2. P. 111–120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2019.060210>

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Shevchenko Z. V., Fialko N. A. The normativity of multiple social identity: from motivation to legitimacy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 22. P. 58–66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i22.271328>
- Skinner Q. *From Humanism to Hobbes: Studies in Rhetoric and Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2018. 446 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316415559>
- Sokalska E. The Development of Deliberative Democracy and Post-Communist Polish Experience (some Remarks). *Actual Problems of Law*. 2019. No. 4. P. 55–60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/app2019.04.055>
- Weber M. *Politik als Beruf*. München : Duncker & Humblot, 1926. 67 s.
- Zakharchenko M. S. Deliberative democracy in the context of the problems of democratic legitimacy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2014. No. 6. P. 82–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr2014/35744>

Р. Г. ДРАПУШКО^{1*}

^{1*}Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта ronadr1502@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-3089-5349

Комунікативний вимір свободи людини за деліберативної демократії

Мета. У цій статті передбачено проаналізувати способи вільного комунікативного вирішення проблем громадянського суспільства як основи розвитку деліберативної демократії на прикладі діяльності волонтерських організацій. **Теоретичний базис.** Концептуальною основою дослідження є філософське розуміння Іммануїлом Кантом зобов'язань особистості як основи інституалізації соціальної комунікації. Цю концепцію розвиває Юрген Габермас у напрямі деліберативної демократії. Макс Вебер, Квентін Скінер та інші теоретики надають особливого статусу мовній комунікації у функціонуванні соціальних інститутів. Сучасні українські дослідники аналізують волонтерський рух як основу комунікативної імплементації людиною своєї свободи. **Наукова новизна.** Практики політичного перформансу в суспільстві сприяють конкретному і контекстуальному вирішенню завдань теорії комунікації і надають відповіді на запитання щодо стійких запитів людини, з одного боку, а з іншого – сприяють розв'язанню політичних завдань повсякдення. Низові соціально-політичні рухи, і особливо – волонтерські, практикують вільне обговорення розмаїтих суспільних проблем, що складає основу деліберативної демократії. **Висновки.** Подолання ціннісних розбіжностей між членами соціуму відбувається більш ефективно в деліберативних практиках як ядрі соціальної комунікації в демократичному суспільстві. Змістовний шлях пошуку нових форм комунікації полягає у використанні деліберативних практик імплементації свободи для вдосконалення функціонування соціальних інститутів. Формальний шлях спрямований на залучення досвіду волонтерських організацій у використанні мінімально необхідних форм бюрократизації роботи соціальних інститутів у демократичному суспільстві.

Ключові слова: свобода людини; політична комунікація; деліберативна демократія; волонтерські організації; соціальні інститути

Received: 12.02.2024

Accepted: 19.06.2024