CIVIL SOCIETY AND CIVIC CONSCIOUSNESS

SİVİL TOPLUM VE SOSYAL BİLİNÇ

Mert BİLGİN

Doğuş Üniversitesi, İİBF, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

ABSTRACT: The meta-narratives of modern times are considered as the most significant factors impeding the development of the civil society' that coincided with the western definition of democracy. Nevertheless, this article suggests that the real problem was institutional inadequacy, which was produced by lack of civic consciousness. The best evidence for this argument is the search by theoreticians for a civic consciousness despite their different ideological orientations. Indeed, the demise of meta-narratives in post-modern times does not tend to lead to a *more* civil society because of the vicissitude of this extant institutional inadequacy, which appears to be created by the decline of cultural understanding of civic consciousness.

Keywords: Civil society, democracy, civic consciousness, meta-narratives.

***ÖZET:** Modern zamanların büyük söylemleri genellikle batı dünyasının demokrasi tanımına uygun bir sivil toplumun gelişimini engelleyen en önemli faktörler olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Buna karşın bu makale gerçek eksikliğin sosyal bilinçsizliğin doğurduğu kurumsal bir sorun olduğunu ifade etmektedir. Bu önermenin en güzel kanıtı farklı ideolojik yönelimlerden gelen teorisyenlerin aynı sosyal bilinci aramış olmalarıdır. Nitekim, modern sonrası zamanlarda büyük söylemlerin geçerliliğini yitirmiş olmaları daha sivil bir toplumu ortaya çıkaramamaktadır çünkü aynı yetersizlik sosyal bilincin kültürel anlayışının zayıflamasının sonucu olarak devamlılığını sürdürmektedir.*

***Anahtar kelimeler:** Sivil toplum, demokrasi, sosyal bilinç.*

I. Introduction

The Western discourse conscientiously supports the existence of civil society as the most crucial leitmotiv of democracy. The contribution of civil society organizations to democratic consolidation is undeniable. (Fuller, 1996: 51-53) This contribution is explicit even under a leftist interpretation, which assigns a mission of counter hegemonic action to civil society organizations for a better democratic consolidation. (Gramsci, 1971) Nevertheless, the elitist critique is still a significant concern about civil society because the oligarchic tendencies are latent within almost all of the organizations. (Controversy 1, C1 from now on) Furthermore, the renowned jeopardy still exists because certain organizations may find the chance to consolidate power, increase their popularity and start to damage the ongoing democracy. (Controversy 2, C2 from now on)

This article suggests that what had once been suggested by Michels (Michels, 1971: 279-293) in the above-mentioned formulation of C1 and C2 is an institutional question, which tends to be a latent but potent characteristic of civil society. In other words, both of the controversies are institutional questions rather than the ideological ones and the so called demise of ideology lacks the ability to overcome them. From

this point of view, the post-ideology era tends to suffer from the same controversies as far as a sort of civic consciousness, which here refers to an understanding that serves to live with the other(s), where the Other is assumed to represent a subject position defined in terms of culture. As a matter of fact, the hypothesis of this article suggests that not the ideological conflicts but the lack of civic consciousness accelerated the decline of the modernist belief in the self. Firstly, the concepts of democracy and civil society will be defined briefly in order to highlight this hypothesis. Secondly, starting from the Enlightenment, a genealogical analysis will be made until the so called demise of meta-narratives in order to point out that the lack of civic consciousness has always been a main concern of the theoreticians trying to ease the above-mentioned controversies that are independent from ideology. This analysis will show that rather than the contradictions among different ideological orientations the lack of civic consciousness as mentioned above had been the main source of the misinterpretation of democratic institutions. Indeed, various theoreticians with different ideological backgrounds attempted to solve the controversies of civil society by emphasizing the necessity of civic consciousness defined in terms of a cultural understanding. The latent controversies of civil society can be eased only by a civic consciousness no matter whether be the civil society characterized by harmonious and/or antagonistic relations. Consequently, the current era, which is characterized by the demise of ideologies, tends to suffer from the same controversies because the collapse of meta-narratives has not been filled by a civic consciousness yet.

II. Civil Society and Democracy
When civil society is based on some primordial phenomena, competition and rivalry amongst distinct groupings may lead to clashes. Most of the post-colonial countries in non-Western world seem to suffer from the fact that there are severe differences within the segments of society based on ethnic, religious, linguistic and tribal factors. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that countries with few civil liberties have limited political rights. A viable civil society creates favorable conditions for the development of democracy, and the existence of democracy enhances a country's development potential. (Entelis, 1996: 47)

In the non-Western world, civil society is understood to be either a 'means of existence' or 'subordination relationship' or else a tool that may gain social upward mobility rather than an intermediate body that sustains the equilibrium between the society and the state. However, is not this exactly the same thing for the so called 'Western world'? To give an example: The PTA, Rotary Club, League of Women Voters, Young Democrats, American Medical Association, United Auto Workers, American Association of Retired Persons, National Rifle Associations, Sierra Club, Young Republicans, PEN Club, Knights of Columbus, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, American Civil Liberties Union, Arab-American Anti-Discrimination an Organization, Daughters of the American Revolution, Matachine Society Friends of the Earth as well as hundreds of other organizations are assumed to be the primary source of the public opinion in America that directly influence national political decisions for exactly the same reasons affiliated to the non-Western world. (Fuller, 1996: 51-539 What we do not like about the non-Western world exist in the Western world in regularly organized institutions characterized by set of clandestine relations. Therefore, the controversies of civil

society do not arise from geographical differences in terms of a Western non-Western dichotomy. On the contrary, these controversies are the outcomes of the lack of genuine civic consciousness no matter whether be it in the Western or non-Western world. Indeed, like any social phenomenon, civil society does have a negative side regardless of geography. "Self- interest, prejudice and hatred cohabit with altruism, fairness and compassion, and the unrestrained free play of civil society is a chilling thought, not a warm and fuzzy one."(Norton, 1995: 7-8) This negative aspect invokes a question about the extent in which it is possible to correlate civil society with democratic consolidation.

In order to better elucidate the correlation between civil society and democracy we first need to decide about the conceptual connotations. It is sure that there are different definitions of concepts such as democracy, liberty rights and freedoms, tolerance etc. "But if it is possible to talk about the universality of Human Rights as a global doctrine, some consensus on the minimum standards, principles and rules must also be reached." (Gemalmaz, 1989: 4) Therefore, it seems more appropriate to indicate firstly to what democracy refers. Within this context, regularly organized free and open elections, low barriers to participation in politics, genuine political competition and wide protection of civil liberties can be considered as preconditions of democracy. Amongst all of the independent variables, it is imperative that protection of civil liberties be associated to the existence of civil society. The article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights suggests that peoples have the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also indicates the freedom of opinion and expression, peaceful assembly as well as the freedom of association, participation in public affairs and elections. Under the modern conceptualization of civil liberties, any governmental and or constitutional obstacle for the existence of civil society can not be compatible neither with the international modern definition of civil liberties nor democracy. However, it must be mentioned here that this argument does not suggest the existence of civil society as a precondition for democracy. Rather, it supports that any attempt that aims to obscure the very existence of civil society should be considered as anti-democratic.

Describing the basic conditions for democratic consolidation is easy because the basic criteria have been explicitly defined and accepted by the international community. Nevertheless, these criteria mean nothing more than utile words, if there is no (civil) society characterized by loyalty to these concepts. Democracy should cover not only the basic rights mentioned above but also comprise a common understanding of fairness that facilitates the existence of various identity groups. (Taylor, 1992) That is to say, in order to be worth of something, democracy should prevail in coincidence with civil society. A society that does not have free individuals and group expression in non-political matters is not likely to make an exception for political ones. (Entelis, 1996: 47) It is explicit that a supportive democracy can not exist without a well developed civil society.

A strong civil society is identified by a very ideal model in Mouzelis: (8) (Mouzelis, 1995: 225-226)

1) The existence of rule-of-law conditions that effectively protect citizens from state arbitrariness.

2) The existence of strongly organized non-state interest groups, capable of checking eventual abuses of power by those who control the means of administration and coercion.

3) The existence of a balanced pluralism among civil society interests so that none can establish absolute dominance.

It is very arduous to attain such an ideal model. The fraudulent aspect of civil society is real. Civil society can act as an intermediate phenomenon that gains impetus to democratic consolidation or as an agent, which guarantees the democratic substantiality under some certain conditions. Otherwise, there will always be a potential danger arising from the above-mentioned tendencies and fortuitous aspects of civil society. What is clear is that, it appears to be much easier to create positive conditions for democratic consolidation, when compared with the consequences of non-existence of civil society. Nevertheless, in any case the existence of civic culture, which indicates the ability to live with the other(s) whose identities are defined in terms of culture, is the main leitmotiv.

III. Genealogical Independence of Civil Society

Having pointed out the basic motives, which constitute a common ground among the pluralist, class and managerial perspectives it seems of utmost significance to refer to some of the theoreticians, who contributed the conceptual maturation of civil society. This genealogy is expected to be useful in the sense that it claims to offer an arena, wherein various approaches interact with each other for the purpose of attaining a more civil society.

It seems as if it is possible to start the conceptual genealogy from Locke because he is generally considered among the first theoreticians, who had emphasized the significance of civil society. This does not necessarily mean that other political theorists, who cover a very wide range starting from Ancient Greek coming to current times, have emphasized civil society less than the others. Nevertheless, it is necessary to choose theoreticians who coincide with the above mentioned ideological lines. This is necessary to show that institutional specificities concretized by civic consciousness take place at the heart of the problematic rather than the ideological ones.

Locke considers the state as a central authority, which had collected the power on the basis of a social contract. He argues that initially all individual property holdings are equal since the law of nature allows no individuals to process more than they can use. It is only when individuals agree to introduce money that property can be accumulated and the 'Possession of the Earth' becomes 'disproportionate and unequal'. Under these circumstances, 'inconveniences' degenerate into a situation of war pressing individuals to form a civil society and a liberal state. (Hoffman, 1995: 105) Identifying social contract with a mere possession of earth would be a too simplistic method to understand the Lockean analysis of civil society. It is important to underline that civil society deviates from the state of nature by the creation of the

state. "Civil Society is distinguished from the state of nature by the presence of a common authority; the state of war is distinguished from the state of peace by the presence of force without right." (Tarcov, 1992: 317) Interestingly state seems to be the reason which leads to the creation of civil society. What makes Locke crucial is his approach to the arbitrary usage of force by the central authority. He offers people the right to involve in a rebellion when an arbitrary force with no right is imposed upon them. In other words, the right for rebellion is assumed to be a phenomenon that protects the people from the arbitrary hegemony of the state. However, he also emphasizes that people do not tend to rebel against the central authority due to some certain characteristics. Firstly, people are slow and in many situations they tend to refer to the former authority which has once imposed a force with no right upon them. Secondly, people are to a large extent illiterate. They feel oppressed by the illegitimate usage of force, but they do not know how to cure them. Finally, people are indifferent to such events and they cannot decide whether oppression of the few can also jeopardize the whole. (Tarcov, 1992: 322-323)

To interpret Locke`s arguments in modern terms, we can argue that a legitimization crisis and an effectiveness problem with regard to the state apparatus may lead to opposition movements of the people. Considering the fact that, people lack the potency to affect political outcomes, they need some organized associations, which have overcome some problems attributed to ordinary individuals such as slowness, illiteracy and indifference so to speak in Lockean terms. This is exactly what Locke had once proposed; people needed to be guided. This kind of interpretation of Locke reminds us of a modern concept that had been considered as a protective mechanism of the individual from the state: that is to say, the civil society in modern terms. The most problematic aspect of this debate is the content of the correlation. Individual rights and the necessity of existence of the state may seem incompatible at first sight because the second one imposes some limitations on individuals. This dilemma of liberalism still exists and Lockean analysis can not offer a sound answer to C1 and C2. Within this perspective, the negative aspects of C1 and C2 can be eased if civil society can be deliberated as an intermediate agent between the state and society in order to attenuate contingent frustrations. Whilst, it seems impossible to restrict the content of civil society within a very confined understanding. Explicitly, Lockean analysis is far away from offering sound solutions to C1 and C2 without accepting civic consciousness as real. Accepting civic consciousness as real will contradict the competitive characteristic of Lockean society. To go beyond this rough interpretation of civil society, we also need to refer some other approaches that built upon than liberal understanding of Locke.

Following very crucial points of views that may be derived from the arguments of Paine, civil society turns into a more comprehensible character. (Paine, 1969: 165-168) Not only his theoretical contributions but also Paine's impact on Hegel should be mentioned. This impact is interesting because Paine and Hegel are generally accepted the preliminary theoreticians of two contradictory ideological lines, which were concretized in terms of liberalism and dialectical materialism consecutively. According to Paine, the existence of man, by definition offers him some natural rights such as the intellectual rights, or rights of the mind in addition to the rights of acting as an individual for his own comfort and happiness, which do not injure the natural rights of others. This limitation seems plausible because both C1 and C2 are

no more problematic, if individuals can successfully pursue their own comfort without endangering that of others. Nevertheless, the real world is far away from this idealization. Respect for others is difficult to define because individuals may adhere to different definitions. Indeed looking for respect for others necessarily puts civic consciousness as the most essential problem. Having recognized this deficiency, Paine develops a formula, which is produced from the idea of mutual dependence. When man becomes a part of the society, he attains his civil rights some of which are inherited from the natural rights. "The mutual dependence and reciprocal interest which man has upon man, and all the parts of a civilized community upon each other, create the great chain of connection which holds it together." (Parker, 1983: 85)

In order to protect the civil rights, there occurs inter-dependence amongst man and the communities. Furthermore, man has to be protected from central authority, which has been created in the sense of a social contract. "According to Paine, the power of the state must be restricted in favor of civil society because within all individuals, there is a natural propensity for society: existing before the formation of states, this natural sociability predisposes individuals to establish peaceful and happy relations of competition and solidarity based only on reciprocal self interest and a shared sense of mutual aid." (Keane, 1988: 45) This formulation tries to solve C1 and C2 by counting on the essence of interaction among civil society organizations. In other words, if individuals are allowed to involve in various interest groups, C1 and C2 are expected to be minimized because only the people who adhere to democratic principles will be supported by others. On the contrary, a civil society organization will explicitly lose popular support. Therefore, antagonism appears to be an essential specificity because the participants' competitions with each other are considered as a natural phenomenon. Nevertheless, there is still a need for civic consciousness the absence of which would make it impossible to compare the essences of different civil society organizations.

Despite similarities in terms of civil society's being the reflection of rights and freedoms, Hegel`s concern on the relations between the state and society is very different from that of Paine. "First, in striking contrast to Paine`s account, civil society (*burgerliche Gesellschaft*) is conceived not as a natural condition of freedom but as a historically produced sphere of ethical life (*Sittlichkeit*) `positioned` between the simple world of the patriarchal household and the universal state." (Keane, 1988: 50)

In other words, civil society takes place in-between the two primordial elements of the system, family and the state, both of which are assumed to be shaped by *Sittlichkeit*. Hegel can be criticized due to the fact that family and civil society are considered to be subordinate bodies of the state. However, it must also be remembered that civil society has a very special role for Hegelian approach. His main contribution with regard to the relations between the state and civil society can be better pointed out, when the deviation of civil society from its classical meaning by increasing its potency as a means of the protector of the society against contingent corruptions within the state apparatus is indicated. Hegelian conceptualization also solves C1 and C2 by differentiating genuine civil society organizations from the corrupted one. That is to say, a society becomes a genuinely civil, when individuals attain *Sittlichkeit* and go beyond a sheer understanding of utility maximization in

terms of Benthamite approach. *Burgerliche Gesellschaft* is considered as the product of the modern capitalist economy, which needs to be improved by *Sittlichkeit*. Civil society can be reached if and only if the individuals stop to consider themselves and also each other as Benthamite utility maximizers unrelated to others, except being potential buyers and sellers of commodities.

To have *Sittlichkeit* is nothing more than the realized form of civic consciousness, which had suggested a certain level of civic culture as the most necessary condition of attaining civil society. What defines civil society as civil, as opposed to a political society, is its division into various classes and estates, each with its own distinctive outlook, interests, and ways of life. These estates- the peasantry, the business class, and the "universal" class of state functionaries- provide the crucial links, or "mediations", between the "natural society" of the family and the more abstract rationality of the state. (Smith, 1989: 140-142) The most striking aspect of the Hegelian doctrine can only be understood when it is elaborated not only within the circumstances of his era, but also within the developments of the modern times. This perspective can make Hegelian concept of corporation (*Korporation*) evident. Otherwise, Hegelian corporatism can offer a very suitable basis for C2 as it had once been in the case of Mussolini's Italy. In other words, despite the fact that Hegel defines the preconditions for attaining genuine civil society through *Korporation,* the C1 and C2 still remain unsolved, if civic consciousness (*Sittlichkeit* so to use Hegelian conceptualization*)* is not realized. It would be so simplistic to refuse the civil society characterized by clandestine interest relations and/or anti democratic inclinations by suggesting that such as system is not genuinely civil. On the contrary, a civil society is an organic structure that is characterized by the existence of different types of *Korporation* characterized by different levels of (anti)humanistic understanding. Therefore, the most viable solution to C1 and C2 would be adherence to variety and plurality in terms of *Korporation* if and only if civic consciousness characterizes the essence of the participants.

Indeed, an analysis of Hegel`s corporatism indicates that, he considers these organizations as a tool to guarantee freedom in modern terms. When we consider the quasi-democratic constitutions in modern times, especially in developing countries, it can be pointed out that the main concern of the central authority is to limit and control the activities of associations. Not surprisingly, the less democratic a regime is, it is more likely to limit and control the activities of corporations and associations, which are assumed to be contingent enemies of the regime. Hence, it is possible to indicate that the existence of corporations is the explicit sign of tolerance, which also can be considered as a very significant ingredient of democratic approaches. Within this perspective, Hegel`s corporate doctrine should be conceived under following functions: (Smith, 1989: 143-144)

1) Like Montesquieu before him and de Tocqueville later, Hegel saw the corporations as essential to the structure of modern freedom. The freedom to associate, even more than freedom of speech, is crucial to modern freedom...these intermediary bodies prevent either excessive centralization from the state above or excessive atomization from the market below.

2) The corporation has important welfare functions, especially for its indigent members. Hegel was no advocate of the welfare state or the planned economy. These functions, providing for people's substantive wants, were not a part of state's role... Civil society produces a class of people who, through no fault of their own, are reduced to penury and thus require a "safety net" to protect them from the vicissitudes of the market. This is where the corporation comes in.

3) The third function of the corporation is to provide political representation for its members. Hegel opposed the system of direct suffrage, thinking it would lead to atomization and apathy, and instead favored a form of corporate representation in the legislature or estates the corporation could serve as a link, or "mediation", between the state and civil society. In this way, the corporations could better defend the aggregate interests of their members by giving them a voice in politics.

This brief analysis indicates that the Latin American authoritarianism and Italian fascism have misinterpreted Hegel`s arguments in order to constitute a framework for their ideologies. This is exactly what this article suggests. The controversies of civil society in the form of C1 and C2 are latent and potent which are open to be activated when the absence of civic consciousness allow the circumstances to exacerbate them. What Hegel suggested was the necessity of autonomous or quasi-autonomous organizations for sustaining the balance between the members of the society and the state. Therefore, a sort of check and balance system was necessary. Nevertheless, it should also be mentioned that Hegel favors organized groups rather than the individuals. This point of view, of course, increases the significance, and though the effectiveness of some members of the relevant organized groups that is to say the elites. As smith points out, "on the whole, Hegel`s form of corporatism is probably closest to the contemporary experiences of Scandinavia, France, and Britain, with their highly structured relations between interest organizations and administrative bodies." (Smith, 1989: 145) Interestingly what makes the cases of Scandinavia, France, and Britain so close to the Hegelian understanding of civil society arises from the existence of a central mechanism, which wisely controls and balances the corporate activities. Nevertheless, it is explicit that such a solution can be viable as afar as the central mechanism keeps itself independent from C1 and C2. This is why Hegel assigns supremacy to the central mechanism, which he thinks as the state. It is assumed that such a wise state is possible because the citizens of the state are members of families and members of civil society. "Family and civil society are actual components of the state, actual spiritual existences of the will; they are the state's modes of existence; family and civil society make themselves into the state." (O`Malley, 1994: p. 2) Indeed, the family and civil society are components of the state, which is assumed to have a sort of ideal wisdom.

In contrast to Hegelian idealism, civil society is attributed a more decisive role within the Weberian approach. The necessity to refer to Weber at this point arises from the fact that he successfully focuses on two very crucial terms: "domination" and "legitimization". Indeed, Weber`s definition of the modern state includes both domination and legitimacy which are crucial not only for his theoretical discourse but also for the modern view of the contemporary politics. The first one of these concepts (domination) reflects the inclination of state to increase its area of influence, while the second one (legitimacy) draws its maximum capacity to impose

its predominance. "The modern state is a community for the domination of the institutional content, who not only has searched (with success) to monopolize a legitimate physical violence within certain limits as a tool of domination, but also collected the material conditions of administration in the hands of the executors." (Weber, 1959: 108)

If civil society organizations are analyzed within an institutionalist perspective then it may be concluded that the same interaction in terms of domination and legitimacy exist. Consequently, Weber urges certain principles in order to minimize the risks, which are defined as C1 and C2 for this article. The first principle is individual self determination, which derives ultimately from the primary value of the dignity of all human beings who, as persons, should act out of their own free initiative and should never be subjected to external determination. (Mommsen, 1989: 31-32) This principle seems to be potent enough to give answers to both C1 and C2 but again in terms of antagonism. First of all, individuals, who have dignity, are expected to be free to make their own choices but also wise enough not to damage others. As a matter of fact, Weberian approach offers a precondition, which coincides with the idea of self determination with the unity of society. In addition, Weber emphasizes what may when individuals lack the above mentioned dignity (civic consciousness in this article or *Sittlichkeit* so to use Hegel's words) There is on the other hand, the insight that all social relations are ultimately relations of domination and that even the different types of democracy do not basically overcome domination, that is, the external determination of individuals by other individuals. (Mommsen, 1989: 31-32)

Therefore, Weber considers domination, at least tendency towards domination, as real. This is why he suggests that best democracy can create the optimum conditions in which the individual's own initiative is subjected to the least possible restrictions. (Mommsen, 1989: 31-32) Within this context, civil society (organizations) should be considered as a tool, which contributes to democracy by minimizing the possible restrictions. Above all, Weberian approach is plausible because of its being able to elucidate how domination and legitimacy are the parts of the real life and how the contingent restrictions upon individual rights and freedom nay be minimized.

Interestingly, despite the fact that Weber and Marx are accepted to be the precursors of two conflicting ideologies, they emphasize similar aspects in terms of civil society. "Marx clearly subsumes the State under civil society, and it is civil society that defines the State and sets the organization and goals of the state in conformity with the material relations of production at a particular stage of capitalist development."(Carnoy, 1980: 67) That is to say, civil society, off course with different connotations, is attributed a sort of supremacy by Marx. Indeed, Gramscian analysis clearly explicates how Marxist conceptualization of civil society correlates with C1 and C2. Hence, Marx and Gramsci can be considered close to each other because they both attribute a very crucial role to civil society in the capitalist development. However, Gramsci differs from Marx, who considered civil society within the relations in production that is to say, the structure. The peculiar connotation in Gramscian analysis arises from the fact that civil society is understood to be ideological, cultural, spiritual and intellectual manifestation of socio-political life, which also constitutes the super-structure. (Cot and Mounier, 1974: 58) This is why it has supremacy and this is why it is open to manipulations. Whilst, in both

cases civic consciousness, as described in this article, had been a significant concern, and even basic assumption, for starting a counter hegemonic action which claims to contribute to democratic consolidation.

It should also be mentioned that Gramsci`s approach deviates from that of Weber. "According to Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci avoided the institutionalism and institutional determinism of Weber, because the apparatus of hegemony is spanned by the class struggle: the institutions that form the hegemonic apparatus only have meaning in the Gramscian analysis when set in the context of the class struggle and the dominant class that expands its power and control in the civil society through these same institutions." (Carnoy, 1980: 70) antagonism explicitly is the main assumption of this interpretation, which derives its *raison d'être* from antagonistic characteristics of defined identity groups. Indeed, civil society and political society with hegemony and coercion are the two aspects of the class domination. (Cot and Mounier, 1974: 59) Considering hegemony as the ideological imposition of the dominant classes in civil society upon the subordinates, Gramsci put it in between consent and coercion as a kind of synthesizer. Hegemonic tendencies control the realm of the relations both in the state and civil state. However, it must also be mentioned that in contrast to Lenin, Gramsci endows a primacy to civil society in the fight against the hegemonic existence of the dominant class ideology. In other words, civil society possesses the mission of involving in a counter action against the dominant class hegemony via expensing its own ideological values. (Cot and Mounier, 1974: 57-65) (Gramsci, 1971: 181-246) In any case civic consciousness is necessary not only in order to successfully complete the counter hegemonic action but also in order to avoid the contingency of C1 and C2 prior, during and in the aftermath of the historical breakthrough.

IV. Conclusion

This article indicated that the two basic controversies of civil society are institutional issues, which can be eliminated only by a general civic culture. Personal interests, the *realm* of the elites, secret bargains, cooperation and rivalry inside and amongst the associations may be taken for granted due to their being compatible with the essence of liberalism. Obviously, these factors prostrate the intensity of the assumptions that suggest the existence of civil society as the precondition of democratic consolidation. Nevertheless, increasing the number and diversity of civil society organizations, as it is being ardently supported by most of the current theoreticians, can not be sufficient for overcoming these controversies without civic consciousness.

There were many expectations from the end of ideological conflicts, which was to accelerate the civic maturation of the society. This euphoria was too far away from reflecting the real problematic. In coincidence with the rising amount and speed of the circulation of the goods and services, the diversity and amount of civil society organizations are constantly increasing. Within this context, no one can deny that the demise of meta-narratives served for the economic integration of the world. However, not too many things have changed with regard to civil society. What made the civil society of modernist era to collapse was not a consequence of ideological conflicts. Rather, the main reason of collapse emerged from the institutional problems described as the controversies of civil society in this article. Indeed, the

demise of modern era did not lead to civic maturation. The reason for this is clear. Today's world allows everything to be traded without forgetting the fact that it is possible to buy and sell the cultural products not the culture *per se*. Consequently, the rising number of civil society organizations does not have much sense because the problematic of the above-mentioned theoreticians trying to solve the controversies of civil society still exists: The lack of civic consciousness based on culture.

References

ALFORD, R. & FRIEDLAND, R. (1985) *Powers of theory : capitalism the state and democracy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BIRNBAUM P. (1975) *Le Pouvoir politique*. Paris, Dalloy.

CARNOY, M. (1980) *The sate and political theory*. Princeton, UP.

COT, J. P. & MOUNIER, J.P. (1974) *Pour une sociologie politique*. Paris, Tonce.

DUNLEAVY, P. & O`LEARY, B. (1987) The new right, *Theories of State : The Politics of Liberal Democracy*, Macmillan.

DUNN, J. (1992) *Democracy the unfinished journey*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

FULLER, G.E. (1996) *Demokrasi tuzağı*. Istanbul, Altın Kitaplar.

GELLNER, E. (1994) *Conditions of liberty - civil society and its rivals.* New York, Penguin Press.

GEMALMAZ, M. S. (1989) *Turkish type of democracy*. Istanbul, Amaç.

GRAMSCI, A. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Lawrence and Wishart.

MOUZELIS, N. (1995) Modernity, late development and civil society, in J.A. HALL (Ed.), *Civil Society*, Cambridge, Polity Press,.

HELD D. (1983) *States and societies*. New York, New York University Press.

HIGLEY, J.; BURTON, M. and FIELD, L. (1990) In defense of the new elite paradigm, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 55.

HIGLEY, J. & GUNTHER, R (1992). *Elites and democratic consolidation in latin America and Southern Europe*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

HOFFMAN, J. (1995) *Beyond the state*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

JOHN A. & HALL, J. A. (1994) *Coercion and consent : studies on the modern state*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

KEANE, J. (1988) *Civil society and the state*. Verso.

MICHELS R. (1971) *Les Partis politiques*. Paris, Flammarion.

MOMMSEN, J.W. (1989) *The political and social theory of Max Weber*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

ENTELIS J.P. (1996) Civil society and the authoritarian temptation in Algerian politics : Islamic democracy Versus The Centralized State, in A.R. NORTON (Ed.), *Civil Society in the Middle East*, Leiden, E. J. Brill.

O`MALLEY, J. (1994) *Marx` early political writings*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

PAINE, T. (1969) *The rights of man*. Penguin Publishers.

PARRY, G. & MORAN, M. (1992) *Democracy and democratization*. London, Routledge.

SMITH, S. B. (1989) *Hegel`s critique of liberalism*. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

TAYLOR, C. (1992) *Multi-culturalism and the politics of recognition,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press

TARCOV, N. (1992) Locke`s second treatise and `the best fence against rebellion., in J. LOSCO & L. WILLIAMS (Eds.), *Political Theory*, New York, St. Martin`s Press.

WEBER, M. (1959) *Le Savant et le politique*. Paris, Union Générale d`Editions.