A Conceptual Projection on Transition of Ideal Dialogue into Civil Dialogue: A Historical Evaluation*
İdeal Diyalogtan Sivil Diyaloğa Dönüşüm Üzerine Kavramsal İzdüşüm: Tarihsel bir İnceleme

● **Ilgar SEYIDOV***

*Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Atılım Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi, Halkla İlişkiler ve Reklamcılık Bölümü, Ankara/Türkiye. Asst. Prof., Atılım University, School of Business, Public Relations and Advertising Department, Ankara /Turkey. ilgar.seyidov@atilim.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-8420-1413

Abstract

Dialogue is one of the basic concepts of communication. As the understanding of two-way communication and mutual relations has become important by 2000s, dialogue has also started to be re-embraced within different fields of social sciences. Although it is known as a communication between two individuals, it includes very sophisticated context. The quality of communication is the main point in dialogic communication. Although this concept has been widely used in different research fields such as culture, political communication, religion, sociology and international relations studies, it has not been conceptualized with all aspects. It still lacks of proper conceptualization and profound research. In this vein, the current study aims to explore the historical and conceptual background of dialogue. Based on comprehensive literature review, first, the conceptualization of "ideal" dialogue will be discussed within various philosophical and sociological perspectives. In doing so, the historical context will be taken into account. Then, "civil" dialogue will be examined within the framework of dialogue. It will be focused on its contextual and structural transformation under specific characteristics. In the conclusion, the study will discuss how and why civil society is appropriate to formation of dialogue.

Keywords: Dialogue, ideal dialogue, civil society, civil dialogue.

Öz

Diyalog kavramı iletişim alanında en önemli kavramlardan biridir. Genel olarak iki kişi arasında bir iletişim süreci olarak bilinse de, diyalog daha karmaşık bir içeriğe ve bağlama sahiptir. Antik dönemlerle birlikte ortaya çıkan ideal diyalog anlayışı 2000'li yıllarla birlikte sivil diyalog kavramıyla yeniden popüler hale gelmiştir. Sadece iletişim alanında değil, uluslararası ilişkiler, sosyoloji, psikoloji ve felsefe gibi çeşitli bilim dallarının da odak kavramı olan diyalog yeterince tanımlanmamış ve ele alınmamıştır. Bu anlamda bu çalışma derinlemesine literatür taraması ile diyalog kavramının tarihsel olarak kavramsal değişimini ve sivil diyalog anlayışının sivil toplumla ilişkisini incelemektedir. Çalışma kapsamında öncelikle ideal diyalog anlayışının felsefi yapısı ve içeriği tartışılacaktır. Daha sonra XIX-XX yüzyılla birlikte kavramsallaşması ele alınacaktır. Daha sonra sivil diyalog kavramı sivil toplum çerçevesinde ele alınarak değerlendirilecektir. İdeal diyalog ile sivil diyalog arasındaki içeriksel benzerlikler ve farklar incelecektir. Sonuç bölümünde sivil toplumun diyalog anlayışı ne kadar yararlı ya da yarasız olduğu tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Diyalog, ideal diyalog, sivil toplum, sivil diyalog.

Introduction

Dialogue is one of the fundamental concepts of human communication. Although it is widely known as interaction between two persons, dialogue is more sophisticated and interactive process which is focusing on mutual understanding between two and more individuals, groups, organizations, countries, etc. It can also be regarded as a social form enabling the self-expression in societal level. This process is being formed and developed spontaneously. As Zoller (2000, pp. 193) stated, dialogue is basically a word, an answer or a relation at least between two.

Dialogue has been studied in several research fields such as sociology, psychology, political science and etc. since Ancient age to date. Starting with the late of 1900s, dialogue has become a phenomenon within democracy and conflict resolution discussions. This phenomenon comes to mean of a new form- "civil society dialogue" or "civil dialogue" in communication studies. By focusing on this phenomenon, the current study aims to find out how the dialogue has changed within the specific periods and what are the main components of civil dialogue? Most importantly, this paper also recommends the conceptualization for civil dialogue by underlining the main attributes of dialogue understanding.

Based on the theoretical problematic of dialogue, this study argues that dialogue can't be implemented in practice based on its theoretical-idealistic structure. However, civil dialogue can considered

as the most optimal *dialogative*[1] or in other words dialogue-based communication form in terms of dialogue conceptualization. The research questions are as follow:

- How the dialogue has changed theoretically since Ancient age to date?
- What are the differences in between *ideal dialogue* and *civil dialogue*?
- How can civil dialogue be conceptualized?
- Is civil society *surrender* or *trap* for civil dialogue?

Based on depth literature review and discussions, the study is composed of two main sections. Firstly, the historical background of dialogue will be tracked by applying to different approaches. The roots of Ancient age's "ideal" dialogues will be examined in the scope of philosophical perspectives. Then, it will be focused on formation of "theoretical" conceptualization of dialogue in between XIX and XX centuries. The latter section will discuss the rise of "civil dialogue" and its importance. It will be attempted to develop the conceptual framework of civil dialogue for future studies. In addition, civil society will be analyzed with two opposite theoretical approaches. In the conclusion, it will be focused on the contextual and structural changes of dialogue within civil society by questioning it is deconstruction or reconstruction.

The Historical Background of "Ideal" Dialogue

The origin of "dialogue" is traced back to the Greek work "dialogos". *Dia* refers to "through" and *logos* comes to mean of "word" (Bohm, 2006: 35). Primarily, dialogue should not to be considered as the communication or conversation between two sides, a fortiori, it is a communicative action which can be conducted among more than two sides. Moreover, the quality of communication is underscored by the notion of dialogue. In this respect, dialogue is related to the "content" of conversation, and the "context" of speech acts, and behavior patterns (Cissna & Andersson, 1998: 64).

The period from VIII BC to AD V century is known as Ancient Age. The philosophical and historical background of this Age was mainly formed in Ancient Greek times (Hançerlioğlu, 1995: 47). In Ancient Greece, there wasn't any holistic and integrated sovereignty system. Instead, there were many small city-states in this chaotic order (Von Aster, 2005: 58-59). In this period, Athens was the main center of art, politics, literature and democracy amongst all. This city-state had a significant role in developing of Greek philosophy. Socrates was one of the important thinkers of this philosophy. His thoughts upon *mind* and

knowledge deeply influenced Ancient philosophy. Socrates' view rendered *human* as "focal point" instead of nature in contradistinction to former philosophers. By focusing on human, Socrates set forth the "dialogical method" which allows questioning and discussing the knowledge. This method was used by various philosophical approaches over the years (Birand, 1958: 38).

For Socrates, dialogue is not a communicative action to get together on something; it is such a "discussion" or "talk" dependent on sustainable and reciprocal conversation. Therefore, dialogical method is a catechetical education technique providing opportunity for mutual understanding. In this respect, Plato (2013a, 2013b, 2014) emphasized on prolific and continuous-didactical characteristics of dialogue in his works by resorting to Socratic Method. The question and answer teaching structure of this method brings about effective "learning" (Ünder, 1994). Mutual conversation and understanding are the goals or principles that must be provided in dialogic discussions equally. In this context, the Ancient dialogues can be also called as "ideal" structured dialogues due to their being more abstract rather than concrete.

Aristotle's approach was different from Socrates and Plato. His methodology was mainly based on the synthesis between "dialogical" and "dialectical" ways. The "dialectical" way points out the relational integrity among the contrasts. In turn, this integrity leads to forming of continuous loop on mutual interaction. A relational coherence is being mentioned here. On the other hand, "dialogical" description addresses to the "polyphonic" communicative action of differences which is highlighted by Bakhtin afterwards (Baxter, 2004: 182-185).

In this vein, Roger Crisp, who translated "Nichomachean Ethics" book of Aristotle (2004) from the original one, underlined the characteristic "direct expression" of Aristotelian dialogue compared to the Socratic Method. For Crisp (2004), Socratic dialogical method was based on "indirect expression" including mostly ironies and riddles. On the other hand, Aristotle's dialogue understanding was based on "direct" and "open" instruction methodology excluding ironies and riddles.

Aristotle (2004: 20) took a "skeptical" stance in discussion of different virtues and values. The questioning and interrogating of a common sense in reality was pivotal to his methodology, predominantly. For Aristotle, "interrogation" is essential phase for philosophy and political science. This concept was very crucial for his rhetoric. Aristotle's (1995: 36-37) rhetoric was mainly based on using all required persuasion methods convenient to the context of the

selected topic. Since the rhetoric was an influential art of persuasive speech, it must include valid arguments.

Unlike the dialectical and persuasive aspect of Aristotle' rhetoric, dialogue is linked to mutual understanding. There is no influence or persuasion in dialogue. The argumentation process can be considered as the common attribute for dialogue and rhetoric. The notion "argument" refers to systematic and valid rationale of any problematic (Habermas, 1984: 18). It is such a task to re-correct or edit the truth of thoughts (Ehniger, 1970: 101). It is intended to make the content clearer on rationality. Therefore, argumentation is an integrated process harmonizing verbal, social and rational aspects. This is also a critical process refuting a viewpoint, a thought or legitimatizing the assumptions based on reasonable analysis. In this respect, the speaker or writer defends his/her own perspective, ideas and proposals within the argumentation process (Van Eemeren, 2001: 11).

Aside from argumentation, Zappen (2004: 6-22) underlined the common ethical values for Ancient "ideal" dialogue such as "trust", "esteem", "equal right to speak", and "mutual recognition". For Stewart and Zediker (2000: 219) these values are directly belonging to ethical living. In this living, dialogical and dialectical aspects are intertwined with each other. There is a perfect harmony in between (Zappen, 2004).

For Ünder (1994: 640-643), the perfectness of this harmony is rooted in the content of dialogue. There are various arguments harmonized and intertwined with each other in ideal dialogues. They are commonly based on the philosophical watchword of "the only thing I know is I know nothing", which addresses to importance of mutual learning. Persuasion was excluded from the theoretical framework of ideal dialogues. Mutual understanding and exchange of sympathy were glorified in Ancient dialogues.

The Roman philosopher, Cicero underlined the importance of *open-endedness* in Ancient dialogues. For Schofield (2009: 62-63), open-endedness was a significant contribution to ideal dialogue understanding in terms of promoting the non-closed discussions. The technique of investigating and solving the problem was akin to Plato's methodology; however, the about ideas about specific issue/problem were dogmatic doctrines in Cicero (1967) dialogues differently from Plato. Therefore, the dialogical method of Cicero was much more complicated. In this framework, Charles Brittain who translated Cicero's (2006: XI-XII) "Academic Skepticism" book from original, identified his dialogues as "adversarial dialogues".

In Late Ancient Times (AD III-VIII), dialogue gained a moral appearance on account of promulgating of Christianity. The rise of

Christianity started with the declaration of Christianity officially in Roman Empire, in AD I century. Vassilopoulou (2009: 1) defined the Late Antique Times as "interregnum period" between Antiquity and Middle Ages. The importance of this period is related to emergence of new theological forms that affected not only the political structure, but also Ancient philosophical and cultural values. The philosophical content of Ancient dialogue which enriched mostly by Socrates and Plato, and but turned out to be ecclesiastical form (Marenbon, 1988: 13). For Cooper & Dal Santo (2009: 183-184), the key feature of Late Ancient dialogue was the concept *reconciliation* embedded in the written materials. Reconciliation was fictionalized and engrained in between human and God through ecclesiastical dialogues. The aim of this tenet was to reach to the "truth" of God. Therefore, the mentioned reconciliation was equivalent to "commitment" made with God. Mostly the works of St. Augustine can be exemplified with regard to describing this commitment formed in the connection between religious and philosophical values. This philosophical-theological formation was prevalent in Middle Ages as well (Bravo, 2007: 113-115).

Middle Ages had begun with the collapse of Roman Empire in V century and lasted to the Renaissance in XV century. In this millennium, the societal and political structures of West civilization were affected predominantly by the Christian tenets. All cultural, educational, religious activities and festivals were controlled by the Catholic Church (Duignan, 2011: 17; Price, 2008: 12). This period is also known as "dark age" due to the domination of feudal system, the coercive power of Church, and thereby the destruction of Ancient wisdom. Many important manuscripts and works of Ancient philosophy were annihilated.

On the other hand, some developments were also seen in XII century by the occurrence and rise of Islamic philosophy in Arabic geography. Both the works of Al-Farabi, Avicenna, Al-Ghazali and such who were mostly inspired by Ancient philosophy, and particularly, some considerable studies of Plato, Aristotle were translated from Arabic into Latin. They were disseminated again and drawn interest by readers (Duignan, 2011: 85). Aristotelian metaphysics and ethics became popular again in this period. Above all, the establishment of first universities in XIII century and the emergence of new theological thoughts on socio-cultural basis were the most important developments. Put it differently, the monadic structure of Middle Ages started to be disrupted (Kenny, 2005: 54-57).In Middle Ages, as Geoffrey (2003: 4) stated, there wasn't any significant work on dialogue until the XV-XVI centuries. However, various political rhetoric forms were prevalent in

this period. Those rhetoric examples divided into three speech-forms: judicial, deliberative and random. All were intended to persuade the audiences (Murphy, 1981: 8-9).

In Renaissance, for Smarr (2008: 2-3), the dialogue was the reinterpretation of Ancient dialogue; however, these dialogues based on concrete problems unlike the abstract themes. Furthermore, they were formed in daily routines *spontaneously*. To understand the Renaissance dialogue, Smarr (2008: 24) referred to works of Italian scholar and dramatist Sperone Speroni. Dialogue was an inevitable part of Speroni's comedies. The salient point was the *mimesis,* which pointed to the connection between dialogue and comedy. Mimesis in dialogue allows speaker to reflect his/her interior world readily. In other words, it is a sort of a dialogical method expressing selfness without applying to formal speech. Being associated with comedy has paved the way for Ancient dialogue to be enriched with artistic content (Geoffrey, 2003: 9).

As to XVIII century, the humanist, reformist and rational impacts of Renaissance brought about the "enlightenment" in whole Europe on socio-cultural and intellectual basis. The development of industrialization and the production, the urbanization and population growth, the discovery of press, the increase of universities and mass communication, thereby the progress in literacy were coincided with this period (Atabek, 2002: 227). Those advances led also dialogue to be conceptualized on more cultural and societal understanding.

In XIX and XX centuries, Austrian-Jewish philosopher Martin Buber and Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin were two important theorists, who attempted to conceptualize the dialogue comprehensively. Buber's dialogue understanding includes both descriptive and normative frames (Stewart & Zediker, 2000: 227). In this respect, Buber's dialogue is neither monologic nor dialogic. More precisely, it is dualistic or polar. The main reason of describing in such way is concerned with the interrelation amongst contrasts. This relation depicts the *tense* connection between monologic and dialogic human nature. For Buber (1958) this tense relationship includes a complex reciprocity as well. Simply, if one side - "I" affects the another side, in return, the another side- "thou" (you) will affect the respondent ("I"). For Buber, "I" and "thou" are neither man nor woman. Those aren't identified with any sexes. They are only specified within spatial and temporal contexts as different centers. Therefore, these centers can't be measured or described. The main point is the quality of relation and communication. In this context, the concept of *integrity* is must in this communication understanding. To form the integrity existentially,

openness, *genuine* and *reciprocity* are needed to be implemented. In this manner, dialogue becomes the base of the relational communication in between (Buber, 1958: 8-16).

On the contrary, Levinas (1999: 100-104) pointed out that, the relation between "I" and "Thou" was not based on dialogical communication. A fortiori, it is a sort of asymmetric relationship dependent on requisite rationale. For that reason, Levinas put forward the importance of *pre-socialization* process in terms of creating dialogue between "self" and "others". He articulated socialization as a self-induced and ever-evolving process, which is formed amongst beings in time. This approach argues that, dialogue can't be created between the parties without pre-socialization process.

Polyphony was the basis of Bakhtin's (1981) dialogue interpretation. It is an important notion to understand the "multi vocal" communication between "me" and "others". In such a situation, dialogical communication can be formed within *carnivalesque* discussions, in which everybody can speak and can be heard by the others (Zappen, 2004: 38-48). Carnivalesque is a specific concept refers to cohesion among the differences or contrasts formed simultaneously. In this context, dialogue is such a "festival" where different or opposite voices are being performed (Bakhtin, 1981: 364). To stress on the importance of dialogical content, Bakhtin (1981: 280-364) differentiated dialogue and rhetoric. For Bakhtin, all rhetoric molds are monological intrinsically. These monotype models are audience-focused and intended to influence the respondent. On the other hand, dialogue possesses carnivalesque and polyphonic structure.

In XX century, *positive regard* and *quality of communication* were the keywords in dialogue studies transferred from psychology. American psychologist Carl Rogers used those terms in order to explain the individual behaviors during the therapies. Through the experimental therapies, Rogers (1994) concluded that the most effective therapist-patient relation should be grounded on *mutual interest* forming unconditionally and positively without resorting to any objective. In case of such positive regard, *confidence* and *sincerity* can be emerged, and a good quality of communication can be provided between the opponents.

Rogers (1961: 33-35) mentioned about three relational phases of conversations. According to his observation, initially, you have to be authentic to your respondent. Then, you must be transparent in self-expression and consider the opponent as a real respondent in conversation. This will lead to mutual acceptance or in other words, *confirmation* which was suggested by Scottish psychiatrist Ronald

David Laing. For Laing (1969) confirmation refers to acceptance and approval of the opponent's existence. The last phase is about acting freely. There mustn't be any coercive power or pressure on any opponents during the conversation. Provided that all the above-mentioned phases are completed, a good quality of reciprocal communication will be provided to some extent (Rogers, 1961: 35).

In XX century, the complex and dynamic structure of dialogue was discussed mostly by two philosophers Paulo Freire and Hans Georg Gadamer. The Brazilian educator and philosopher Paulo Freire stressed on *creativity* and *reproductive* attributes of dialogue by linking to its historical and cultural context. For Freire (2005: 68-108), dialogue is the core of humanistic pedagogy. In this vein, dialogue is related to both teaching and learning process. Mutual learning is the key word of this process. It leads to forming of intellectual reproduction in creative ways. Therefore, a *dialogical person,* who is aware of "others" is not a person to dominate the conversation. On the contrary, dialogical person will endeavor to create mutual, intellectual and actionable communication with "others" through dialogue (Freire & Shor, 1987: 98-104).

In dialogue conceptualization of Freire, a sort of self-reflexive loop, which is a flow of information and learning was highlighted. This tendency is similar to Gadamer's methodology. Yet, Gadamer's dialogical turn also includes a dialectical aspect based on relational flow from part to whole. This relation understanding between subject and object is historical and paradoxical. Therefore, dialogue is the key to explore this existential relationship due to its multidimensional process-driven formation aspiring to reciprocal understanding (Scherto, 2015: 9). The concept of *context* is the key for Gadamer's dialogues to find out the *meaning*. For Gadamer (2008: 262), the speech is not only a process of creating ideas of inwardness abstractly, but also an external communicative form tends to convey the thoughts concretely. In order to convey the abstract idea to respondent in concrete frame, the right time and right context are needed to be existed. In such a way, dialogical relation can be formed between the sides.

Since the midst of XX century, various societal movements, economic crises, migration, the Cold War and other global issues have led dialogue to become a key concept in political science and international relations along with communication field. In this period, the *Communicative Action Theory* of famous German philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas attracted attention. In order to clarify the ground of this theory, Habermas (1984: 10-17) focused on communicative rationality that is defined as consensus-aimed and

consolidative platform, where different and subjective perspectives can be discussed. Various norms, self-presentations, expressions, descriptive speech-acts and such communicative acts take the tasks of consensus under the rational conditions. Therefore, *compromise* can be seen as the ultimate aim (Alexander, 1991: 64). In particular, Habermas (1991: 223) addressed to the communicative act called as "ideal speech situation" in which participants communicate with each other not to exercise control over but to make an agreement in between on equal footing. While expressing the ideas freely, the participants are applying to different aforementioned communicative practices in order to reach to mutual understanding and mutual agreement (Baynes, 2016: 49).

Habermas' theory has been the first and most comprehensive theoretical examination on communicative acts. This sophisticated communication theory has nourished different approaches in communication and dialogue studies. One of them is Richard L. Johannesen's (1990) work on communication ethics. In his work, Johannesen (1990) suggested 5 fundamental principles for dialogical communication: *mutual empathy/sincerity*, *unconditional positive relationship, simultaneity*, *mutual equality* and *the relevant speech situation*. Another scholar Grudin (1996: 12-13) pointed out the importance of *reciprocity* for dialogue along with *mutual trust*, *esteem*, *affection* and *open-mindedness* in order to reach to *mutual consent*. An open-ended agreement is meant by the mutual consent without linking to any control or ultimate aim. Therefore, dialogue is concerned with the process-driven structure of reciprocal communication among the parties rather than result-oriented.

By the late of 1990's, a new approach become popular, whic is named as *Dialogic Theory*. This approach has been alleged by Michale L. Kent and Maureen Taylor within Public Relations research. This approach argues the possibility of dialogical communication practices via digital platform. For Kent and Taylor (2002: 30), these platforms can provide mutual communication among the organizations to discuss and solve the problems by considering the mutual advantages (Taylor & Kent, 2004: 62). This theory is effected by the another Public Relations approach- *two-way/symmetric relationship* that was asserted by James E. Grunig. Grunig (2005: 249) described two-way communication as a deliberative communication practice based on dialogue and free of persuasion or manipulation. However, Arnett (2001: 232) objected to entitlement of this theory as dialogic due to its formation. He believes that digital platform is not suitable for the dialogical practices. To be more precise, any of technological infrastructures can meet the humanist ethics or characteristics of

dialogue practically. In this vein, the theory is more "dialogue-pretending" rather than "dialogic".

Hammond, Anderson and Cissna (2003) stated that dialogue is basically a content-driven communication process. Therefore, dialogue must be discussed within the framework of *heteroglossia*. The Bakhtinian word, heteroglossia refers to multidimensional and polyphonic infrastructure consisting of words, discourses, etc. holistically (Bakhtin, 1981: 263-273). In this regard, dialogue process provides an essential opportunity for various social forms, semantic and linguistic structures to be intertwined with each other; and forms a heterogenic matrix of economic, political and historical sets (Anderson, Baxter and Cissna, 2004). This process can be only sustainable when the differences exist. As Bauman[2] mentioned in one of his conversations, "the real dialogue is not to talk with who thinks the same as you*"*. On the contrary, it is to communicate with person who thinks different from you.

Civil Society and Dialogue: How to Conceptualize Civil Dialogue?

In the beginning of 1990's, *civil dialogue* has become a widespread in EU's social policies. The concept civil dialogue was firstly used in Social Policy Forum conducted by General Directorate of EU Social Policies in 1996. Approximately 1.000 participants including representatives of various public, media organizations and NGOs made discussions on civil dialogue formation in order to find out how to implement and develop at EU level. Unlike the social dialogue, which is intended to socio-economic convention, civil dialogue is articulated in civil society framework to organize relations with society (Smismans, 2003: 475-476).

In 2007, civil dialogue was praised along with public policy, consultations and civic participation for the democracy development in Lisbon Treaty. According to the 2nd clause of 11th Article, EU applies to civil dialogue to build open, transparent and stable relations with representative organizations and NGOs. In this respect, civil dialogue is considered as a "support" (mediation role) in development of politic dialogues with local authorities, and social dialogues with social partners (Heurberger & Schwarel, 2013: 5-6).

In the Treaty, civil dialogue is constructed in two interrelated phases: *Horizontal* and *Vertical dialogue.* Horizontal dialogue refers to pre-dialogue process (interconnections) between EU and citizens or presentative. Vertical dialogue is the relationship process between civil society organizations and representatives. More clearly, horizontal

dialogue provides a suitable platform for discussions, in turn; vertical dialogue mediates to building of mutual-symmetrical relationship between the parties in this platform. Thus, a holistic civil dialogue becomes a public opinion process on democratic principles including *openness*, *participation*, *harmony* and *accountability* (Pichler, 2015). Yet, Pichler (2015: 36) questioned the possibility of reciprocal relationship in vertical dialogue. He underlined the need of egalitarian situation for building the dialogical relationship between the parties. Therefore, he touched on the interests that can hinder any of dialogical relationship between a voluntary/non-profit organization and private/political institution.

Although civil dialogue was firstly used by EU's Social Policies Directorate in 1996, it hasn't been conceptualized adequately. It still lacks of theoretical background. On the other hand, there are some salient concepts have been marked in civil dialogue understanding. For instance, both in Lisbon Treaty and in following documents, *reciprocity* was particularly demonstrated in the objectives to address to the two-way communication or symmetrical relationship. The other remarkable concepts are *mutual recognition* and *accountability* along with reliable *information transfer and sharing* (Heuberger & Schwarel, 2013: 6). In this vein, Fazi & Smith (2006: 22) characterized civil dialogue as *interactive*, *multidimensional*, *contentful*, *promotional* and *social utility-oriented* communication tool between the parties.

For Garcia (2010: 92), since the civil dialogue is a sort of democratic tool reorganizing the relations between public institutions and civil society organizations, it can be regarded as the main component of participatory democracy. To expound the connection in between, Beger (2004: 7) pointed out that civil dialogue has become phenomenon by the support of EU Commission, hence, it is grounded on EU's basic values and principles such as *equal access*, *reconciliation*, *human rights*, *sustainable collaboration*, *community development*, and *economic progress*. Those are also promoted by participatory democracy. Tough the connection can't be denied between civil dialogue and participatory democracy; however, only concentrating on democracy context will restrain the conceptualizing of civil dialogue inventively.

In the current study, civil dialogue is conceptualized within the framework of dialogue understanding rather than a fancy but nonfunctional term used by EU in the above-mentioned processes to build so-called collaboration with candidate countries. Above all, civil dialogue is considered as the current phase of dialogue evaluation. In

this regard, the below table can be helpful in understanding the contextual change/transition of dialogue over the periods:

Table 1. *The Evaluation of Dialogue*

Main Characteristics	Ideal Dialogue of Ancient Age	Theoretical Dialogue of XIX-XX Centuries	Civil Dialogue of XXI Century
Description of Parties	More than two persons	Me and others	Individuals/Groups/Institutions/Countries
Basic Conditions	Openness/Accuracy	Openness/Accuracy	Openness/Transparency/Accountability
Reciprocity	Mutual Recognition	Mutual Positive Regard/Confirmation/Approval	Mutual Recognition and Acceptance
Ethical Values	Mutual confidence and esteem	Mutual confidence and esteem	Mutual confidence and esteem
Communicative action	Daily conversation and talks	Social/Political discussions on rational basis	All participatory and deliberative communicative actions on rational basis
Speech Situation	Egalitarian "ideal" speech situation	"Carnivalesque" speech situation	Two-way/symmetrical and collaborative communication
Method	Socratic question and answer learning method	Mutual learning method tied to context and understanding	Mutual learning method tied to information transfer and sharing
Course of proceeding	Spontaneous and pedagogical process	The process of empathy exchange	The progressive process on feedback and evaluation
Relationship	Ongoing relation without aiming at "give-and-take"	Ongoing relation intended to individual and social utility	Sustainable relation intended to compromise based on public interest and social utility
Scope	Public and Private Sphere	Public and Private Sphere/"Lifeworld"	Civil Society

As illustrated in Table 1, 10 different categories were identified in order to reveal the main characteristics of dialogue on periodical base. It is shown that, despite the changes formalistically, the essences of features have been almost remained the same throughout the evaluation. However, there is a salient difference in description of relationship category. Unlike the "ancient" and "theoretical" dialogues,

the compromise or in other words, consensus is targeted in civil dialogue by means of two-way communication and collaboration. The findings of the abovementioned comprehensive research[3] on "Civil Society Dialogue" program, which was conducted in Turkey by EU showed that collaboration and partnership were mostly emphasized within civil dialogue intended to overcome the prejudices and promote the harmonization process. Additionally, capacity building and information sharing were the other purposes indicated in the general framework. Through framing analysis in the research, it was revealed that all concepts were identified and designed to inform Turkey with the EU standards and thereby to prepare the candidate country for membership through the program based on so-called dialogue.

In ideal dialogue, as theorists (Plato, 2013a, 2013b, 2014; Bakhtin, 1981; Buber, 1958; Freire, 2015) underlined, there must be a continuous teaching and learning process. Equalitarian and "carnivalesque" speech situation is desired without expecting a compromise. Consensus is not must. Instead of aiming to make agreement or compromise, different ideas and perspectives are encouraged to be clashed, ethically. In such way, the dialogue will be enriched and developed gradually. Positive regard (Roger, 1961) and confirmation (Laing, 1969) will be formed between the opponents. Above all, for a sustainable civil dialogue process, as Freire & Shor (1987) stressed, a reciprocal communication must be created on equal basis.

As shown in Table 1, another salient difference is about with the scope of dialogue. Originally, dialogical forms were generally carried out in public/private spheres. With the emergence of civil dialogue, civil society has become the main implementation field; however, it is necessary to specify which civil society definition is appropriate to dialogue understanding. In this respect, two major and opposite views are being discussed extensively.

First is dominant perspective which is based on liberal/neo-liberal ideology and has been sprung from the works of English philosopher John Locke. Locke (1998) described civil society tied to political society. The onus is on this civil/political society to protect the civic rights such as liberty, healthcare, fund and material needs of the nation within its legality (Locke, 1998: 7). In the scope of civic rights, Bignami (2007: 14-18) stated that civil society organizations contribute to democratization process by controlling the state power. They are playing balanced role between the public and private institutions. Therefore, the right of association is given to individuals by the state.

This right is defined and promoted as self-expression platform for social differences in liberal democracies (Macedo, 2000: 420).

To epitomize, the supportive role of civil society in public services and social policies is mainly encouraged by dominant approach. The main aim is to land civil society organizations with public services such as healthcare, education, social security, and such which are not regarded as governmental services anymore (Özbek, 2004: 24-25; Freeman, 2016: 180). As a result, civil society organizations become a sort of political institutions dependent on the state (Acar, 2017: 256-257). Moreover, civil society turns into a *private sector* including the given purposes and interests. In such a case, it will be impossible to claim that the dialogue can exist or function with its fundamental characteristics. If there is purpose, interest and privity, civil dialogue can hold only a mediatory position amongst the individuals/organizations to reach the compromise or agreement. Therefore, civil dialogue will be unable to go beyond of so-called dialogical from. In practice, it will remain as a sort of deliberative communication process intended to conclusion rather than quality of content.

In Critical paradigm, civil society is identified as a specific and systematic sphere including various structures. To this approach, *participation*, *representation* and *mutual recognition* are crucial components of the society (Onuf, 2005: 45-60). G.W. Friedrich Hegel was the premise philosopher, who defined sophisticated structure of civil society by distinguishing it from the state. Hegel (2001: 138) pointed to *solidarity* within the understanding of civil society. He believed that, civil society was focused on individual benefits rather than general interests. Therefore, it was a transitional stage between family and state (Chakraborty, 2016: 20)

Differently from Hegelian perspective, Marx (1978) thought that civil society regulates the state. Therefore, civil society was positioned as the *base*, and state was considered as *superstructure* (Calabrese, 2004: 319). For Gramsci (1992: 235) the structure of civil society reminds of the modern *trou-de-loups*. It is such a defense system in position warfare. In this context, civil society was defined as a hegemonic superstructure in Gramscian perspective.

Within critical approach, the communicative aspect of civil society is discussed, in particular, with reference to Habermas' works. In this scope, public sphere is considered as a *neutral zone* between civil society and state, which also re-organizes the relations in between. Various social groups are allowed to express or show their free thoughts in this zone. In this way, Habermas (1996: 359-367) thinks that, public

sphere turns to be a "medium" of complex relations system in civil society, where forms by voluntary organizations independent from state and economy. These organizations attempt to find out solutions for common social utility by means of communicational activities. In this context, Castells (2008: 78) also described public sphere as the network area between state and civil society. This area provides the opportunity for individuals/organizations to discuss the problems or to pass the remarks on any issue merely. Therefore, civil society provides an opportunity for civil actors or organizations to organize effectively in order to become visible and have a voice in public sphere. In the framework, civil society is an important platform among state, family and economy (Keyman, 2016: 15). Above all, as Scholte (2007) stated, civil society is an *independen*t and *non-profit* sphere, where is free of any political or private power.

This independent and non-profit civil society approach can allow dialogue to be implemented as practicable communication tool. In this civil society, "others" can find opportunity to be visible and to discuss their issues through the content-oriented process without obliged to comprise or give-and –take. Any of sides will abdicate of any rights. Thus, as Castells (2008) noted, civil dialogue will be the *organized expression* of all parties voiced on equal footing. Civil society organizations will also turn to be *civil dialogue intermediaries* meeting all parties on common discussion ground. In a broad sense, they will contribute to forming and developing of large-scaled communication platform between state and society; public and private spheres. Undoubtedly, this platform will not reflect all "ideal" characteristics of dialogue in practice. Yet, it will be grounded on dialogical communication form. On the other hand, in "sectoral" understanding of civil society, civil dialogue will remain incapable and "non-dialogical" in implementation. As mentioned before, *if there is aim, there is no dialogue*. Most importantly, dialogue cannot be used with the task of informing and transferring EU values to the candidate country. It will only remain an oxymoron between the conceptualization and practice of civil dialogue. So, civil dialogue must be developed on more dialogical form that can be accorded with the implementation.

Conclusion

The main aim of this study was to propound dialogue and civil dialogue in point of philosophical and sociological review. In doing so, it was intended to examine civil dialogue inventively, and not to evaluate as subcomponent of participatory or deliberative democracy

approaches. It is believed that, unless civil dialogue can't be seen as a specific and independent structure, any of suggestions will be helpful to enrich its content to be more dialogative.

By tracing back the origin of dialogue in Ancient age, it was applied to various schools of philosophical and sociological thoughts in order to understand dialogue's idealistic roots and main characteristics in comprehensive way. Furthermore, the main difference between ideal and civil dialogue is related with the scope of sphere where that concepts are belong to. In this context, it can be seen that a new sphere-civil society is considered to be the optimal and suitable domain for civil dialogue in terms of implementation. In what follows, to comprehend the civil dialogue in dialogical way, two different views of civil society were discussed to find out whether the civil society is surrender or trap for dialogue.

In this regard, it was discussed that ideal dialogue can't be fit in "sectoral" civil society which includes interests, profits and etc. In such a system, how can we mention about "others", or carnivalesque dialogic platform. Under those circumstances, civil society will be only a trap for dialogue, contrary to what is believed it is surrender. All communication attempts will be literally as if they are dialogical platforms which have no connection with the "ideal" one. The aim and result will be important than content and process. In such a case, civil dialogue can be regarded as the deconstructed version of dialogue. However, if civil society can be a common equalitarian platform for all parties in order to discuss the problems, civil dialogue will be formed and developed in more dialogative way. Civil society organizations will play the "intermediary" roles in building and conducting of civil dialogue process. Furthermore, two-way communication and symmetrical relations may be grounded isolating from any coercive power.

If "ideal" dialogue can't be practiced, it is believed that civil dialogue can be re/formed upon dialogue's main attributes within impartial civil society. In this vein, civil dialogue must be compatible with the process-focused practice rather than result-oriented. Instead of arriving at conclusion, the course of proceeding is necessary in the conversations or discussions. The equal right to speak is needed to be provided for all parties without exercising control over. No manipulation should be allowed during the discussions. Most importantly, solution or compromise shouldn't be expected. For instance, workshops are adequate practices in understanding dialogical speech situations. In these activities, everyone is encouraged to express his/her opinion freely. Self-expression is more preferred than

manipulation or pressure. Therefore, workshops can be regarded as useful practices for the discussions. Civil dialogue can be adapted in such communication tools like open discussion platforms as well. They are low-cost and thereby, can provide more sustainable processes. Civil society organizations are the optimal mediums to organize these suitable platforms due to their independent and non-profit structures. This idea must be developed in future studies. For this, various dialogative designs can be theorized by applying to dialogue characteristics.

This study mainly intended to pay attention on civil dialogue as the reconstructed phase of dialogue to be implemented within civil society. In this respect, it is attempted to emancipate the main aim and content of civil dialogue from EU policies by which it has been enlightened. It is believed that this conceptual projection on civil dialogue by referring to different theoretical perspectives from Ancient age to date will provide a resource for more comprehensive research in the future.

References

Acar, E. (2017). Neoliberalizm ve Sosyal Refah Devleti Ekseninde Üçüncü Yol Yaklaşımı. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18 (1), 248-263.

Alexander, J. (1991). Habermas and Critical Theory Beyond the Marxian Dilemma? In A Honneth & J. Hans (eds), *Communicative Action: Essays and J. Habermas* (p. 49-49). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Anderson, A., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N. (2004) Texts and contexts of Dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (p. 1-17**)**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Aristotle. (1995). *Retorik.* Doğan, H. M (transltaor). Istanbul: YKY.

Aristotle. (2004). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Crisp, R. (translator). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arnett, C, R. (2001). Dialogic Civility as Pragmatic Ethical Praxis: An Interpersonal Metaphor for the Public Domain. *Communication Theory*, 11 (3), 315-338.

Atabek, N. (2002). Kamuoyu, Medya ve Demokrasi. *Kurgu Dergisi*, 19, 223-238.

Bakhtin, M, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Baxter, A. L. (2004). A Tale of Two Voices: Relational Dialectics Theory, *The Journal of Family Communication*. 4 (3-4), 181-

192.

Baynes, K. (2016). *Habermas*. New York: Routledge.

Beger, N. (2004). Participatory Democracy: Organized Civil Society and the "New Dialogue. *Online Paper*, 9 (4), 1-8.

Bignami, F. (2007). *Civil Society and International Organizations: A Liberal Framework for Global Governanc*e. Access Link: https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1 933&context=faculty_scholarship

Birand, K. (1958). *İlkçağ Felsefesi Tarihi*. Ankara: Ajans-Türk Matbaası.

Bohm, D. (2006). *Birlikte Düşünmek: Diyalog.* Atalay, O. (Translator). İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları.

Bravo, H. (2007). Augustinus' un Varlık ve Bilgi Görüşleri. *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15, 111-128.

Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Calabrese, A. (2004). The Promise of Civil Society: A Global Movement for Communication Rights, *Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 18 (3), 317-329.

Castells, M. (2008). The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks and Global Governance. *AAPS*, 616, 78-93.

Chakraborty, L, S. (2016). Gramsci's Idea of Civil Society. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studie*s, 3 (6), 19-27.

Cicero. (1967). *De Oratore.* Warmington, H. E. (Translator). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cicero. (2006). *Academic Skepticism.* Brittain, C. (Translator). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Cissna, N, K. & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing About Dialogic Moments: The Buber-Rogers Position and Postmodern Themes. *Communication Theory*, 81, 63-104.

Cooper, K., & Dal Santo, M. (2009). Boethius, Gregory the Great and Christian Afterlife of classical Dialogue, In S. Goldhill (ed), *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* (p. 173-191). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duignan, B. (2011). *Early Medieval Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Ehninger, D. (1970). Argument as Method: Its Nature, Its limitations and Its Uses. *Speech Monographs,* 37 (2), 101-111.

Fazi, E. & Smith, J. (2006*). Civil Dialogue: Making it Work Better, EU Civil Society Contact Group.* Access link: http://act4europe.horus.be/module/FileLib/Civil%20dialogue, %20making%20it%20work%20better.pdf

Freeman, M. (2016). Neo-liberal Politikalar ve İnsan Hakları. *D.E.Ü. Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (2), 165-188.

Freire, P. & Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation*. London: Macmillan LTD.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary Edition. New York: Continuum.

Gadamer, G. H. (2008). *Hakikat ve Yöntem* I. Aslan, H. & Yavrucan, I. (Translator). İstanbul: Paradigma.

Garcia, B, L. (2010). From Civil Dialogue to Participatory Democracy: The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Sharing the Agenda in the Debates on the European Constitution. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 6 (1), 85-106.

Geoffrey, R. (2003). *Defining Dialogue: From Socrates to the Internet*. New York: Humanity Books.

Gramsci, A. (1992). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Grudin, R. (1996). *On Dialogue: An Essay in Free Thought*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Grunig, J, E. (2005). Yönetimde Mükemmelik Nedir? In J.E. Grunig (ed), *Halkla İlişkilerde ve İletişim Yönetiminde Mükemmellik* (p. 237-271). İstanbul: Rota.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason on the Rationalization of Society*, Volume I. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1991). A Reply, In A. Honneth & J. Hans (eds), *Communicative Action: Essays and J. Habermas* (p. 244-265). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hammond, S. C., Anderson, R.& Cissna, K, N. (2003). The Problematics of Dialogue and Power. *Communication Yearbook*, 27, 125-157.

Hançerlioğlu, O. (1995). *Düşünce Tarihi*. Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.

Hegel, G.N.F. (2001). *Philosophy of Right*. Ontario: Batoche Books.

Heuberger F., & Schawarel, M. (2013). The Chances for Participatory Democracy and a Citizen- Powered Europe, *ENNA/ European Network of National Civil Society Associations*. Access Link: http://www.b-b-e.de/fileadmin/inhalte/themen_materialien/europa/Chances_for_Participatory_Democracy_Final.pdf

Johannesen, R, L. (1990). *Ethics in Human Communication*, 3rd

Edition. New York: Waveland Press.

Kenny, A. (2005). *Medieval Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kent, L. K. & Taylor, M. (2002). Towards a Dialogic Theory of Public Relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28, 21-37.

Keyman, F. E. (2016). *Türkiye'de Sivil Toplumun Serüveni: İmkansızlıklar İçinde Vaha*. Ankara: STGM.

Laing, D. R. (1969). *Self and Other*, 2nd Edition. New York: Pantheon Books.

Levinas, E. (1999). *Alterity and Transcendence*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Locke, J. (1998). *Concerning Civil Government "Second Essay" An Essay Concerning the True Original Extent and End of Civil Government*. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press.

Macedo, S. (2000). Constituting Civil Society: School Vouchers, Religious Non Profit Organizations and Liberal Public Values. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, 75 (2), 417-452.

Marenbon, J. (1988). *Early Medieval Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Marx, K. (1978). On the Jewish Question, In R. C. Tucker (ed), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (p. 26-46). London: Norton & Company.

Murphy, J. J. (1981). *Rhetoric in The Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Onuf, N. (2005). Late Modern Civil Society, In D.R. Germain & M. Kenny (eds), *The Idea of Global Civil Society: Politics and Ethics in a Globalizing Era* (p. 45-66). New York: Routledge.

Özbek, M. (2004). Kamusal Alanın Sınırları, In M. Özbek (ed), *Kamusal Alan* (p. 19-91). İstanbul: Hil Yayınevi.

Pearce, W. B. & Pearce, K, A. (2000). Combining Passions and Abilities: Toward Dialogic Virtuosity, *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 161-175.

Pichler, W. J. (2015). *Civil Dialogue and Participatory Democracy in the Practice of European Union Institutions*, European Economic and Social Committee Press. Access Link: https://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/qe-02-15-397-en-n.pdf

Plato. (2013a). *Devlet*. Demir, S. (Translator). İstanbul: Ataç.

Plato. (2013b). *Sokrates'in Savunması*. Çelik, Ö. (Translator). İstanbul: Say.

Plato. (2014). *Diyaloglar*. Genç, T. (Translator). Ankara: Alter.

Price, A. J. (2008). *Understanding Philosophy: Medieval and Modern Philosophy*. Chelsea: Chelsea House Publishing.

Ricardo De Querol. (2016). *Social Media are a Trap*. Conversation with Zygmunt Bauman El Pais. 25 June 2016. Access link: https://elpais.com/elpais/2016/01/19/inenglish/1453208692_4 24660.html

Rogers, C. (1961). *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflon.

Rogers, C. (1994). The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change, In R. Anderson, K.N. Cissna & R.C. Arnett (eds) *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice and Community* (p. 126-140). New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Schofield, M. (2009). Ciceronian Dialogue, In S. Goldhill (ed), *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* (p. 63-85). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scholte, H. J. (2007). Global Civil Society- Opportunity or Obstacle for Democracy. *Development Dialogue*, 49, 15-29.

Seyidov, I. (2018), *The Analysis of Civil Society Program of EU within the Framework of Dialogu*e (Doctoral Dissertation). Ankara University/ Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Smarr, L. J. (2008). *Joining the Conversation*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Smismans, S. (2003). European Civil Society: Shaped by Discourses and Institutional Interests. *European Law Journal*, 9 (4), 473-495.

Stewart, J. & Zediker, K. (2000). Dialogue as Tensional, Ethical Practice. *Southern Communication Journal,* 65 (3), 224-242.

Taylor, M. & Kent, L. (2004). Congressional Web Sites and Their Potential for Public Dialogue. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 12 (2), 59-76.

Ünder, H. (1994). Sokratik Diyalog. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (27), 1301-3718.

Van Eemeren, H. F. (2001). *Crucial Concepts in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Vassilopulou, P. (2009). Introduction, In P. Vassilopoulou & S.L. Clark (eds), *Late Antique Epistemology: Other Ways to Truth* (p. 1-19). UK: Palgrave McMillian.

Von Aster, E. (2005). *İlkçağ ve Ortaçağ Felsefe Tarihi.* Okur, V. (Translator). İstanbul: IM.

Zappen, P, J. (2004). *The Rebirth of Dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates and the Rhetorical Tradition*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Zoller, H, M. (2000). A Place You Haven't Visited Before: Creating the

Conditions for Community Dialogue. *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 191-207.

---

[1] In the study, dialogative is used to imply more dialogue-contended base for civil dialogue in implementation. Based on acceptance of impossibility of "ideal" dialogue's existence, more normative and practicable structure is being purposed by this term.

[2] See: Ricardo De Querol. (2016). *Social Media are a Trap*. El Pais. 25 June 2016.Retrieved from:

https://elpais.com/elpais/2016/01/19/inenglish/1453208692_424660.html

[3] Ibid., 130-135