RAWLS OR SCHMITT: THE CASE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mehmet Sercan Ercan[1]

Abstract

Religious freedom is a very controversial issue in today's world. Commenting on the religious freedom on the basis of the theories of Carl Schmitt and John Rawls, two of the most important philosophers and legal theorists of the last century, may be a guide for us to discern the contemporary debates because these philosophers represent two different ideas. Schmitt is a strong criticism of liberalism, while Rawls is literally a liberal. Rawls contends that the ideas of flexibility and uniformity are not totally unrelated. His evaluation of the equity framework drives him to presume that for equity to be genuinely just, everyone must be managed similar rights before the law. On the other hand, Schmitt argues that the sovereign has decided to make an exception. The condition of exemption is the monopolistic area of the sovereign, while uncovering the sovereign itself. In any case, sway, as well, then, is likewise he who characterises what's "the typical." Who determines the limits of religious freedom? Where does the law come from? Who is the sovereign? These questions are significant for understanding the constitutional theory and religious freedom. Firstly, this article will summarise their theories. Afterwards, will discuss the

[1] Birkbeck University of London, Constitutional Politics Law and Theory, LLM Student, mehmetsercanercan@gmail.com

relationship between the freedom of religion and the constitutional system by these questions.

Key words: Religious freedom, Carl Schmitt, John Rawls, constitutional law, sovereign

I. Introduction

The concept "constitutional law" is generally utilised as a part of a few distinct contexts, two of which are especially applicable to a comprehension of constitutional obtaining. Practically every nation has a constitution that sets out major tenets and standards establishing the elements of the organs of focal and nearby government, and controlling the relationship between the individual and the state. Notwithstanding their composed constitutions, nations are likewise comprehended to have an unwritten piece of their constitutions containing administrative acts, legislative requests, and court choices administered by their composed constitutions[2].

Law is the outflow of power; however, sway is itself constituted and subsequently additionally constrained by law. For some of its commentators, this is exactly where the calculated uncertainty of present day sway lies: it communicates both the power that authorises law and the law that re-strains control. Legitimate political speculating about power in fact frequently seems, by all accounts, to be gotten in

[2] Loughlin, Martin, Foundations of Public Law, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, chapter 10, The Constitutional Contract pp 275-311

the antinomy between sway that, unconstrained, lies past law, and sway that is lawfully constituted and thusly not politically preeminent, or, not sovereign[3].

From a hypothetical point of view, the key issue of the cutting edge hypothesis of sway subsequently introduces itself as an issue of the proper lawful hypothesis. To re-regard the idea of sway, what is required is a legitimate hypothesis that can air conditioning mean the co-innovation and in distinguishability of law and power. Additionally, to put the point in Marinos' terms, such a hypothesis must recognise, to the point that current positive law suggests the duality of facticity and legitimacy: it must have the capacity to air conditioning mean the way that lawful standards are, from one viewpoint, obligatory certainties supported by approvals, while, then again, they likewise raise a case to authenticity[4]. Cutting edge law, at the end of the day, comprises in coercive standards that must be adequate and for the most part unmistakable on balanced grounds, and lawful hypothesis should subsequently have the capacity to arrange the romanticising, regulating character of the law's case to authenticity with regards to concrete political foundations and courses of action[5].

[3] R. C. Van Caenegem, An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 37-71

[4] Brian Z. Tamanaha, On the Rule of Law, History, Politics, Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 7-14

[5] Diamantides, Marinos, Constitutional theory and its limits - reflections on comparative political theologies, Jr. Law, Culture and the Humanities 11 (1), 2015, pp. 109-146

Not at all like Habermas, Kelsen and Schmitt are not commonly considered as conspicuous scholars of popular government. In fact, Schmitt, known for his staunch evaluate of progressivism and parliamentary, his decisionistic hypothesis of true blue political activity, and the tyrant ramifications of his contemplations on the condition of special case and autocracy, does not have a place with the standard of vote based and constitutional hypothesis[6]. Schmitt's disputable cases that, amid the remarkable snapshots of lawful burst, vote-based qualities are best typified in the individual choice of the sovereign despot has been to a great extent negated by advanced vote-based hypothesis.

II. A Theory of Justice, John Rawls

A philosopher, John Rawls, who is also holding the James Bryant Conant University Professorship at Harvard University, published many articles and books. He is primarily known, in any case, for his book *A Theory of Justice*[7], a push to characterise social equity. The work has enormously impacted cutting modern political thought.

In A Theory of Justice, Rawls contends that the ideas of flexibility and uniformity are not totally unrelated. His evaluation of the

[6] Chris Thornhill, A Sociology of Constitutions: Constitutions and State Legitimacy in Historical-Sociological Perspective, Cambridge University Press, 201, pp. 77-103
[7] Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice, Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971, p. 11 – 17

equity framework drives him to presume that for equity to be genuinely just, everyone must be managed similar rights before the law.

Rawls was highly saddened with all the conventional logical arguments about what makes a social substance and what are the legitimate politics moving around the social activities. The utilitarian dispute holds that social requests should look for after the best helpful for the best number. This dispute has different aspects, especially including, that it is all in all consistent with the likelihood of the mistreatment of bigger parts over minorities. The intuitionist conflict holds that individuals intuit what is right or wrong by some common great sense. This is also unsafe in light of the way that it essentially clears up away value by saying that social orders "know it when they see it," and it fails to deal with the many conflicting human senses. Rawls begins his work with the possibility of value as sensibility. He perceives that the key structure of a society is the basic subject of value and recognises that value is the key morals of social foundations. He considers value as a matter of affiliation and inward divisions of a society.

Consequent to considering the essential qualities of value as conventionality and the speculative predominance of this approach over utilitarianism, intuitionism, or distinctive perspectives, Rawls look at models of value. He recognises two criteria: First, each individual should have approach rights to the most expansive opportunities dependable with different people getting a charge out of comparable flexibilities; and second, that differences should be planned in a way

that everyone's inclination as considered. In addition, these differences should be arranged in a way that no individual would be upset from including any position. Rawls closes the initial segment of his book by examining the possibility of the first position outside society. This theoretical unique position can be approximated by utilising the thought test about the shroud of obliviousness[8]. In the second part of the work, Rawls considers the ramifications of his equity for social foundations. He mentions in detail about measure up to freedom, financial appropriation, and obligations and commitments and the principle attributes of everything that would constitute a fair society. He does not, however, distinguish a specific sort of social or political framework that would be steady with his hypothesis. He bargains just with the requests that his rendition of equity places on organisations. In the third and last area, Rawls manages extreme objectives of contemplating social equity. He contends for the need a hypothesis of goodness, and he presents a defence for considering goodness to be sanity. At that point, he swings to good brain research and considers how individuals procure an estimation of equity. At last, he looks at the benefit of equity, or how equity is associated with goodness. Rawls contends that in a very much ideal society, thoughts of goodness and equity must be steady with each other.

[8] Kukathas, C. and Pettit, P., Rawls: a theory of justice and its critics. Stanford University Press, 1999

III. Political Theology, Carl Schmitt

Schmitt[9] characterises the pith of power as the choice over what is a special case and choose the measures taken to wipe out such an exemption. The condition of exemption is the monopolistic area of the sovereign, while uncovering the sovereign itself. In any case, sway, as well, then, is likewise he who characterises what's "the typical." As Schmitt composes, "for a legitimate framework to bode well, an ordinary circumstance must exist, and he is sovereign who certainly chooses whether this typical circumstance really exists". The safeguarding of the typical is unequivocally the method of reasoning for which the special case is initiated. All things considered, power is an innate hypothesis of the express: "The state suspends the law in the special case on the premise of its privilege of self-safeguarding, as one would state".

The way Schmitt comprehends political theology as a strategy for the social science of ideas, or rather, history of ideas may give accommodating bits of knowledge into the distinctive orders, both in the humanities and in addition in the characteristic sciences. Notwithstanding the philosophical parts of this strategy, the request to dependably have as a primary concern ideas and the setting of their arrangement is the way to comprehension our life-world and additionally prior recorded periods. It could improve the work of

[9] Schmitt, Carl, Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty, 1922, Trans. G Schwab (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL 2005, Ch 1, p. 5-15

researchers working with various issues, particularly associated with the socio-political circle.

In refinement from the liberal view, Schmitt expressly contends against the state's part being the eliminator of contention and the political, yet rather the methods through which request and security are not the cost of these adversarial relations. He composes: "Today nothing is more present day than the surge against the political," discovering communists, rebels, and liberals all liable on this point. Snidely parroting them, he proceeds, "There must never again be political issues, just authoritative specialised and financial sociological ones". Another reason Schmitt contends against the liberal view is that, he says, liberal normativism (specifically constitutions) cannot anticipate the unforeseen occasions that require the suspension of the law in light of a legitimate concern for protecting the state itself. The most a constitution can give is an outline of who chooses.

Notwithstanding, a vital note is that Schmitt claims toward the end of the book that the special case is not oppressive on the ground that regardless it has some real premise. He gives authenticity a majority rule turn. He acknowledges Donoso Cortés' view which individuals are vile to the point that they cannot be normal, a great deal less all in all as in the liberal casing, to be managed such vote based

benefits. Middle class progressivism[10], Donoso Cortés said, was essentially a group of individuals talking their ears off, never going to the basic snapshot of choice. Schmitt cuts the book off at a point in which he would sensibly give an option, however, he does not give.

IV. Religious Freedom

Modern law and religion are basic socio-political wonders that have some similar hidden components. Both try to constitute, or if nothing else to casing, human cognisance and attempt to regulate in all circles of private and open life. Likewise, current law and religion are reciprocal, conflicting and synchronous wellsprings of lead making, mediation and execution. Both insert dutifulness and commitments, authority, organisations and legitimate belief system as establishments of their support and pervasiveness, in light of a strict structure of orders. From times long past to current innovation in the midst of different verifiable changes, some of which have been progressive, law and religion have never been totally isolated. They have never been so autonomous as to accomplish independence from each other. Religion has basically been exemplified in current legitimate frameworks, even in those that have tried to privatise religion[11]. Religions are implanted in every day, being honed in different areas, from the Middle East and

[10] Ryan, B., Carl Schmitt: Zones of Exception and Appropriation. Kierkegaard's Influence on Social-Political Thought (Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception, Resources, zv. 14. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, pp.177-207.
[11] Sullivan, W.F.. The impossibility of religious freedom. Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 138-150

Africa to Europe, Latin America to North America and Asia, and in Western administrations and post-comrade administrations alike.

The perspectives on multicultural toleration taken by John Rawls and Carl Schmitt in their work seem to struggle with each other. Multicultural toleration would appear to be the regular consequence of the hypothesis of equity as decency, as Rawls means to make a society based around social collaboration and toleration[12]. Rawls' concept of an all-around requested society can be viewed as restrictive upon multicultural toleration to genuinely exist since social collaboration is one of the basics of a just society. Conversely, multicultural toleration is generally displayed as a misrepresentation by Schmitt in that it would dependably be reliant on the sovereign choice[13]. In Rawls' hypothesis the way of the state is to a great extent chosen and legitimated through the origination of political equity settled upon by society. At the point when Schmitt's perspective is connected, multicultural toleration to a great extent exists on the impulse of the state, yet this toleration is just a façade as the sovereign will dependably be one-sided towards a specific gathering in settling on the sovereign choice. The exemption demonstrates the choice and the sovereign at its root in light of the fact that eventually it will demonstrate that the sovereign will bolster the qualities that it is occupied with as opposed to those of others in

[12] Rawls, J., *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001, pp. 140-145

[13] Laycock, D. and Thomas, O.S., Interpreting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Tex. L. Rev., 73, 1994, p.209.

society. This is not quite the same as Rawls' origination of the state as choices in the model of equity as reasonableness must take after the standards of equity, guaranteeing a feeling of resistance for all gatherings[14].

Another purpose of complexity between the speculations of Schmitt and Rawls is standing out that the fundamental organisations of the state are made, and the way in which these foundations influence multicultural toleration. Schmitt sees fundamental organisations of the state as secularised philosophical ideas, implying that all aspects of the present day state has a religious starting point. This represents an issue for multicultural toleration in light of the fact that since the state has a religious root; it will mirror the interests of the theology that was secularised to make it to the detriment of restricting perspectives[15]. The instruments of the state would wind up being one-sided towards bunches that share its interests, and this is a circumstance that is inconsistent with multicultural toleration. In this environment, genuine multiculturalism would never exist as one gathering would dependably have its interests hoisted over whatever remains of society in the death of the sovereign choice. Then again, Rawls comprehends the essential organisations and components of the state as the "fundamental structure" and the reason for it is to secure foundation equity for society. Rawls' fundamental structure of society is not saddled with the

[14] Diamantides, pp. 109-146

[15] S. Mancini 'The Tempting of Europe, the Political Seduction of the Cross: A Schmittian Reading of Christianity and Islam in European Constitutionalism' in Mancini & Rosenfeld (eds.) Constitutional Secularism in an Age of Religious Revival , Oxford UP, 2014, pp. 111-135.

inclination coming about because of a philosophical starting point. Rather, the fundamental structure is directed by the standards of equity settled upon under the cloak of numbness. The cloak of numbness is composed by Rawls to guarantee that the interests of all gatherings are spoken to reasonably in the trusts that an understanding can be made on standards of equity that can catch the covering accord. Consequently, the fundamental structure of the society is consistent with multicultural toleration as it is made under conditions that are reasonable for all gatherings through the standards of equity. Under this essential structure, the state is unprejudiced and focused on beliefs of toleration connected with multiculturalism[16].

For multicultural toleration to appropriately exist, it must be a part of the regulating circumstance of a given society. Rawls and Schmitt have contrasting thoughts on how the standard is chosen and legitimated in society. The possibility of the ordinary circumstance is critical to multicultural toleration since it guarantees the conditions required for multicultural toleration's existence on a regular premise in the state. Under Rawls' origination of equity as decency, the typical circumstance is made by the political and social establishments that constitute the essential structure. Since the essential structure is worried with guaranteeing "foundation equity" in society, it is additionally accused of guaranteeing that multicultural toleration is multiplied as an ordinary circumstance in society. Since the essential structure is

[16] Sakaranaho, T., Religious freedom, multiculturalism, Islam: cross-reading Finland and Ireland. Leiden: Brill, 2006, pp. 51-60

directed by the standards of equity, the fundamental structure should then be organised to guarantee multicultural toleration is a societal standard. Rawls is obvious that so as to accomplish a very much requested society, multicultural toleration and social participation are fundamentally present in the standards of equity and this makes it a player in the standard as these standards control the regularising essential structure of the society. Schmitt takes a restricting perspective, trusting that the typical circumstance is directed just by the sovereign[17]. According to Schmitt, a lawful request requires an ordinary circumstance to exist. Besides, all law is situational law to Schmitt and the sovereign has an imposing business model over making the circumstance, making the sovereign the power over how law is connected. Basically, multicultural toleration in Schmitt's state is completely contingent on the sovereign. While the sovereign could endeavour to realise a multicultural state, it would never really support multicultural toleration given that it has a restraining infrastructure over the choice. If a choice should have been made between the convictions of the sovereign and the perspectives of another gathering, the perspectives of the sovereign would at last win by the ethicalness of sovereign power. There would be no ensured freedoms in Schmitt's state, as every one of them would be contingent on the sovereign choice and possibly brought away to manage the special case. This probability

[17] Schmitt, pp. 91-120

for abuse is not consistent with an express that incorporates multicultural toleration[18].

While Schmitt can be seen as takes a critical position towards multicultural toleration, Rawls takes an a great deal more positive position through his standards of equity as decency. Firstly, the standards of equity as reasonableness that Rawls lays out passing on beliefs that are compatible with multicultural toleration. Particularly in his first standard, he ensures the fundamental freedoms and flexibilities of all gatherings similarly[19]. These freedoms guarantee a level of resilience as every gathering has security of their fundamental freedoms paying little heed to whether they are the greater part or minority.[20] Above all, Rawls makes these rights indefeasible as they can't be taken away under any conditions. This is a basic on the ground that multicultural toleration amounts to nothing on the off chance that it doesn't persevere on account of a crisis. A crisis is when assorted perspective are well on the way to conflict, and Rawls' first rule guarantees that gatherings won't have their freedoms undermined or taken away amid a potential outstanding condition. This guarantees the conservation of multicultural toleration and shields bunches from abuse by the lion's share or the state utilising the crisis for defence. In Schmitt's view when a choice should be made between the predominant

[18] Taylor, C., Multiculturalism, Princeton University Press, 1994, pp. 50-75
[19] Rawls, J., *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001, pp.42
[20] Rawls, J. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001,pp.42

estimations of the sovereign and any clashing perspectives, the sovereign qualities would prevail. This would be in conflict with any kind of immaculate and genuine multicultural toleration as it would take into consideration potential abuse of gatherings not sharing the perspective of the sovereign. While a comparable plan of essential freedoms could fit inside Schmitt's origination of the state, they would not be indefeasible on the ground that they would retreat simply like whatever is left of the law on account of the special case. At the point when Schmitt's hypothesis of the crisis and the special case is connected to multicultural toleration, he would plainly trust that genuine multiculturalism would never exist in the state since multiculturalism would dependably be restrictive on the choice made by the sovereign.

This maybe ought to have been the end of the matter. There is little to say in regards to power, other than that it is an out of date method for portraying the administrator. By and by, the story proceeds. Cutting edge constitutional law has conveyed power not as the way that makes law conceivable but rather as a sui generis office or political capacity. Here is power a constitutional necessity, an aftereffect of a general system of constitutional tenets. It implies that there is a management of acknowledgment or an equal constitutional structure of guidelines and thinking that requires that someone should be a sovereign. To be sovereign in this sense does not imply that you summon submission indeed. It implies that you appreciate pretty much select, extreme and exhaustive forces of law-production, under some

central lawful system. This is "sovereign" power and not standard law-production control, unequivocally in the light of the fact that it ought to be extreme and overpowering as an issue of law. This position is taken, for instance, by British constitutional lawyers and Schmitt himself, for whom the power of parliament is prerequisite of the constitution and the control of acknowledgment[21].

Schmitt's view depends on extremely unrefined perspective of majority rules system which never addresses the topic of how the general population or 'popular conclusion' might be constituted and communicated in law[22]. By the way, his contention demonstrates that on the off chance that we support an Austinian perspective of prominent power and seek after its hypothetical ramifications to the full, we will again achieve a perspective of constitutional law that is profoundly new. It creates the impression that all establishments of government are presently subject to the lead of the general population or, on the other hand, of popular supposition. By amassing sway in the general population and putting famous power at the heart of the constitution, Schmitt undermines the general concept of law. The reason is in his exceptional definition of power, which is similar that of Austin's. In his general hypothetical examination of sway in Political Theology, Schmitt contends that 'each lawful request depends on a choice, furthermore the idea of the lawful request, which is connected

[21] Baumann, G., The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic, and religious identities. Psychology Press, 1999, pp. 17-25
[22] Schmitt, pp. 91-140

as something plainly obvious, contains inside it the difference of the two unmistakable components of the juristic-standard and choice. Like each other request, the lawful request lays on a choice and not on a standard'[23].

The privilege of Freedom of Religion, Conscience and Thought is a flat out right. Nonetheless, the appearance of a privilege, for example, wearing religious dress may force constraints. This implies under a few conditions it is feasible for a state to meddle into the necessities of the article 9(2) ECHR[24]. The rules that are suggested are the accompanying. The limitation ought to have a lawful premise in residential law and ought to constitute a true blue point by securing 'people in general request', 'wellbeing', "ethics" and 'the rights and opportunities of others' and ought to be essential in a vote-based society as a result of the "few religions which exist together inside one and a similar populace and it might be important to place confinements on flexibility to show one's religion or faith keeping in mind the end goal to accommodate the interests of the different gatherings and guarantee that everybody's convictions are regarded". The state ought to be "unbiased" and "unprejudiced" with a specific end goal to keep up amicability and resistance in the society. "Pluralism, resilience and broadmindedness are signs of a majority rule society". The issues that may emerge ought to be settled through discourse so as to advance the

[23] Kymlicka, W., Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights. Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 145-170

[24] Kamal, J., Justified interference with religious freedom: the European Court of Human Rights and the need for mediating doctrine under Article 9 (2). Colum. J. Transnat'l L., 46, 2007, p.667.

estimations of majority rule government. Besides, the Court ought to permit the States an edge of gratefulness to control the issue for which there is a debate on the grounds that occasionally it is better for the state to determine the issue by evaluating an adjust. Obviously the Court does not lose the duty to oversee the State. In addition the prerequisite of the need in a law-based society was censured by the Judge Tulkens mostly in view of the edge of thankfulness, the rule of secularism and balance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baumann, G., 1999. *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic, and religious identities*. Psychology Press
2. Brian Z. Tamanaha, 2004, On the Rule of Law, History, Politics, Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
3. Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, [1922], Trans. G Schwab (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL 2005).
4. Chris Thornhill, 2011, A Sociology of Constitutions: Constitutions and State Legitimacy in Historical-Sociological Perspective (Cambridge University Press)
5. Diamantides, Marinos (2015) Constitutional theory and its limits - reflections on comparative political theologies, Jr. Law, Culture and the Humanities 11 (1)
6. John Rawls. *A Theory of Justice,* Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 1971.

7. Kamal, J., 2007. Justified interference with religious freedom: the European Court of Human Rights and the need for mediating doctrine under Article 9 (2). Colum. J. Transnat'l L., 46
8. Kukathas, C. and Pettit, P., 1990. *Rawls: a theory of justice and its critics*. Stanford University Press.
9. Kymlicka, W., 1995. *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press
10. Laycock, D. and Thomas, O.S., 1994. Interpreting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Tex. L. Rev
11. Loughlin, Martin Foundations of Public Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), chapter 10, The Constitutional Contract
12. R. C. Van Caenegem, 1995, An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
13. Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press,
14. Ryan, B., 2011. Carl Schmitt: Zones of Exception and Appropriation. Kierkegaard's *Influence on Social-Political Thought (Kierkegaard Research: Sources, Reception, Resources, zv. 14*). Farnham: Ashgate.
15. S. Mancini 'The Tempting of Europe, the Political Seduction of the Cross: A Schmittian Reading of Christianity and Islam in European Constitutionalism' in Mancini & Rosenfeld (eds.) *Constitutional Secularism in an Age of Religious Revival* (Oxford UP, 2014),

16. Sakaranaho, T., 2006. *Religious freedom, multiculturalism, Islam: cross-reading Finland and Ireland*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 51-60
17. Sullivan, W.F., 2005. *The impossibility of religious freedom*. Princeton University Press
18. Taylor, C., 1994. *Multiculturalism,* Princeton University Press