TESAM Akademi Dergisi
Journal of TESAM Academy

Religion and the Parameters for the Modern Understanding of Public Sphere: An Unwanted Association

Din ve Modern Kamusal Alan Anlayışının Parametreleri: İstenmeyen Birliktelik

Ahmet ÖZKİRAZ
Prof. Dr.,
Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Kamu Yönetimi.
ahmet.ozkiraz@gop.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0003-2349-6566

Mutlu SESLİ
Dr.,
Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Adalet Meslek Yüksek Okulu, Hukuk Bölümü.
mutlu.sesli@gop.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-1009-0041

Abstract

The concept of public sphere is a highly controversial term in several disciplines. Dating from ancient Greece, the concept gained its modern definition in the early 18th century. The sense of public sphere was gender and property based and later changed completely through modernity. The concept emerged in a dereligionized area where any topics were discussable after religious and traditional beliefs and values were left in the private sphere.

Following the Industrial Revolution, the efforts to understand life and world led to new opinions, including individualism, rationalism, secularism, nation-state and citizenship. The common acceptance of these notions is definable by their rejection of religions. This study examines the unwanted association of religion with some parameters for the modern public sphere that intends to constitute its own beliefs since religion has aimed to orient itself to such changes and obtain a public characteristic, which is today more apparent than ever before.

Key Words: Modernity, Public Sphere, Private Sphere, Citizenship, Religion

Öz

Kamusal alan kavramı, çeşitli disiplinlerde oldukça tartışmalı bir terimdir. Geçmişi Antik Yunanistan'a dayanan bu kavram, modern tanımını 18. yüzyılın başlarında kazanmıştır. Toplumsal cinsiyet ve mülkiyet temelli olan kamusal alan anlayışı daha sonra modernite ile tamamen değişmiştir. Kavram, din ve geleneksel inanç ve değerlerin özel alanda bırakıldığı herhangi bir konunun tartışılabilir olduğu dinsizleştirilmiş bir alanda ortaya çıkmıştır.

Sanayi Devrimi'nin ardından yaşamı ve dünyayı anlama çabaları bireycilik, akılcılık, laiklik, ulus-devlet ve yurttaşlık gibi yeni görüşlerin doğmasına yol açmıştır. Bu kavramların kabül ettiği ortak husus dinleri reddetmeleriyle tanımlanabilir. Bu çalışma, dinin kendisini bu değişimlere yönlendirmeyi ve günümüzde her zamankinden daha belirgin olan kamusal bir nitelik kazanmayı amaçladığı için, kendi inançlarını oluşturmayı amaçlayan modern kamusal alan için dinin istenmeyen bazı parametrelerle ilişkilendirilmesini incelemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modernite, Kamusal Alan, Özel Alan, Vatandaşlık, Din

Introduction

The term of public sphere has been one of the most popular matters of debate in the modern age. The term gained its modern definition soon after the 17th century though it dated back to ancient Greece. The sense of public sphere was gender and property based in ancient Greece and it later changed completely through modernity. Modernity, including the Enlightenment Era, had the assumption that reason and science could cope with any problems since the Enlightenment focused that we would comprehend the universe and life through rather reason and science than religious dogmas. In fact, what is modern is considered to be against what is traditional.

The Enlightenment was born and raised in France and later spread all across Europe, playing an active role in paving the way for the Revolution. The Enlightenment aimed to create a dereligionized world with the help of the positivist thinking. The concept of public sphere emerged in a completely dereligionized area, where anything became arguable, soon after the bourgeoisie appeared on the stage of history. Public sphere was where all citizens had equal access to discussions and creating a public opinion (Odabas, 2018, p. 2052).

Individuals would put all their religious and traditional views aside in their private spheres and later attend in the public sphere. How can the main difference between the two spheres be understood? Where does the border between *public* and *private* spheres start? What are the roles of religion in the two spheres? Has the religion phenomenon gained any public attributes so far?

Religion was no more a key element and became obsolete in public areas

where individuals gathered and shared anything, which may be attributed to religion's being the basic power throughout the Middle Ages. There was an intention to create a religious cult in accordance with the spirit of public sphere. Removed from the public sphere, religion modified itself to gain public qualities in various ways since it had already been included in constitutions, policies and education curriculums. However, the confinement of religion in private spheres was against its nature in the Middle Ages as religions was always intrinsically associated with publicity. Religions never classify life into two as private and public.

In Europe, a new situation emerged particularly after the Industrial Revolution and led to some new concepts and changes as to understanding life and world, including individualism, rationalism, nation-state, secularism and citizenship. The widely accepted common trait of these new concepts was their rejection of traditional divine beliefs, which are religions. In the present paper, we discuss the unwanted conjunction of religion with some prominent parameters in the public sphere. We must consider religion tend to gain publicity in various other ways if removed from such parameters.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework: Modernity, Public Sphere and Private Sphere

Modernity is one of the widely used concepts in social sciences and above all related to time (Özkiraz, 2007, p. 14). However, there is still a controversy about when the modern age actually started. Furthermore, there is today no total agreement on the characteristics of modern society. The reason for this disagreement stems from the fact that key sociological concepts have undergone some changes since Marx. Deriving from the Latin word 'modernus' in the 5th century, the term has been used to define transition from old to new (Özkiraz, 2007, p. 14; Persembe, 2002, p. 160). The term means 'relating to the present, contemporary and up-to-date' and is used for describing communities that had converted into Christianity completely quit their old beliefs and traditions and a new culture was born. Thus, the term refers to a difference, even a contrast, between old and new (Beris, 2006, p. 484). As a result, the term *modern* has always been regarded as a consequence of a transition from old to new (Habermas, 1994, p. 31).

Modernity comprises the Renaissance and Reformation, which broke out as philosophical and scientific reactions to Church's oppression on people and science, scientific advancements, the Industrial Revolution, political developments and any reason-based changes. (Aslan and

Yilmaz, 2001, p. 95; Beris, 2006, pp. 485-496). Giddens (1998, p. 11) defines modernity as a concept that emerged in Europe in the 17th century and later affected almost the entire globe, focusing on communal living and organizational patterns. This period coincided with some historically important radical changeovers (Beris, 2006, p. 484). Modernity has contained a transformation of mentality, industrialization, democratic revolutions, contemporary social facts and life styles (Wagner, 2003, p. 24). The modern age proposes a new political model, a new sense of science, a new mentality of economy and a new moral sentiment. For instance, the new political model includes equality, identity, democracy, stability, talent, participation, mobilization, bureaucratization, institutionalization, differentiation, distribution, freedom, integration, legitimacy, rationalization, justice and welfare (Cetin, 2003, pp. 12-13).

Modernity is an automatic transition that happened at the junction of social, political, economic and cultural changeovers in Europe. However, some authors use 'modernization' to show an intervention oriented process in non-Western countries that will be established with intentional attempts (Beris, 2006, p. 506). Modernization is a transition process from traditional political and social values to modern principles (Cetin, 2003, p. 12). Modernization focuses on two different social structures: Modern society and traditional (ancient-primitive) society. Modern society refers to an affirmative, ideal and target type of society whereas traditional society points to an unfavorable type that must be rejected completely. As a result of the Enlightenment, modernization theories focus the transition from traditional to modern society is inevitable and irreversible and all societies will evolve from traditional into modern (Beris, 2006, p. 506). Modernization is *not* a free change but an interwoven process of transition. Modernization aims to provide urbanization via industrialization, removal of magic and religion via rationalization, further democratization and rugged individualism via several economic, political and cultural advancements (Özkiraz, 2007, pp. 44-45).

Public sphere, as old as the concept of modern, is a controversial notion in modernity. The concept of public sphere was used in ancient Greek and Roman periods and is still a matter of debate, which is closely associated with the transition that mankind underwent in the modern ages (Köroglu, 2013, pp. 432-433). The importance of public sphere is an old theme in social and political democracy theories (Zaret, 2000, p. 22). Sennett (2013, p. 15) suggests modern ages were frequently compared with the collapse of the Roman Empire and moral corrupt in the modern period prevented the Romans dominating the Western world just as it

diminished the modern West's power in ruling the world . He further asserts the crisis that broke out after the death of Augustus was associated with the balance between public and private spheres.

Such thinkers as Habermas, Arendt and Sennett that studied on public and privates spheres have still come to no agreement. However, the modern period has introduced some parameters for public sphere. The private sphere has gradually begun to enclose privacy.

The Turkish Language Association (TDK) defines the word 'public' as all people in a country, community, of people and related to people. In English, this term is usually used for people-related situations. The public sphere is described as physical places where people gather and have political discussions (Dacheux, 2012, p. 14). Sennett (2013, p. 32) argues the early usages of *public* in English focused on common interest of all individuals. The word gained some new definitions including *apparent* and *observable*. The word private was used to mean privileged for top government officials. Arendt (1994, pp. 74-77) describes public as anything visible and audible to everyone and as a common world that is completely different from what is private for us. The physical world focuses on the goings-on happening on it and any human-oriented events or activities. The differentiation between public and private is similar to that between obligation and freedom or that between mortality and immortality or shame and honor (Arendt, 1994, pp. 74-77). Sennett (2013, p. 32) remarks what is public is open to every individual's supervision whereas what is private is a living space restricted to an individual and his family and immediate circle. In TDK's dictionary, private means something relating or belonging to only a single person or a single thing, belonging not to state but to a person and concerning a person only. Thus, we can define private sphere as a place where an individual has an absolute possession and he may expel anybody he wants (Köroglu, 2014, pp. 1493-1494). In this sphere, the individual is free to do whatever he wishes. However, religion finds its way into this private sphere of which the individual has an absolute possession. The concepts of public and private date back to ancient times when Aristotle defined life into three as pleasure, politics and contemplation. In Aristotle's definition, physical pleasure and domestic life are accepted in the private sphere while contemplation (*theoria*) is regarded as a part of the public sphere in which policies regarding city-states (*polis*) and obligatory social relationships are established (Odabas, 2018, p. 2052). In ancient Greece, free citizens maintained their lives by the distinction between the public and the private. They gathered in public places to discuss civic issues and

maintained their private lives in their houses. Citizenship and property were to determine city residents' status in their city-states. Free citizens were equal in city-states. The public sphere was strictly hierarchical. Slaves, women, foreigners and those with no lands were excluded from the system of citizenship. The public sphere was under the control of an elite group of free citizens. Ancient Greeks' understanding of the public and private separation continued in the same way in the Roman period (Köroglu, 2014, pp. 1489-1491; Nebati, 2020, pp. 836-837). We have no evidence that the public sphere was parted from private places in medieval Europe. Habermas argues no public sphere existed under feudalism (Habermas, 2014, p. 97).

In the 18th century, the concepts of public and private gained similar meanings to those we use today. In addition to establishment of big cities shortly after the Industrial Revolution, rapid population growth, introduction of printing press, newspapers, developments in education, changes in commercial relationships, increasing importance of labor; several radical changeovers in almost all fields of life including family, economy, religion and thoughts revolutionized the way people used to live. All these changeovers modified the earlier mentalities for public and private (Köroglu, 2013, pp. 432-433). Hobsbawn (2013, p. 13) describes the Industrial Revolution, which is one of the major underlying reasons for such drastic changes, as the most radical documented change in the history of humanity. Thus, the Revolution contained any advancements and changes that affected people in every aspect of life. In this period, the public sphere was the part of an individual's life he spent out of his family and immediate circle. Complex groups of communities came inevitably together in the public sphere, the focus of which was big cities of that time. In these cities, coffee houses, cafes and inns turned into social hubs and theaters and operas became popular hangouts for ordinary people (Sennett, 2013, p. 34). In major European cities, like London and Paris, several political and literary works were published and discussed in social hubs and information exchange led people to arouse interest in political issues (Dagtas, 1999, p. 162). For this reason, Habermas (2002, pp. 100-103) defines this phenomenal situation as *literary public*. To him, the introduction and discussion of literary and artistic issues in such hubs is labelled as literary public. Thus, Habermas attributes the origins of the public sphere to the 18th century when the bourgeoisie elite participated actively in literary world (Zaret, 2000, p. 23).

Having emerged with the Industrial Revolution, the bourgeoisie interacted with a wide variety of groups in their cities and gave a new meaning

TESAM

to the word *public*. The word became to encompass both a social space of living out of family and immediate circle and the public sphere consisting of relatively various acquaintances and foreigners (Sennett, 2013, p. 339). In the early 18th century, the distinction between public and private evolved into the public sphere where the bourgeoisie started to live with foreigners in various identities as well as their families and immediate circles (Nebati, 2020, p. 837). The Enlightenment played an important role in this evolution.

Examining the public sphere in modern period through a historical perspective, Habermas (2004, p. 95) suggests the public sphere points primarily to a scope in which a public-opinion-like formation is achievable. Every citizen is guaranteed to have access to this sphere. Habermas' classical public sphere model has the same characteristics as the post-Enlightenment revolutions, which are regarded as the basics of modernity. Thus, reason and science are the sole acceptable criteria for negotiations to achieve the common good and social consensus (Köroglu, 2013, pp.435-436). The two criteria are parallel with the Enlightenment's approaches to reason and individual. Habermas endeavors to legitimate bourgeois values (i.e. equality, freedom, human rights, democratic values and rights, property, privacy, etc.) in the public sphere (Cigdem, 1997, p.171).

Dacheux (2012, p. 21) defines the public sphere as a symbolic place that enables individuals from different ethno religious communities to interact with each other in creating a common political community. Dacheux further states political agents take the stage in the public sphere where public issues become detectable. There are plenty of various identities in the pluralism-dominated public sphere where debates and conflicts are considered healthy (Nebati, 2020, p. 836).

The Modern Public Sphere: Parameters and Religion – The Unwanted Association

The public sphere is, in the simplest definition, a social stage open to all individuals that can freely participate in. There are some parameters for this sphere. The coexistence of these parameters with religion is considered as *unwanted association*. These parameters' distant relation with religion is still a matter of debate in Turkey.

Individualism and Religion: Religious Individualism

Individualism found a meaning with the Renaissance, which liberated

individuals, and the Reformation, diminishing the religious pressure (Celik, 2018, p. 65). Modernism rediscovered mankind and gave him new degrees and definitions (Özkiraz, 2007, p. 15). With the impact of the Industrial Revolution, industrialization in some big cities caused giant immigration waves and economic worries, leading to the rise of individualism. The individual that was seeking for economic pleasure featured his individuality and autonomy spiritually. The modern period exalted the assumption that the society exists, works for and strengthens individuals (Sennett, 2013, p. 171). Individualism is a notion that highlights a person's freedom and personality and regards this person as an autonomous being than can exist on his own (Ünal, 2010, p. 7). The Enlightenment and modernism have always obliged individuals to be in a continuous development (Celik, 2018, p. 65). The individual was passive in traditional communities but became as active as possible in the modern period and began to attribute his acts to rather fate than to his preferences. In this sense, the main element that creates individuality by which an individual controls his own fate is *reason* (Tas and Berköz, 2015, p. 37).

Giddens (1991, p. 247) asserts in modernity individualism is related to freedom of contract unique to capitalist employment. In other words, markets contributed to individualism by placing emphasis on rights and responsibilities. Capitalism attached more importance than necessary to consumer autonomy and heightened the universal culture via exchange relationships, contributing to the emergence and rise of individualism (Saribay, 1996, p. 92). The prominence of individualism led to the emergence of new ideologies and ethics. The socialization of individualized persons created modern social institutions and the individual freedom theme became the most significant concept for the modern mentality (Tutar, 2012, p. 60). In the modern public sphere, individuals understood who they actually were, believed they could never be replaced and fulfilled their individuality (Arendt, 1994, p. 64). This is why a modern individual is regarded as a religious individualist in the public sphere.

Religious individualism may date its religious wing from the Reformation. As a result, religious individualism is a social phenomenon deriving from the Enlightenment and Reformation (Ünal, 2010, pp. 8-15). To Lukes (1995, p. 101), religious individuality is the case in which a devout person feels no need for any middlemen, assumes full responsibility and has the holly right to communicate with what he names as holly. In return for his acts, the individual comes to the present of God by himself. He now

cannot blame anyone for his acts in the presence of God. This awareness comes directly from the individual's own internalization (Ünal, 2010, p. 14). In this sense, modern man has maintained his religious beliefs and life in his private sphere after achieving individuality and religion has disappeared in the public sphere. Furthermore, modern man has linked none of his actions in the public sphere with religion and started to maintain his religious acts in his inner world. Thus, in the modern era, while individualism has come to the fore in the public sphere, religion has been lived in the private sphere of the individual.

Reason and Religion: Rational Reason

The Enlightenment lies in the intellectual background of modernity and the order created through reason is believed to be indisputably an ideal order for people (Beris, 2006, pp. 487-488). The Enlightenment aims to rescue the individual from the narrow and irrational view imposed by his own passions by educating him to join the society that organizes the action of reason and attaches importance to rational knowledge (Touraine, 2004, p. 269). The Enlightenment believes social values such as religion and tradition are an obstacle to the liberation of people and that they can get rid of this situation only through reason. Modernity is called the 'age of reason' since it is based on reason and establishes all social relations and institutions on rationality. Reason is seen as sufficient to meet human needs in this period. God is even reachable for the individual through reason (Beris, 2006, pp. 487-488). Modernity placed science with God at the center of society. With modernity, the Western mentality accepted reason as the basic pattern and adopted the idea of rational individual and society. Thus, modernity is strictly connected with rational thought (Persembe, 2002, p. 161). Rationalization means the way people think and act has increasingly been stripped of supernatural forces and left to considerations of objective performance or practical relevance (Erdogan, 2000, pp. 180-181). Modernity has shown man his own abilities and opened the way for man to get rid of other authorities such as God and tradition (Özkiraz, 2007, p. 15). This issue is a result of the Enlightenment philosophy, which was based on reason and created modernity. The Enlightenment is the intention to apply a rational way of life to everyone (Touraine, 2004, p. 25). This idea constitutes the basic paradigm of social engineering ideas. The Enlightenment wants to arrange the good for everyone. That's why the Enlightenment thinkers wanted to change society around their own ideas.

The Enlightenment relies on human reason. According to this idea,

every person has a will that can determine his own destiny, reason and the right to enlighten himself. If individuals can participate in the public sphere as equal and free individuals, fair and rational outcomes regarding social issues can be achieved for all at any time (Köroglu, 2014, p. 1493; Özbek, 2004, p. 42).

It is reason that created modernity and modern period. (Tutar, 2013, p. 58). Reason functions as a universal tool suitable for producing all other means for its purposes (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2014, p. 56). Touraine (2002, p. 13) suggests that it is also reason that drives science and scientific applications and enables social life to be adapted to individual or common needs and eventually replaces arbitrariness and violence with the rule of law and the market order. Humanity states that it moves towards both abundance, freedom and happiness by acting in accordance with the laws of reason. The dominant paradigm of the Enlightenment, and therefore of modernity, is instrumental rationality, which means the rationalization of tools against values (Özay, 2006, p. 84). Instrumental rationality rationalizes capitalist societies (Tutar, 2013, p. 58). In other words, the instrumental reason, which feeds the modern conceptions, implements the ancient law of value of capitalism and thus takes its destiny to its destination (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2014, p. 61).

Citizenship and Religion

The concept of citizen derives from the word *cite* and means someone residing in a city or town, a notable or free person of a city that has the rights and privileges of citizenship (Aslan, 2004, p. 88). According to TDK, citizenship means being a citizen, being born and raised in a country or living in a country. Citizenship is seen as a product of the Enlightenment, which is thought to have formed the philosophical basis of the French Revolution. The concept of modern citizenship is a constitutional concept that generally expresses the rights, loyalty and duties of the individual in his relationship with the state (Demir, 2005, p. 24; Tas and Berköz, 2015, p. 93).

Citizenship is an old institution and has undergone great transformations in the historical process. According to Aristotle, citizen is a person that takes office in the public sphere and gives ideas (Aristotle, 1975). That is, this person is a male proprietor. Persons, such as children, women, foreigners, who are *not* entitled to citizenship are noncitizens. Arendt (1994, pp. 51-52) argues in ancient Greece, only those, such as women and slaves, who had a private life were noncitizens because they were *not* entitled to enter the public sphere. In ancient Greece, the concept of

TESAM

freedom was peculiar to men only. Citizenship was the social and political status of privileged property-owning rulers. There were examples of the phenomenon of equal citizenship in some cities in the Middle Ages but the rights and duties specific to these cities were limited (Saribay, 1996, p. 91).

Modernity, thought to have emerged with the Enlightenment, forced the West to make radical changes. Industrialization initiated an intellectual enlightenment, transformation in agriculture, and political and social revolutions. These revolutionary changes naturally affected the way people perceived themselves and led to the need to revise and adapt traditional religious interpretations to the times (Armstrong, 1998, p. 370). These developments affected the status of citizenship as well. The Enlightenment caused the end of the status of servitude, which had been applied for long years, and led to the emergence of a new social formation called *nation* consisting of free citizens (Demir, 2005, p. 22). This social category, shown as a nation, created the core of the modern state. Pierson (2000, p. 284) regards citizenship as one of the necessary features for the definition of the modern state. The modern state melted all social identities in the civic pot and opposed the clarification of sub-identities such as religious, racial and gender in the public sphere. In other words, the most important feature of modern citizenship is its rejection of racial and religious discrimination. In this context, the modern state treated citizens as *same* rather than *different* (Beris, 2006, p. 504; Sit, 2008, p. 82). Civic rights and duties were local before the emergence of the modern nation-state. However, with the formation of the nation-state, civic rights and duties were no more local and became universal after gaining a national quality. Thus, citizenship has a parallel history with Western capitalism. Historically, the core element of nation-building has essentially been the legal guarantee of the rights and duties of all individuals classified as citizens (Saribay, 1996, pp. 91-92). Citizenship that modernity has entitled for everyone has equal status in the public sphere and every individual has the right to participate in political life. A citizen is a person present in the public sphere not to realize his own personal interests but to accept public problems as everyone's problems and realize common interests. A citizen is a person that can assume collective responsibility based on the idea of a common world (Yilmaz, 2007, p. 63). Citizenship is thus a consequence of modernity and a citizen is the person empowered to participate in the life of political community (Pierson, 2000, p. 24). Roughly speaking, he is the person that participates in the political decision making process by voting.

In today's democratic state, citizenship is a legal bond established between the state and the individual that realizes a legal status in which the state unilaterally uses its sovereign right and determines its conditions and provisions (Uluocak, 1988, p. 6). That is, citizenship is a link between a person and a certain state and has legal and political aspects (Dogan, 2015, p. 239). Today, individuals defined as citizens have many rights just because they are citizens. Further, they can freely express these rights in the public sphere, where they can interact with each other on problems that concern almost every person, without any restrictions in their social environment, that is, by using their freedom of assembly, organization, expression and dissemination of their thoughts (Habermas, 2004, p. 95). In this public sphere, they chance to have an opinion and political information to choose the people that will later exercise political power. For this reason, both law makers and those that will be exposed to laws come to the fore in the public sphere (Olgun, 2017, p. 53). Political thought seems to have remained almost exclusively within the sphere of communication of the elite before the individual becomes a citizen (Zaret, 2000, p. 24).

Nation-State and Religion

One of the most distinctive features of modernity is related to the political field. During this period, power relations changed theoretically and practically. Nation-state largely defines the modern state although it emerged with the French and American revolutions (Beris, 2006, pp. 492-493).

In the modern era, nation-state refers to the institutionalization of political power whereas nation points to the source of legitimacy of the institutionalized structure (Erkis, 2013, p. 63). Based on this definition, we can define nation-state as follow: It is a modern phenomenon defined by the formation of a kind of state that has the right to use legal force within a defined territory and aims to homogenize the people under its rule, creating common norms, symbols, values, and reviving -sometimes applying- traditions and origin myths (Aslan, 2004, pp. 86-87).

According to Saribay (1996, p. 92), the process of establishing a nation-state in Western Europe was completed in four stages. The first stage includes a very long period from the 15th century to the 18th, when the French Revolution took place, and the formation of the state. The main reason for the emergence of this stage was the political, economic and cultural integration at the elite level. At this stage, political debates in public spaces such as coffee houses, cafes, theaters, operas and inns led to

integration. The second stage was the expansion of the school where the center played a role in providing contact between the elite and the margin. The third stage was the transition of individuals from passive subjects to active citizens in the political system. At this stage, the guarantees given to the opposition were institutionalized, a wider electorate was given the right in the elections of the members of representative bodies, and the interests of the political parties were organized and combined. Furthermore, industrial and national revolutions started and the cultural and economic conflicts caused by these revolutions led to new changes and transformations in societies. The concepts of property and rights began to develop and become institutionalized. In the last stage, the state tried to improve national economic conditions in order to ensure public welfare by expanding its administrative apparatus (Saribay, 1996, p.92).

The centralization of power and determination of the only source of legitimacy as citizens formed the basis of the modern state. The determination of legitimate source of sovereignty as the people created nation-state in modern times. We can here say that the magic word of modernity, reason, came into play and determined all political relations (Beris, 2006, pp. 492-493). In this period, democracy began to emerge as the only rational form of government and power was centralized and there were major changes in the legitimacy of power. The belief that the only source of legitimacy was the people became widespread (Akinci, 2012, p. 63). Thus, sources of legitimacy such as religion began to lose their influence.

The emergence of nation-states in the modern period also caused religious reality to take a national dimension. This reality paved the way for the processes of nations to build religions in accordance with their own spirit (Akkir, 2018, pp. 97-100).

State and Religion: Secularity

A large part of the history of humanity lived for a long time in a period when the worldly and otherworldly powers were together or the otherworldly was subordinate to or supported by the worldly. This situation was *not* seen as a problem when the elements of the otherworldly life, i.e. people and organizations representing religion, were politically and economically weak. However, this unity was disrupted by the political and economic strengthening of the Church, which represented religion, and the history of humanity witnessed the conflict of these power areas for a long time (Wach, 1995, pp. 353-370). Religion retained its authority for a long time until modern times and the penetration of its power

into political sphere initiated a power struggle against the worldly authority. As a result of the changes stemming from the Enlightenment and Renaissance, the sphere of influence of religious institutions and their representatives began to shrink. The relationship between the two types of power that emerged after the Industrial Revolution in the West has begun to evolve in favor of the worldly in modern times (Tas and Berköz, 2015, pp. 97-98). Religion determined demands and needs of human beings for centuries yet has begun to lose its spheres of influence and existence in modern times (Altintas, 2005, p. 42; Tutar, 2012, pp. 56-59). The developments that proposed reason for solution of any problems in modern times have formed the basis of legitimation for a secular state that is no longer dependent on religious legitimacy. The conflict between representatives of worldly and otherworldly life in France led to the institutionalization of the post-revolutionary Republic and the understanding of secularism. This transition spread gradually in the West over time, and religious and state institutions were separated from each other and the affairs and actions of the state became independent of religion. In this sense, secularism is considered as a part of the modernity process. The birth of modernity in the West was incidental to the beginning of the secularization process (Habermas, 2021, p. 6; Tas and Berköz, 2015, pp. 97-98).

In modern times, religion represents the phenomenon left behind while future is emphasizing the idea of progress independent of religion (Wagner, 2003, p. 24). Modernity acquired a position in the field of existence that belonged to religion in ancient times (Karisman, 2010, p. 118). In this period, there were attempts to reconstruct religion in accordance with society (Özay, 2006, p. 92).

Until the modern age, the sense of necessity for the sacred was intense in societies and the content of the sacred was usually filled incorrectly. With the modernity, *sacred canopy*, termed by Weber, started to move away from humanity. The sacred itself was on the target for the first time in modernity. Weber argued the canopy would become thinner and religions would disappear from the stage of history as industrialization and urbanization increased. Furthermore, such writers as Berger and Cox were highly inspired for their secularization theories by Weber's ideas that science would replace religion through the effect of scientific and technological developments, and history progressed in a straight line on which religions ceased at the beginning and middle (Erincik, 2008, pp. 105-106).

Modernity has caused radical changes in religion- and state- and society relations. Compared to traditional societies, there is a serious weakening of the social authority of religious teachings in modern societies (Mert, 1994, p.88-89). Religion will no longer be an area of sociability, but of individuality, and will *not* be determinative and binding in social relations. The point here is rather withdrawal of religion into the private sphere, which is an individual domain than a complete abandonment. Modernity has transferred God's place in the center of society and its religious functions to science and directed religious beliefs to the private sphere only (Touranie, 2004, p. 239). The rational individual of modernity, attributing everything to reason, excludes all kinds of his beliefs and thoughts from the public sphere. Individuals may have religious beliefs, however these must remain private. The rational individual is the actor of the public sphere and may have religious beliefs or traditional values but must reserve them in the private sphere. Thus, the individual has to leave everything except rational reasoning in the private sphere (Köroglu, 2013, p. 436).

Conclusion

The concept of public and private dates back to ancient Greece and has gained its modern meaning in the 18th century. In ancient Greece, only male citizens with property were allowed to participate in the public sphere where they discussed many issues concerning the society. The private sphere was considered to be the living space that concerned the home and body of the individual. The modern period started to shape the distinction between public and private spheres more clearly. Modernity led to many changes and determined a different role for the religion phenomenon. In the modern period, religion was removed from many public places and confined to the private sphere, which we may attribute to the negative functions of religion on the individual and society during the Middle Ages in the West. The transformations due to wars of religion, the Industrial Revolution, Renaissance and Reformation evolved religion into a phenomenon in the individual's inner world. In this period, the public sphere was considered as symbolic spaces where individuals gathered to meet and discuss in order to realize their goals. Individuals would come to these areas after leaving their religious views and thoughts in their private areas. This situation was evident especially in the relationship between citizenship, religion and state, and in the process of establishing a nation-state.

The attempt to confine religion to the private sphere, in other words,

the new role society assigned to religion is against its nature since it is intrinsically public. Removed from the public sphere in the modern period, religion showed tendency to gain publicity in various other ways. Religions, excluded from the public sphere and publicity, chanced to acquire positions in the public sphere through freethought. Further, religion has to some degree successfully gained a place in constitutions, policies and education curriculums. Religions circumvent formal rationality to enter the public sphere (Yükselbaba, 2008, p. 90). Allegedly, religion has always been in political modernity, even in modern times (Cigdem, 2004, p. 506). The boundaries between public and private are today blurred and the appearance of religion in the public sphere can be seen as a contribution to the diversity and pluralism of that society.

Declaration

In all processes of the article, TESAM's research and publication ethics principles were followed.

There is no potential conflict of interest in this study.

The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

The authors contributed equally to the study.

References

Akıncı, A. (2012). Modern ulus devletlerin doğusu. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, *34*, 61-70.

Akkır, R. (2018). Modern zamanlarda ulus-devlet ve din-devlet ilişkilerinin batı dünyası çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi. *Siirt University Journal of Faculty of Divinity*, *5*(1), 97-121.

Altıntaş, R. (2005). *Din ve sekülerleşme.* İstanbul: Pınar Yayınları.

Arendt, H. (1994). İnsanlık durumu (B. S. Sener, Çev.). 1, İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

Aristotle, (1975). Politika (M. Tuncay, Çev.) İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Armstong, K. (1998). Tanrı'nın tarihi, (O. Özel, H. Koyukan ve K. Emiroglu, Çev.). Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları.

Aslan, C. (2004). *Birey-toplum-devlet (etnisite)*. Adana: Karahan Yayınları.

Aslan, S. ve Yılmaz, A. (2001). Modernizme bir baskaldırı projesi olarak postmodernizm. *Cumhuriyet University Journal of Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, *2*(2), 93-108.

Beris, H. E. (2006). Moderniteden postmoderniteye. M. Türköne (Ed.)., *Siyaset* içinde. Ankara: Lotus Yayınları.

Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved 21.07.2021, 2021 from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/s%C3%B6zl%C3%BCk/ingilizce/public.

Celik, N. (2018). Değişen devlet algısı: Toplumsallıktan bireyselliğe. *Istanbul Gelisim University Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 60-78.

Cetin, H. (2003, November). Gelenek ve değişim arasında kriz: Türk modernleşmesi. *Doğu-Batı Dergisi*, *25*, 11-40.

Cigdem, A. (1997). *Bir imkan olarak modernite Weber ve Habermas*. İstanbul: İletisim Yayıncılık.

Cigdem, A. (2004). Kamusal alan, kamusal din ve kamusal akıl. M. Özbek (Ed.), *kamusal Alan* içinde (501-513). İstanbul: Hil Yayınları.

Dacheux, E. (2012). *Kamusal alan: Demokrasinin anahtar bir kavramı*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Dagtas, E. (1999). Onsekizinci ve ondokuzuncu yüzyıllarda kamusal alan-özel alan ikilemi ve basının tarihsel gelişimi. *Kurgu Dergisi*, 16, 157-173.

Demir, S., (2005). *Yurttaşlık kavramı ve Türkiye için bir model önerisi: Anayasal yurttaşlık*. (Gaziosmanpaşa University, Institute of Social Science, unpublished MA thesis, Tokat).

Dogan, V., (2015). *Türk vatandaşlık hukuku*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Erdogan, M. (2000). *Demokrasi laiklik resmi ideoloji*. Ankara: *Liberte*.

Erincik, S. (2008). *John rawls'un siyasal liberalizminde din-toplum ilişkisi*. (Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy and Science of Religion, unpublished PhD thesis, Ankara).

Erkış, İ. U. (2013). Ulus-devletin tarihsel gelişimi üzerine. *Selçuk University*,

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences journal of Economis Researches, *13*(26), 54-76.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernite ve bireysel-kimlik, geç modern çağda benlik ve toplum*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Giddens, A. (1998). *Modernliğin sonuçları*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Goode. L. (2005). *Jürgen Habermas: Democracy and the public sphere, (Modern European Thinkers)*. London: Pluto Press.

Habermas, J. (2004). Kamusal alan, M. Özbek (Ed.), *Kamusal Alan* içinde. İstanbul: Hil Yayınları.

Habermas, J. (1994). *Modernlik tamamlanmamış bir proje*. İstanbul: Kıyı Yayınları.

Habermas, J. (2021). *Religion in the public sphere*. Retrieved August 23, 2021 from https://www.sandiego.edu/pdf/pdf_library/habermaslecture031105_c939cceb2ab087bdfc6df291ec0fc3fa.pdf.

Hobsbawn, E. (2013). *Sanayi ve imparatorluk*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.

Horkheimer, M. ve Adorno, T. W. (2014). *Aydınlanmanın diyalektiği*. İstanbul: Kabalca Yayıncılık.

Karisman, S. (2010). *Erzurumlu İbrahim Hakkı ve Adam Smith: Marifet ile zenginlik arasında iki düşünce iki dünya*. İstanbul: Ötüken Nesriyat.

Köroglu, C. Z. (2014). Kamusal alan ve din ilişkilerinde yeni dönem. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, *9*(5), 1487-1505.

Köroglu, C., Z. (2013). Modern kamusal alana eleştirel yaklaşımlar: Genel bir değerlendirme (postmodernizm, feminizm ve din). *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, *8*(6), 431-457.

Lukes, S. (1995). *Bireycilik*. Ankara: Arık Yayınevi.

Mert, N. (1994). Laiklik tartışması ve siyasal islam. *Cogito*, 89-103.

Nebati, N. (2020). Siyasi tartışmalar bağlamında Türkiye'de kamusal alanın evrimi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *9*(2), 828-852.

Odabas, U. K. (2018). Tarihsel süreçte kamusal alanın yapısal dönüşümü

ve Habermas. *Atatürk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *22*, 2051-2066.

Olgun, H. B. (2017). Jürgen Habermas, Hannah Arendt ve Richard Sennett'in kamusal alan yaklaşımları. *Sosyolojik Düşün*, 2(1), 45-54.

Özbek, M. (2004). Kamusal alanın sınırları. M. Özbek (Ed.), *Kamusal Alan* içinde (19-91). Istanbul: Hil Yayınları.

Özkiraz, A. (2007). *Modernleşme teorileri ve postmodern durum*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi Yayınları.

Perşembe, E. (2003). *Modernlik ve postmodernlikte din problemi*. Retrieved 19.08.2021 from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/188599, 159-181.

Pierson, C. (2000). *Modern devlet*. İstanbul: Çiviyazıları Yayınları.

Sarıbay, A. Y. (1996). *Siyasal sosyoloji*. Bursa: Uludağ University.

Sennett, R. (2013). *Kamusal insanın çöküşü: 168 ağır kitaplar dizisi*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Sit, B. (2008). Modern vatandaşlık kavramına bir bakış. *TBB Dergisi*, *76*, 64-82.

Tas, K. ve Berköz, H. (2015). Modernizmin kamusal alan parametreleri ve din. *Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Institue of Social Sciences*, *2*(22).

Touraine, A. (2002). *Modernliğin eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Touraine, A. (2004). *Modernliğin eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Tutar, H. (2012). Modernite ve gelenek ikileminde kimlik tasavvurları. *Sakarya İktisat Dergisi*, *1*(1), 56-69.

Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlükleri. Retrieved 15.08.2021 from https://sozluk.gov.tr/.

Uluocak, N., (1988). *Türk vatandaşlık hukuku*. İstanbul.

Ünal, M. S. (2010). Dinsel bireycilik: Tehdit mi, fırsat mı? *Dini araştırmalar Temmuz-Aralık, 13*(37), 5-18.

Wach, J. (1995). *Din sosyolojisi*. İstanbul: Marmara University Faculty of Divinity Publishing.

Wagner, P. (2003). *Modernliğin sosyolojisi.* Ankara: Doruk Yayınları.

Yilmaz, Z. (2007). *Hannah Arendt'te özel alan-kamusal alan ayrımı ve modern çağda toplumsal alan* (Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy, unpublished PhD thesis).

Yükselbaba Ü. (2008). *Habermas'ta kamusal alan/özel alan ayrımı* (İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences unpublished PhD thesis).

Zaret, D. (20009). *Origins of democratic culture: Printing, petitions, and the public sphere in early modern England*. Princeton University Press.

TESAM