

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2025-2-14>

THE CONSENSUS PROBLEM: SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS

Gulmaliyeva Vusala Loghman,

*Scientific Specialist at the Ethics Department, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan (Baku, Azerbaijan)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2206-5919

vusalagulmaliyeva86@mail.ru

Abstract. The article is devoted to the social-philosophical analysis of consensus, which is one of the pressing issues of contemporary times. Consensus is regarded as a critical mechanism in ensuring both individual and collective welfare. The world is fraught with conflict zones that arise based on various motives and contentions, and simultaneously, efforts are made to seek solutions to these conflicts. In modern science, optimal consensus models and pacifist approaches are proposed, with attempts being made to define new directions for the development of conflictology. The article emphasizes that the resolution of social conflicts faces considerable challenges, as each new conflict emerges with its own unique content and scenario, necessitating different approaches for its resolution. These searches also encompass the philosophical, political, and legal aspects of public consciousness. Within the framework of the laws of social dynamics, efforts are made to bring conflicts to the consensus plane and to seek scientific solutions to them. In the article, the relationship between consensus and conflict, based on Hegelian logic, is explained through the structure of antithesis (conflict), thesis (dialogue), and synthesis (consensus). While dialogues aim for a predetermined consensus, conflict, in turn, promotes consensus through dialogues in a philosophical sense. This approach highlights the reciprocal relationship and interdependent nature between conflict and consensus. The limitations of idealizing consensus, as well as the difficulties in its realization, are linked to the impact of the multifaceted and multi-content social structure of contemporary society. The human factor plays a fundamental role in consensus, as moral values are crucial in conflict resolution. Social conflicts arise from the balance created between human nature and morality, reflecting the results of broader societal and state struggles. Ultimately, the achievement of consensus in social conflicts is a product of human moral and value-oriented consciousness.

Key words: consensus, conflict, dialogue, stability, order, harmony.

Introduction. The concept of consensus is examined in various disciplines, including social philosophy, conflictology, sociology, political science, economics, cultural studies, and others. In our complex and interconnected world, the role of consensus has become increasingly significant. Its profound and multifaceted analysis is one of the critical intellectual demands of contemporary times. Consensus plays a pivotal role, not only in resolving socio-political contradictions and conflicts but also in finding harmony between different thoughts and interests. Although there is no simple definition of this concept, its complexity lies in expressing human capabilities for dialogue and understanding, as well as the willingness of various parties to reach a common ground. As a human quality, consensus is not merely a product of the interaction between nature and society; it also forms a conceptual framework at the level of cognition and understanding. In its essence, consensus is a reciprocal process of voluntary agreement, where each participant forms their position in response to the positions of others. While consensus might seem to be a product of contemporary times, this idea has developed over centuries, initially related to notions such as agreement, unanimity, and public opinion, which gradually converged under the term "consensus." Approaches proposed for resolving social conflicts must not only be logically consistent but also connected to the scientific, cultural, and social conditions of the modern world. The process of reaching consensus should address the needs of society while considering future perspectives. Additionally, the philosophical roots of these approaches and their impact on society must be taken into account, as consensus should be analyzed

not only as a mechanism for conflict resolution but also as a concept at the level of human existence, morality, and social consciousness.

The dynamics of consensus and its societal application cannot be fully explained through practical approaches alone, as they also demand a profound exploration of human nature, morality, and the dialogue between actions. In this context, consensus plays a crucial role not only in establishing future social order and harmony but also in shaping an individual's understanding of their existence and reforming their relationship with society.

Degree of problem elaboration. The concept of consensus has been extensively studied and debated across various academic disciplines, particularly in social philosophy, political science, conflictology, and sociology. It is regarded as a vital mechanism for ensuring both individual and collective well-being. In recent decades, the role of consensus in societal development and in resolving social conflicts has gained even greater significance. However, theoretical discussions and research in this field continue, as the nature of consensus and its societal functions are interpreted in diverse ways by different scholarly perspectives.

The issue of consensus is one of the most pressing topics in contemporary discourse, especially in the context of resolving social conflicts and misunderstandings. Prominent philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas, John Rawls, Emmanuel Levinas, Pierre Bourdieu, and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel have addressed this issue from various angles in their works. Habermas emphasized the importance of communicative action and consensus theory, highlighting their role in societal interactions. Rawls grounded his theory of justice on consensus, Levinas linked ethical responsibility to consensus, and Hegel explored the historical and social development of consensus through dialectical methods.

Nevertheless, numerous unresolved questions remain regarding the interrelationships between these theoretical approaches, the methods applied, and how consensus manifests in practice. As a result, there is a need for deeper and more comprehensive research into the conditions under which consensus can be achieved in social dynamics and conflict resolution. This article aims to examine the theoretical dimensions of consensus and its role in addressing social conflicts, based on contemporary scientific literature, while also clarifying the extent to which this concept has been developed across various philosophical and social approaches.

Objectives and tasks. The primary goal of this article is to offer a social-philosophical analysis of the concept of consensus and underscore its role in resolving contemporary socio-political conflicts. The article will explore how consensus has been treated in various scientific fields (social philosophy, conflictology, sociology, political science, economics) and examine its application in society. Furthermore, it will analyze the role of consensus in shaping human morality and public consciousness, as well as its relationship with conflict and dialogue.

Methods. In conducting this research, comparative analysis and a general analytical approach were employed. Depending on the tasks at hand, methods such as generalization, historical-comparative analysis, and a systematic approach were utilized.

Main section.

The Dialectical Unity of Consensus and Conflict

Consensus and conflict are interrelated concepts that complement one another while simultaneously exerting mutual influence. From a dialectical philosophical perspective, each concept necessitates its opposite, or antithesis. Conflict plays the role of antithesis in the formation of consensus. The presence of conflict inherently leads to a confrontation of opposing positions, thereby paving the way for the emergence of consensus. Consensus itself is understood dialectically as a synthesis that arises from the interaction between thesis and antithesis.

In general, when discussing consensus, we implicitly acknowledge the existence of some form of disagreement, misunderstanding, problem, contradiction, or conflict. These two phenomena are dialectically intertwined and inextricably linked. Consequently, those who emphasize the concept

of “consensus” do not shy away from recognizing the significant role conflict plays in societal life. Similarly, conflict theorists, although recognizing the dialectical development laws governing social conflicts, also acknowledge that the very existence and harmonious development of society demand consensus. They emphasize the importance of creating conducive conditions for the interaction between conflict and consensus.

The central issue here is not the avoidance of conflict, but rather the determination of the appropriate communication styles and behavioral patterns in conflict situations and their resolution. Questions regarding how communication should be structured, how decisions should be made, whether opposing parties can hear one another and reach mutual agreements, and similar concerns must be addressed. Ultimately, conflict should be understood as reflecting consensus. Societies cannot exist in disarray; order and harmony are indispensable. If disarray signifies conflict, then harmony corresponds to socialization.

From a philosophical standpoint, the very foundations of order, harmony, and consensus are contingent upon the absence of disintegration. Without this condition, consensus becomes meaningless. These two concepts – conflict and consensus – are inherently unified, and one cannot exist without the other. Socialization, in this respect, is no exception. Just as consensus is essential for the socialization of societies, conflict plays an equally crucial role. In this regard, social conflicts are, by their nature, contradictions that, while often destructive, also possess constructive elements.

This is because the evolution of the world proceeds in a dialectical manner, grounded in principles such as the negation of the negation, the unity and struggle of opposites, and the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative shifts. The emergence of the new is contingent upon the destruction of the old. One system cannot replace another without the former being dismantled. When viewing society as a system, the roles of conflict and consensus can be more precisely delineated. This logic also demonstrates the inherent unity between these two concepts.

According to Lewis Coser, “The source of real conflicts inherent in every social system arises from the position of individuals, the demands they make, and the degree to which power, resources, and the values that generate these conflicts are supported” (Coser Lewis A., 1956: 54). In other words, the intensity of conflicts and the sustainability of consensus are directly tied to the human factor. Conflicts arise based on human desires and demands. Coser further argues that “If conflict is the most effective means of determining the relative power of antagonistic interests, then it is also an essential mechanism for achieving balance within society” (Coser Lewis A. (1956: 136). In summary, equilibrium, or its specific manifestation in the form of consensus, must inevitably emerge through conflict. Absent conflict, the continuity of consensus becomes untenable. It is posited that the scope and depth of conflicts significantly influence the subsequent stability of consensus. The Second World War serves as a prime illustration of this. Indeed, the relative unity of modern Europe is, to a considerable extent, a byproduct of the Second World War’s aftermath. In truth, to attain a robust and enduring consensus, leaders must not shy away from conflict but, rather, should foster and engage with it. Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger articulated this sentiment by stating: “Avoiding the resolution of a problem engenders a crisis, and an uncontrollable crisis inevitably leads to catastrophes within society” (Henry Kissinger, 2001: 43). Thus, these two processes are dialectically interconnected, functioning as complementary forces, whether within smaller models (such as specific economic or business contexts) or broader, global issues. Furthermore, “civil society represents a domain where processes of conflict and solidarity, disagreement and consensus, are continuously generated. The dialectical relationship between conflict and consensus is manifest precisely in this realm” (Fontana Benedetto, 2006: 37).

Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), the founder and leader of the Italian Communist Party and a prominent Marxist theorist, contended that “civil society, while representing and defining spheres of liberty and consensus, is also an arena characterized by competition, conflict, and factional struggles”

(Fontana Benedetto, 2006: 37). In essence, civil society cannot exist without the interplay of conflict and consensus. These two elements, in fact, constitute the very essence of its nature. "Conflict, considered an inherent phenomenon in human relations, requires that particular attention be given to decision-making processes within broader social contexts when resolving such disputes" (Jeong Ho-Won, 2010: 30). In other words, given that conflict is a perpetual and inherent aspect of the human condition from a philosophical standpoint, the formulation of well-grounded decisions, as well as the acceptance of their outcomes, assumes critical importance in addressing conflicts more fundamentally. Consequently, the human and societal dimensions must be integrated into these processes. Absent this consideration, the objectivity of the decisions rendered would be subject to doubt. Since conflict is inherently tied to humanity, the resolution mechanisms must be designed with human welfare as their ultimate objective, directing efforts accordingly. Philosophically, just as conflict is embedded in human nature, so too is a predisposition toward peace, dialogue, and consensus.

The Social and Philosophical Foundations of Consensus and Conflict

Consensus and conflict are not merely social processes; they must also be evaluated within a profound philosophical and ethical framework. Both concepts are rooted in the social nature of human beings, their morality, and public consciousness. Consensus, based on moral and ethical values, represents the most optimal approach to resolving social conflicts. The emergence of social conflicts is a social process grounded in the clash of differing interests and positions. Consensus offers various pathways for addressing these confrontations. It functions as a mechanism that ensures collective action based on mutual respect and understanding among individuals. In seeking to resolve social conflicts, consensus strives to maintain a balance of mutual interests. The philosophical foundations of consensus are intricately linked to human morality and behavior. Human morality consists of the natural and cultural norms that guide actions and decisions. One of the primary factors in the formation of consensus is the moral values of individuals. In the ethical domain, consensus represents the process through which individuals understand themselves and align with others. This process, from a philosophical perspective, reflects an individual's social position and civic responsibility. Dialogue plays a crucial role in this process. Dialogue and consensus are complementary concepts in a philosophical context. While dialogue aims at reaching truth through the open and rational discussion of differing viewpoints, consensus is the outcome of this process, resulting in the establishment of a common, acceptable position among participants. In other words, in consensus, it is essential that communication between the parties be properly structured to steer the decisions made towards resolving the issue at hand. According to Jürgen Habermas, "consensus emerges precisely from communication or communication directed at understanding" (*Legitimations probleme im Spätkapitalismus*, 1975: 92). Therefore, the fundamental condition for consensus is dialogue and communication. Achieving consensus based solely on abstract principles is infeasible. "Habermas emphasized the intersubjective (dialogue-based) direction of the search for truth in communicative action aimed at achieving consensus" (*Legitimations probleme im Spätkapitalismus*, 1975: 92). Thus, intersubjective communication (whether among small or larger subjects) or dialogue is a crucial condition for consensus. In short, consensus is a philosophical-social phenomenon directly proportional to dialogue. For Habermas, "ultimately, consensus is the reason for the existence of any form of communication" (*Legitimations probleme im Spätkapitalismus*, 1975: 92). The ultimate goal of communication and interaction is the achievement of consensus. If communication does not culminate in consensus, from a philosophical standpoint, it is considered futile and unsuccessful. Researchers argues that "the goal of consensus is not to comprehend the truth, but to reach mutual understanding. Here, language and the speech act carried out through communication play the central role" (*Legitimations probleme im Spätkapitalismus*, 1975: 93). "In the process of achieving consensus, everyone's contribution is essential" (*Anarchy Works*, 2010: 65). Hence, consensus inherently involves dialogue; as a process,

it cannot be a monologue. In this regard, the opinions of each party are crucial. The essence of consensus lies in connecting the parties communicatively and achieving a shared goal. Consensus, which involves dialogue, is aimed at the civilized resolution of any contradictions and serves as a reliable and proven tool for eliminating socially dangerous conflicts. “Consensus is the immanent-internal direction of the communicative process. It is determined not by external communication factors, but by language itself, as a tool for dialogue” (Hans Köchler, 1997: 59-60). Thus, rhetoric, speech culture, and the successful organization of dialogues are critical components in consensus. Therefore, dialogue serves as a means to achieve consensus, but consensus does not always equate to unanimity. “On a global scale, the issue arises of a conscious choice regarding the rational model of world order that aligns with the realities of the 21st century, which can ensure not only the survival of humanity but also the transition to a new phase in the development of world civilizations. The choice lies between the unipolar, bipolar, and multipolar models of world order” (Homeira Moshirzadeh (2020: 474). We posit that the multipolar world model is an essential development for the survival and future evolution of modern civilizations. In its absence, the independent existence and diversity of civilizations would become unattainable. According to the dialectical law, a fundamental principle of philosophy, the concurrent existence of diverse civilizations, their harmonious complementarity, and their continuous dialogue are critical for fostering development and catalyzing qualitative changes, as such transformations necessitate a quantitative basis. However, in certain instances, “groups may fail to reach a consensus due to dysfunctional dialogue patterns and decision-making processes having become ingrained as second nature for many members of the organization” (Roberto, Michael A., 2005: 143). This implies that, in the face of inherent disagreements and contrasting perspectives, the establishment of a univocal consensus and a fully successful dialogue becomes unfeasible. From a philosophical perspective, both consensus and dialogue are characterized by discreteness and conditionality. Michael A. Roberto asserts that “in my research, I identified three forms of dysfunctional decision-making cultures: the ‘no’ culture, the ‘yes’ culture, and the ‘maybe’ culture. Each of these cultures exhibits predictable and easily discernible patterns of interaction and dialogue, as well as primary causal factors. Nonetheless, all lead to the same outcome: the chronic impossibility of transitioning from conflict to consensus, from thought to action” (Roberto, Michael A., 2005: 144).

The Moral and Philosophical Foundations of Consensus

Consensus fundamentally necessitates a form of universal agreement or mutual understanding, which is inherently linked to both an individual’s internal moral values and the overarching social contract of society. By following Hegel’s perspective on the moral foundation of the state and society, the significance of dialogue and mutual understanding in resolving societal conflicts becomes evident. Hegel contends that “historical development necessitates continuous dialogue and consensus for society to achieve higher values and legal systems” (Hegel, 1807: 102). In contemporary philosophical discourse, the ethical dimension of consensus holds a paramount position. Jürgen Habermas, in his seminal work *The Theory of Communicative Action*, underscores the necessity of mutual understanding for individuals to share their experiences and reach consensus. Habermas observes that societal development is contingent upon dialogue grounded in trust and understanding, a process which is indispensable for resolving social conflicts (Habermas, J., 1981: 77). According to his theory, the resolution of social and political conflicts via dialogue and consensus is fundamentally reliant upon mutual respect and agreement.

The ethical underpinnings of consensus encompass both human social morality and the collective interests of society. This notion is intimately connected to John Rawls’s theory of justice, as articulated in *A Theory of Justice*. Rawls introduces the principle of the “veil of ignorance,” wherein individuals are tasked with discussing and establishing the general societal rules without considering their own interests. This approach accentuates the idea that every participant in the consensus possesses equal rights, thereby highlighting the necessity of a system aimed at the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

A further ethical perspective on consensus is found in the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas, who emphasizes the importance of respecting the individuality of others in ethical relationships. According to Levinas, making decisions that account for the needs of others ensures that both individuals and society as a whole can reach consensus in conflict resolution (Totality and Infinity, 1969: 56). Thus, consensus is not solely grounded in objective decision-making but is also underpinned by subjective ethical considerations and humanistic principles.

The formation of consensus is profoundly influenced by social structures and the collective consciousness of society. Pierre Bourdieu's theory of social fields provides valuable insight into this aspect. In his explanation of the manifestation of power structures and consciousness within social fields, Bourdieu illustrates the social and ideological disparities that exist between various segments of society. Consensus emerges only when there is a shift in the balance of power and social relations. This perspective highlights that consensus is not merely about agreement, but is also intrinsically tied to the regulation of power and ideological structures (The Logic of Practice: 1990: 98).

These philosophical frameworks and theories underscore the necessity of evaluating consensus not only from a practical standpoint but also in ethical and philosophical terms. The application of consensus in resolving social conflicts becomes feasible when both individual morality and the collective interests embedded within social structures are considered.

Consensus, Harmony, Stability, and Orderliness

Consensus represents the alignment of ideas and the harmony needed to regulate the social order of a society's population and unity. Therefore, consensus serves as the cornerstone for establishing both order and social stability. Its value becomes particularly evident in environments where social order is dominant, as it is believed to contribute to social stability by fostering cooperation and minimizing the likelihood of violence in conflict resolution. "The design of consensus has clear social benefits" (Day Christopher, 2003: 30), as it simplifies the identification of conflicting interests and demands, thereby seeking to limit disputes. "In numerous societies facing decline, the process of designing consensus could ignite a renaissance" (Day Christopher, 2003: 13).

Loyalty to shared values drives members of society to align with one another, embrace common goals, and reach an agreement on the norms that dictate how these goals should be realized. Such agreements are regarded as the most enduring, as they effectively eliminate the negative stances of both opposing parties. Instances where consensus is achieved despite differing opinions – where not everyone is compelled to think identically, but a collective decision is made through majority rule while ensuring the minority is not excluded – highlight the intricate nature of consensus. In reality, individuals often hold distinct views, pursue different objectives, and possess varied experiences, and consensus strives to reconcile these differences. In other words, it is a process through which everyone is afforded the opportunity to express their perspectives and endeavor to attain their goals. This is not merely an imperfect or concessionary decision but rather a process capable of generating outcomes that can affect all parties involved in one way or another. In certain societies, reaching consensus is driven by natural factors, rendering it inevitable. Additionally, the encouragement or facilitation of consensus is closely intertwined with geographic and geopolitical influences. For instance, "Saudi Arabia's primary interest in advancing inter-Arab consensus stems from its geopolitical and social vulnerabilities. Its expansive borders, vast yet sparsely populated territory, limited military forces required to protect oil resources from potentially destructive neighboring states, and the entrenched traditional tribal society experiencing modernizing pressures all contribute to this incentive" (Kostiner Joseph, 2009: 103). Consequently, consensus often plays a crucial role in regional security and politics.

The Application of Consensus in the Social Environment

The application of consensus should extend beyond the individual and global levels to various sectors of society, particularly in the resolution of conflicts and disputes. The creation of consensus within social and political spheres is founded upon mutual respect, understanding, and social agree-

ment. This extends beyond the realms of law and justice to encompass economic, cultural, and psychological considerations.

In the resolution of social and political conflicts, consensus involves arriving at a shared position by taking into account the diverse interests of different societal groups. In democratic systems, this often necessitates dialogue and cooperation among various segments of society. The process of resolving social conflicts through consensus is shaped not only by state mechanisms and law enforcement agencies but also through the interactions of non-governmental organizations, activists, and various community groups.

John Rawls' theory of justice serves as the cornerstone of this process. According to Rawls, "justice" is a social contract that guarantees equal rights for all citizens and ensures that the interests of different members of society are considered when addressing public matters. He contends that consensus must be achieved while respecting the rights of each individual within society. Additionally, Rawls' "difference principle" offers a vital framework for minimizing inequalities between various social groups in the context of conflict resolution.

Consensus within the cultural and economic spheres pertains to the recognition of equal rights among various social strata and economic groups, alongside the promotion of mutual understanding. This holds particular significance in addressing issues of economic development and social justice. For instance, government policies and programs aimed at reducing socio-economic disparities and inequalities play a crucial role in this context. Furthermore, consensus serves as a fundamental tool in intercultural dialogue, as agreement and cooperation are essential for the peaceful coexistence and mutual understanding of diverse cultural groups. Pierre Bourdieu's theory of social fields provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how consensus is formed among different societal groups. He underscores how power dynamics and social positioning shape the processes of conflict and dialogue between different societal strata. Bourdieu's concept of "social capital" defines the positioning, opportunities, and reciprocal relationships among social groups within a society. According to Bourdieu, the resolution of conflicts and the establishment of consensus can be achieved through the equitable distribution of social capital and the provision of equal opportunities.

Individual-Level Consensus Formation

At the individual level, consensus is influenced by psychological and emotional states. Positive interpersonal relations, dialogue rooted in empathy, and mutual respect are critical for conflict resolution and the fostering of understanding. A person's internal moral framework facilitates the attainment of consensus in interpersonal interactions. In this context, an individual's natural needs, social relationships, and personal interests converge. Numerous psychological studies have explored this topic. For example, Carl Rogers' theories on empathy and self-expression offer insight into how consensus is developed. Rogers asserts that individuals are more likely to reach consensus when they accurately express their emotions and needs while striving to understand the perspectives of others (Rogers, 2011: 105).

Challenges in Achieving Consensus

Several challenges can impede the process of achieving consensus. One of the foremost challenges is globalization. While globalization is an inevitable and distinctive process at the global level, it can introduce significant obstacles in reaching consensus. The cultural and religious diversities induced by globalization, economic inequalities, the influence of global powers on international politics, and technological advancements can all complicate the attainment of consensus. Moreover, factors such as pluralism can exacerbate the difficulties in forging consensus, as various groups and individuals endeavor to preserve their own interests and values, thereby hindering the development of mutually agreed-upon decisions. A major issue in the contemporary world is polarization, which serves to deepen societal rifts. "The heightened level of polarization complicates the achievement of consensus on politicized issues" (Jeong Ho-Won, 2010: 197). Developed societies often encounter difficulties

in comprehending the challenges faced by less-developed, conflict-prone societies. These disparities frequently exert a negative influence on consensus-building. Similarly, large, developed societies, by disregarding the issues faced by smaller communities and acting according to their own interests, adversely impact the consensus process. A salient example of this is the United States' withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2022. After 22 years, the U.S., which had analyzed Afghan society and its national and spiritual values through a unipolar lens, ultimately withdrew from Afghanistan without securing the long-anticipated consensus. This not only plunged Afghan society into further instability but also tarnished the U.S.'s international standing.

The formation of consensus in the modern world encounters numerous challenges. Social, cultural, and political differences significantly complicate this process. Moreover, the attainment of consensus in the context of global conflicts and international relations has become increasingly difficult. In such a scenario, the clash of competing interests and ideologies impedes the possibility of reaching mutual agreement.

Ideological and cultural opposition often represents a fundamental obstacle to the establishment of consensus. Divergences in political views, cultural frameworks, and values can effectively obstruct the pathway to agreement. Therefore, the process of consensus-building is not confined to legal and political matters alone but extends to intercultural dialogue and the mutual recognition of ethnic differences.

Social inequities and power imbalances also serve as critical barriers to the formation of consensus. Each social group has distinct interests and objectives, and reconciling these often proves unfeasible. Power asymmetries can result in the marginalization of weaker parties and the disregard of their rights and interests.

Conclusion. Consensus represents a vital mechanism grounded in mutual understanding and agreement among diverse members of society. It is central not only to the resolution of social conflicts but also to the philosophical underpinnings of both individual and collective morality. The application of consensus holds significant importance across multiple domains in the contemporary world, including political, cultural, and economic contexts. However, various factors, such as social structures, power dynamics, and cultural differences, hinder the process of consensus-building. Accordingly, future research should explore the social and philosophical foundations of consensus more deeply, considering the complexities and challenges it faces.

The social-philosophical essence of consensus presents a broad and profound subject. Consensus is a key social and philosophical concept that seeks to establish common ground between parties with divergent interests and values. The achievement of consensus within society is contingent upon the harmonization of differing perspectives, which is facilitated through mutual respect, empathy, and constructive dialogue. Therefore, it is inherent that consensus arises from the resolution of conflicts and the navigation of complex issues. Subsequently, through dialogue and deliberation, the final consensus is reached. From a philosophical perspective, consensus transcends a mere agreement; it is inherently connected to the principles of social justice, equality, and human rights. In this context, the attainment of consensus is not merely a conclusive outcome, but rather a process that ensures the recognition of the needs and interests of diverse groups within society, allowing each individual the opportunity to have their voice heard. However, the challenges involved in consensus formation remain of considerable contemporary relevance. In pluralistic societies, the process of consensus-building faces multiple obstacles. The collision of various ideologies and economic interests serves as a significant hindrance to consensus formation. Ultimately, consensus is a cornerstone of social justice, and the advancement of this process is vital for the overall well-being of society and the protection of minority groups.

References:

1. Kişi olmaya dair (To become a person), Rogers, C. (2011) Çevirmen: Aysun Babacan, Butlu: İstanbul: Ocak 2011. 586 s.
2. A Oberschall (1978). Theories of Social Conflict/ Annual Review of Sociology Volume 4, 1978. pp. 291-315 (Volume publication date August 1978). <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals>
3. Anarchy Works by Peter Gelderloos. Ardent Press, 2010. <https://files.libcom.org/files/Gelderloos>
4. Blondel, Jean and Inoguchi, Takashi (2006). Political Cultures in Asia and Europe: Citizens, states and societal values. New York: Routledge. 2006. 207 p,
5. Coser Lewis A. (1956) The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: The Free Press, 1956. 192 p.
6. Day, Christopher with Parnell, Rosie (2003). Consensus Design: Socially inclusive process. Burlington: Architectural Press, 2003. 241 p.
7. Fontana, Benedetto (2006). The Concept of Hegemony in Gramsci // Hegemony and Power: Consensus and Coercion in Contemporary Politics // Edited by Mark Haugaard and Howard H. Lentner, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2006, pp.23-44.
8. Galam, Serge and Moscovici, Serge (1991). Towards a theory of collective phenomena: Consensus and attitude changes in groups // European Journal of Social Psychology, 1991, Vol. 21, pp. 49-74.
9. Galtung, Johan (1996). Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute. 1996. 289 p.
10. Habermas, J. (1981). The Theory of Communicative Action, 1981
11. Hans Köchler (1997). Philosophical Foundations of Civilizational Dialogue. International Seminar on Civilizational Dialogue (3rd: 15–17 September 1997: Kuala Lumpur), BP171.5 ISCD. Kertas kerja persidangan / conference papers. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Library, 1997
12. Henry Kissinger (2001). Does America Need a Foreign Policy? Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century. ISBN 0-684-85567-4.
13. Homeira Moshirzadeh (2020). The Idea of Dialogue of Civilizations and Core-Periphery Dialogue in International Relations. All Azimuth V9, N2, 2020, 211-227. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1066093>
14. Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). Phenomenology of Spirit, 1807. 539 p.
15. Jeong, Ho-Won (2010). Conflict Management and Resolution. An introduction. New York: Routledge. 2010. 256 p.
16. Kostiner, Joseph (2009). Conflict and Cooperation in the Gulf Region. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009. 287 p.
17. Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus (1975). (Edition Suhrkamp 623), Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. Translated as *Legitimation Crisis*, Thomas McCarthy (trans.), Boston: Beacon Press
18. Roberto, Michael A. (2005). Why Great Leaders Don't Take Yes for an Answer: Managing for Conflict and Consensus, New Jersey: Wharton School Publishing, 304 p.
19. Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority (1969). Duquesne University Press, in English, translator ,Alphonso Lingis, 400 p.
20. The Logic of Practice, Bourdieu, P. (1990) Translated by Richard Nice. 1990. 330 p.