

**Syllabus**

**NEWEST DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FRANKFURT SCHOOL**

**SOCIOLOGY 6050**

**By**

**Rudolf J. Siebert**

**Professor of Religion and Society**

**Western Michigan University  
Department of Comparative Religion  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
2017**

*During times of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act. (George Orwell, writer 1903 - 1950).*

*No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it's not the same river and he's not the same man. (Heraclitus 540 – 470 BCE)*

“  
*At bottom, every man knows perfectly well that he is a unique being, only once on this earth; and by no extraordinary chance will such a marvelously picturesque piece of diversity in unity as he is, ever be put together a second time.” (Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900)*

*The best way to predict the future is to invent it. (Alan Kay, 1940-).*

*Unicumque homo est, ibi beneficio locus est*

*Wherever there is a human being there is an opportunity for a kindness. (Lucius Annaeus Seneca).*

*Three grand essentials to happiness in this life are something to do, something to love, and something to hope for. (Joseph Addison, 1672 – 1719).*

## **A. Course Description**

In our sociological discourse, we shall deal with the critical theory of society as Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, Ernst Bloch, Leo Löwenthal, Ossip Flechtheim, Siegfried Kracauer, Ludwig von Friedeburg, Alfred Schmidt, Jürgen Habermas, Karl Heinz Haag, Helmut Peukert, Edmund Arens, Helmut Dubiel, Axel Honneth, Steven Best, Douglas Kellner, Eduardo Mendieta, Michael Ott, Dustin Byrd, Rudolf Siebert, and others, have developed it so far in the by now globally recognized Frankfurt School. We shall concentrate particularly on the works of Habermas and Honneth, and their students in Europe and America and their concern with the human potential of language and memory and the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition in family, civil society, constitutional state and history, without neglecting, however, in the present global economic crisis the human potentials of work and tool, sexuality and eroticism as well as nationhood. The five human potentials or evolutionary universals are part of the system of human condition, including the world of nature, the inner world of man, the social world, the cultural world and the world of language. The dialectics of the antagonisms in the system of civil society point to the alternative global Futures I, II, or III. We shall particularly analyze the pathology of reason originating from, and being present in the social world, and affecting the other worlds as well. We shall concentrate on the human potentials of language and memory and of the struggle for recognition in the world of human subjectivity as a possible source of the pathology of reason, and the first location of its therapy (See website <http://www.rudolfjsiebert.org/>. See specifically Web Publications, Appendices A, B, C, D).

### ***Central Notions and Problems***

While Habermas belongs to the second generation of the Frankfurt School, he has deeply influenced the third, and fourth generations of critical theorists: Dubiel, Honneth, Gunzelin Schmid - Noerr, Claus Offe, Kellner, Mendieta, Peukert, Arens, and many others. Honneth belongs to the third generation of the Frankfurt School. We shall explore Habermas's and Honneth's thoughts on the following notions and problems: the struggle for recognition and personal and collective self-preservation; the struggle for recognition between the self-consciousness of the one and the other; recognition, conscience, duty and internal harmony; recognition and identity; recognition and self-esteem; recognition between master and servant in different historical stages; recognition between winner and loser; recognition between men and women; recognition between romantic

lovers; recognition between races; recognition between national states; recognition and the moral grammar of social conflicts; the struggle for self-preservation; crime and social morality; the structure of social recognition-relationships recognition and socialization. models and patterns of intersubjective recognition, love, right, solidarity, personal identity and disregard; rape, deprivation of rights; degradation, morality and social development; disregard and resistance; the moral logic of social conflicts; intersubjective conditions of personal integrity; a formal concept of social morality; critique of power and communicative action, reflective stages of a critical theory of society; struggle as the paradigm of the social, dialectic of enlightenment; interests of knowledge; species history; preventive wars; liberation from majority; the paradoxes of late global zing capitalism; paradoxes of recognition of work; empowerment and disciplination; responsibility in present capitalism; organized self-realization; paradoxes of individualization; emancipation of women and the children; globalization and human suffering; the limits of humanitarian politics; contradictions, ambivalences and paradoxes in the newer social theories; communitarianism; the moral foundations of modern societies; justice as fairness; communitarian critique of liberalism; patriotism as virtue or vice; the torn - to - pieces world of the social and of symbolical forms; critique of modernity; body-bound reason' ontological rescue of the revolution; intersubjectivity and struggle for recognition; moral consciousness and class domination and class struggle; normative action potentials; the other of justice; pathologies of the social; the social dynamic of disregard; morality of recognition; between justice and affective bond , tie or binding in the family, love and morality; decentralized autonomy; universalism as trap; conditions and limits of a politics of human rights; democracy as reflective cooperation; negative freedom and cultural membership and belonging; post-traditional communities; redistribution or recognition or participation; redistribution as recognition; recognition distorted beyond the point of recognition., We shall deal with modern scholars, who were particularly interested in the struggle for recognition: from Machiavelli through Hobbes and Hegel to Carl Schmitt, Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas Honneth and Dubiel. We shall, of course, also take into consideration, the positivistic critics of Habermas and Honneth and the Frankfurt School. Come and join us – anthropologists, historians, philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, and scholars of comparative religion! We are interdisciplinary in scope

### ***Political Ideals***

Not too long ago, after the end of World War II, a generation of young Germans, who had been liberated from the Nazi regime by American soldiers developed admiration for the political ideals of the American nation, that had helped to win the struggle for recognition against the barbarous forces of fascism in Europe and in Asia, and that soon became the driving force in founding the United Nations and in carrying out the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals. As a consequence, classical international law was revolutionized by limiting the sovereignty of nation-states, by abolishing the immunity of state authorities from supra-national prosecution, and by incorporating unprecedented crimes into the penal code of international jurisdiction. This generation also received Horkheimer and Adorno enthusiastically, when they, now American citizens, returned to Germany and reconstructed the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research. Horkheimer and Adorno became the intellectual leaders of the third great youth movement in the 1960s, which also reached into Michigan, Kalamazoo, and Western Michigan University.

### ***Civilizing Achievement***

Today. Horkheimer's and Adorno's disciple Habermas and Habermas 's disciple Honneth ask in the face of the second war against Iraq, if this same American nation should now brush aside its enormous success in the international struggle for recognition and its related civilizing achievement of legally domesticating the state of nature among belligerent nations. What recently has disturbed Habermas and Honneth most was the Bush Administration's new National Security Strategy of the United States and its uni-lateralism. According to

Habermas, with this provocative document, a superpower assumed the privilege of launching pre-emptive strikes against anyone who appeared to be sufficiently suspicious: it declared moreover its determination to prevent any competitor from even approaching a status of equal power: of equal recognition. Habermas's critique expressed fully the spirit of his teachers, Horkheimer and Adorno, when he protested against this imbalance of recognition in the international and historical sphere. Likewise the critical theorists are very uncomfortable about the American supported State of Israel's war against Lebanon, because of Hesbolah, and the likewise American supported Israeli war against the Gaza Strip, because of Hamas, They remember Horkheimer's critical but at the same time loyal attitude toward the State of Israel during the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem.

### ***Competing Theories***

While in our critical sociological discourse we shall concentrate on Habermas's and Honneth's critical theory of society and their disciples in Europe and America and particularly the human potentials of language and memory and the struggle for recognition, against the background of Georg W.F. Hegel's Jena System Design I and II, we shall take into consideration the competing theories on the Hegelian Right, in the Hegelian Center and on the Hegelian Left, in the praxis philosophy as well as in neo-conservatism and deconstructionism. Our discourse will reflect on possibilities of the further development of the critical theory of society with a particular emphasize on the evolutionary universals of language and memory and the struggle for recognition in discourse with competing alternative theories: particularly those of Karl Marx, and Friedrich Nietzsche, and August Comte and their followers up to the present We shall try to follow Habermas and Honneth theoretically and practically toward alternative Future III – a society, in which language mediated mutual recognition of individuals and nations can take place, and in which personal autonomy and universal solidarity will be reconciled, and in which a friendly and helpful living together of human beings will be possible, and in which even animals are not used as mere work- and war machines- but are recognized in their own vulnerability, mortality and rights .How can that be done?

### ***Discourse***

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we understand with Habermas and Honneth and their European and American disciples discourse as a privileged form of communicative action and rationality. Mimetic action and rationality are rooted in the human potential of language and memory and anticipation as well as in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition. The communicative action is characterized by five elements: 1. Subject, 2. Text, 3. Context or Situation, 4. Double structure, and 5. Intention or goal. Discourse can be defined as argumentative dialogue, in which the better arguments should win. We see discourse as the self-reflection of communicative action, particularly in times of crisis. Practical discourse is the very opposite of instrumental, functional, or strategic discussion. More precisely and concretely, we define discourse as future-oriented remembrance of human happiness and suffering, with the practical intent to increase the former and to diminish the latter. There has been a theological, philosophical and scientific phase of discourse in the past 6000 years of world history from the Euphrates, Nil, Indus and Yellow River cultures to the present modern civilization. In the critical theory of society all three forms of discourse are concretely superseded.

### ***Dialectical Method***

In our critical sociological discourse, we follow the critical theorists and particularly Habermas and Honneth in applying the dialectical method, which they inherited from George, W. F.Hegel's Phenomenology of

Spirit and Science of Logic, and which they transformed with the help of Karl Marx from an idealistic into a materialistic dialectic, and which Adorno further developed in terms of a negative dialectic - radical, but still determinate negation, and which they concretely superseded into their own theory of communicative action. We shall trace the history of human life forms and paradigms, as one of them determinately supersedes, i.e. not only critically negates, but also preserves and elevates and fulfills the previous one toward a historical goal, that is ultimately imageless and nameless and as such unknown. The critical theorists' dialectical method is not only rooted in Greek philosophy, e.g. in Heraclitus' philosophy of becoming, but also and most of all in the Jewish religion and civilization, in the second and third commandment of the Mosaic Decalogue - the prohibition against making images or naming the Absolute, and also in Immanuel Kant's tabu against the penetration of the dimension of the Thing in itself: God, Freedom and Immortality. Habermas and Honneth practice this prohibition even more radically than Horkheimer or Adorno, or any other of the older critical theorists have done. We shall continually compare our dialectical method with the different positivistic methodologies used today by the always more and more formalized, systematized, mathematized, quantified and technified social sciences in their many, extremely detailed, technical tasks.

### *The Notion*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we speak with Horkheimer and Adorno as well as with Habermas and Honneth, and unlike the positivists, still of the notion, understood as the dialectical unity of the universal, the particular and the singular, as Hegel had formulated it in his Logic: or of the essence, totality, or even truth or untruth of society. With Habermas and Honneth, we see modern civil society as a totality that reproduces and realizes itself antagonistically (See Appendix C). The social totality is characterized by contradictions or antagonisms, which since Auguste Comte's *Course de philosophie positive* have often been explained away or ideologically harmonized by positivistic sociologists. Comte was the father not only of sociology but also of positivism. We understand positivism with Adorno as the metaphysics of what is the case. To the contrary, Habermas and Honneth agree with Hegel and Marx, that the totality of modern civil society is driven beyond itself by what Hegel had called its own inner contradictions: be it by the antagonisms of man and nature, individual and collective, men and women, producers and consumers, owners and workers, rich and poor classes, luxury and misery, sacred and profane, or by what Comte named the dichotomy between the principle of order and the principle of progress, or between the static and the dynamic principle, or by what Marx determined as the contradiction between the productive relations and the productive forces. While Habermas and Honneth agree with Hegel, that the truth is the whole, they at the same time insisted with Adorno most emphatically, that the present social totality is still untrue. Today, the Left-Hegelian critical theorists, disciples of Habermas and Honneth, do not agree with the skeptical Right-Hegelian Francis Fukuyama, that present liberal democratic society is the end of history, or that the bourgeois is the last man. The present global economic crisis is proving how wrong Fukuyama has been. Also the present liberal democratic society is - like all previous social formations - driven by its own inner antagonisms beyond itself not into nothing or anything, but rather into alternative Future III - another, hopefully more humane life form. Habermas and Honneth do also disagree with Samuel Huntington, the student of Hobbes and of Carl Schmitt, the jurist and political theologian of Adolf Hitler, and present advisor of the Pentagon, that the clash of civilizations is unavoidable and that the struggle for recognition between the different religion - based cultures - e.g. the Islamic and Christian civilization- may lead into alternative Future II - a third world war. According to the Right Wing Fox News we are already in the third world war in the form of the war against Islamic terror. Habermas and Honneth rather promote with Kofi Annan, General Secretary of the UN, and with Seyed Mohammad Khatami, former President of Iran, and the Christian theologian Hans Küng a dialogue and the cooperation of cultures. We shall take seriously Habermas's present critique of the notion of totality on the basis of the linguistic turn, which he introduced into the critical theory of society.

## ***From Liberalism through Socialism to Fascism, and Back again***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall remember, that Adolf Hitler understood in his book *My Struggle* and in his *Second Book* and in his *Tabletalks* and in his overall folkish or nationalistic and racist folk philosophy fascism or national socialism as the counter-philosophy against Jewish Marxism in general, and specifically against the critical theory of society and the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, the so called “Café Marx”, the by now globalized Frankfurt School. Vice versa the critical theory was from the start most deeply opposed to positivism as well as to fascism in all their forms. Today the third generation of critical theorists in the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research – besides Honneth Alex Demirovic, Gerd Paul, Sabine Grimm, Klaus Ronneberg, Thomas von Freyberg, and Hans-Gerd Jaschke - discover, that Rightwing extremist groups and movements in Germany, and Europe, and America carry on and practice the same fascist philosophy of life against foreigners - Turks, gypsies, Yugoslavs, Jews, Arabs, etc. These Rightwing groups and movements are engaged in a nationalist and racist struggle for recognition in Germany, Europe and elsewhere. The Aryan race is in danger and thus must defend itself! From its very start, the critical theory understood itself as a counter-philosophy not only against positivism but also against the fascist philosophy of life, which the critical theorists considered to be interconnected. Hitler and Joseph Goebbels would have been recognized as the greatest positivists, if they had won the war. The critical theory came into existence at a time, when socialism had just won revolutions against nationalism in Russia and Germany, but when also already folkish, tribal, nationalist, and fascist elements began to prepare counter-revolutions, in the name of the resurrection of the Germanic nations and the Aryan race. In 1933, fascism won over socialism, and almost wiped it out by 1942. However, fascism was finally defeated by socialism in Stalingrad, Kursk, and Berlin in 1943 – 1945: to be sure not without the help by the high-bourgeois nations, and their Second Front. In 1989, racism, tribalism, nationalism, and fascism once more defeated socialism, to be sure, not without help of the neo-conservative governments of the liberal democratic societies. That gives the critical theory, as anti-fascist philosophy, a new actuality and importance. The struggle between nationalism and socialism, the fascist philosophy of life based in the aristocratic principle of nature and the critical theory of society, rooted in the Messianic law, reflects the inner antagonisms in present day civil society, which push it beyond itself into a post-modern Future: alternative global Future I – the totally administered society; or alternative global Future II – the entirely militarized society; or alternative global Future III – the reconciled society. The successful counter-revolution of 1989 claimed to have overcome socialism and fascism and to have established once and for all the victory of neo-liberalism. The present global liberal-capitalist disaster of 2008/2009 has disproven this claim. New ways must be found to achieve alternative Future III – a concrete liberal society in which personal autonomy and universal solidarity will be reconciled, and to prevent alternative Future I – brown or red fascism, from returning into history.

### ***Military Industrial Complex***

In terms of our dialectical sociological discourse, informed by the critical theory of Habermas and Honneth and their colleagues, fascism embraces sociologically a racial nation's military-industrial complex, the lower middle classes with a prevalence of the authoritarian personality, religious fundamentalism, and the charismatic leader, and cultural-anthropologically the myth of origin - unbroken by prophetic Messianism, the bourgeois principle of freedom - distorted by monopoly capitalism, and the hostility against all forms of socialism( See Appendices A,B,C,D). To be sure, we have chosen our theme, the critical theory, with its specific emphasis on Habermas and Honneth, and their specific forms of the critical theory, and their concentration on the notions of language and recognition, because of the present historical situation, in which in 1989 liberalism had won a counter-revolutionary victory not only over socialism, but also over cosmopolitanism, and in which thus neo-fascism rises again in many forms in many countries, in the East and in the West. There is the danger in America – long predicted by Horkheimer, Adorno, Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm - that

fascism will be introduced in the name of antifascism, unfreedom in the name of freedom. This danger has gained even greater actuality after September 11, 2001 and the consequent Patriot Act with all its explicit and implicit, manifest and latent implications: particularly the trends toward alternative global Futures II and II.

## ***Truth***

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we must never forget the fact that the critical sociologists are - unlike the more positivistic and technical social scientists - still concerned with the truth in an emphatic philosophical sense as the negation of untruth, i.e. ideology and mythology. That is particularly true of Horkheimer and Adorno, but also still for Habermas and Honneth . The critical theorists' concern with social issues leads them almost automatically to questions about the creation of alternative Future III - a better, or the right society, characterized by linguistically and understanding - mediated mutual recognition of the one and the other. The critical theorist as dialectician does not belong to those skeptical sociologists, who know, that all is swindle anyhow: that there is no revolution, and that there are no classes, and that all such things are only inventions of certain interest groups. It is the very rational of positivistic sociology, to elevate itself above those issues. The critical theorist does not agree with those sociologists - like e.g. Vilfredo Pareto, the teacher of Benito Mussolini - who resist and negate such theologumena of theoretical thinking like the truth, the essence, or the totality, because everything is conditioned by particular social interests anyhow. They do not agree with Foucault, for whom everything in social life was a matter of power, rather than as for Habermas and Honneth a matter of mutual understanding and recognition, West-German positivistic sociologists, who have taken over chairs in East German universities, are driven mad, when their East German students and colleagues still continually ask concerning every project, how it can possibly improve society, instead of simply registering the facts and data, or simply what is the case. Definitely, the critical theorists try to promote the long march of man from animality to alternative Future III – the realm of freedom, the truth. . When Habermas studies religion, then he does so because he wants to know, what its fragments of communicative rationality and action can possibly contribute to the humanization of man toward alternative Future III. . The mass murderer Pontius Pilatus, Roman Governor of Palestine, asked skeptically: What is truth? The positive social sciences in late capitalist society do not even ask that question any longer. For them the truth question has become obsolete: a metaphysical residual from the Middle Ages. For them truth has shrunk in terms of the correspondence theory into the correctness of protocol statements about quantified facts and data. The critical theory tries through the identification of the untruth – the disregard, neglect, contempt, humiliation, degradation, torture etc. of human beings - to open up the horizon for the truth - alternative Future III - the socio-ethical totality characterized by mutual recognition through mutual understanding. The critical theorist works for the day, when abstract liberal democratic society will change its identity in such a way, that also such human actions and attitudes, which do not carry a price tag, do nevertheless have a value, into alternative Future III - the free society, in which personal autonomy and universal, i.e. anamnestic, present and proleptic solidarity will be reconciled, and in which friendly living together of human beings – and even plants and animals - will be possible.

## ***Social Technology***

In our dialectical sociological discourse, we shall be very clear about the difference between the critical theory of society - rooted in the human potential of language and memory and anticipation and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition - on one hand, and social technology - based in the human potential of work and tools - on the other. With Habermas and Honneth, we shall be aware of the fact, that from Comte on up to Talcott Parsons and Niklas Luhmann sociology had always had a certain technocratic tendency pointing toward alternative Future I - the totally mechanized, automated, computerized, robotized, and bureaucratized signal society. There was always present in positive sociology a tendency toward social

engineering. There always existed the faith and the hope, that scientific experts, who use certain mainly quantitative methodological techniques, can bring about - if people only surrender to them openly or indirectly the control over society - a balanced, stable, functioning social condition, in which - through extensions, improvements, ameliorations, and corrections - the old system of human condition or action system can be maintained for ever, and the truth can be prevented from coming into existence: alternative Future III - a reconciled society. Habermas has discussed this issue with Parsons and Luhmann for many years. Where Luhmann was concerned with social engineering, Habermas spoke of communicative and discourse ethics. Self-preservation is an essential category of social engineering. Language-mediated recognition is an essential category of communicative ethics. The human freedom - history consists of a sequence of forms and stages of linguistically mediated mutual recognition in family, civil society, state, history and culture.

### ***Instrumental Rationality***

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall agree with Adorno's insight, that even Marx, who was very critical of Comte and positive sociology in general, nevertheless shared not only Saint Simon's but also Comte's faith in the primacy of technical science, techniques, technology, engineering, shortly instrumental rationality and action rooted in the evolutionary universal of work and tools. Marx was on one hand of the very optimistic opinion, that the status of the technical productive forces must assert itself as the key category of society, while on the other hand he considered the specific productive relations, i.e. the order of private property, depending always on their position in relation to the means of production, as the really determining factor of the social process as production process. Marx did not answer adequately the question, what really determined social life: the technical productive forces or the productive relations? It is possible, that this Marxian theoretical ambiguity has something to do with the practical collapse of the really existing socialism in Eastern Europe in 1989, and the victory of the neo-liberal counterrevolution. During my teaching activities in Eastern Europe in the past 30 years, I often had the impression, that the change in the productive relations - the partial socialization of the means of production - had not been able to unfetter the productive forces, but rather chained them, at least to some extent, and at some times. Of course, those thinkers, who worry about the ecological consequences of the unchaining of the productive forces, should really not complain about their socialist or bourgeois fettering. That Habermas and Honneth – following Adorno and Horkheimer - shifted from the human potential of work and tool to the evolutionary universals of language and memory and the struggle for recognition, that did not mean that they forgot the former: or at least that one would hope. The price for such forgetfulness would be the transformation of the critical theory into an uncritical one: from the support of revolutionary to the support of counterrevolutionary tendencies in civil society. Habermas and Honneth, however, continue in the spirit of the first generation of critical theorists to work for an identity change in antagonistic civil society toward alternative Future III. They are optimistic enough to believe that alternative Future I – the totally administered society, and alternative Future II - the militarized society, can be modified or even prevented through critical social movements. Habermas and Honneth's linguistic turn in the critical theory of society, which included the categories of mutual understanding as well as mutual recognition, remains progressive as long as it does not abandon and is connected with the category or work and tool.

### ***Productive Forces and Productive Relations***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall share with Habermas and Honneth their dialectical conception of society. Their theory of communicative action does not negate dialectics abstractly but rather concretely: i, e. it critically negates dialectics, but it also tries to preserve and to elevate and to fulfill it. In terms of such a dialectical notion of society, a teaching of the absolute preeminence is it of the productive forces or of the productive relations is not really possible. In reality, such priority changes all the time, depending on the



status of the class struggle in globalizing late capitalist society. As long as it was in the interest of the rising bourgeoisie, to unchain the forces of production, there existed certain equilibrium between productive forces and productive relations. At that time, Marx was justified to consider the productive forces as the key category. But the present monopoly - and oligopoly - capitalist system is very different from the liberal capitalist situation, in which Marx lived and theorized. Today, it is in the interest of the capitalist owners - in spite of all the talk about the industrial society instead of the late capitalist society - that the productive relations have the supremacy over the technical productive forces. This supremacy reflects itself in the political struggle. Thus e.g. on our local level in the 1994 - campaign for the Michigan Governorship, the incumbent Republican Governor, John Engler, called his democratic challenger, Howard Wolpe, a blue-eyed liberal, who is out of step with reality, and Wolpe called Engler a friend of the rich people, and of the large corporations. Wolpe lost. But in 2002 a liberal democratic woman won the Governorship of Michigan. She probably was a little bit more to the center of the political spectrum than Wolpe. But political progress is obviously possible. In any case, Habermas and Honneth stress the political over the economic without however – hopefully – not neglecting the latter. It is in the political dimension, which Marx somewhat neglected as mere super-structure, that the struggle for recognition takes place. Certainly the class struggle is not only one for material gains, but also for political recognition: the end not only of hunger, but also of disregard, degradation and humiliation and life-endangering neglect of the lower classes: e.g. in the case of the miners in the West Virginia mining corporations in the last 130 years.

### *Inhomogeneity*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall see from the ambiguities and problems of positive sociology with Habermas and Honneth, why it cannot possibly be such a relatively unanimous science as e.g. medicine, or jurisprudence. The reason for this inhomogeneity of positive sociology lies in the antagonisms of liberal democratic society, which it studies, as well as in its own contradictory character. When sociology begins to deny or cover up the antagonisms in civil society or harmonizes them, it turns into bourgeois ideology: understood as false consciousness, masking of class and national interests or simply as untruth. It becomes untrue. The very fact, that the Republican Government of Michigan excluded sociology from the social sciences, proves that it still contains some critical elements. Sociology remains critical as long as it connects the categories of understanding, work, and recognition.

### *Potential for Change*

In our dialectical sociological discourse, we shall agree with Habermas and Honneth, that sociology should not only be a collection of social data, but beyond that the insight into society in its totality: into what is essential in society. Sociology should be the insight into - as Ludwig Wittgenstein put it - what is the case in society, but in such a way, that this insight is critical in the sense, that it measures its facts, by what it, the society itself, claims to be, in order thus to discover in its contradiction between its data and its idea or aspiration, at the same time the potentials for change of the total system of human condition and of the total action system toward alternative Future III. This, of course, is not to be taken as a definition of sociology. Unlike for the positive social scientists, e.g. Max Weber, for the dialectical theorist there can be – as for Friedrich Nietzsche before – no verbal definition at the beginning of his research, but at best only at its end: after the research has been done. All things, which have a history, cannot be defined. Society has a history. At best we can have a working definition and can say that modern civil society is an exchange process, which is supposed to be equivalent.

## *Auschwitz*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall discover, that Habermas and Honneth, when they - unlike the positivists - speak about the essential in society, they are also always concerned with the practical. They hold on to the theory-praxis dialectic. In the critical theory of society certain subjectively directed, social-psychological questions, which in relation to the structural problems of society may not have great importance, have great practical relevance nevertheless, because after Auschwitz at least there must be the interest, that what has happened, shall not happen again. For the critical theorists, Auschwitz is prototypical for something that since then has again and again repeated itself. What is wrong with Schindler's List, is not the movie's assertion, that there are sometimes capitalists, who give their surplus value back to the exploited workers, or that there were also good Nazis - which all fits well into the present Rightwing-revisionism in Europe and America to the point, that Hitler's Asiatic cruelty was supposedly only the response to Joseph Stalin's Asiatic cruelty, or that the Holocaust never took place at all - but rather the pretense, that what happened then is over now once and for all, in spite of the growing Rightwing extremism, including anti-Semitism, everywhere: not to speak of Afghanistan and Iraq, Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay. During the Senate race of 1994, Colonel Oliver North had at his disposal 20 million dollars. Who pays him? Cui bonum? Since that time North is on Fox News every night showing movies about World War II and promoting militarism in direction of alternative Future II. In the present homeland-defense discussions and arrangements the former shadow government behind the Reagan Administration, of which North was a part, has come out of the shadow and threatens quite openly particular human and civil rights on the national and international level. Habermas's and Honneth's critical theory of society can be understood only against the background of Auschwitz, its roots and its present day and future consequences.

## *The State of Israel*

The remembrance of Auschwitz determines Habermas's and Honneth's attitude toward the rise of the State of Israel. Thus, Habermas, following the first mainly Jewish generation of critical theorists, found himself in agreement with the former German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer's repeated attempts to get the Quartet – the United States, Russia, the European Union and the UN – engaged in a joint effort to arrive at and guarantee a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. Habermas remembered that this conflict also has roots in German and European history. Most recently - January 2008 - the Iranian and other Government have stressed this point again in the face of the war of Israel against the Gaza Strip. According to Habermas, since the founding of the German Federal Republic solidarity with Israel has been an unwritten law of German foreign politics, no matter who ever was in charge, and it will remain so for the time being in spite of strains produced by the Israeli Government's often degrading behavior toward the Palestinians. In Habermas's perspective, the recent German national elections have proved again and again that anti-Semitism is at present, not a danger within the larger German population either. Throughout his work Habermas has continued the whole first generation of critical theorist's struggle against nationalism, fascism, racism, particularly anti-Semitism. At the same time Habermas appreciated the Palestinian struggle for political recognition in direction of the establishment of a Palestinian state besides the State of Israel. By the way, none of the Jewish members of the first generation of critical theorists was a Zionist. Horkheimer was critical of the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem. The critical theorist will not forget that the bombardments of the Gaza Strip in December 2008 and January 2009, which have cost the lives of over 400 Palestinians and injured and wounded over 2000, was provoked by Hamas rocket attacks on Southern Israel. But he will also remember, that the rocket attacks of Hamas from the Gaza Strip into Southern Israel, have been provoked in the past 2 years by the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip, which prevented its sovereignty. The critical theorists are continually engaged in time - diagnosis and - prognosis in search for the truth.

## ***Resistance against the Horrible***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall share with Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas and Honneth their emphatic longing, hope, and interest, that wherever and whenever the horrible happens again in history, it shall be effectively resisted. Adorno stressed, that even if those terrible things are seemingly non-essentials or merely epiphenomena of the social process in its totality, that the interest to prevent them should, nevertheless, determine the choice of the means and of the problems of sociological research. Adorno thought, that if 6 million innocent people are murdered, because of paranoid fascist delusions, then that is important, even if in sociological terms it is merely an unessential epiphenomena, a mere derivation, and not the key to the whole of society. According to Adorno, such genocide has simply through the dimension of the horror, which is intrinsic to it, such weight, such significance, and such right, that at this point the pragmatism is correct, which demands, that that knowledge is to be promoted and is to receive priority, which aims at the future prevention of such moral catastrophes. Habermas and Honneth share such pragmatism as they develop the categories of mutual understanding and recognition.

## ***The Aristocratic Principle of Nature***

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall speak about five races - the African, Asian, Middle Eastern, European, and Malaysian race - and the tribes and nations, into which each race has differentiated it. With the critical theorists, we shall determine racial tribalism and nationalism as the attitude of a race, tribe, or nation to apply - what Hitler called in his book *My Struggle* - the Aristocratic Principle of Nature: the law of racial and national self-assertion and self-preservation, the law of the survival of the fittest race and nation, the right of the predator-race or -nation over the prey-race or -nation to enslave, and to exploit, and even to annihilate it, as e.g. in the case of the Shoa or the Holocaust. The aristocratic principle is of Machiavellian, Hobbesian, Darwinian origin. It is rooted in the human potential of work and tool, of purpose rationality directed toward the survival of individuals and collectives. The symbol of the Aryan aristocratic principle of nature is the swastika in whatever form. The Aryan aristocratic principle of nature is the abstract negation of the Judeo-Christian, prophetic-Messianic law of the wolf, which lives with the lamb; of the panther, which lies down with the kid; of the calf and the lion cub, which feed together, with a little boy to lead them; of the cow and the bear, which make friends, and the young of which lie down together; of the lion, which eats straw like the ox; of the infant, who plays over the cobra's hole; of the young child, who puts his hand into the viper's lair (Isaiah 11). The Messianic law is rooted in the human potential of language and memory aiming at mutual understanding, and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition aiming at mutual recognition and equality between the one and the other. Once in the early stages of the European development, the Judeo-Christian Messianic law concretely superseded the most primitive and archaic Aryan aristocratic principle of nature, at least on the cultural level, and as vision and hope. Fascism is an extremely regressive form of racial nationalism. The critical theory resists the Aryan aristocratic principle of nature, and the consequent fascist regression, in the name of the secularized Messianic law. All the earlier critical theorists were assimilated and secularized Jews, who through German idealism - from Immanuel Kant through Johann, G.Fichte and Friedrich, W.J.Schelling to Georg W.F.Hegel - found their emancipatory way from orthodox Judaism to modern bourgeois, Marxian, and Freudian enlightenment, and thus were able to prepare and to initiate a fourth modern enlightenment, in which our critical sociological discourse participates, and which it promotes. The second, third and fourth generation of critical theorists is mostly no longer Jewish, but continues nevertheless to pursue the realization of the Messianic law inverted into the secular discourse among the expert cultures: particularly into their secular critical theory of society

## *The Authoritarian and Democratic Personality*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we see with Erich Fromm and Adorno as well as with Habermas and Honneth the authoritarian or fascist personality as being characterized social-psychologically by 1. Romanticism, 2. Nationalism, 3. Pro-capitalistic attitude, 4. Sadistic tendencies, 5. Masochistic tendencies, and 6. Racism. The authoritarian or fascist personality is the very opposite of the revolutionary or democratic personality, characterized by 1. Future orientation, 2. Internationalism, 3. Pro-socialist attitude, and 4. The sublimation of aggressive and libidinous forces, 5. The tendency toward national and racial equality in terms of a truly pluralistic and multi-cultural, liberal democratic or socialist society. We understand with Habermas and Honneth democracy in terms of collective will-formation in the framework of a public discourse, which follows the Golden Rule and its fundamental principles of a global ethos – the humanity principle, non-violence, solidarity, justice, honesty, tolerance, equality and partnership of man and woman - which is present and grounded in all living world religions and humanisms, or its secularization in the Kantian categorical imperative, or in Habermas's communicative ethics, which aims at what Charles Peirce and Karl-Otto Apel had called the universal communication community, and which considers only such norms to be valid, which can find consent from all people concerned, particularly from the possible innocent victims. We determine revolution as the not only quantitative, but also - and particularly so - qualitative, and even radical and Messianic supersession of a previous, incomplete social and historical form of recognition: the critical negation of its negative aspects, as well as the preservation, elevation, and fulfillment of its positive elements.

## *Cultural Origin*

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall explore through Horkheimer and Adorno as well as through Habermas and Honneth the cultural origin and background of the critical theory of society, particularly its aesthetical and religious components. It is ultimately rooted in the Judeo-Christian, and Greek tradition, in Jerusalem and Athens, rather than in Rome, where fascism has found many of its impulses. But also other religious and aesthetical traditions - e.g. Hinduism, Buddhism, or the Egyptian tradition play an important role in the genesis of the critical theory of society. Furthermore, the critical theory concretely supersedes in itself German idealism from Immanuel Kant through Johann, G. Fichte and Friedrich W.J. Schelling to Georg, W. F. Hegel. The critical theory also determinately negates in itself the materialistic philosophies of Karl Marx, Arthur Schopenhauer, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Sigmund Freud. In general, the critical theory also understands itself as the concrete super session of the great world religions and the great systems of philosophy. Finally, it also contains in itself an interdisciplinary program: it determinately negates in itself the positive social sciences, as they have developed since Hegel and Comte. Certainly we cannot understand any of the critical theorists and particularly not Habermas and Honneth and their critical theory without deeper knowledge of Kant and Hegel.

## *Hegelian Right, Left and Center*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we remember, that Hegel's school split into the Hegelian Right, Center, and Left. Today, the three main theories of modernity - praxis philosophy, neoconservatism, and deconstructionism - trace their origin to Hegel. The praxis philosophy is connected with Hegel through Marx. Neoconservatism is related to Hegel through the bourgeois evolutionists, liberalism, Carl Schmitt, Joachim Ritter, and E. Forsthoff. Deconstructionism is rooted in Hegel through Friedrich Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger. The praxis philosophy stands on the Hegelian Left. Neoconservatism and deconstructionism are situated on the Hegelian Right. The critical theory belongs to the wider constellation of the praxis philosophy, together with Marxism, American pragmatism, French existentialism, and Freudianism. Habermas and Honneth continue the tradition of the praxis philosophy.

## ***The Sacred and the Profane***

In our dialectical sociological discourse, we shall identify with the critical theorists two major problems of modernity: the dichotomy between the sacred and the profane, and the contradiction between universal, i.e. anamnestic, present and proleptic solidarity, on one hand, and personal autonomy on the other. We shall trace the dialectical historical movement from the traditional unity of the religious and the secular through their modern differentiation to their possible postmodern reunion in alternative Future III. Likewise, we shall follow the movement from the traditional unity of solidarity and autonomy through their modern differentiation, to a possible post-modern reconciliation in alternative Future III. We shall see, how particularly Habermas and Honneth deal with those two cardinal modern problems, and their resolution. Adorno has introduced the notion of the open dialectic between the religious and the secular as well as between autonomy and solidarity. Habermas and Honneth continue to promote such open dialectic in terms of mutual understanding and recognition.

## ***Fundamental Conditions***

In our critical theoretical discourse, we must - like the critical theorists, particularly Habermas and Honneth - obey 10 fundamental conditions, if it is to succeed: 1. Ideal speech situation, 2. Power-free zone, 3. Direction toward the unlimited communication community, 4. Ideology critique, 5. Mythology critique, 6. Objections, 7. Mutual understanding, 8. Mutual recognition and respect, 9. The law of universalization, 10. Innovative speech acts.

## ***The Other, or Inverse Theology***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall follow Adorno and his teacher and friend Benjamin, as they tried to give their critical theories of society a grounding in another or inverse theology. This theology is different from all the other theologies, that can be found in Hegel's dialectical philosophy, or on the Hegelian Right, or in the Hegelian Center, or on the Hegelian Left: a theology of the insatiable longing and hope for the entirely Other, as the determinate negation of what is the case, particularly what Habermas calls in Adorno's spirit the human perils. While Habermas and Honneth do not emphasize like Adorno and Horkheimer the notion of the totally Other, their other or inverse theology is, nevertheless, concretely superseded in their methodological atheism. With Adorno's and Benjamin's inverse theology Habermas and Honneth still allow semantic or semiotic potentials to migrate from the depth of the religious mythos into the secular discourse of the expert cultures, and through it into the communicative praxis and the language mediated struggle for recognition from one stage of social evolution to the next.

## ***Five Human Potentials***

In critical-theoretical perspective, what Hegel said in his famous Jena System Designs I and II the five human potentials - 1. Language and memory, 2. Work and tool, 3. Sexual and erotic love, 4. The struggle for recognition, and 5. Nationhood - remains of greatest importance not only for Horkheimer and Adorno, but also still for Habermas and Honneth. There had been initial tendencies among the critical theorists to ground the critical theory with Karl Marx in the human potential of work and tool, or with Sigmund Freud in the evolutionary universal of sexual and erotic love, or with Friedrich Nietzsche in the struggle for recognition.

more recently particularly Habermas and Honneth have been engaged - with the help of Karl-Otto Apel - in a linguistic paradigm change in the development of critical theory, and have tried to ground it in the human potential of language and memory and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition and their communicative rationality, and from there to critique the instrumental rationality rooted in the human potential of work and tool, which is still dominant in monopoly capitalist and socialist societies. Of course Horkheimer and Adorno had criticized instrumental rationality and the corresponding positivism long before Habermas's linguistic turn, but without naming and defining expressively their own theoretical basis communicative action and rationality. We shall take all five human potentials most seriously.

### ***Five World Model***

In our dialectical sociological discourse, we shall share with Horkheimer and Adorno as well as with Habermas and Honneth and the other critical theorists their five-world model, which they have inherited from Plato and Aristotle, as well as from Schelling, Fichte and Hegel: 1. The world of nature, 2. The internal world of man, 3. The social world, 4. The cultural world, and 5. The world of language. With each of the five worlds are connected five validity claims: 1. Truth, 2. Honesty, 3. Rightfulness, 4. Tastefulness, and 5. Understandability. All five validity claims constitute together with the law of universalization Habermas's and Honneth's discourse or communicative ethics. In discourse each validity claim can concretely be challenged. In each discourse each challenged validity claim must be redeemed with good reasons. Please, challenge continually our discourse on the basis of the five validity claims grounded in the five-world model. The realization of the five validity claims is the result of a process of understanding and recognition.

### ***Theodicy***

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we cannot avoid the theological core problem of Adorno and Horkheimer's critical theories: the theodicy (theos - God; dikae - justice) problem. The critical theory shares this core problem with all great world religions, art forms, and philosophies. Thus we find the theodicy problem present in the Job and Jesus Story, in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Werther and Faust, in Ludwig van Beethoven's 9th Symphony, and in Hegel's philosophy of history. It is the problem of God's justice in the face of the injustice of his world. It is the problem of finitude, natural and moral evil, loneliness, abandonment, and meaninglessness, fear of illness, aging, dying, and death. The religious theodicy has found its classical expressions in the Buddha Story, the Job Story, and the Jesus Story. A positive religion rises, when it is able to solve the theodicy problem on a certain level of human evolution, as learning and recognition process. A positive religion moves into a crisis, or even into a niche of history, or simply "dies", when it can no longer solve the theodicy problem on a higher level of human language, learning, experience, and recognition. The same is true with art. After Auschwitz I, II, and III and Treblinka, Coventry and Dresden, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq, and all the horror and terror of the 20th and 21st centuries, these names stand for, all living world religions, art forms and philosophies have a hard time, to solve the theodicy problem, and are thus in a crisis. It can go both ways: the renewal of a religion or an art form, or a philosophy, or its disintegration, and the birth of a new religion, art, or philosophy. Our globe is the cemetery of many positive religions, art forms and philosophies, which at a certain point in history were no longer able to solve the theodicy problem, and therefore became implausible and unacceptable and thus had to die. The theodicy notion has moved from its primitive beginning - human suffering is the consequence of secret sins - through three major paradigm changes: the monistic, dualistic, and dialectical change. The theodicy problem is present also in the secular social sciences. Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud had a theodicy in the sense of the scientific exploration of human suffering, its nature, causes and consequences. Max Weber was concerned with the theodicy problem. Habermas and Honneth take the theodicy problem as seriously as Horkheimer, Benjamin, or

Adorno. The critical theory of society concretely supersedes, i.e. critically negates, but also preserves and elevates all religious and secular theodicy forms: the talion-theodicy, the test-theodicy, the freedom-theodicy, the shame-theodicy, the love-theodicy, particularly the eschatological theodicy.

### ***Theory - Praxis Dialectic***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall emphasize with Habermas and Honneth the fact, that the critical theory is necessarily connected with praxis. It is rooted in the human potentials of language, love and recognition. Christianity introduced praxis into world-history: understood as the liquidation of exploitation, degradation, and humiliation of human beings: negative forms of recognition. That is the truth of Christianity. Its untruth is, that it understood praxis only in religious terms. Following Marx, the critical theorists continued to secularize praxis as the negation of all forms of exploitation: particularly of the private appropriation of surplus value, the very heart of capitalism. This was not only a matter of work but also of recognition. The critical theorist moves into praxis, and then carries his practical experiences back into his theory again, and with the enriched theory moves back into praxis again. The critical theory continually develops through such theory-praxis dialectic. Contrary to the critical theorists, positivistic sociologists often suppress together with the theory-praxis dialectic also words like praxis, exploitation, or surplus value, or lack of recognition in the interest of the owners: prefascist language regulation. It is paradoxical enough, that the critical theorists, who mostly came from the middle German bourgeoisie, used such politically incorrect words, while their positivistic opponents, who often come from the low bourgeoisie and even from the working classes, suppress them. It is possible that the critical theorists by using those words protested - in Freudian terms - against their rich fathers in the name of the secularized Jewish, prophetic-Messianic law of mutual recognition and equality, which the latter violated in the process of getting rich from other people's labor. Adorno was the son of a rich wine merchant in Frankfurt a. M. Horkheimer's father was an industrialist in Stuttgart, Germany, and the son by working in his father's factory could observe, how he became rich through his workers sweat and blood: their surplus labor. The young Horkheimer reflected on this experience in a poetical form in his early diaries and plays during World War I. Habermas's grandfather was a seminary director. His father was a state official. Most critical theorists come from the bourgeoisie. Often positivistic social scientists are not engaged in social action, and social activists have no social theory. We shall explore, why people on the Hegelian Right and Left, and in the Center are forming theories at all, and why they apply them to praxis, or not.

### ***Social Objectivity***

In our critical - theoretical discourse, we shall agree with Adorno, that the notion of society has its objective basis in the conceptual essence or in the abstraction-relationship of the social objectivity itself, which is given through the exchange process. The social totality, in which we live, speak, remember, work, love, and struggle for recognition, and which we can feel with every step, which we take, and in each of our communicative or instrumental actions, is not conditioned through an immediate all-embracing being with each other in the sense of Plato's, or Aristotles, or Hegel's. socio-ethical totality, characterized by mutual recognition mediated through mutual understanding. This social totality is rather conditioned through our being separated and alienated from each other in modern antagonistic civil society: as it happens through the abstract exchange relationship. This exchange relationship is a unity not only of separated individuals. It is rather a unity, which realizes and constitutes itself precisely through the separation- and abstraction- mechanism of the different markets of modern bourgeois society. Thus, this social unity is the exact opposite of all organizistic and holistic social ideas and ideals of Antiquity and the middle Ages. Those organizistic representations may in backward

projection be applied to agricultural areas, where they have also probably never been valid. Certainly, such holistic ideas are not valid for the today prototypical, highly industrialized countries. If the critical theorist wants to characterize the notion of society, then the concept of the system, of an in a certain sense abstractly imposed order, as we find it in the structural functionalism of Parsons and Luhmann, would be much more adequate than the traditional notion of totality or of the organic. Of course, the critical theorist wants to make sure, that when he speaks about the system of society, this does not only mean his own subjective systematization of social facts, but that the systemic character is intrinsic to the society itself.

### *Alienation*

In our dialectical sociological discourse, we must be aware of the fact, that Adorno - unlike Marx and the Marxists - does not really like to use the word alienation, because it is often psychologized. But Adorno cannot deny the fact, that the word alienation aims at the very system-character intrinsic to modern society. We live in an antagonistic social totality, which unites human beings only via their alienation. For Adorno, the present liberal democratic society is mediated only through individuation. For Adorno, that insight has also the critical meaning, that precisely through its insisting and persisting on the principium individuationis the social totality keeps itself alive and reproduces itself: to be sure, with much groaning and with unspeakable sacrifices and sufferings. This happens through the fact, that in the dominant forms of modern civil society the individual human beings seek merely for their individual advantage, their individual surplus value, or profit. In the modern antagonistic social totality, personal autonomy to the point of utter selfishness has swallowed up universal, i.e. anamnestic, present, and proleptic solidarity. To be sure, we can also be solidary with each other after a hurricane- flood- or earthquake- catastrophe. But after a few weeks at most - as soon as the capitalist system is restored to normal again - all solidarity once more disappears. While Eastern-European socialist societies lost all recognition and collapsed, because of a lack of personal sovereignty, some day Western capitalist societies may lose all recognition and break down, because of a lack of solidarity. Adorno's critical theory aims at alternative Future III - a reconciliation of autonomy and solidarity. So does Habermas and Honneth's critical theory of society based on the principles of mutual understanding and recognition.

### *Antagonistic Reproduction*

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall take seriously Adorno's thesis, that precisely through the fact that the totality of modern society does not keep itself alive and reproduces itself through mutual understanding and recognition and universal solidarity, but rather through the antagonistic interests of the individuated individuals, through their contradictions rather than through a unified social total subject, it develops together with its progressing rationalization and integration at the same time also traits of progressing irrationality and disintegration. Adorno and Horkheimer expressed this connection of modern rationalization and irrationality, integration and disintegration through the notion of the dialectic of enlightenment: the regression of enlightenment into the mythology, out of which it once arose, and from which it once liberated itself. According to Adorno, with the always-increasing integration of modern society, as a visible phenomenon, come along tendencies toward a disintegration of society in certain deeper strata. In that disintegration, different social processes, which are welded together, but which to a large extent grow out of divergent and contradictory interest-situations and -positions, move against each other, instead of maintaining that element of neutrality and relative mutual indifference, which they once had in earlier stages of the societal development and process of recognition. Adorno observes this social disintegration most clearly particularly in extreme situations of the late capitalist society, as e.g. in fascism. Habermas and Honneth try to overcome the dialectic of enlightenment through their theory of communicative action characterized by the principle of progressing inter-subjective, understanding - mediated mutual recognition



## ***Behemoth***

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall pay particular attention to the critical theorist Franz Neumann, whom Adorno appreciated very much and who produced in his work *Behemoth* the most adequate social-economical representation of fascism, which exists so far. In his *Behemoth* Neumann showed, that precisely the social and systemic integration under fascism is a surface issue, and that under the very thin veil of the authoritarian and totalitarian state rages an almost archaic and anarchical struggle of different social groups with each other. Adorno did not exclude the possibility, that such disintegrative struggles go on also in more peaceful periods of the late capitalistic society: e.g. today not only under the name of Right wing extremism, but also under the cover of the notions of pluralism, or of multi-culturalism. Adorno considered such pluralism or multiculturalism to be ideological: i.e. false consciousness, masking of national or class interests, shortly untruth. He believed, that the antagonistic social forces, which exist side by side in liberal democratic society, are after all in reality held captive, and are essentially determined by the all-dominating social system, under which we live. We shall try to explore and clarify with the help of Habermas and Honneth particularly those issues - like rationalization and irrationality, integration and disintegration - in liberal democratic society, which the older critical theorists could not yet be clear about: often simply because they lived in earlier stages of the development of capitalist society: in earlier stages not only of the struggle for self-preservation and survival, but also in the fight for new forms of mutual understanding and recognition.

## ***Positivism***

In our dialectical sociological discourse, in agreement with Adorno we understand positivism as an abstraction from the modern positive sciences, and more concretely as the critique of knowledge, which attributes to the exact positive sciences the last judgment about reality. We take positivism into our discourse, in so far as aesthetical or religious experiences are not allowed to state anything as the truth, which comes into conflict with the positive sciences. The seemingly irreconcilable modern contradiction between faith and knowledge has its main cause in the fact, that only too often theologians or artists or philosophers have made assertions, for which they were not competent. They only too often posited as reality, what had symbolical meaning. For us - like for Adorno - positivism is right, in so far as the establishment of the empirical reality is concerned. Positivism is wrong, in so far as it simply acquiesces with facts and data: with what is the case, no matter how degrading or unjust it may be. In so far as positivism accepts unquestionably the empirical reality as it is given in late capitalistic society, and does not transcend it in sorrow and hope, it is utterly inhuman. Such positivistic inhumanity we shall try to avoid under all circumstances. We shall not be value-free. There is no knowledge without interest. We share with the older critical theorists as well as with Habermas and Honneth the knowledge-steering interest in alternative Future III – a free, autonomous, solidary and reconciled society as unlimited communication community, characterized by mutual understanding and recognition, and thus by the possibility of an undamaged life - against the horizon of the totally Other as perfect justice and non-possessive love. Adorno and Habermas were early on involved in the positivism - struggle of the social sciences. against Carl Popper and his disciples. Already according to Horkheimer the materialistic, but anti-positivistic longing for the totally Other than the horror and terror of nature and history included the longing for light, friendship and love, as well as the longing for alternative Future III – a free and just society.

## ***Art, Religion, and Philosophy***

One main goal of our critical theoretical discourse is the exploration of the relationship between the social totality, which reproduces itself antagonistically, on one hand, and art and religion and philosophy on the other. With Adorno and Marcuse we differentiate between affirmative and negative art, religion, and philosophy. Affirmative art and religion and philosophy justify the antagonistic social totality. They resign themselves to what is the case luke-warmly or in cold despair. Negative art and religion and philosophy insist that the antagonism of the social totality must be overcome. Society needs not only money and power, but also mutual understanding and recognition; The struggle for language-mediated recognition is the very foundation of all ethical and legal norms and values. Who recognizes another person in his or her human dignity and human and civil rights, will not exploit him or her, lie to her or him, or kill him or her. Negative art and religion and philosophy resist alternative Future I - the totally administered society, and alternative Future II - conventional wars and civil wars, NBC wars, and ecological destruction, and promote alternative Future III - a society, which is characterized by mutual understanding and recognition, and in which amnestic, present and proleptic solidarity are realized without loss of personal autonomy.

### ***Pro-American Left***

In Europe, Habermas has always counted himself among the Pro-American Left. For Habermas, today many Americans do not yet realize the extent and the character of the growing rejection of, if not resentment against, the policy of the present Bush Administration throughout Europe, including Great Britain. According to Habermas, the emotional gap may well become deeper than it has ever been since the end of World War II. For thinkers like Habermas and Honneth, who always sided with the Pro-American Left, it is important to draw a visible boundary between criticizing the policy of the American Administration, on one hand, and the muddy stream of Anti-American prejudices on the other. As Habermas remembers the Vietnam War, he would consider it to be helpful in this respect, if the opposition in Europe could relate to, and identify with, a similar movement in the USA. Yet compared with 1965, timidity now prevails in the American society. Precisely as a great European Habermas and Honneth has been and is and could be - more than Horkheimer and Adorno, Marcuse and Fromm had ever been - a bridge builder between Europe and the United States. There is a struggle of recognition raging between Europe and America.

### ***Cosmopolitanism against Liberal Nationalism***

In Habermas's view, maybe a kind of systematically distorted communication, understanding and recognition between the United States and Europe is in play at this time. Habermas had not thought of such a possibility until an American friend tried to explain to him, what he perceived as the hawkish worldview of influential politicians in America like e.g. the former Undersecretary of Defense in the second Bush Administration and now President of the World Bank, Paul Wolfowitz. These influential neo-liberal, conservative-revolutionary or better counterrevolutionary American politicians think of themselves, so the explanation went, as the real defenders of universalist ideals. Europeans, always susceptible of anti-Semitism, are perceived as falling back on the cynical realism of their pre-1945 power games, while brave Americans and Britons are rushing to arms for the same goals as in World War II. According to Habermas, from this perspective, only the Anglo-Saxons are committed to defending the universal values of freedom and democracy against an evil that is now embodied and incarnated in new rogue states like Iran or Syria or North Korea. If that, so Habermas argues, were in fact more than a caricature, we would need, perhaps, a discussion

on the respective faults and merits of what we might contrast as liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism. No doubt, Habermas and Honneth – like Horkheimer and Adorno before - and their communicative theory of society remain most deeply committed to universal values and cosmopolitanism: and thus not to a preemptive and preventive clash of civilizations, but rather to discourse and mutual understanding and recognition among them.

## **B. Main Discourse Themes**

In each discourse - session, we shall deal with one or more of the following themes:

1. History, structure and consequences of the critical theory of society: Jürgen Habermas and Axel Honneth with emphasis on the pathology of reason, different forms of reason
2. Central notions and problems: mutual understanding and recognition as sources of the pathology of reason, and the locations of therapy
3. Political ideals
4. Civilizing achievement
5. Competing theories
6. Communicative and instrumental action, rationality and discourse
7. Dialectical and positivistic methods
8. The dialectical notion
9. Liberalism, Socialism, Fascism
10. Military-industrial complex
11. Truth or correctness
12. Social technology
13. Instrumental rationality
14. Productive forces and relations
15. Inhomogeneity of the social sciences
16. Potential for social and cultural change
17. Auschwitz – as paradigm of the pathology of reason
18. The State of Israel
19. Resistance against the horrible and terrible in society and history
20. The aristocratic principle of nature
21. The authoritarian and democratic personality
22. Cultural origins of the critical theory of society
23. Right, Left and Center
24. The sacred and the profane
25. Fundamental conditions of discourse
26. Critical theory and inverse theology
27. Five human potentials
28. Five world model
29. Theodicy in the social sciences
30. Theoretical and practical discourse: Theory-praxis dialectic
31. Social objectivity
32. Alienation
33. Antagonistic reproduction
34. Behemoth
35. Positivism
36. Art, religion and philosophy

37. The pro-American Left
38. Liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism
39. Historical forms of discourse.
40. Antagonistic totality of society
41. Universal pragmatic
42. Discourse theory of morality and right.
43. Discourse theory of war
44. Discourse theory of the Democratic Constitutional State.
45. The struggle for recognition as the moral grammar of social conflicts between master and servant, between the classes,
46. The struggle for self-preservation of individuals, nations, races and the species.
47. Recognition, crime and criminology.
48. Ethical life and socio-ethical totality
49. Recognition and socialization
50. Patterns of intersubjective recognition
51. Personal identity and disrespect
52. Disrespect and resistance
53. Intersubjective conditions for personal integrity
54. The corresponding traditional theories
55. Hegel's intersubjectivist innovation.
56. Herbert Mead's naturalistic transformation of Hegel's idea.
57. Recognition, love, rights and solidarity.
58. The violation of the body
59. The denial of rights
60. The denigration of ways of life.
61. Recognition in Marx, Engels, Sorel and Sartre
62. A formal conception of ethical life as friendly living together in the life world.
63. Competing theories in praxis philosophy, neo-conservatism and deconstructionism.
64. Fundamental modern problem: the collective and individual; universal solidarity and personal autonomy.
65. Dialectical idealism and materialism
66. Optimism and pessimism.
67. Between metaphysics and positivism, or the post-metaphysical age.
68. Max Horkheimer's critical theory: recognition
69. Theodor, W. Adorno's critical theory: recognition.
70. Walter Benjamin's critical theory: recognition.
71. Alfred Sohn-Rethel's critical theory: recognition.
72. Leo Löwenthal's critical theory: recognition.
73. Herbert Marcuse's critical theory: recognition.
74. Erich Fromm's critical theory: recognition.
75. Jürgen Habermas on the struggle for recognition.
76. Axel Honneth on the struggle for recognition
77. Thomas Mann on the struggle for recognition.
78. Bertolt Brecht on the struggle for recognition.
79. Franz Kafka's on the struggle for recognition.
80. Habermas and Honneth's theory of communicative action: alternative futures

## C. Background Reading

The following books constitute the background reading of our critical sociological discourse on the critical theory of society and the struggle for recognition. You shall find the books in the WMU's bookstore and library. Together we shall choose one background reading from the following list of books each fourth week: four books altogether.

### *Required:*

- Siebert, *From Critical Theory to Critical Political Theology: Personal Autonomy and Universal Solidarity*
- Siebert, *Hegel's Philosophy of History: Theological, Humanistic, and Scientific Elements*
- Siebert, *Horkheimer's Critical Sociology of Religion: The Relative and the Transcendent*
- Siebert, *From Critical Theory of Society to Theology of Communicative Praxis*
- Siebert, *The Critical Theory of Religion. The Frankfurt School*

### *Recommended:*

- Siebert, *Recht, Macht und Liebe*
- Siebert, *Hegel's Concept of Marriage and Family: The Origin of Subjective Freedom*
- Siebert, *The Evolution of the Religious Consciousness toward alternative Futures*
- Siebert, *The Development of the Moral Consciousness toward a Global Ethos*
- Reimer, A. J., (ed), *The Influence of the Frankfurt School on the Contemporary Theology: Critical Theory and Future of Religion - Dubrovnik Papers in Honor of Rudolf J. Siebert*
- Jensen, Walter. 2015. *Sociology of Religion: A critical primer.* ( See chapter 3 for an overview of my work )

## D. Depth Study

Please, choose your own depth study from one of the critical theorists mentioned below. Select one book for each fourth week in the semester, four books altogether: preferably books by Jürgen Habermas and Axel Honneth. You shall become most thoroughly familiar with your author's version of the critical theory. You shall become a specialist concerning the critical theorist, whom you have chosen. You shall become a critical theorist of a kind in your own right yourself. On the basis of the works of the critical theorist, whom you have chosen, you shall be able to make contributions to our discourse in class. You can also stress your critical theorist and his outlook on the struggle for recognition, during our three take-home tests at the beginning of February, March and April. During the semester you may give an oral report on your research into the works of your critical theorist. At the end of the semester you may give a short written report on your research into the works of "your critical theorist" for extra-credit, if you so wish: emphasis -the struggle for recognition. You may want to compare the three books of your critical theorist, which you have chosen during the semester and see, if he made some progress in his critical theory, particularly in terms of the struggle for recognition. You may also compare your critical theorist with other critical theorists, represented by other discourse partners in our class, in terms of audience, texts, situation, structure and purpose, and see, who made most progress in the critical theory particularly in relation to the struggle for recognition. You may also choose books from outside this reading list, in so far as they are by one or the other of the critical theorists mentioned in it, and as long as they deal directly or indirectly with the critical-theoretical view on the struggle for recognition. You may also choose for your special reading philosophical and scientific books, mentioned below, which are not produced by the critical theorists, but are related to their work. You may also choose from the works of art mentioned below, which are not produced by the critical theorists, but are necessary for their understanding. You find the books and works of art in the WMU Library. The following books and works of art are recommended for your depth study choice: choose one of them for every fourth week of our semester. In the context of our present special

course choose particularly texts, in which the critical theorist speaks about the struggle for recognition. You may give particular preference to the works of and about Habermas and Honneth, and their German and American followers. Please choose one of the following scholars each month and study him and one of his works in such a way, that you are prepared to give a ten minute report in our seminar

### I. Max Horkheimer

- Critical Theory.
- Critique of Instrumental Reason.
- Dialectic of Enlightenment.
- Dawn & Decline. Notes 1926 - 1931 and 1950 - 1969.
- Eclipse of Reason.
- Between Philosophy and Social Science.
- The Longing for the totally Other
- Writings 1931 -1936

### II. Theodor W. Adorno

- Negative Dialectics
- Aesthetic Theory
- The Authoritarian Personality
- Introduction to the Sociology of Music
- Philosophy of Modern Music
- Kierkegaard. Construction of the Aesthetic
- Jargon of Authenticity
- Notes to Literature
- Minima Moralia
- Prisms
- Against Epistemology
- Hegel. Three Studies.
- The Positivism Struggle in German Sociology
- Ludwig van Beethoven
- Adorno / Sohn Rethel, Letter Exchange 1936 - 1969
- Introduction into Sociology
- Adorno / Benjamin, Letter Exchange 1928 - 1940
- Studies about the Authoritarian Character
- About Walter Benjamin
- The Religion of the Critique of Religion
- The musical Monographies
- On Kafka

### III. Walter Benjamin

- Reflections
- Illuminations
- Angelus Novus
- The Passage Work
- Understanding Brecht
- Moscow Diary
- Correspondence

- About Children, Youth and Education
- On Kafka
- The Origin of German Tragedy
- Understanding Brecht

#### IV. Herbert Marcuse

- Hegel's Ontology and Theory of History
- Reason and Revolution
- An Essay on Liberation
- Eros and Civilization. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud
- Soviet Marxism. A Critical Analysis
- Psychoanalyse und Politik
- One-Dimensional Man
- Five Lectures
- The Aesthetical Dimension. Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics
- Studies in Critical Philosophy
- Negations. Essays in Critical Theory
- Counterrevolution and Revolt
- From Luther to Popper
- Critique of Pure Tolerance
- "Marxism and the New Humanity: An Unfinished Revolution," in J.C.Raines / Th. Dean, Marxism and Radical Religion. Essays Toward A Revolutionary Humanism

#### V. Erich Fromm

- Beyond the Chains of Illusion
- Dialogue with Erich Fromm by Richard I Evans
- Escape from Freedom
- Greatness and Limitations of Freud's Thought
- Man For Himself. An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics
- Marx's Concept of Man
- On Disobedience
- Psychoanalysis and Religion
- Revolution of Hope. Toward a Humanized Technology
- The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness
- The Art of Loving
- The Crisis of Psychoanalysis
- The Dogma of Christ and other Essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture
- The Forgotten Language
- The Heart of Man
- The Sane Society
- The Working Class in Weimar Germany
- To Have Or To Be
- You Shall Be as Gods. A Radical Interpretation of the Old Testament and it's Tradition
- Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis

## VI. Alfred Sohn-Rethel

- Economy and Class structure of German Fascism
- Intellectual and Physical Labour
- Sociological Theory of Knowledge
- The Form of Commodity and the Form of Thought

## VII. Leo Löwenthal

- Early Philosophical Writings
- False Prophets Studies on Authoritarianism
- Judaic, Speeches, Letters
- Literature and Mass culture
- The Bourgeois Consciousness in the Literature

## VIII. Jürgen Habermas

- Adorno Konferenz by Habermas/Friedeburg
- Autonomy & Solidarity
- Change in the Structure of the Public
- Comments on the Discourse Ethics
- Communication and the Evolution of Society
- Critical Debates
- Facticity and Validity Contributions to the Discourse Theory of Right, and of the Democratic Constitutional State
- From Sensuous Impression to Symbolical Expression
- Habermas Critical Debates by Thompson and Held
- The Past as Future
- Justification and Application
- Knowledge and Human Interest
- Knowledge and Human Interests
- Legitimation Crisis
- Legitimation Crisis
- Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action
- Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action
- Observations on the Spiritual Situation of the Age
- On the Logic of the Social Sciences
- On the Logic of the Social Sciences
- Philosophical and Political Profiles
- Politics, Art and Religion
- Post-Metaphysical Thinking
- Reconstruction of Historical Materialism
- Small Political Writings
- Technology and Science as “Ideology”
- Texts and Contexts
- The Catching up Revolution
- The Future of the Human Nature On the Way to a liberal Eugenics?
- The Inclusion of the Other
- The New Conservatism
- The Normality of a Berlin Republic



- The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity
- The Post National Constellation Political Essays
- The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere
- Theory and Practice
- Theory of Communicative Action, I and II
- Theory of Society or Social Technology
- Time of Transition
- Toward a Rational Society
- Toward a Rational Society Student Protest, Science and Politics
- Truth and Justification
- Two Speeches by Habermas/Henrich,
- Uncritical Theory Against Habermas by Bolte

#### IX. Axel Honneth

- Axel Honneth: Redistribution or Recognition? A political-philosophical Controversy by N. Fraser
- Communitarianism: A Debate about the Moral Foundations of Modern Societies
- Struggle for Recognition
- The Critique of Power Reflection Stages of a Critical Theory of Society
- The Liberation from Majority Paradoxies of Present Capitalism
- The Other of Justice
- The Torn-apart World of the Social

#### X. Other Recommended Philosophical and Scientific Books, relevant for the Development of the Critical Theory of Society and the Notion of Mutual Recognition:

1. R. Wiggershaus, The Frankfurt School. History. Theoretical Development. Political Significance.
2. M. Jay, Dialectical Imagination. The History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research 1923 - 1950.
3. A. Arato and E. Gebhardt, (eds), The Essential Frankfurt School Reader.
4. E. Dürkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method.
5. T. Parsons, The Social System.
6. E. Kogon, The SS. State
7. Hitler, My Struggle
8. R.J. Siebert, "Parsons's Analytical Theory of Religion as Ultimate Reality", in G. Baum, Sociology and Human Destiny.
9. Kant, Critique of Judgment.
10. Kant, Religion in the Boundaries of Reason.
11. G.W.F. Hegel, The Phenomenology of Spirit.
12. G.W.F. Hegel, The Science of Logic
13. G.W.F. Hegel, Philosophy of Law.
14. G.W.F. Hegel, Philosophy of History.
15. G.W.F. Hegel, Aesthetics.
16. G.W.F. Hegel, Philosophy of Religion.
17. G.W.F. Hegel, History of Philosophy.
18. K. Marx, The Capital.
19. K. Marx, The Communist Manifesto.
20. S. Freud, Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.

21. S. Freud, Civilization and its Discontent.
22. S. Freud, The Future of an Illusion.
- A. Löwe, Economics and Sociology. A Plea for Cooperation in the Social Sciences.
- A. Löwe."The Social Productivity of Technical Improvements," in The Manchester School, 8,1937.
23. R. K.Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure.
24. H. Spencer, The Principles of Sociology.
25. W.G.Sumner, Folkways. A Study on the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals.
26. F. Neumann, 'Behemot.' The Structure and Practice of National Socialism.
27. Huxley, Brave New World.
28. Comte, Course of the Positive Philosophy.
29. G.Orwells, Nineteen Eighty-Four.
30. M.Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.
31. R. Dahrendorf, Elements of a Theory of Social Conflict.
32. E.Durkheim, The Division of Social Labor.
33. Th.Veblen, Theory of the Leisure Class.
34. H.D.Lasswell, Propaganda Technique in the World War.
35. H.D.Lasswelland N.Leites (eds), Language of Politics. Studies in Quantitative Semantics.
36. K. Popper, The Logic of Research.
37. R.S. Lynd and H.M. Lynd, Middletown. A Study in Contemporary American Culture.
38. R.S.Lynd and H.M. Lynd, Middletown in Transition.
39. Columbia University, Columbia Studies in the Social Sciences.
40. E. Durkheim, Suicide.
41. S.Freud, The Ego and the Id.
42. M. Weber, Economy and Society.
43. M. Weber, Sociology of Religion.
44. K.Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Culture.
45. K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia.
46. W. Mills, The Sociological Imagination.
47. Schopenhauer, Works.
48. F. Nietzsche, Works.
49. L. Feuerbach, Works.
50. S. Kierkegaard, Works.
51. E. Bloch, Works
52. L.v.Friedevurg/ J.Habermas, Adorno-Konferenz 1983.
53. K. Landauer, Theorie der Affekte..
54. M. Mitscherling, Work of Remembrance. On the Psychoanalysis of the Inability to Grief.
55. W.Reich / A.S.Neill , Witnesses of a Friendship. Letter Exchange 1936 - 1957.
56. W. Reich, The Mass Psychology of Fascism.
57. Institute for Social Research, Rightwing- Extremism.
58. St. G. Mestrovic, Durkheim and Postmodern Culture.
59. Honneth, The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts
60. H. Küng, Project World Ethos
61. W.S.Goldstein. Critical Sociology, Volume 31.Number 1-2.2005.
62. R.C.Tucker (ed), The Marx-Engels Reader
63. M.Ott, Max Horkheimer's Critical Theory of Religion
64. E.Mendieta, Jürgen Habermas. Religion and Rationality. Essays on Reason, God, and Modernity.
65. St.Best and D. Kellner .Ppstmodern Theory. Critical Interrogations,
66. R.Bachika(ed), Traditional Religion and Culture in a New Era,
67. E.Mendieta (ed), The Frankfurt School on Religion. Key Writings by the Major Thinkers,

68. Th.Y.Levin(ed), Siegfried Kracauer, The Mass Ornament. Weimar Essays.
69. E. Bloch., Principle Hope
70. E. Bloch, On Karl Marx.
71. E. Bloch, A Philosophy of the Future
72. E. Bloch, Man On His Own.

XI. Other Recommended Poetical Books and Music, relevant for the Development of the critical Theory of Society and the Theme of the Struggle for Recognition:

1. Homer, Odyssee.
2. Marquis de Sade, Justine.
3. J. W. von Goethe, Faust I.
4. 02. L.van Beethoven, Missa Solemnis
5. L. van Beethoven, Symphonies.
6. L. van Beethoven, Sonatas
7. A. Mozart, Symphonies.
8. A. Mozart , Sonatas.
9. 07. G. Mahler , Symphonies.
10. 08. V. Hugo, Les Miserables.
11. 09. V. Hugo, Ninety-Three.
12. 10. V. Hugo, The Laughing Mask
13. 11. V. Hugo, The Workers of the Sea.
14. 12. Th. Mann, Doctor Faustus
15. 13. B. Brecht, Prose I - IV.
16. 14. F. Kafka, The Trial
17. 15. F. Kafka, The Castle
18. 16. G. Flaubert, Madame Bovary
19. 17. U. Sinclair, The Jungle
20. 18. B.Brecht, St. John of the Stockyards
19. B. Brecht, Early Pieces
20. B. Brecht, Work journal 1938 - 1942
21. B. Brecht, Work journal 1942 - 1955
22. Th. Mann, An Appeal to Reason.
23. B. Brecht, Man is Man.
24. Ch. Baudelaire, Fleurs du Mal.
25. B. Brecht, Drums in the Night
26. G. Keller, Love stories.
27. A. Stifter, Stories.
28. S.Beckett, Watt
29. S. Beckett, Waiting for Godot
30. Aeschylus, The Oresteian Trilogy
31. Th. Mann, Confessions of Felix Krull
32. Sophocles, King Oedipus.
33. H. Ibsen, Four Great Plays
34. H. Flashar, (Ed.), Greek Readings.
- 35 L.Tolstoy, Anna Karenina.
36. E. Seckerson, ( ed),Mahler,his Life and Times
37. P. Klee, Images of Angles.
38. G. Keller, Master stories.

39. S. Wiesenthal, The Sunflower.
- 40 B. Brecht, Seven Plays.
41. J.P.Sartre, Troubled Sleep.
42. F. Kafka, The Complete Stories.
43. F. Kafka, The Emperor's Message.
44. Homer, The Iliad.
45. A. Hitler, My Struggle.
46. Th. Mann, Disorder and Early Suffering.
47. G. Orwell, 1984.
48. Marquis de Sade, Writings from the Time of Revolution.
49. A. Huxley, Brave New World.
50. L. Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilych.
51. Th. Mann, Tonio Kröger. Mario und der Zauberer.
52. F. Dostoyevsky, Notes from Underground. White Nights. Ridiculous Man.
53. B. Brecht. Baal.
54. J.P.Sartre, Nausea.
55. J.P.Sartre, The Devil and the Good Lord.
56. M. Proust, Remembrance of Things Past
57. J.Joyce, Ulysses

## **E. Tests**

During our critical sociological discourse, we shall have three take-home tests, one each fourth week. The last test in April shall be a comprehensive one: i.e. in addition to new questions referring to the discourse of the past weeks since the last test, there shall be questions from the previous two tests. But such questions shall be asked in a different form. The test questions are related to the main themes of our discourse as they are listed under B. No question can appear in the tests, which has not been thoroughly discussed and answered in our discourse.

## **F. Grading**

The oral participation grades, which will be given after each weekly discourse, constitute 1/4 of the final grade. The three take – home - tests constitute 3/4 of the final grade. You have the opportunity to write and extra-credit paper at the end of our discourse in order to improve your final grade. F. Grades

The final grade will be based on

1. the participation in our discourse during our 14 weeks of seminar;
2. the monthly 10 minute presentation on a chosen critical theorist ;
3. the three take home tests;
4. a voluntary extra - credit paper at the end of our course;
5. our discourses during office hours at WMU, at my House of Shalom, and / or during lunch at Colonial Kitchen on Saturday at 12.30 pm..
6. Grading is based on a 200-point scale divided as follows:
7. We shall have a role call after each class session. Attendance will be worth 10 points total. Students who are chronically late or leave early will have their final grades penalized.
8. We shall have as much lecture in each class session as necessary and as much discourse as possible according to the contemporary discourse philosophy. Oral participation in our discourse will be checked

after each class and will be worth 50 points.

9. We shall have two mayor essay tests in the first week of the second and the third month and a final and comprehensive test in the first week of the fourth month. Background reading, depth study, time diagnosis, audiovisual material, excursion experiences and substantial issues will be tested. The first two tests will be worth 40 points each. The final and comprehensive test will be worth 50 points.
10. We shall have a voluntary extra-credit paper at the end of the course. It will consist of a critical summary of one of the background readings. The extra credit paper will be worth 10 points.
11. Exam make-up policy: in the case of illness, exams can only be made up with a written note from a doctor, or in the case of family emergencies, with a note from the Dean of Students.
12. The grading scale is as follows: A ( 200 - 185), BA ( 184-173), B ( 172 - 159), CB(158-145), C ( 144 - 131), DC ( 130-119), D (118-105), E (104 and below).

## **G. Objectives of the Course**

This listing of the objectives of our critical sociological discourse on the critical theory, and on its specific attitude toward the struggle for recognition between individuals and collectives, master and servant, the classes, the genders, races, and nations, may help you, to evaluate it at its end. It is the purpose of our discourse:

1. To make the student familiar with the general critical sociological discourse: particularly the works of Habermas and Honneth
2. To introduce the student into the critical theory of society: particularly the category of the struggle for recognition and authority.
3. To make the student familiar with the individual critical theorists, and in what they differ, and in what they are identical, particularly Habermas and Honneth.
4. To enlighten the student about racism, tribalism, nationalism, and fascism, which once more have become of great actuality in the East and the West, after the victory of liberal nationalism over socialism and cosmopolitanism in 1989, as well as about the role the struggle for recognition plays in the different forms of nationalism and racism.
5. To help the student to understand the contemporary phenomena of racism, tribalism, nationalism, and fascism as well as of the struggle for recognition taking place in them, and its historical, psychological, sociological, and philosophical roots.
6. To introduce the student into the dialectical method, and its application to the family, civil society, political state, history and culture and to the struggle for recognition and authority.
7. To show the student, to what extend the dialectical sociology supersedes in itself concretely the positive social sciences
8. To let the student see, how critical theorists - particularly Habermas and Honneth - introduce inverted theological concepts into the secular discourse, toward the horizon of the totally Other, as the determinate negation of human injustice, abandonment, and alienation.
9. To teach the student to differentiate between communicative and instrumental rationality, and action, and to cultivate the one as well as the other.
10. To make the student familiar with the essential preconditions of a successful discourse, particularly about the struggle for recognition between master and servant, and the classes, and for authority.
11. To teach the student, how to become a good discourse-partner, and to realize the necessary discourse conditions.

To teach the student, how to reconcile the religious and the secular in civil society.

To teach the student, how to conjugate personal autonomy and universal solidarity in theory and praxis,

To help the student, to differentiate between the Right and the Left, particularly in their attitude toward the struggle for recognition.

To help the student to reconcile materialism and idealism in a new form of thinking and social theory, effectively concerned with the struggle for recognition between master and servant and the classes, and for authority.

To help the student in combining a pessimistic theory with an optimistic practice in a new form of thinking and acting, particularly in relation to the global struggle for recognition and authority.

To help the student, to differentiate between metaphysics and positivism, and to supersede them both in a new form of thinking and acting, particularly in relation to the world-wide struggle for recognition and authority.

To show the student, how the critical theory, as well as its themes, e.g. the category of the struggle for recognition and authority, is reflected in the arts, and the religions and philosophies of the 20th and 21st centuries.

To help the student, to discover the theological element in the critical theory as well as in all great philosophy, art, and religion, and its connection with the struggle for recognition and authority.

To help the student, to discover the theodicy as the oldest form of theology in the critical theory, as well as in other great philosophies, and in great art, and in great religion, and to search for answers, particularly concerning the human suffering, which is produced by the worldwide struggle for recognition and authority.

To show the student the global influence of the critical theory of society today, particularly in relation to the worldwide struggle for recognition and authority.

To make clear to the student, why today the critical theorists of society must necessarily theorize at all about the global struggle for recognition and authority.

To help the student, to enter the dialectics of theory and praxis, particularly in relation to the worldwide struggle for recognition and authority.

To make the student familiar with the futurological tendencies in the critical theory of society.

To teach the student, how - with the help of the critical theory of society - to mitigate at least alternative Future I - the totally administered society; to resist alternative Future II - conventional wars or civil wars, NBC wars, and / or ecological destruction; and to promote passionately alternative Future III - a liberated and reconciled society, characterized by mutual, symmetrical recognition.

To teach the student to differentiate with Habermas and Honneth between liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

## **H. Academic Honesty**

Students are responsible for making themselves aware of and understanding the University policies and procedures that pertain to Academic Honesty. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse. The academic policies addressing Student Rights and Responsibilities can be found in the Undergraduate Catalog at <http://catalog.wmich.edu/content.php?catoid=24&navoid=974> and the Graduate Catalog at <http://catalog.wmich.edu/content.php?catoid=25&navoid=1030>. If there is reason to believe you have been involved in academic dishonesty, you will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. You will be given the opportunity to review the charge(s) and if you believe you are not responsible, you will have the opportunity for a hearing. You should consult with your instructor if you are uncertain about an issue of academic honesty prior to the submission of an assignment or test.

Students and instructors are responsible for making themselves aware of and abiding by the “Western Michigan University Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Violence, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy and Procedures” related to prohibited sexual misconduct under Title IX, the Clery Act and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and Campus Safe. Under this policy, responsible employees (including instructors) are required to report claims of sexual misconduct to the Title IX Coordinator or designee (located

in the Office of Institutional Equity). Responsible employees are not confidential resources. For a complete list of resources and more information about the policy see [www.wmich.edu/sexualmisconduct](http://www.wmich.edu/sexualmisconduct).

In addition, students are encouraged to access the Code of Conduct, as well as resources and general academic policies on such issues as diversity, religious observance, and student disabilities:

Office of Student Conduct – [www.wmich.edu/conduct](http://www.wmich.edu/conduct)

Division of Student Affairs – [www.wmich.edu/students/diversity](http://www.wmich.edu/students/diversity)

University Relations Office – [www.wmich.edu/policies/religious-observances-policy](http://www.wmich.edu/policies/religious-observances-policy)

Disability Services for Students – [www.wmich.edu/disabilityservices](http://www.wmich.edu/disabilityservices)

## **Finis**

**Don't Worry!!! Be Happy!!!**

**You have my  
Telephone Number: 269-381-0864,**

**and my E-mail: [rudolf.siebert@wmich.edu](mailto:rudolf.siebert@wmich.edu)**

© 2017 by Rudolf J. Siebert. This document may be reproduced in any non-profit form without permission of the author; however, for-profit reproduction requires written permission.

<http://www.rudolfjsiebert.org>