

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

The opening remark on this research envisages the philosophy of Habermas' conceptual analysis and theoretical framework of communicative action. His theory of communicative rationality is otherwise known as *reasoned communication*. It presupposes understanding of rational consensus or orientation of human actions. According to Habermas, "...understanding rational orientations of action become the reference point for understanding all action orientations".¹ Habermas in his *Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and Rationalization of Society* places emphasis on the internal connection between the theory of rationality and social theory. After the theory of communicative action, Habermas expands upon the theory of communicative action and a conceptualization of the social life world context that is tailored to the paradoxes of the scope for engineering the mass loyalty and it made it easier to uncouple the political world. To uncouple the political world means to decolonize the social life-world. Habermas' attitude in the theory of communicative action or 'lifeworld' context and the paradoxes of the system-life-world or the political institutions then refers to the background resources of this intellectual discourse. Habermas reflects on the two track model of deliberative politics distinguishing the normative demands from the background consensus in which communicative action is embedded. Habermas' communicative action is a contemporary ideal of basic normative core of communicative interaction and may also be refer to as communicative association or constitutive of transformative association. The normative ideal of communicative interaction, to use Lain Mackenzie's phraseology allows differences to flourish. Accordingly, Lain Mackenzie, reiterating the Habermasian tradition, believes that differences should flourish and there should be the need for tolerance. Philosophy is a living discourse. Habermas believes that:

The ideal of communicative interaction is precisely that which enables differences to flourish. A genuinely open conversation, undistorted by money and power, is the basic principle on which all varieties of social integration and democratic politics can be modelled. Not only does a rational exchange of views allow for all perspectives to be aired equally, it also undoubtedly requires that each participant transform their initial presumptions in light of the force of a better argument.²

His philosophy is that of socio-rational reconstruction and it presupposes the need to deconstruct society. There are some measures of Derridian deconstructive philosophy in Habermas' philosophy. One affinity between Habermas and Derrida is that their philosophical background presupposes the philosophy of peace and rational reconstruction of society.

According to Lain Mackenzie:

Jacques Derrida ushered into the intellectual world the idea of deconstruction... it expresses a form of critical practice aimed at exposing the inevitable gaps or lacunae that both structure and de-structure any text; hence de-con-structure is both de-structuring the text to find how it is held together and constructing an interpretation of the text that shows how the structure holding it together is never watertight, on its own terms; that is, that it has no essence. Just to ward off an obvious rejoinder, it is important to mention that the text that is deconstructed is not simply a written text or speech but any 'discursive practice'; patriarchal behavior, for example, is a social text that can be deconstructed.³

It reveals the fact that language from the Habermasian universal pragmatic perspective and ideal speech situation showcases rational discourse and language itself objectifies the human social world. Habermas' theory of communicative action is hermeneutic dialogue and cultural humanism of some sort. Habermas advocates a radical nature of democracy that is called deliberative democracy or to use Giddens' term 'dialogic democracy' and his theory of communicative action has been heralded by the whole of Western tradition. Habermas' theory of communicative action is social activity and his theoretical framework is traceable to the Greek philosophers namely Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates. Plato's, Aristotle's and Socrates' philosophical background to Habermas' philosophy showcases the need for the good, happiness and tolerance. Habermas envisages the need for irreducible otherness as advocates by Levinas and it heralds the human order, and social structure. Habermas' concept of morality and aesthetics is an appeal to inter-

subjectivity (the politics of inter-personal relation). His philosophy is a revision of Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Kant, Parson, Mead, Hegel, Wittgenstein, Marx, Durkheim, Freud's philosophical traditions. In line with this argument, Lain Mackenzie submits that; "it is interesting to notice, as one reflects on who is on the conversation, that the contributions deems to be of real lasting value, those made by the 'great' political philosophers (ancient, modern, and contemporary), are ones that have fundamentally changed dominant habits of thought".⁴ The conceptualization of the 'communicative action theory' is not just a theoretical acrobatic or abstraction but social interaction or discursive practice. The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' philosophy is an aesthetic appeal to inter-subjectivity. The relationship between intersubjectivity and dialogue is that both concepts presuppose the need for social change.

Habermas' conceptual framework or contextual justification of aesthetic appeal to inter-subjectivity reflects an avowed affinity with the philosophy of Alfred Schutz's phenomenological sociology that is, the philosophy of inter-subjectivity and Edmund Husserl's phenomenology of the life-world. It is invariably a dialogical imperative. Understanding the Habermasian picture should be the essence of dialogue and it reveals its sustained or continued relevance to contemporary society. We are rational beings and the sacredness of the human person is examined in the light of communication context. Habermas' subject matter of moral consciousness is implicit in his communicative action theory. It is a discursive ethics, and it is communicative ethics or normative core of human communication. The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' theory of communicative action reveals its implication to global ethics or global order or new world order. Philosophy has a great role to play here in making sure the contemporary relevance of dialogue remains particularly explicit in order to combat global terrorism. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori, in his book, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, believes that dialogue plays a critical role in "global terrorism".⁵

The political relevance of this thesis is that philosophy should be seen as emancipatory and practical in all its ramifications.

Consequently, this book encapsulates the fact that the rejection of dialogic democracy will necessarily lead to fundamentalism, and fundamentalism necessarily can lead to violence. It is a rationalization of society and rationalized ethics spurs rapid social progress. The Habermasian communicative rationality reflects a new world order. It is a dialogical imperative of global interdependence and rational cognitive capacity or social activity. It is an appeal to moral autonomy, it is a discursive ethics of social cooperation or discursive practice and it showcases the synergy between the system and the life-world. The ideological distortion between the system and the life-world, Habermas opines must be removed through the intersubjective recognition of a systematically undistorted communication and how it can be averted in human practical everyday life and it is a dialogical cum reciprocal relationship of discursive-theoretical dimension of human social interaction. The ideological distortion between the system and the life-world simply means the internal contradictions that are usually caused by the steering capacity of money and power in human society. The Habermasian tradition immediately reveals the basic phenomenological, ethical, political, linguistic, existential and global imports. It reveals the ethical import of “ought” in ethics. It awakens us to a moral consciousness that will enable, we humans to be rational or educative and to be able to make proper judgement. Habermas’ theory of communicative action reveals purposive rational activity, cognitive capacity and the rationalization or the radicalization of communicative competence thus reveals that the anachronistic character of human senselessness can be corrected through educable sensibility or training and retraining processes. The concept “communicative action” means an attempt to express differently the unbridgeable distance among individuals; it connotes an anthropological, existential, moral dimensions and it presupposes the philosophy of rational reconstruction.

The concept “communicative action” means the need for social emancipation and social interaction. Moreover, moral order is traceable to human order and this traceability

brought to the foreground the creativity of individuals in society. This comprehensive theoretical and contextual justification has its own relative, subordinate and objective truth especially with regard to the economic, political and social structural conditions of individuals to me is contemporary task. The indispensability of dialogical relation and practical everyday experience of social practice, social cooperation or interaction lie in the origin of discursive ethics, moral consciousness, normative ideal social order, social change, social/normative structures, equality, autonomy, justice and human rights. Similarly, Habermas' theoretical framework and contextual justification have watertight sorts of positive role if it remains aware of its dialogical and idyllic role with regard to the unprecedented systematically distorted communication. Habermas' philosophy talks about cultural humanism and critical social theory. Critical concern with the question of moral consciousness is invariably implicit and constitutes the normative core or heart of 'modernity' and 'post-modernity'. Habermas observes that what characterizes modern rational society is systematically distorted communication. The idea of a closed society devoid of free and open communication keep modern society in a serious social, cultural, economic, political instability, moral crisis and epistemological confusion.

Nonetheless, it is germane to note here that by "communicative action" Habermas does not mean a phenomenon of semantic analysis in abstraction but a mode of '*linguistification of the sacred*' in a system- life-world and religious rationalization. The '*linguistification of the sacred*' presupposes linguistic communication of individuals in the system-life-world. Communicative action demands social activity or purposive-rational activity and the web of social interaction devoid of symbolic violence. Violence use to disrupt the human project and it destabilized the project of humanity. The communicative action in the discursive-ethical sense invoked by Habermas is a notion through which man comes to me via a human face or act different from knowing, but an 'ideal speech act' which is fundamentally and originally rational, dialogical and ethical in outlook. Habermas believes that for effective communicative competence our dialogical relation with others must reflect

purposive activity and normative structure. Moral consciousness is very much implicit in Habermas' theory of communicative action. The moral element in communicative action presupposes the need for social change and social order. Dialogical relationship towards the other 'human person' demands an infinite rational reflection and an aesthetic appeal to 'inter-subjectivity'. It constitutes a dimension of cultural identity which is prior to any of dialogical commitment/engagement in order to guarantee human autonomy and human flourishing. According to Lain Mackenzie in his book *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy* believes that "cultures are only important to the extent that they provide individuals with frameworks that enable autonomy to flourish".⁶

Moreover, Habermas re-iterates that moral consciousness in our purposive rational activity presupposes the demand of criticizable validity claims or truth claims and communicative competence demands a continuous learning process. The dialogical process reminds us of "human fraternity itself" in our social life-world and it commits us before the objective truth and certainty. The boundless or unlimited double function of dialogue made the idea of Habermas' theory of communicative rationality a timeless objective truth. Habermas' contemporary legacies have been matchless and have shown to the Western world and beyond that he is a scholar of many parts. Communicative action theory adumbrates that purposive socio-rational activity situates the hitherto side of free and equal society and human freedom prior to any criticizable validity claims. The conceptualization of moral consciousness is implicit in Habermas' theory of communicative action which showcases discursive-theoretic- ethical immediacy which does not situates the null site of inter-subjectivity. The exposition of Habermas' theory of communicative action is a moral and aesthetic appeal to inter-subjectivity. The theory of communicative rationality affirms the very bond of human inter-subjectivity, cultural identity or what may be refer to as 'cultural humanism' and even to the point of purposive social action. It raises the supreme universal pragmatics and proceduralist approach to the democratic principle of basic human rights presents in yet another theoretical or philosophical formulation, 'deliberative democracy' or

‘dialogic democracy’. The Habermasian tradition of communicative action theory is logically an appeal to social action, social cooperation or social interaction. Kenneth Barnes opines that; “communicative action’, however, constitutes an independent and distinct type of social action”.⁷

Communicative action theory opens up the process for societal learning process and human emancipation. Accordingly, Kenneth Barnes, argues that “however, in contrast to Weber, Habermas does not regard rationalization as a process that inevitably culminates in the loss of meaning and the loss of freedom in the world, but as an ambivalent process that also opens up a potential for societal learning and new levels of human emancipation”.⁸ Habermas’ wide range of theorizing has been extraordinary. It covers epistemological debates, the dynamics of advanced capitalist system and a thoroughgoing eclecticism of developments in social sciences and philosophy. Habermas is a German social theorist and leading living exponent of a style of radical social theorizing originating with the Frankfurt School Critical Theory.

According to David Jary and Julia Jary:

The range of Habermas’s theorizing is extraordinary. He deals with most of the broad themes developed by earlier critical theorists, including epistemological questions and debate about the fundamental dynamics of advanced capitalist societies. In addition, he has sought to achieve a thoroughgoing synthesis of developments in social sciences and philosophy- including analytical philosophy, the philosophy of science, linguistics, political science, and systems theory- they are of relevance in exploring the basis for a rational reconstruction of society on socialist lines with the starting point of a critique of the ‘scientization of politics’ ... Habermas has endeavoured to re-establish social scientific and political debate as an arena of ‘open discourse’.⁹

This canon of Habermasian tradition elucidates the normative character of true rationality any contemporary society must begin to imbibe by bracketing all prevailing prejudices, biases or preconceived ideas and ideological distortions. This theoretical framework and the contextual justification of the indispensability of dialogue in Habermas’ philosophy can presupposes an ‘ideal speech situation’ and creating the platform for equal opportunities for citizens to engage in a liberal dialogue and this marks the crux of this intellectual discourse.

According to David Jary and Julia Jary:

True rationality can be seen to be achieved only when this emerges from condition which corresponds to an ideal speech situation, in which all parties have equal opportunities to engage in dialogue, without undue domination by one party, without restriction and without ideological distortion. This model states the conditions for a critical and truly 'emancipatory' social science. Even if there are difficulties in realizing the models, it establishes a benchmark in terms of which the ideological distortions involved in existing forms of social science can be gauged.¹⁰

In consequence, Habermas' intellectual contribution has been a regeneration of so many discourses or discursive practices that heralds our human contemporary society in a manner that his contemporary philosophical formulation re-awakens in our social consciousness the notion of social movement and the 'scientization of politics'. This canon of communicative reasoning and radical political consciousness reveals the import of normative ideal socio-political new world order. The Habermasian picture marks the crux of a humanistic/epistemological dimension and the unprecedented concern for the social structural transformation or rational reconstruction of society. Habermas, German philosopher and social theorist, is perhaps best known for his wide-ranging defense of the modern public sphere and its related ideals of publicity and free public reason, but he has also made important contributions to theories of communication and informal argumentation, communicative ethics, the foundations and methodology of the social sciences.

Habermas has been widely recognized as the leading intellectual heir to the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, a variant of Western Marxism that includes such figures as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse. His two-volume book- *The Theory of Communicative Action* has been a major contribution of social theory, in which he locates the origins of the various political, economic and cultural crises confronting modern society in a one-sided process of rationalization steered more by the media of money and administrative power than by forms of collective decision-making based on consensually grounded norms and values. In his first book, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas traces the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere which, at least for a time, offers the prospect of an arena that would mediate between state and society. Rooted in the social and

economic conditions of liberal capitalism, the 'bourgeois public sphere' is being referred to those socio-cultural institutions that arose in the eighteenth century in opposition to the absolutist powers of the state private clubs and coffeehouses, learned societies and literary associations, publishing houses, journals, and newspaper. He refers to the 're-feudalization' of civil society during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Habermas traces the commercialization of civil society, the bureaucratization of power and non-political authority, monetization of human democratic society and the growth of a manipulative or propagandistic mass-media in his communicative action theory. A 're-politicized social sphere' erodes the real distinction between state and society that has been a necessary social structural condition for the bourgeois public sphere, and a society oriented to consumption and a politics based on the competition and bargaining between interest groups emerge in the place of a public sphere forms by an enlightened citizenry.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Habermas pursues a number of related issues. He sharply criticized the 'scientization of politics' and increase in 'technocratic consciousness' he discerns in contemporary societies. For Habermas, the growth of technocracy is not inevitable but the result of a systemic failure to preserve the classical distinction between theory and practice, and between practical wisdom (phronesis) and technical skill (techne). In a series of influential essays, many of which are collected in his book, *Theory and Practice* published in 1963, he traces the loss of these distinctions in modern political theory from Hobbes to Hegel as well as in Marx whose own concept of praxis blurs a related and equally important distinction between labour as the epitome of the human species and modes of social interaction based on shared interpretations of the system-life-world. Positivism or scientism, for Habermas, is the insistence that only the sciences constitute genuine knowledge together with the belief that science does not need any further critical analysis or justificatory clarification. It refers less to be the practice of the sciences than to their 'scientific self-misunderstanding'. Understanding praxis in the hermeneutic construction of social reality means the use of interpretation in dissecting human social action or reality.

Habermas challenges this view and attempts to secure an independent basis for critique by arguing that all forms of knowledge are deeply rooted in fundamental human interests. Habermas' priority on knowledge and human interest is that human beings are governed by epistemological and anthropological foundation. He identifies three 'quasi-transcendental' or 'anthropologically deep-rooted' cognitive interests with reference to which distinct forms of knowledge can be ascertained. The natural sciences correspond to a technical interest; the historical-hermeneutic sciences, to a practical and social interest; and the critical sciences deal with the idea of society and its normative structures. Habermas has been influenced by Marxism as a theory of social change, class war, history, revolution and society. Marx/Marxism influences Habermas' critical theory with regards to understanding the ideals of society and its normative structure. He has been very significant and vocal to Freud's psychoanalysis when each is freed from its own 'scientific- self-misunderstanding' to an emancipatory interest. Thus, through a kind of continuation of epistemology by social theory, Habermas intends to complete a critique of positivism and provides a 'prolegomenon' for a critical social theory. It is germane to note that or it is the case that Habermas' communicative rationality is western biased. In other words, it is possible to have an ideal speech situation as championed by the west that can work perfectly in other pattern/form in other countries and cultures irrespective of their political structures.

Habermas has been dissatisfied with the anthropological and the ideological distortions of this initial attempt of human society. There are already hints of the 'linguistic turn' in his later critical social theory, evident, for example, in his remarks that 'the human interest of autonomy and responsibility is not mere fancy, for it can be apprehended through discursive practice. Habermas critically observes that what raises us out of nature is the only thing whose nature we can know: 'language'. Language is not a means to an end but an end in itself.

Habermas' conception of society is predicated on the philosophical significance of reasoned communication. This valid discourse attempts to elucidate or dovetail into the

contemporary approaches to the problem of communicative rationality. “Rationality” has been a preliminary specification and a contextual justification of new world order. The Habermasian tradition aimed at some of the characteristics of the mythical and the modern ways of understanding of the system-life-world, the relations to the system-life-world and aspects of communicative rationality from a more sociological and philosophical concept of communicative action theory. Habermas’ philosophy anchors in the problem of understanding meaning in the social sciences. Habermas’ social and contemporary political philosophy has an avowed affinity with Max Weber’s theory of rationalization. Habermas has been very critical in terms of the disenchantment of religious- metaphysical world views and the emergence of modern political/economic structures and social consciousness.

Modernization as societal rationalization has been one of Habermas’ central themes. Habermas’ systematic philosophy is hinged on rationalism of Western conception of reason. Habermas believes that reason or what we may call reasoned communication has played a great role in contemporary human society. Habermas believes that reason is a tool for communication. Habermas’ emphasis has been on the rationalization of law in relation to Max Webers’ diagnosis of the times. Habermas’ philosophy has been influenced by the Frankfurt School and two prominent scholars in this school are Theodo Adorno and Max Horkheimer. Scholars such as Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parson, Max Weber, Edmund Husserl, and Martin Heidegger have influence the philosophy of Habermas. Habermas strongly believes in immediate reflections, social action, purposive activity, reasoned communication to ward off our worldly prevailing prejudices, and communication. The role of dialogic communication from the Habermasan perspective reveals rational dialogue in our social world and the need to bracket all prevailing prejudices in our thought. Habermas’ philosophy toed the line or the pathway of Max Weber’s conception of rationalization of society. His critical philosophy has to do with Max Weber in the tradition of Western Marxism. Habermas has been lending his voice on the intrigue of our international system, instrumental reason and strategic reason. The volume two of Habermas’ book “*The Theory of*

Communication Action”, *Volume 2: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, translated by Thomas McCarthy, talks about the role of reasoned communication in the life-world and system and the thesis of internal colonization from the Marxian point of view. He makes a critique of symbolic interactionism and the functionalist reason in relation to the system-life-world. Habermas has made a paradigm shift in Mead and Durkheim from purposive activity to communicative action theory and symbolic interaction.

He has made a normative foundation of social science in the theory of communication. Secondly, he emphasizes on the authority of the sacred and the normative background of communication. The rational structure of the linguistification of the sacred showcases the social fact that human life has to be respected with great awe. He emphasizes on the concept of the system-life-world and the hermeneutic idealism of interpretive sociology and the notion of the uncoupling of the social system and the life-world, and the problems of the construction of critical social theory. Our theoretical purview shall not be restricted to Habermas’ theory of communicative action theory alone, but his procedural concept of dialogic democracy and contemporary relevance to the political new world order or global politics and ethics. Contemporary democratic theory, advanced capitalist system and cosmopolitan political order are of Habermas’ theoretical objectives.

Habermas’ contemporary political philosophy took historical precedence over the Aristotelian tradition of politics of the state and the freedom of the individual. Habermas’ social and political philosophy is a domain of overlapping rational consensus and objective validity. Habermas’ philosophy is geared toward the politics of difference, mutual recognition and an aesthetic appeal to inter-subjectivity (phenomenological sociology) and the indispensability of dialogue to the new world order. Habermas’ theory of communicative action has great theoretical affinity with his conceptual framework and contextual justification of deliberative democracy or the Giddian conception of dialogic democracy. Habermas’ deliberative democracy has been thematically a discursive or dialogic democracy. It assumes a procedural concept of democracy. Democracy assumes certain human face and

deliberative process. It is virtually characterizes by collective decision making process according to proceedings of legal principles. Democracy is like two sides of a dubious tossing coin. It reflected the liberty of the individual in particular and the liberty of the state in general. Deliberative democracy or dialogic democracy is not a new phraseology because the Greeks are the greatest source of inspiration in their intellectual canopy and in their political organization. Every society has made frantic efforts to get rid of undue restrictions to the freedom of the state and the individual. The individual and the state must fraternize in a harmonious atmosphere. But to understand Habermas' concept of deliberative democracy, we must bring to the fore the etymological meaning of democracy.

However, the idea of political participation simply suggests a full blown democratic setting, a kind of positive form of democratic structure and not a negative democratic setting. Political participation brings about rational consensus and it is actually enhanced by deliberative democracy. Democracy is a political ideology, a system of government and a form of government. It connotes three major fundamentals such as social, economic and political strands. Democratic structure is characterized by a political dimension that strategically think of safeguarding the basic rights of the masses with regards to politics, ensuring social justice and basic normative order and to distribute wealth equitably among the populace in society. Freedom is a driving and powerful concept. Liberty, majority rule, constitution, constitutionalism, human rights, political participation, accountability, are part and parcel of democratic question, normative structure and principle, and the democratic structure demands tranquility. The democratic question is geared towards putting in place an ideal society, rational dialogue, reasoned communication that is undistorted. A peaceful society which is anchored in social justice and the prevalence of the common good what Rawls calls the primary goods.

Primary goods as understood in the context of Rawls' theory means the basic needs of the people in society. The provision of primary goods enhances social order through the possibility of equal liberty and equal opportunity and the need for the re-distribution of

resources in human society. In other words, the collective happiness of all becomes the main objective of any political state. The provision of primary goods in African societies especially in Nigeria is a problematic one due to the prevailing injustices and ideological distortion facing Nigeria due to the evils of corruption and greed. Democracy has been a demand that the common man needs some level of sense of belonging in society and to guarantee the normative orders or character of a rational conduct, active participation in political affairs, religious tolerance, cognizance of human basic rights, an intelligent understanding of public affairs, and undaunted devotion or unalloyed commitment to public reason and common interest.

1.2 Statement of Problem

Many scholars have criticized Habermas' theory of communicative action due to its inability to grasp complexities of present democratic realities. Communicative action has been seen as the normative foundation of democratic society. Habermas reflects on the possible solution to the present political instability facing our contemporary human society. He sees communicative action and law as the solution to the problem of contemporary democratic politics. Habermas has advocated for 'reason' as the tool for communicative interaction. This concept of 'reason' as a tool for communication presupposed rational dialogue and social change in our international system. What comes first is reason; human proper way of reasoning devoid of immaturity. The problems of global justice, universal human rights and global citizenship can only be resolved by international interaction through reasoned communication.

Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action* presupposes undistorted communication, and political goals and the procedural justification of deliberative democracy or dialogic democracy. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "for Habermas the political goal is a society of undistorted communication action".¹¹ Habermas' possibility of systematically undistorted communication in society as an ideal speech situation in any

human society is a mirage. Habermas fails to factor in the complexities of present democratic societies in his theory of communicative rationality.

However, the phraseologies (communicative action theory and deliberative democracy) are simply tackled intelligently to address the contextual justification of these concepts in good society and the intelligible network of social interaction. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “social interaction exists first within social groups...social structure emerges from social interaction, but once this occurs, social structures have a separate existence that affects the process of interaction”.¹²

Communicative action has been human form of social activity while communicative rationality is reasoned communication. Habermas’ theory of communicative action reflects on his contemporary democratic theory. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that “Jurgen Habermas offers the best contemporary statement of logical entailment”.¹³ Habermas shares the same conception of basic human rights with the Rawlsian conception of justice as fairness which has global contemporary relevance. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that “the growth in consciousness of human rights is one of the achievements of communicative rationality”.¹⁴ Contemporary political philosophy has been all about the exploring of political ideas in our practical everyday life which showcases action and re-thinking of our new world order. According to Lain Mackenzie, “political philosophy, therefore, is not just thought, but also action: or, better still, it is both thought and action together”.¹⁵ Now, the problematic questions are:

1. Is reasoned communication really a solution to our global crises? Reasoned communication, to some extent, can contribute in solving myriad of human internal crises in society.
2. Can we say that reasoned communication can really present anything truly new? Reasoned communication cannot really present anything truly new but reason becomes the leit mus test in solving human ethical quandaries.

3. Is there any way the critique of reason can be subverted? The use of reason becomes very fundamental or critical in our deliberate human actions/choices.
4. Is there any critique of reason within reason itself? Human reasoning is limited.
5. What are the limits of rationality in our contemporary world? The limits of rationality to the human world is our inability to use our reason properly what Kant calls “immaturity”
6. What are the present solution (s) to our contemporary global crises especially the plethora of crises in North Africa and Middle East? The present solution(s) to the myriad of problems plaguing the Middle East and North Africa include ensuring political stability, economic buoyancy such as adequate food supply and immediate response to social unrest/crises.
7. Can dialogue play any significant role and can it bring to the fore social change and bring about anything new at the national and international level? Dialogue can bring about social change both at the national or international level.
8. Does deliberative democracy have any thing to offer or contribute to our enlightened democratic vision or human betterment?
9. Does Habermas’ thought have the ability to grasp the complexities of democratic society? Habermas’ moral and political theory has not been able to factor in complexities of our present democratic societies.
10. What are the major constraints to communicative freedom of the individual and communication community? The major constraints to human communicative freedom are law, bureaucracy, market/economic system.
11. What are the ideological distortions to the system-life-world or what we may refer to as the thesis of internal colonization? The ideological distortions are caused by the steering capacities of money, power and the media.

12. How is social order really possible in human contemporary society? The idea of social order is possible through the need for moral rebirth or moral consciousness in Habermas' philosophy.

These research questions are fundamental in terms of understanding the ideals and the normative structure of human society in Habermas' philosophy and this research has been able to provide fundamental solutions to the research questions.

1.3 The Scope of Study

The essence of communicative action theory in political philosophy has been to guarantee contemporary ideal political order. The task in this intellectual discourse is the firmer understanding of the conceptual analysis and theoretical framework of communicative rationality and its continued contemporary relevance to normative ideal social order and new world order. The tenacity for good human dialogical relation provides broad range of ethical implication and discursive social practice. We shall circumscribe the conceptual analysis of communicative action theory in Habermas' political philosophy within the ambit of logical entailment and normative ideal social order. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "the rational entailment argument identifies certain conditions for the existence of social order and from those conditions maintained that there are certain standards of treatments which all societies should respect".¹⁶

Communicative action theory represents the form and substance positing the real philosophical justification of social interaction. According to Joan Ferrante, "social interactions are everyday events in which at least two people communicate and respond through language and symbolic gestures to affect one another's behavior and thinking".¹⁷ Another pressing contemporary issue to be looked at include the critique of Habermas' philosophy from the perspective of communicative stand point and the differentiation based theory of social systems developed by Niklas Luhmann a student of Talcott Parson.

1.4 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this intellectual discourse has been to bring to the foreground the theoretical and practical implications and the normative frameworks of the Habermasian theory of communicative rationality to contemporary human society. The theory of communicative rationality demands criticizable validity claims. The Habermasian tradition represents communicative competence and communicative skills of human association (speech skills and social interaction). Language or what we may call ‘ideal speech situation’ guaranteed the need for human social interaction. Social interaction plays a crucial role in human activity.

Furthermore, one cardinal purpose of this research is to bring to the foreground the indispensability of dialogue method and its role in solving the crises of humanity in order to ensure new world order or global peace and the strategy of stemming out global terrorism. Dialogue, invariably, has been the basis of normative ideal global order. Habermas’ discursive ethics showcased his theoretical contribution to cosmopolitan politics. Put differently, cosmopolitan politics simply means global politics and the role of the indispensability of dialogue to international system. Habermas has been so committed to global world order and his contemporary political philosophy has come to stay with us in our search for contemporary ideal political order. Habermas’ theory of communicative action correlated with his discourse ethics, theory of law and democracy.

Moreover, it is germane to extrapolate that the philosophical imperative for dialogical philosophy cum existential import are anchored on the discursive ethics of Habermas, and a synergy should take place between social system and life-world to prevent any ideological breakdown or distortion or the internal colonization of human society. Society is not a free-rider system, so to speak, but it is governed by customs, traditions, rules and regulations, values and norms. Habermas’ theory of communicative action is invariably and undoubtedly predicated on the normative structures of interpersonal linguistic communication skill or strategy. Habermas considers his major contribution to be the development of the concept

and theory of communicative reasoning or communicative rationality, which distinguished itself from the rationalist traditions by locating rationality in the structures of interpersonal linguistic communication rather than in the structure of the social world. Habermas has been fondly referred to as a radical or social reformist who has dovetailed into the theoretical framework, contextual justification and conceptual clarification of critical social theory.

1.5 Significance of Study

My contribution to knowledge is that Habermas' moral and political theory has a metaphysical foundation and his idea of truth demands the idea of the good. Habermas' philosophy has a metaphysical groundings/footing; that is, the idea of truth is derived from the idea of the good and the idea of being is derived from the idea of pure reason. Habermas' philosophy presupposes the metaphysics of politics. Habermas' thought presupposes an existential/political dimension. The significance of Habermasian philosophical tradition has been that his philosophy cut across political philosophy, law, political science, sociology, linguistics, communication, psychology, and ethnology. Habermas' philosophy has a continued relevance to our contemporary normative ideal social order and social structures. The internal logic or logical mechanisms that governed our social normative structures and system-life-world or society has been bastardized, balkanized or mesmerized.

Interaction is not feasible in an atmosphere of dog-eat-dog society. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "interaction is the process in which the ability to think is both developed and expressed".¹⁸ Society cannot progress rapidly in an atmosphere of rancour, acrimony and bloodletiness. This research is expected to prove so candidly that theory can be converted into practical demonstration and workable form if such theory is well articulated, well natured and nurtured. The pragmatic study of Habermas' philosophy serves as a kaleidoscope or eye-opener for the indispensability of dialogue and the rationalization of society by re-awakening in the mind of the people, the sense of freedom and responsibility as the hallmark of societal progress. It reminds us the sense of purposive rational activity, constitutional patriotism, honesty of purpose, purity of intention or motives, enhancing the

idea of the common good and provided a strong normative foundation of goodwill in rational society. Finally, Habermas' philosophy has been 'ipso-facto', the centre-point of continuous learning process of social activity between our moral obligations and others. Many of us have lost the sense of reasoning, meaning and our freedom. Our reasoning faculty has been beclouded by high level of irrationality, carnivorous tendencies and no sense of awe for human life and we have virtually lost our sacredness for humanity. Democratic public life cannot develop where matters of public importance are not discussed by citizens in an atmosphere of free and open communication or discursive communication.

An 'ideal speech situation' required participants to have the same cognitive capacities of discourse of social equality and their words are not confused by ideology or other human errors. In this version of the rational consensus coherence theory of truth, Habermas maintains that truth is what would be agreed upon in an 'ideal speech situation'. Habermas has express optimism about the possibility of the revival of the public sphere.

1.6 Methodology

The application of the phenomenological and hermeneutical methods to Habermas' theory of communicative rationality/action makes this research to be more systematic, rigorous and lucid. Put it differently, the phenomenological and hermeneutical methods help in this research to bring to bare Habermas' communicative rationality in a more lucid, systematic and rigorous manner. In this discourse we shall adopt the phenomenological and the hermeneutic methods. The work uses the method of phenomenology and hermeneutics because it exposes the understanding of Habermas' theory of communicative action and democratic society from a more workable approach. Habermas' theory of communicative action presupposes the phenomenological method because phenomenology has to do with the revealing of the hidden goals in things. Phenomenology reflects bracketing of our prevailing biases or prejudices in order to see things as they are.

The purpose of the phenomenological approach has been to illuminate the specific, and to identify phenomena and how they are perceived by the actors in a situation. In the human sphere, this normally translates into gathering 'deep' information and perceptions through interviews, discussions and participations observation, and representing it from the perspective of the research participant. Phenomenology is concerned with the study of consciousness and experience from the perspective of the individual, 'bracketing' taken-for-granted- assumptions and the usual ways of perceiving things in the world. Epistemologically, phenomenological approaches are based on a paradigm of personal knowledge and subjectivity, and emphasizes the importance of personal perspective and interpretation. Phenomenological research has overlap with other essentially qualitative approaches including ethnography, hermeneutics and symbolic interactionism. My major interest in this work has been to embark on the method of phenomenological hermeneutics. It is the merging or conglomeration, the adoption of phenomenology and hermeneutics in research in order to get the hidden goals or truth in things as they are.

Phenomenological methods are particularly effective at bringing to the foreground the experiences and perceptions of individuals from their own perspectives, and therefore aimed at challenging structural or normative assumptions. Adding an interpretive dimension to phenomenological research, enabling it to be used as the basis for practical theory, allowed it to inform, support or challenge policy and action. A variety of methods can be used in phenomenologically based research, including interviews, conversations, participant observation, action research, focus meetings and analysis of personal texts. If there is a general principle involved an indepth analysis or maximum depth, in practice constrained by time and opportunities to strike a balance between keeping a focus on the research issues and avoiding undue influence by the researcher. Phenomenological approach exposes taken-for-granted- assumptions and challenges a comfortable status quo. According to Stan Lester:

Phenomenological approaches are good at surfacing deep issues and making voices heard. This is not always comfortable for clients or funders, particularly when the research exposes taken-for-granted assumptions or challenges a comfortable status quo. On the other hand, many organizations value the insights which a phenomenological approach can bring in terms of cutting through taken-for-granted assumptions, prompting action or challenging complacency.¹⁹

Human reality is based on observation, consciousness and experience. Phenomenological method has been clearly defined as that method that has to do with the method of analysis showcasing the fact that the whole is dissected into parts and these parts are critically put together for meaningful understanding. Things are broken into parts and these parts are put into a coherent whole. Phenomenology has been the study of structures of consciousness as experienced from the first person point of view. The central structure of an experience is its intentionality and it is that which is directed towards something. Phenomenology is the study of structure of consciousness and experience. These two methods are adopted for the sole purpose of ensuring the best possible, the aim or objective of this intellectual discourse.

Furthermore, we shall also adopt the hermeneutic method which has to do with the science of interpretation. Hermeneutic philosophy envisages how understanding is possible. The origin of the term "*hermeneutics*" (from the Greek *hermeneutikos*) bears an obvious reference to Hermes, the messenger god of the ancient Greeks. Hermeneutic philosophy attempts to foster understanding and render what is unclear clear. Hermeneutics has been the science of the interpretation of meaning. Habermas' critical social theory is contemporary hermeneutics characterized by observation, pragmatics, critical and radical philosophy. Critical theory envisages interpretation and interpretation involved entering into the interpretation of normative core of human communication community; meaning here operates and is to be found within the historical contexts of the interpreter and interpreted. When we say that something is critical we mean the purpose of interpretation here is emancipatory; conventional wisdoms within communities are challenged in order to address potential power asymmetries or irregularities or illogicalities. Paul Ricoeur's phenomenological hermeneutics presented a set of basic normative core or methodological principles to guide praxis. The

concept of the hermeneutic circle of understanding presented an overview of social development process. It follows, then, that this conceptual framework of the hermeneutic circle of understanding required recognition if a phenomenon such as the social development process is to be fully understood. Social actors must begin to explore the Gadamerian ‘fusion of horizons’ and that of mutual understanding of the phenomenon of social development.

According to Georgie Wanke, “hermeneutics is a tradition of thought that deals with the understanding of interpretation of meaning”.²⁰

Broadly speaking, the hermeneutic circle reflects the critical understanding of our existential condition of our system-life-world. Georgie Wanke opines that, “the hermeneutic circle becomes a historical fact and an element of our existence”.²¹ Strictly speaking, the hermeneutic method is associated with philosophers such as Gadamer, Derrida, and Levinas, we will apply the Gadamerian kind of hermeneutic method as far as this work is concerned.

We must acknowledge that we are finite and historical beings and that, as long as we are concerned, our understanding will be partial and interpretive. Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa assert that “hermeneutics recognizes the contextual and pragmatic character of all claims of knowledge”.²² The theory of knowledge is the most crucial in human reality. Hence, “it is concerned with edification, with a conversation in which we can enrich our various conceptions of ourselves and the world by trying to understand those of others...hermeneutic, here reaches its fullest extent thus”.²³

This work is broken into Six Chapters. Chapter One will be the general overview and introduction. Chapter Two is on the review of relevant literature. Chapter Three anchors on the exposition and a critical look at the philosophical formulation and normative foundation of Habermas’ theory of communicative action. We shall look at the basis of Habermas’ theory of communicative action from a plethora of angles such as communicative action as a dialogical relation with a view to understanding the concept of communicative action theory as it relates to the system- life-world and the ideological distortions of the thesis of internal colonization. Chapter Four reflects on the inextricable nexus between communicative action

and deliberative democracy; communicative action is characterized as a social constructs. This chapter reflects on the need to explain communicative action as the viable avenue to study and to understand the ideals of society and its normative structure. Chapter Five shall be a critical examination of the indispensability of dialogue of communicative action theory in the political philosophy of Habermas and its role towards a new world order. Chapter Six shall be the evaluation and the concluding remarks or reflections on communicative action theory in the contemporary political philosophy of Habermas. This research is a six chapter work and the most crucial of the chapters is Chapter Four because the theory of communicative action is pregnant with robust conceptual analyses and myriad of theoretical presuppositions.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Communicative Action

Communicative action means mastering the world reality and it showcases the establishment of interpersonal relation. Communication has been very crucial as far as human association is concerned. According to David Jary and Julia Jary, “communication(s) means the (1) imparting or exchange of information. Communication may be verbal or non verbal, intended or unintended (2) the message(s) or unit(s) of information communicated (3) the means of communication”.²⁴ Thomas McCarthy posits that “communicative action is a social activity. According to David Jary and Julia Jary, “communicative competence is the means, including the rules, by which persons sustain communicative exchanges and interactions with others within a world’s community. The term ‘*communication*’ is coined by Hymes (1966) to focus attention on the skills and knowledge involved in human communication...It reflects on the limitations in linguistics of concentration mainly on syntactic competence”.²⁵ The idea of rational communication amongs human persons showcases the need for the imperative of dialogue. The human capacity for rational communication showcases the idea of time and space. According to David Jary and Julia Jary:

The human capacity for communication, especially through language, is far more extensive than that of any other animal. The capacity to communicate across time and space has expanded enormously in modern times with the invention of writing, printing, electronic communications- telegraphy, telephone, radio,-and media of mass communications, as well as, the mechanization of transportation. A reduction of what geographers refer to as the friction of distance has been particularly evident in the 20th century in the capacity to send messages over long distances at great speed. This has many implications, not least the increased capacity for social control this makes possible for the modern state.²⁶

Nevertheless, Habermas' theory of communicative rationality exposes the criticizable validity claims: yes/no claims that are usually acceptable by the human society.

Political Philosophy

Political philosophy is the study of topics such as politics, liberty, justice, property, rights, law, and the enforcement of a legal code by state authority. Habermas' theory of communicative action heralded his political philosophy.

Dialogue

The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' philosophy guarantees the acceptability of dialogic democracy and the errant rejection of an ideology that is dogmatic that allowed no debate such as fundamentalism. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy does not presuppose a free- rider- system (a social system whereby anything goes without being checked by laws or moral precepts).

The idea of communicative action theory will be clarified in this intellectual discourse because according to the Ayerian tradition, the clarification of concept is the sole business of philosophy. Dialogic or dialogical philosophy is a twofold issue and it exemplifies relational analysis or dialectical process. This method starts from the normative assumption that every utterance has an addressee. The central question is: To whom is the person speaking?

However, the address is rather a multiplicity of others, a complex web of invisible or cob-web of human interaction whose presence can be traced to in the content, flow and expressive elements of the utterance. It means connection between two persons or things. The word "*dialogic*" is ambiguous. It has its relevance in various fields; the psychology of globalization, educational psychology, media psychology, cultural anthropology,

developmental psychology, social constructivism, philosophy, Habermasian psychoanalysis, cultural psychology, social work, experimental social psychology, brain science, psychopathology, and psychotherapy. The topic of mediated dialogue in a global age has been at the heart of a special issue on cultural identity and the sacredness of our humanity. Religion is the transcendence within. Transcendence means the movement of consciousness of being. In this connection, Alexander Moseley opines that “consciousness generally implies being able to be aware of one’s surroundings”.²⁷ Habermas is very critical about the mode of production called capitalism.

Philosophy

Etymologically, philosophy is derived from the Greek word *philo sophia*. When joined together it means the love of wisdom. Philosophy is systematic, logical, rational and theoretical. It is an open system of study and not a closed-system. Philosophy is said to be the peak or height or mother of all disciplines.

Democracy

Etymologically, the term “democracy” is derived from the Greek words “demos” (people) and “kratia” (power) which simply means people and power respectively or put conversely the people’s power. Literally, it could be said to be people’s power or power of the people. The people are the source of state’s sovereignty. Democracy is not a new system of government. It is as old as humanity itself. In every society, the system of social control has some democratic principles, respecting some popular normative ideals, having a measure of popular support, and goodwill. Democracy presupposes the voluntary free intelligence and social activity of men in a harmonized and systematically coordinated manner.

Deliberative Democracy

The term ‘deliberative democracy’ was originally coined by Joseph.M .Bessette in his 1980 work “*Deliberative Democracy: The Majority Principle of Republican Government*”. The James Fishkins model of deliberation is characterized by information, substantive balance, diversity, conscientiousness, and equal consideration.

Contemporary Political Philosophy

Finally, Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is radical democracy or dialogic democracy characterized by liberal society and demands more political participation, contemporary debate and discussion or public conversation.

Habermas' contemporary political philosophy emphasizes the need for global order and a more reasoned communication (communicative discourse) on public issues.

According to Mitchell Stephens:

The key word in Habermas's political vocabulary, however, is democracy. He often has in mind a more "radical democracy" than that with which most Americans are familiar. In the phrase 'government by and for the people', Habermas places much more emphasis on the 'by' than most of us normally would", McCarthy explains. He wants less unthinking nationalism and more reasoned communication on public issues. He wants more participation by citizens in government processes, in political parties, in economic decisions- a larger "public sphere" than can be found in any existing society. Habermas wants more debate and discussion.²⁸

Habermas' philosophy transcends national and global dimensions or cosmopolitan politics. Political philosophy involves a creation of norms and forms of social interaction. According to Lain Mackenzie, "political philosophy involves the creation of new forms of norm governed social interaction".²⁹

Habermas' philosophy of reasoned communication has been an intellectual contribution to global terrorism. Terrorism is an elusive concept. It constitutes an imminent danger to the project of humanity. Hence, there is this need for global dialogue or global interdependence. John Hoffman and Paul Graham opine that "terrorism is the use of political violence in situations in which people have reasonable avenues of peaceful protest".³⁰ The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' communicative action theory showcases his contemporary political philosophy. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "theories of global justice are concerned with what obligations nation-states have to one another and obligations citizens of different nation-states have to one another".³¹ Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is all about human emancipation, social integration and his enlightenment democratic vision revealed an emancipated global society. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham emancipation is "the capacity of people to act freely and thus govern their own lives".³²

Human Rights

Habermas' contemporary political philosophy encapsulates the basic normative core of human rights. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "human rights means the entitlement to treatment which it is claimed individuals have simply by virtue of being human".³³

The major criticisms leveled against Habermas' communicative action and deliberative democracy is that Habermas' theory of communicative action is a mirage; it is mere appearance and that Habermas' concept of human rights as herald for universal solidarity is onesided. Finally, it has been asserted that the theory of communicative action has not been able to address the present complexities of our democratic societies.

Language

Language means the medium of communication. Language reflects the means for responsible interchange. It reflects the use of verbal and extraverbal means. According to the Wittgenstenian tradition, the limit of language is the limit of the world. According to David W. Carroll, "language is not a means to an end, but an end in itself".³⁴ Language is the carrier of culture. Culture becomes vital in human existential conditionality. Language and culture are coterminous or interrelated. Language, from the Heideggerian perspective helps in the world's disclosure. The disclosedness of the human existential world is made possible through the use of language. Language, from the Habermasian perspective, is distorted due to the ideological problem such as the rise of advanced capitalist system. Language is developed not only by culture but by the use of mutual understanding. One fundamental element in the use of language is understanding. Understanding, as far as language is concerned requires a continuous learning processes. Finally, the communicative framework, therefore, reflects a problem solving mechanism and a cultural learning process.

Endnotes

1. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984a), p. 6
2. Mackenzie, Lain, *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p. 162.
3. Ibid., p. 133.
4. Ibid., p.163.
5. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in the Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jacques Derrida and Jurgen Habermas*, (Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 2003), pp.1-12.
6. Op. cit., p.140.
7. Barnes, Kenneth, *Jurgen Habermas in Edward Craig (ed), (1998), Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 195.
8. Ibid.,
9. Jary, David and Jary, Julia, (Eds), *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*, (Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 2000), p. 259.
10. Ibid.,
11. Ritzer, George and Stepnisky, Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory*, (New York: Mc-Graw Hills Higher Education, 2014), p. 293.
12. Ibid., p.414.
13. Hoffman, John and Graham, Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory*, Second Edition, (England: Pearson Education Limited, 2009), p. 421.
14. Ibid., p. 422.
15. Mackenzie, Lain, *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy*, (2009), p.164.
16. Op. cit., p.421.
17. Ferrante, Joan, *Sociology: A Global Perspective, Fifth Edition*, (USA: Wadsworth & Thomson Learning, 2003), p. 142.
18. Ritzer, George, *Sociological Theory*, Second Edition, (2014), p. 350.
19. Lester, Stan, *An Introduction to Phenomenological Research,* (Tauton UK: Stan Lester Developments, 2009), p. 4.
20. Wanke, G., Hermeneutics in Jaegwon Kim & Ernest Sosa (Eds). *A Companion to Metaphysics*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995), p. 206.
21. Ibid., p. 207.
22. Loc, cit
23. Loc, cit
24. Jary, David and Jary Julia, *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*, (2000), p. 92.
25. Ibid.,
26. Ibid.,
27. Moseley, A., *A to Z of Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008), p. 36.
28. Mitchell Stephens, *The Theologian of Talk; "The Question is whether Justice Exists and Reason can benefit Society"*. (Los Angeles Times Magazine, October 23, 1994), p. 10.
29. Mackenzie, Lain, *Politics: Key Concept in Philosophy*, (2009), p.164.
30. Hoffman John and Graham Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory*, (2009), p. 501.
31. Ibid., p.497.
32. Ibid., p. 496.
33. Ibid., p.498.
34. Carol, W. David., *Psychology of Language*, Fourth Edition, (USA: Wadsworth and Thompson, 2004), p.33.

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

This research showcases the need for the indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' theory of communicative action which paves the way for civil rights and human rights in democratic society. Habermas has been profoundly critical of the need for an emancipated global society and the re-enactment of the Enlightenment democratic ideal. The two catchwords in Habermas' ethical and political theory as elucidated above are "*communicative action*" and "*deliberative democracy*". The basic idea of deliberative democracy is an appealing convergence with Habermas' notion of communicative action. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a legitimate and normative expectation. It is the reconstruction of contemporary human society. For Allan Thomas, aligning himself with Davidson argues that "a person is irrational if he is not open to reason".¹

The prevalence of communicative reasoning and communicative sociation (communicative interaction) gave rise to free and open society. Dialogue is indispensable in Habermas' philosophy and it is the basic normative core of human society. Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action reflects on the monetary-bureaucratic complex of human society (the ideological problem of money and power in human contemporary society). Martin Plot in *Communicative Action Democratic Deficit: A Critique of Habermas' Contribution to Democratic Theory, International Journal of Communication, Vol. 3, California Institutes of the Arts, 2009*, develops a critique of Habermas' concept of communicative action based on the concept's inability to grasp the complexities of democratic politics and of democratic political action. Martin Plot's conceptual analysis or critique of communicative action reveals the moralization of speech act's theory. This moralization of speech is the Habermasian moralization of society. It also reveals the rational capacity of a civil society which possesses the key to the ultimate source of democratic legitimacy. Martin Plot argues that Habermas' communicative, political action outlines an emancipatory type of political legitimacy. Martin Plot asserts that Habermas' theory of

communicative action reveals the need for political order free from domination, guarantees social peace, political stability and the objective validity of the rational- critical emancipation project. Martin Plot traces Habermas' theory of communicative action and his democratic vision to the Hobbesian and Rousseauian tradition respectively.

Martin Plot observes that Habermas' theory of communicative action made clear the necessary normative standards that democratic theory should establish for the institutions and rational practices of democracy. Martin Plot criticizes Habermas' theory of communicative action due to its inability to grasp the complexities of democratic political action. Martin Plot also makes it clear that the field already prepared by Habermas' decades of research is characterized by a systematic and methodic attempt to locate a linguistic, extra political source for a new type of democratic legitimacy. Martin Plot observes that Habermas' theory of communicative action has a normative standpoint and reveals the critical judgement in newly developed social setting. Martin Plot reveals as clear as crystal that Habermas' theory of communicative action is characterized by social significance, normative context and critical reasoning. Habermas' theory of communicative action presupposes the normative expectations of constitutional democratic state. Martin Plot argues that Habermas has been unable to see the political realm proper as contributing to the dynamics of societal meaning formation. Martin Plot remarks that Habermas' 'communicative turn' revealed the project of emancipation and emancipated global society.

Martin Plot in his critical examination of Habermas' theory of communicative action reveals that his communicative, political theory has fallible outcomes and a normative presumption of practical reason. Habermas' theory of communicative action is the radicalization of democratic procedure, the possibility of rational agreement, meaningful normative coordination and commonality. Habermas' theory of communicative action and democratic theory reveals the normative context of an institutionalized disembodiment of power and the practice of modern and contemporary democracies. Habermas' theoretical orientation has been traceable to Kant's reformulation of Rousseau's emancipatory project.

Martin Plot concludes that “the only problem with Rousseau’s ‘solution’ is, Habermas says, that it left aside the critical-rational side of opinion formation and will formation”.² He is of the opinion that Habermas is still struck with the Rousseauian paradox of the general will and the conception of the good life in the constitutional democratic state. Martin Plot aligns himself with William Rehg and James Bohman, that Habermas’ democratic theory is very appropriate to contemporary social conditions and ideal political order. Martin Plot believes that Habermas’ notion of communicative action is well known and it reveals the identification of unanimous agreement or rational agreement under ideal conditions with the rationality of normative outcomes of political discourse.

Martin Plot argues that communicative action seeks to achieve linguistic understanding of our socio-political and objective world. Habermas switches from potential centrality of language or linguistic communication to social strategic action. Martin Plot asserts that Habermas’ democratic political vision is irreducible to communicative or strategic action not only because it is both communicative and success oriented, but also because it is self fulfilling. Habermas’ theory of communicative action and his normative validity of democratic context of society reveal moral agreements within disagreements. Martin Plot posits that:

Normatively speaking, in Habermas’s view, disagreement should be overcome at some level of reflexivity and lead to universal agreement because he fails to understand the need for a theory of conflict consubstantial to the theory of agreement that he attempts to defend. The communicative meaning of our actions- to put it better, our ability to reach understanding with the many in a democratic context- always intermingles with agreement and conflict. More often than not, we reach an understanding with the many because we are able to engage in a conflict with the rest. That is, we manage to stage the conflict in such a way that the organization of political differences institutes a broader consensus for our principle and values than for those of our political adversaries. This dynamic is not only empirically unavoidable in a democratic context, but it is also normatively desirable from a democratic theory point of view.³

Martin Plot re-echoes Flynn’s position that “Habermas begins by stating that the task of universal pragmatics is to identify and reconstruct universal conditions of possible mutual understanding”.⁴ Martin Plot asserts that one of his central criticisms of Habermas’ theory of communicative action is, in fact, that his attempt of normative foundation of democratic

context of society is misleading and ultimately failed. Habermas' normative basis of society is a habitual communicative practice of everyday life of rational society. Habermas' thought is profoundly implicated in his conception of the metaphysics of language and the linguistic transparency of society. Habermas' critics believe that communication is only a mirage, it is mere appearance and it never brings us anything new. Habermas' Enlightenment democratic vision has been a vision of a broadened communication, the reinforcement of the space of public debate and the precise logical nature of human linguistic exchange. Martin Plot believes that Habermas' thought is the enigma of language or expression and an enigma intrinsic to any human institution. Habermas' conceptualization of communicative normative standards reveals democratic political action as such. Martin Plot aligns himself with the position made by Axel Honneth and Hans Joas that Habermas' notion of communicative, political action characterized "monetary-bureaucratic complex".⁵ Habermas' communicative discourse is anchored in the question of democratic control of the economy and of the state, the internal colonization of the system and the lifeworld, the tendency of voluntary association, and good neighborliness. Habermas' notion of communicative action is the desirability of turning his communicative-action-model into a normative standard for contemporary democratic politics. Habermas' communication model implies a continuum between the dialogue of two subjects in their speech and action through interpersonal relation, on the one hand, and the public use of speech on the other hand.

Habermas' communicative action theory indicates normative presupposition of characteristic sociological formation. Habermas' notion of communicative action assumed great sociological significance and the plurality of meanings characteristic of open communicative processes. Habermas' thought reveals a broader and more complex deliberation and decision making processes. The question of criticizable validity claims revealed truth, rightness and truthfulness claims. The objective validity of legitimate and normative expectations of criticizable validity claims reveals precisely the essence of democratic action. Habermas believes that the notion of communicative action, affirmed

pragmatic analysis, social, political, and epistemological significance. Martin Plot reveals that Habermas attempts to develop a 'reconstructive' approach to the pragmatics of communication. Habermas' thought reveals contemporary political action and his communication model characterized normative context or structure of linguistic communication, legitimate expectations and the communicative mode of human association. Habermas' model of communicative action is an interpersonal relation between at least two subjects capable of speech and action in their interpersonal relationship. Martin Plot asserts that Habermas' model of communicative action revealed that speech is the human way of acting par excellence. Martin Plot concludes that the Habermasian picture reveals that political struggle has a built-in communicative dimension. Habermas' theory of communicative action is the legitimate and normative expectations of individual and collective actors in their political struggle and the attempt to ascertain democratic legitimation.

Antonio Sandu in *Deliberative Democracy and Communicative Action of Jurgen Habermas, Romania, Balutescu: Universitatea Mihail Kogalniceanu, 2013*, stresses that Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy is all about contemporary political philosophy. Antonio Sandu argues that the Habermasian project of Enlightenment democratic vision is one of the most comprehensive, ambitious and debated project in social theory. Antonio Sandu believes that Habermas' theory of communicative action is embedded in his political philosophy. Antonio Sandu argues that Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy is characterized by moral theory and political theory. Antonio Sandu critically analyzes or examines some of the social and the political dimensions of the philosophy of Habermas. Antonio Sandu's conception of Habermas' thought is taken from the perspective of reconstruction theory of democracy, based on communicative action

Antonio Sandu believes that Habermas' philosophy constitutes a benchmark for social and political thinking. Antonio Sandu focuses on Habermas' matured writings and

sociological views. Antonio Sandu reflects on Habermas' writings as being dependent on cosmopolitan, universalistic vision, post national and global dialogue. Antonio Sandu's conceptual analysis and contextual justification of Habermas' cosmopolitan politics and global dialogue has contemporary relevance and presupposes a contemporary reflection on the international system or world politics. Antonio Sandu argues that the global aspect of Habermas' political theory makes our objective world narrower and making the world a global village, so to speak. It reflects on the fact that our global world is in a state of chaos. We are actually at a cross road. Habermas' conceptualization of linguistic communication and contemporary political theory showcased global world order. Antonio Sandu focuses more specifically on the cosmopolitan politics of Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy. Antonio Sandu concludes that the Habermasian picture becomes crucial in terms of cosmopolitan politics or the universal or normative core of world politics.

Adrian Blau in *Rationality and Deliberative Democracy: A Critique of John Dryzek's Democratic Theory*, *Journal of Politics*, School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, M139 PL, United Kingdom, 2011, reflects on the contemporary political theory of Habermas. Adrian Blau reflects on the critique of John Dryzek's democratic theory vis-à-vis Habermas' communicative action. Adrian Blau argues that the critique of instrumental reason in Habermas' theory of communicative action is a reflection on the problems of contemporary political theory. Adrian Blau sees communicative action as a form of transformative dialogue. Transformative dialogue reflects on the need for social interaction and it is a process whereby the intersubjectively shared world or mutual recognition can bring about social change and cultural values. It is a social dimension or political dimension whereby difference is allowed to flourish.

Adrian Blau aligns himself with John Dryzek's justification of deliberative democracy. John Dryzek's justification of deliberative democracy rests on the critique of instrumental rationality and a defence of Habermas' idea of communicative rationality. Adrian Blau in agreement with Dryzek conflates communicative rationality with Habermas' idea of

discourse ethics. Adrian Blau aligning himself with John Dryzek argue that deliberative democracy is described as a better means to better ends- a more powerful and more positive position. The critical issues discussed by Adrian Blau include John Dryzek's democratic theory, communicative rationality, critical theory, deliberative democracy, democratic legitimation, and Habermas' instrumental rationality.

Guido Palazzo and Andreas Georg Scherer in *Corporate Legitimacy as Deliberation: A Communicative Framework*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 66, No.1, 2006, stress on detractors of Habermas. Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer argue that the communicative framework of democracy has an application in the real world situation. Guido Palazzo and Andreas Scherer's position reflects on the pragmatic account of communicative framework of democracy. Recent contemporary politics highlighted this Habermasian picture of the real world situation. This real world situation has been an existential-discourse and ethical-political discourse dimension. Communicative action is communicative cooperation predicated on social coordination and problem solving mechanism. Communicative action is social cooperation undertaken by individuals based on mutual deliberation or understanding. Modern society is challenged in national governance systems and a growing pluralism of beliefs, values, and lifestyles. Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer's conceptualization of the communicative framework of democracy is cultural pluralism in the normative context of corporate legitimacy or organizational legitimacy.

Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer reflect on the idea of corporate social responsibility and organizational legitimacy in our real world situation. Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer argue that the communicative framework of the real world situation is a reflection on the problems arising from the a-political role of corporate governance. Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer base their argument on the concepts of cognitive capacity and pragmatic legitimacy of communicative interaction of society. Corporate legitimacy as deliberation reflects on the compliance to national law and on relatively homogenous and stable societal expectations. Guido Palazzo and Andrea Scherer propose a fundamental

paradigm shift to moral legitimacy from input-output outlook of the concept of legitimacy. This paradigm shift created a new normative basis of legitimacy and involved organizations in processes of active justification vis-à-vis society. Corporate legitimacy as deliberation is a broader context of political theory while reflecting on the recent ‘communicative turn’ from a liberal to a deliberative concept of democracy. Guido Palazzo and Andreas Scherer reflect on key issues such as business and society, business ethics, corporate social responsibility, deliberative democracy, globalization and organizational legitimacy.

Guido Palazzo and Andreas Scherer reflect on the precarious legitimacy of globally active corporations infringing on the legitimacy of democracy at large. The consequences of globalization reflects on deliberative communication, validate fruitful discourse and ensuring challenges for corporate social responsibility. Guido Palazzo and Andreas Scherer conclude by asserting that morals are pre-modern mode of creating organizational legitimacy.

Paul Healy in *Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue*, *Journal of Politics, Philosophy and Social Criticisms*, Swinbourne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, May 1, 2012, stresses on Habermas’ deliberative democracy as a political method of transformative dialogue. He believes that deliberative democracy enhanced the inclusiveness, responsiveness, transparency, and accountability of socio-political decision making, and that deliberative model has achieved considerable prominence. Paul Healy’s conceptualization of *Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue* is the revitalization of democracy. Paul Healy believes that “it has become clear that deliberative proposal exhibits certain weaknesses”.⁶ Paul Healy argues that Habermas’ communicative transformative dialogue effects corrections in contemporary society. Paul Healy believes that communicative transformative dialogue is geared towards realizing its potential for revitalizing democracy in our contemporary pluralistic and multi-cultural world. Paul Healy aligns himself with the clarion call for significant modifications. He aligns himself with Irish Marion Young’s call for a communicative re-appropriation of the standard model with a view to rendering a more

inclusiveness and responsiveness to difference in society. Differences is allowed to flourish in contemporary society.

Paul Healy gives judicious and timely suggestions of Irish Young's call for re-configuring the deliberative political template in a manner conducive to treating difference as a resource rather than as a barrier to unity. In my Master's thesis, when looking at the Levinas' continental philosophy, we assert that difference is not a barrier. The politics of difference is part and parcel of the human being. Communicative proposal does not achieve or envisages real normative outcomes. Paul Healy believes that the enhancement of inclusiveness and responsiveness to difference brings to the foreground a manner conducive to promoting mutual understanding and potentially transformative learning process. Paul Healy believes that thoroughgoing dialogical re-appropriation and deliberative proposal can live up to its pluralistic as well as its inclusive or normative intent. Paul Healy places emphasis on cultural homogeneity, uniformity and rational consensus in intersubjectively shared dialogical commitment or existential encounter.

Jorge Adriano Lubenow in *Public Sphere and Deliberative Democracy in Jurgen Habermas: Theoretical Model and Critical Discourses, American Journal of Sociological Research, Vol.2 No.4, 2012*, presents the theoretical model and the major critical discourses about the category of the political public sphere. Jorge Adriano's theoretical orientation is on the centrality and the normative foundation of deliberative democracy and the transformations of the conception of politics in Habermas' writings. Habermas reflects on the deliberative democracy unleashed in the endless confrontation of the political traditions of liberalism and republicanism. Jorge Adriano takes historical trajectories of Habermas' investigations on the reshaping of the dual relationship between the system and the common-life-world, public sphere, and democracy.

Jorge Adriano's emphasis is on the systemic dimensions of deliberative procedural politics, or deliberative democracy. Jorge Adriano clears the controversies involving the deliberative public sphere, democracy and the critical issues that have become not just

problematic but also need to be better investigated. This view envisages by Jorge Adriano forms the theoretical orientation and the main thrust of this work. Jorge Adriano believes that the critical moment of transformative dialogue is to guarantee a synergy between the system and the life-world.

Charles J. Hoch in *Pragmatic Communicative Action Theory, Journal of Planning Education and Research, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2013* stresses that communicative action has a pragmatic account and need not displace the critical insights of social scientists. What Charles Hoch is really saying was that there should be cooperation between philosophers and social scientists. Charles Hoch observes that communicative action created the insight for scholars to unravel the processes or intrigues of social, economic, and political change. Charles Hoch major concern in his pragmatic account of communicative action was the reshaping of the social, economic and political templates of our common-life-world. Charles Hoch brings to the foreground that communicative action creates the catalyst for settling differences in society. Differences produce the interpretation of normative outcomes, legitimate expectation, instead of creating a philosophical trump card. Charles Hoch summary of communicative action theory helps us in settling differences in social planning processes.

Charles Hoch critiques that communicative action is unrealistic explaining that communicative action theory does not bring about causal certainty. Communicative action analysis investigates the conceptual framework of Habermas' views on the structural condition of society. Communicative action combined structural and intentional concepts to integrate the apparent antagonisms in society. Charles Hoch concludes that the pragmatic account of communicative action brought about comprehensiveness and compromise in society. The pragmatic account of communicative action provides a useful, conceptual apparatus and critical theory for social planning and practice. The pragmatic account of communicative action remains open to future challenge and critical debate.

Joachim Kernstock and Tim Oliver Brexendorf in *Implications of Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action for Corporate Brand Management, An International Journal, Vol. 14, 2009* stresses that Habermas' communicative action theory have implications on corporate brand management. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf propose the application of Habermas' theory of communicative action (TCA) to corporate brand management. Joachim Kernstock and Tim Oliver Brexendorf discuss the benefits of incorporating the concept of communicative interaction in the field of Corporate Brand Management. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf's conceptualization of the implications of communicative action to corporate brand management is derived from Habermas' critical social theory. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf connect Habermas' theory of communicative action to corporate brand management which shows the myriad of contemporary relevances of Habermas' writings to other fields of studies such as economics and business ethics. Habermas' theory of communicative action does not just provide a research background for other fields of studies but normative expectations of organizational legitimacy.

Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf argue Habermas' theory of communicative action also provides a managerially useful insight of human interactions. Habermas' theory of communicative action provides certain starting point for classifying social interactions. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf argue that Habermas' theory of communicative action provides or introduced a form of human action. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf bring to the foreground Habermas' theory of communicative action in terms of its cognitive, moral-expressive and aesthetic-expressive knowledge to organizational structure. Joachim Kernstock and Oliver Brexendorf conclude that Habermas' notion of criticizable validity claims have real implication to communicative interaction, normative context as well as world relations. What is quite glaring is that Habermas' theory of communicative action is connected with real life situation in terms of the linguistic communication in our real world situation.

Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig in *Problem Solving and Communicative Action: A Situational Theory of Problem Solving, Journal of Communication, Vol. 61, Issue 1, Wiley Online Library, 2011*, reflect on the situational contexts of Habermas' theory of communicative action in problem solving. The theory of problem solving is an extended and generalized version of the the situational theory of publics. The theory of problem solving introduced a new concept, communicative action in problem solving as its dependent variables. Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig believe that to explain communicative action, the theory of problem solving has been characterized by the independent variables of the theory of public: problem recognition, constraint recognition, involvement recognition, and referent recognition. Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig identify a new variable in problem solving.

Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig introduce a new variable: situational motivation in problem solving. Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig argued that the new motivational variable mediates the effects of antecedent perceptual variable on communicative behavior. The main thrust of Jeong –Nam Kim and James E. Grunig's conceptualization of Habermas' theory of communicative action is invariably predicates on problem solving theory.

Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia in *Communicative Versus Strategic Rationality: Habermas Theory of Communicative Action and the Social Brain, (ed) Ben J. Harrison, The University of Melbourne, Australia, 2013*, stress on the philosophical-psychological implications of the theory of communicative action to cognitive development. Rationality refers to interpersonal communication rather than about knowing subjects. Rationality is common to all men as far as society is concerned. Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia suggest that the social view of rationality remains appropriate in cognitive (brain) development. Michael Schaefer, Hans, Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia distinguish two kinds of rationality: emancipatory communicative rationality and strategic or instrumental rationality.

Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia explore similar questions of the critique of reason in relation to the social world. The critiques of reason approached by Habermas' communicative action highlighted brain areas associated with strategic and communicative reasoning. Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia suggest that participants should assess different social scenarios with respect to communicative or strategic rationality. Humans become more activated and the cognitive capacity became more strengthened when they engage in meaningful communicative interaction or meaningful dialogue. Participants performed communicative reasoning compares with strategic thinking and a social control condition. Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia explain that communicative reasoning is associated with moral sensitivity, emotional processing, and language control. Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia suggest that strategic reasoning is associated with reduced control and emotional cognitions which became successful thinking and the social network of language. Thus, Michael Schaefer, Hans Jochen Heinze, Rotte Michael, and Denke Claudia demonstrate experimental support for the normative assumption and psycho-dynamic and cognitive dimension of the theory of communicative action in contemporary human society.

Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang in *A Communicative Action Approach to Evaluating Citizens' Support for Government Smoking Policies*, *International Journal of Communication Association, National University of Singapore, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, 2013*, critically examine the communicative grounds of democratic legitimacy in a hybrid political system in Singapore, by applying Habermas' theory of communicative action. Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang believe that the theory of communicative action holds that citizens will be more likely to accept the normative expectations, democratic legitimacy and the right of justice of an ideal political order to the extent that they recognize its orientation as being communicative, oriented to increasing reciprocal understanding with the public assessments of communicative action.

Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang develop two basic arguments such as: whether citizens agree with government claims or policies and whether citizens perceive opportunities to engage in dialogue with policy makers in public discourse. Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang argue that the communicative action is a well tested pragmatic approach using the case of Singapore government action on smoking control. Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang reflect on the validity conditions and speech conditions associated with legitimate appraisal of Singapore.

Leanne Chang, Thomas L. Jacobson and Weiyu Zhang stress the importance of dialogue between the citizens and the government in terms of policies as it affects the citizenry.

Thomas Risse in *“Let’s Argue”*: *Communicative Action in World Politics*, *American Journal of International Relation*, USA, 2013, introduces a mode of social action and communicative interaction in world politics. He advocates for dialogue in the international community. Thomas Risse believes that interaction has been largely overlooked in the US-dominated international relations. Thomas Risse focuses his theoretical debate on between rational choice and social constructivism. Thomas Risse focuses mainly on the differences between instrumental rationality and norm-guided behavior. Thomas Risse argues that deliberating about criticizable validity claims have inherent communicative statement about personal identities, public interests and the state of the world.

Thomas Risse explains that validity claims in communicative action has truth seeking behavior presupposing that actors no longer hold fixed interests during their communicative interaction. Social actors are open to dialogue, persuasions, challenges, counter-challenges geared towards reaching mutual understanding and a reasoned or rational consensus. Reasoned consensus is rational and moral agreement. The precondition for argumentative validity is the common-life-world and mutual recognition of speakers as equal consociates. Thomas Risse argues that communicative action has underlying rules of the game and optimal solution to social problems in the system-life-world. Thomas Risse believes that

communicative action framework can lead to negotiated settlements of the Cold war in Europe- German unification: the idea of the East-West talks. Thomas Risse argues that Habermas' work creates an insight for the implementation of international human rights norms into domestic practices of the Third World states.

Claire O. Neil in *Understanding Habermas: Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy*, *Zotero International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 4, 2005, argues that the idea of global citizenship in Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy is timely. Claire O. Neil showcases the comprehensive nature of Habermas' thought as his contemporary political theory affects both national and trans-national level. Claire O. Neil believes that Habermas' theory of communicative action investigates the critical role of society. Claire O. Neil critically observes that Habermas' theory of communicative action is characterized by normative framework, legitimate expectations and society sole rests on this normative cum legitimate context. Claire O. Neil reflects on the fact that Habermas' communicative action and deliberative democracy is built on the ladder of commonality or what we may humbly refers to as complementarity thesis. Claire O. Neil believes that this ladder of commonality and complementarity presupposes universal solidarity and normative character. Claire O. Neil argues that Habermas' commincative model is the model for the transformation of society, normative social order and social stability. Communicative action is an interpersonal relation of two subjects in their speech and action characterized by the sole objective of transformational mechanisms of society. Claire O. Neil in his interpretation of Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy argues that Habermas' philosophy has multi-levelled analysis. Claire O. Neil believes that Habermas' communicative action and deliberative action showcases the prerequisite for social transformation and normative assumptions. Claire O. Neil argues further that Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy is the critical examination of the question of Enlightenment democratic vision.

However, Claire Neil's understanding of Habermas' communicative action and deliberative democracy reveals the rethinking of the Enlightenment democratic vision. Claire O. Neil's work *Understanding Habermas: Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy* has been a contemporary reflection on the theory of justice, the principle of democratic legitimation, global dialogue, ideal political order, social change, the logic of legal morality, social order and the challenge of social activity.

Patrick Mahony in *Habermas and Communicative Power, Journal of Power, Vol.3 No.1, 2010*, explores Habermas' concept of communicative power as an expression of citizens' political autonomy. Patrick Mahony gives a conflictual account of communicative power dominant in the social sciences. Patrick Mahony diagnoses the problems of Habermas' account in doing justice to the creativity of social power in shaping the substantive parameters of communicative power. Patrick Mahony explains the deontological theory of morality of Habermas' philosophy and the 'polycentric-synchronic theory of society. Patrick Mahony x-rays Habermas' theory of society from its polycentric social science, functional, normative and linguistic perspectives.

A path forward is suggested by Patrick Mahony in which the concept of communicative power is set in relation to both social and functional forms of power within a combined philosophical, sociological, theoretical framework emphasizing the duality of system- life-world, social agents, socio-cognitive and learning theory dimension. Patrick Mahony argues that the duality of the system and the lifeworld of Habermas' philosophy is communicative ethics characterized by a normative framework and the system of continuous learning process. Habermas' conceptualization of communicative power to use the words of Patrick Mahony reveals the basic normative framework of role meeting and the indispensability of dialogue.

Pieter Duvenage in *Communicative Reason and Religion: The Case of Habermas, Sophia, Vol.49, No.3, 2010*, explores the theoretical links between reason and philosophy. Reason becomes the acid test for philosophical exercise and the sole instrument of

philosophy. Pieter Duvenage thinks that religion has a linguistic place in the rational public sphere. This conception of reason also brought to the fore the correlation between reason and religion. Can reason justify the place of miracle in philosophy? Pieter Duvenage articulates certain widely shared moral and substantive intuitions in human ways of life. Religion has become an integral part of the practical everyday life of the human being. Pieter Duvenage critically examines the issue of critical theory and religion. Pieter Duvenage explores more fundamentally the reconstruction of Habermas' intellectual project (with its religious implications). Pieter Duvenage makes some critical remarks on the inter-paradigmatic and extra-paradigmatic conception of Habermas' view of religion and was also critically examined.

Pieter Duvenage successfully gives a paradigm shift of Habermas' philosophy from the communicative turn to a more religious implication of society. Pieter Duvenage brings to the foreground the clear facts that Habermas' theory of communicative action is replete with religious and metaphysical implications of world views. It exposes the fact that world religions make human specie being more relevant to their real world situation. Religion does not just reflect on some form of celestial knowledge but it has to do with our practical everyday existence. Habermas' work is characterized by both moral and religious values. Duvenage's work took a democratic turn of the nineteenth century. Duvenage analyzes why this turn took place. Habermas' religious implication is predicated on epistemological effectiveness. Pieter Duvenage assumes the pattern of realism. Duvenage sees Habermas' theory of communicative action as the theory of discourse ethics. This scholar believes that Habermas discursive ethics has a real application to communicative action vis- a- vis his religious values.

David L. Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr *in Communicative Action and the Radical Constitution: The Habermasian Challenge to Hayek, Mises and Their Descendants, Cambridge Journal of Economics, Vol. 31, No.2, 2007*, evaluates or articulates Habermas' typology of action and his recent call for a radically democratic rule of law. David L.

Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr believe that the theory of action represents a methodological challenge to Austrian praxeology. David L. Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr observe that Habermas' criticism of the welfare state is shown to be somewhat consistent with Hayek's criticisms. David L. Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr demonstrate that both Habermas' welfare state and Austrian praxeology suffers from similar weaknesses and epistemological pretences. David L. Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr observe that the theory of action that Habermas develops, however, suffers significantly from the science of action or praxeology of the Austrian school.

The Austrian school is all about the idea of praxeology. Praxeology is from the word 'praxis'. It means action and it is the deductive study of human action based on the fact that humans engage in purposeful behavior as opposed to reflexive behavior like sneezing. It is possible to draw a conclusion about human behaviour is objective or universal. The notion that humans engage in acts of choice implies that preferences and this must be true for anyone who exhibits intentional behavior. The term "praxeology" is used by the Austrian school of economics established by the economist Ludwig Von Mises. The term "praxeology" is closely related with various fields of study physiology, hygiene, medicine, animal, history, human, political science, philosophy, economics, and morality. Praxeology reflects on the order of the world. Economics is considered as a subdiscipline of praxeology. Praxeological study is characterized by the theory of isolated individual, voluntary interpersonal exchange, bounded rationality, cognitive science, methodological individualism, self-efficacy, semiotics, and social action. David L. Prychitko and Virgil Henry Storr connect Habermas' conceptual explication of communicative framework with the Austrian notion of praxeology but this pragmatic position has its own weaknesses. Praxeology provided insights for ethics. Habermas' conceptual explication of communicative ethics as global dialogue has a praxeological intent.

Deflem Mathieu *in Social Control and the Theory of Communicative Action, International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 22(4) 1994 develops a perspective of social

control on the basis of Habermas' theory of communicative action. Habermas' theoretical project has been applied to the study of criminal justice and social control. Deflem Mathieu makes a comparison between the Foucauldian theory of social control with the idea that social control should be conceived in the duality between lifeworld and system involving state and private agents of control. This is directed at interventions in a plurality of lifeworlds. Deflem Mathieu is inspired by the social-scientific debate. Deflem Mathieu reflects on Habermas' inspired perspective for the analysis of the sociological concept of social control. Deflem Mathieu's position of social analysis and criminal justice system reflects on an integrated paradigm shift of sociological theory. Social control reflects on how social order is possible and the basic normative structure of society. Any crime prone society is bedeviled by myriad of social vices. The question of how social action is coordinated remained very pivotal in the basic normative structure of any society. Social control has been narrowly conceived in relation to deviation between crime and social control. Deflem Mathieu applies the work of Habermas to the more circumscribed definition of social control. Deflem Mathieu brings to the foreground how Habermas attempts to reconcile an action-oriented approach with a system's theory. Deflem Mathieu demonstrates the contemporary significance of Habermas' work for the study of law, crime and social control. Deflem Mathieu argues from the duality of the system and life-world. Communicative action is crucial for mutual agreement and the communicative framework becomes indispensable for democratic legitimacy and the normative question of social order.

Darrow Schechter in *From Rationalization to Communicative Action: The Critique of Instrumental Reason from Weber to Habermas*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010, summarizes the most philosophical import, theoretical orientation and political debates about instrumental reason and political legitimacy, starting from Weber and concluded with the present day conceptualization of society. Darrow Schechter diagnoses the emergence of the Habermasian paradigm and the political debate about the relation between Weber's conceptualization of rationalization to Habermas' conceptualization of

communicative action. Darrow Schechter observes that much of the theory of communicative action seek to situate itself to the political significance of society. Darrow Schechter's argument has been a linguistic and systems' theoretical approach in his theory of communicative action.

Darrow Schechter discusses certain key issues in his philosophy of communication such as from the importance of reason to rationalization of society. In section two of the book, Darrow Schechter explores the emergence of the Weberian paradigm of society. Section three of Darrow Schechter's work reflects on the Revolutionary Critiques of Instrumental Reason: Lukacs and Benjamin, Max Horkeimer, Theodo Adorno' conception of Critical Theory of Society. Darrow Schechter, in section four of his work argued from The Ontological and Republican Critiques: Heidegger and Arendt Reason, Thinking and the Critique of Everyday Life. The theory of communicative action is the critique of reason and the rationalization of society and its ideological frameworks. Section five of Darrow Schechter's work talks about the philosophical import of rationalization to the communicative power of social action. However, Schechter concludes his work by articulating the emergence of the Habermasian paradigm to contemporary society. Darrow Schechter concludes on the post liberal autonomy and post capitalist legitimacy of complex modern society.

Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce in *Taking a Communication Perspective on Dialogue in Anderson, R., Baxter, L.A., and Cissna, K.N., eds, (2003), Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies. Thousand Oaks, Cambridge: Sage Journals, 2003*, reflect on the fact that dialogue has become a global phenomenon and a variety of social contexts including conflict resolution, community building, interpersonal relation and personal development. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce believe that dialogue have been predicated on theories of communication. They argue that communication characterized models of deliberation and the development of the practices of participatory democracy. These scholars postulate that enriching the practice of dialogue is the basis of communication theory. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce argue that dialogic

communication is one way of achieving better argument or the process of getting the better of argument. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce reflect on the articulation of the theories of communication and that dialogue can be understood as better way of articulating various concepts and tradition of social practices. These scholars explain that language helps us to create things in our experiential objective world.

Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce argue that the lives we live are contingent on the interaction of our choices and circumstances. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce believe that the creative aspect of communication is so powerful. The creative power of communication brings to the fore transformative dialogue. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce adumbrate that the plurality of ways of being human can be seen as a warrant for a life of dialogic communication. Dialogic communication aims at the complex webs of responsibility and morality. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce recognize the social nature of communication and argued that communication is fundamentally social. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce observe that dialogic communicators are immersed in the linguistic webs of the world and that dialogic communication remains in the tension between standing our own ground and being profoundly open to the other human person. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce describe dialogue as the avenue where people can interact and the quality of interpersonal relation or communicative reasoning. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce argue that the dialogic quality of speech acts is often achieved by verbal or non-verbal or metacommunication. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce believe that dialogic communication bring to the foreground the dynamics and rational account of interpersonal relations. These scholars argue that emotions, passion, confrontation and challenges occur within the dialogic space. They also argue that communication is the observable practice of an interpersonal relationship whereby everything is seen as a matter of polarized opposites. Barnett W. Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce conclude that dialogue is characterized by a constituted pattern of reciprocated communicative action.

James Gordon Finlayson in *The Persistence of Normative Question in Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action, Constellation, Vol. 20, No. 4, 2013*, argues that Habermas' theory of communicative action is normative ethics. Normative ethics is the study of ethical action or reciprocal relation. It is the branch of philosophical ethics that investigates the set of questions that arise when considering how one ought to act. Normative ethics examines the rightness and wrongness of actions in society. James Gordon Finlayson brings to the fore the normative questions of Habermas' communicative action and its inextricable nexus with the robust conception of intersubjectivity. Intersubjectivity is a key concept in philosophy, psychology, sociology and anthropology. It conceptualizes the psychological relations between people. It is used in contrast to solipsistic individual experience, emphasizing our inherent social being. James Gordon Finlayson sees communicative action as role playing and it constitutes the basic normative structure of society. This scholar believes that the theory of communicative action is the critical consciousness of society. Critical consciousness is conscientization of reaching mutual understanding through intersubjectively shared commitment.

Critical consciousness is a popular education and social concept developed by educational theorist grounded in the Marxist critical theory. It focuses on indepth analysis or understanding of the social world. Critical consciousness allowed the perception and exposure of social and political contradictions. It conceptualizes the attempt to take action against any oppressive elements of the ideological world. Habermas' theory of communicative action is an attempt to remove the ideological distortions facing human beings. James Gordon Finlayson's conceptualization of the persistence of normative question is embedded in Habermas' theory of communicative action that is deeply rooted in social dialogue and making dialogue as the process of changing the world.

Harald Muller in *Habermas Meets Role Theory-Communicative Action as Role Playing in Journal of International Relations edited by Sebastian Harnisch et.al London: Routledge, 2011* reflects on the role of law in international relation. This work is about role

theory and it provides a detailed analysis or comprehensive survey of recent foreign policy roles and exclusive empirical analysis of role behavior of a variety of nation-states in the current era of evolving American hegemony. This work reflects on communicative action as role playing. The scholars probed the contemporary approaches of role playing in international relation. The conceptualization of role theory is an attempt to understand international relation and its key concepts such as socialization, learning process and communicative action. This work drew upon a comparative analysis of foreign policy roles of nation-states such as United States, Japan, China, Germany, Poland, France, Sweden, Norway and international institutions such as NATO and European Union as well as normative power and the impact of China's rise on US hegemony.

These scholars reflect on idea of identity and role change in the international politics. Communicative action has an inextricable nexus with role theory and the definitional analysis of role theory in international relation was also advanced. This work gave a pragmatic account of role playing in the international arena. Communicative action as role playing has become a contemporary issue in international politics. Communicative action as role playing is the conceptual analysis of comparative foreign policy. This work combines role playing with complementary approach of international politics. Communicative action as role playing in international relation is a complementarity thesis of some sort. It actually reflects on the role transformation of NATO and EU in international politics. This work reflects on the agency of role change from Bush- Obama's administrations and the attempt of these administrations in ensuring the reshaping or reconstitution of US hegemony. This work reflects on the negative role of terror and terrorism in international politics. This work reflects on the September 11 terrorist attack and its impacts on US foreign policy. The chapters in the book offer compelling theoretical approaches, contemporary debates and empirical arguments. The work is all about the nexus between foreign policy, role change and the evolution of the international politics or emancipated global society. This work also reflects

on the idea of US hegemony and the role of consent in the foreign policy analysis in international politics.

Herald Muller concludes that communicative action is seen as role playing and it reflects the current state of role theory and the international social order.

Helmut Peukert in *Science, Action and Fundamental Theology: Towards a Theology of Communicative Action*, trans. James Bohman, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1984, stresses on key issues such as theology, methodology, communication, social science, philosophy of action, and the critical examination of social analysis. Social engineering becomes the key idea for the new discipline (sociology). Methodology tends to establish itself as an independent discipline in its own right, solely concerned with the verification, or falsification, repeatability of subjective opinions, motivations, attitudes, and behavioral patterns and all of which are divorced from the contemporary sociological analysis of objective social formations. The chief danger then consists of the growing autonomy of a specific methodological apparatus, spreading over the entire domain of sociology: in other words, of establishing the primacy of method over theory. Development has already led to the situation we are today as far as sociological issues are concerned. We are told that in sociology, that, the idea of social evolution is paramount. Theory is regarded more as a necessary evil and must be associated with practicability or practical rationality and hypothesis helps us to construct rather than something that should exist in its own right. Helmut Peukert argues from the angle of the social sciences in terms of Habermas' theory of communicative action. When we talk of action, we are simply talking of two subjects engaging in speech and action in their interpersonal relation.

Helmut Peukert argues from the robust conception of intersubjectivity and existential negotiations in Habermas' theory of communicative action. Helmut Peukert explains that Habermas' theory of communicative action is based on the intersubjectively shared commitment of communication community through rational agreement and mutual recognition. Helmut Peukert argues that communicative action aims at purposive rational

activity. Purposive rational activity aims at human emancipation. Helmut Peukert posits that Habermas' theory of communicative action has been characterized by metaphysical/religious and sociological implications. Helmut Peukert reveals that Habermas' the theory of communicative action has theological and cosmological worldviews. The world order is conceived from the angle of world religions. It reflects on the religious and metaphysical questions of linguistic communication. Helmut Peukert's conceptual analysis of fundamental theology of communicative action is virtually contemporary moral theory.

Habermas' theory of communicative action reflects on the normative context and religious foundation of ethics. It reflects on the linguistic, theological, metaphysical, and scientific thought of the world order. Helmut Peukert blends the purely ethical questions of Habermas' communicative action with the normative question of the world order. Helmut Peukert's conceptualization of the fundamental theological background of Habermas' theory of communicative action reveals the normative orders of society. Habermas' philosophy has been a conglomeration of methodology, epistemology, ethics, and the philosophy of language. Helmut Peukert's fundamental theological background of Habermas' communicative action critically examines the moral normative failings of communicative interaction. Habermas' communicative action is a critique of reason, world ideology, discourse ethics, and the normative questions of truth and justice. Communicative action is the authentication of aesthetics experiences. It reflects on authentic dialogue, free, open and equal society. Helmut Peukert's reflection on communicative rationality of the intersubjectively shared system-life-world is not only by individuals but by collective actors as well. Habermas' theory of communicative rationality explicates in grisly detailed analysis the rational conduct of life. The theory of communicative action does not only presupposes a normative structure of the system-life-world but constituted epistemological significance.

The system life world showcases the communicative network of social subjects and the theory of communicative action presupposes the establishment of interpersonal relation. Helmut Peukert believes that Habermas' theory of communicative action assumed

intersubjectively shared social and religious worldviews. Finally, the theological foundation of communicative action reveals the legitimate or normative expectations of the world order.

Kenneth Baynes in *Deliberative Democracy and the Limits of Liberalism*, Albany: SUNY Press, 2002, stresses the conceptual framework of ideal speech situation in Habermas' theory of communicative action. Kenneth Baynes's work reflects on the freedom of the state and the freedom of the individual. Deliberative democracy is the basis of political socialization and public discussion. The concept of deliberative democracy has a radical and liberal strand. The democratic theory sets the limits between the state and the individual. Kenneth Baynes reflects on the limits of human freedom and the model of liberal democracy in contemporary society. Kenneth Baynes reflects on Habermas' theory of communicative action as being embedded or dependent on his contemporary political philosophy. Kenneth Baynes believes that the phrase 'ideal- speech- situation' reveals the indispensability of rational relation in human communicative interaction or human association. Kenneth Baynes observes that the idea of communicative action and deliberative democracy are greatly connected and it reveals an inextricable nexus. Communicative action is very crucial in any democratic setting. Kenneth Baynes posits that public deliberation becomes crucial in any democratic setting. Kenneth Baynes' work *Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy* reveals the crucial importance of the existential, epistemological, political significance and linguistic analysis in Habermas' conception of political philosophy.

Habermas' contemporary political philosophy reveals the ethical, linguistic, existential, phenomenological, and epistemological import of critical social theory. Kenneth Baynes reveals the political significance of Habermas' contemporary political philosophy vis-avis the Enlightenment democracy vision of human society. Communication is an integral part of democracy. Kenneth Baynes' conceptualization of communicative action and deliberative democracy anchors on the fundamental role played by the notion and the limits of human freedom. Kenneth Baynes argues that Habermas' theory of communicative action based on the theory of human freedom reveals the force of the debate between private and

public autonomy. Communicative freedom presupposes the normative context of communicative reasoning in our objective world.

Jeffrey Flynn in *Communicative Power in Habermas's Theory of Democracy*, *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 4 critically examines Habermas' theory of democracy as expounded in *Between Facts and Norms*. Jeffrey Flynn focuses on the concept of communicative power and argues that there is an ambiguity in Habermas' use of the concept "communicative action." Jeffrey Flynn argues that since communicative power is the key normative resource that is supposed to counter the norm-free steering media of money and administrative power. Jeffrey Flynn argues further that the role of the theory of communicative power must be made clear. Jeffrey Flynn begins by explaining the normative and social-theoretic foundations of the theory of communication power. Jeffrey Flynn therefore highlights the normative importance of the public sphere in Habermas' two-track model of deliberative politics before returning to the problems with the concept of communicative power. Communicative power becomes crucial in the concept of deliberative democratic decision making process.

Iris Marion Young in *Justice and Communicative Democracy* in Roger S. Gottlieb (ed), *Radical Philosophy: Tradition, Counter Tradition, Politics*, Temple University Press, 2004, argues that communication is an integral part of democracy. The idea of democracy is borne out of the idea of the politics of difference. Iris Marion Young's conception of politics of difference simply means that we as humans can engage in communicative interaction by recognizing our human limits in this process of communicative dialogue. Iris Marion Young's conception of politics of difference reflects on rule making, norm and it is a social movement. The politics of difference is about the ethics of community. It premises on the world of power. The politics of difference reflects on cultural recognition and cultural homogeneity. The politics of difference is built on the normative question of justice. The concept of communicative democracy reflected not just the politic of difference but the

inclusion of the other in our dialogic space, social equality, freedom, justice, politics, agreement and disagreement.

Communicative democracy is all about democratic action based on deliberative process where two or more persons engage in speech and action in their interpersonal relation. Iris Marion Young's conceptualization of justice and communicative democracy is emphatically normative background of Enlightenment democratic vision. This focus on normative foundation established in the politics of difference is a critical examination of mutual intersubjective recognition of individuals in democratic society. Iris Marion Young's conceptual framework of communicative democracy is public deliberation and the practical discourse of everyday political life. Communicative democracy is the everyday political talk. Communicative democracy is described as public discussion among free and equal consociates in democratic society. The central problem with Iris Marion Young's philosophical reduction of cultural homogeneity and normative criteria of rule norm does not really account for universal humanity.

Ukoro Theophilus Igwe in *Communicative Rationality and Deliberative Democracy: Toward a Consolidation of Democracy in Africa, Belgium, Munster: Catholique University of Loivaine, 2004*, reflects on the political instability facing Africa as a continent. Ukoro Theophilus believes that deliberative democracy is central to decision making. Deliberative democracy requires authentic deliberation, not by mere voting in an election but rational consensus. It is the primary source of political legitimacy for the law. The practice of democracy in African contemporary society is lopsided. Communicative action referred to fair bargaining, negotiating systems and linguistic representation. Ukoro Theophilus argues that democracy needs to be redefined in Africa and consolidated in the African continent and to guarantee the Enlightenment democratic vision of African- states. Ukoro Theophilus explains that politics is an avenue for social reconstruction and transformation. Politics presupposed dialogue of African states of some sort. Politics is the avenue for social engineering while dialogue is the avenue for social cooperation and social integration. Ukoro

Theophilus believes that Habermas gives an explanatory schema of social and political progress, stability, change and this has immediate implication in all its ramifications to African contemporary democracy. Ukoro Theophilus sees the consolidation of democracy in Africa from the perspective of African philosophy.

African philosophy, as far as Ukoro Theophilus is concerned, has a pragmatic implication. Ukoro Theophilus using the Habermasian picture believes that African society should reflect on intersubjective recognition, social order, egalitarian principle and normative peace. Ukoro Theophilus' consolidation of democracy in Africa has been a clarion call for social change. This consolidation of democracy in Africa showcases the notion of civil rights and universal human rights. Human right presupposes the Habermasian tradition of national, trans-national or universal character. The consolidation of democracy in Africa reflects on the political aspect of African political and egalitarian society. Ukoro Theophilus also brings to the foreground the religious aspects of democracy in the Habermasian picture of Enlightenment democratic vision. The conceptualization of democracy in Africa is closely related to the principle of commonality in African philosophy as a theoretical pathway or orientation for the concept of 'we-consciousness or we-feeling' and complementarity thesis. African philosophy radicalizes and advocates for the moral consciousness of communication community and complementarity thesis. African philosophy assumes the idea of 'we consciousness'. We communicate therefore society exists to use the words of Mitchell Stephens. There is some level of metaphysics that underpins Habermas' communicative theory of action/rationality.

Ukoro Theophilus brings to the foreground the economic contribution of Africa. Ukoro Theophilus reflects on the problem of political parties. He sees political parties as a process of interest articulation and interest aggregation. Political parties create the forum or platform for the articulation and the aggregation of interest for the sole objective of the political good. Ukoro Theophilus' conception of the consolidation of democracy in Africa stipulated that the liberty of the state and the liberty of the African person are paramount. Africans identify

themselves with the larger society. An African sees his immediate society as man writ large. Ukoro Theophilus argues that the idea of communicative rationality in Habermas' contemporary political philosophy reveals the critique of reason, African ideology and the critical examination in the intersubjective recognitions of African subjects through mutual agreement.

Rationality, though, common to all human persons has its own limitation. Ukoro Theophilus argues that the Habermasian picture is characterized by an intersubjectively shared commitment of human existential and dialogical encounter. The Habermasian picture of communicative, political dialogue or social action is the rethinking of democracy and the contextual justification of the normative structure of African society. The Habermasian picture is the projection of good society. Africa as a continent has been bedeviled by plethora of political instability and economic challenges, social crises and the way out of this political quagmire is through public deliberation or the intersubjectively shared human encounter within the African democratic states.

Ukoro Theophilus pinpoints the continued contemporary relevance of the Habermasian tradition to the African society and global order. Africa as a continent has been at a cross road. At this juncture, we have to chart a new course of communicative political or social action from a more pragmatic or rational account or normative context. Ukoro Theophilus advocates for radical form of social cooperation among African states. Ukoro Theophilus' reflection on Habermas' conceptualization of communicative rationality and deliberative democracy is a contemporary reflection on African complementarity thesis. This contemporary reflection is actually on the normative foundation and legitimate expectations of African democratic society. Society is characterized by social system, normative ideal social order, social justice and egalitarian principle. The idea of social order reflected on social stability and normative ideal political order. Ukoro Theophilus places so much emphasis on the Habermasian picture of the reconstructive tendency and the rethinking of the Enlightenment democratic vision of African society. It is not yet 'uhuru' as far as Africa

as a continent is concerned. Contemporary African society is faced with plethora of challenges such as religious, ethnic, political and economic crises. Ukoro Theophilus believes that we can avert this plethora of political, cultural and economic challenges facing Africa as a continent. Ukoro Theophilus seeks the rethinking and the consolidation of African democracy.

The main drawbacks in African practice of democracy include ethnic politics, corruption, religious bigotry. These drawbacks have actually affected African democracy. In addition, ethnic politics, corruption, religious bigotry can give way to deliberative democracy in Africa through what Habermas calls “purity of motives”. He has made an attempt to seek the re-unification of African- states through an unparalleled communicative interaction or reasoned communication. Ukoro Theophilus’ conceptualization of Habermas’ communicative rationality reveals the pragmatic and hermeneutics dimensions of African commonality and solidarity in African philosophy. African philosophy should not be seen as an abstract or mere theoretical discipline or exercise, but should be able to build, reconstructs and seeks the radical transformation of African politics and various governments in African nation-states. African countries have to undergo reconstruction politically, socially, economically and culturally, scientifically and technologically.

Axel Honneth, and Hans Joas, (eds) in *Communicative Action, Essays on Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1991*, stress on the persistence of normative question in Habermas’ Communicative, Political Action. One very strong argument made by Axel Honneth and Hans Joas is that Habermas’ theoretical orientations have not being able to grasp the present challenges facing our humanity. The normative process requires social significance. The normative standpoint is a dynamics of societal meaningful formation. Habermas’ communicative action is a normative assumption and the project of emancipation. Habermas’ communicative action is a normative presupposition of practical reason.

Axel Honnet and Hans Joas reflect on the possibility of political stability, normative context, and social peace in Habermas' theory of communicative action. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas observe that Habermas' communicative, political action is a mere theoretical exercise because of inability to solve the complexities of democratic setting. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas argue that Habermas' theory of communicative action showcased social setting and Enlightenment democratic vision. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reveal the robust conception of intersubjectivity and existential negotiation of human encounter. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas explain that Habermas' theory of communicative action adequately account for the psychic life of human existential encounter, the paradoxes of human communication and the careful analysis of intersubjective recognition, commitment or existential encounter. It reveals the socialization and the experiential relation of the self to the other.

Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reflect on the anthropologically informed modification of Habermas' understanding of cognitive development and social interaction. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reflect on Habermas' bifurcated moral theory of discourse ethics. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas see the notion of intersubjective recognition as a moral or speech acts. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas argue that Habermas' theory of communicative action is the moralization of speech acts. Honneth and Joas reflect on the collective attempt to establish and expand institutional and cultural forms of reciprocal recognition. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas argue for the anthropological need of intersubjective recognition through social psychology and provided the normative framework of mutual recognition. The cognitive capacity of an intersubjective theory provided the normative criterion and the affectionate bonds of human society. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas highlight the existential, linguistic, political, sociological, and epistemological significance of intersubjective recognition in the theory of communicative action.

Axel Honneth and Hans Joas analyze the concept of basic human rights from the conceptual framework of reason. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas accord legislative, normative, and universalistic principle on particular concrete community. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas'

detailed analysis stipulated that the democratic legitimation of norms is derived in relation to civil, political or cultural rights. The political domain is found within the ambience of the sphere of formal discursive encounter. The formal discursive encounter revealed political legitimacy and normative expectations. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas believe that human rights heralded universal humanity. Habermas' theory of communicative action regarded the intermingling of communities that shared cultural, political, and social values. Solidarity can motivate or propel people towards political participation in progressive social change. Honneth and Joas selective use of historical data is problematic. The basic bonds of human intersubjectivity logically extends to the realm of universal human rights and support the justification of philosophical anthropology. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas' work present an innovative account and rational account of structural condition of communication and the rethinking of some of the ongoing problems found in Habermas' thought. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas locate the moral core of social and political conflict in the normative context of intersubjective recognition.

Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reflect on the transformation of critical theory of society. In addition, Axel Honneth and Hans Joas focus on Habermas' conceptualization of Language and Society. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reflect on the Two Meanings of Communicative Rationality: Remarks on Habermas' Critique of a Plural Concept of Reason. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas base their argument on the conceptualization of Habermas' Communicative Action vis-à-vis Critical Theory: Beyond the Marxian Dilemma. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas theoretical orientation is predicated on Habermas' conceptualization of Communicative Reason and Interest: On the Reconstruction of the Normative Order in Societies Structured by Egalitarianism and Domination. Axel Honneth and Hans Joas reveal the Unhappy Marriages of Hermeneutics and Functionalism.

Joseph Heath in *Communicative Action and Rational Choices*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001, stresses the crucial importance of our rational choices in our thought and actions. The democratic question implies the focusing on the contemporary ethical dimension

with existential-political implication. In his book, Joseph Heath brings to the fore Habermas' theory of communicative action into rational dialogue with the most sophisticated articulation of the instrumental conception of practical rationality and modern rational choice theory. Rational choice analysis is an economic theory which has its roots very much in liberal theory. For Alison Watson, "liberalism today continues to embrace such notions with a focus on the benefits of individual action and a limited role for the state".⁷

Joseph Heath offers an alternative to Habermas' use of speech act theory to explain normative ideal social order and outlines a multi-dimensional theory of rational action that includes norm-governed social action. In the second part of the book, Heath discusses the more philosophical dimension of Habermas' conception of communicative rationality. He criticizes Habermas' attempts to introduce a universalization principle governing moral discourse, as well as his criteria for distinguishing between moral and ethical problems. Heath offers an alternative account of the level of convergence exhibited by moral argumentation, drawing on game-theoretic models to specify the burden of proof that the theories of communicative action and discourse ethics must assume. In the work *Communicative Action and Rational Choice*, Joseph Heath develops an insightful rational account of practical reason that builds on his critical evaluations of both Habermas' theory of communicative action and the instrumental conception of rationality.

Heath argues that the idea of language helps to solve the problem of indeterminacy. According to Joseph Heath, the Habermasian picture reflects on the fact that the use of language has dire practical consequences. Heath's pragmatic account of the variation that discourses exhibit in their levels of convergence makes sense of our level of dialogical commitment to achieving moral agreement. Heath's rational account of practical reason is robust intersubjectivity and the linguistic analysis of rethinking the objective world. The idea of practical rationality in communicative action theory creates the platform for profitable social interaction. The key contemporary issues which have surfaced in global discussion is the transformation of modernity and the relative paradigm shift of emphasis on the

debasement of moral values to rational reconstruction and the rationalization of contemporary society. What becomes the form and substance of the moral regulation of human rational conduct is the cognizance of cognitive-normative structure and the lifting out of things out of the local context of interaction. There is intellectual moral crisis in which there is proliferation of written laws undermining moral laws in the purposive social activity of our contemporary global societal institutions and the public sphere.

Joseph Heath in his book *Communicative Action and Rational Choice* stresses the rational reconstruction of communicative rationality to human social world. Joseph Heath re-emphasizes the critical social theory in Habermas' communicative action. Joseph Heath emphasizes that Habermas theory of communicative action presupposes the basic normative core of practical rationality. Joseph Heath believes that human beings are rational animals who are always involved in dialogical engagement and commitment in a rational discourse. Language use and existential encounter have become indispensable in the workability of human communication. Joseph Heath re-examines Habermas' theory of communicative action as that of reasoned communication among rational beings.

Furthermore, Heath argues that the Habermasian picture is a shared commitment to socialization, social integration and the view of normative judgments. Heath argues that agents can be socialized to seek intersubjectively shared commitment. Heath reflects on the norm-based judgments interpreted as categorical rather than hypothetical imperative. Heath develops a more pragmatic account of Habermas' philosophy which seems to be intriguing. This pragmatic account paves the way for compromise-readiness, moral agreement and rationalization of society and social order. Heath explains that "the use of argumentation rather than coercion commits participants to a specifically moral resolution of their differences".⁸ Joseph Heath's moral account of communicative rationality is impressively clear and subtle. Joseph Heath's rational account of communicative reasoning reveals the future opportunities for profitable social interaction with others. Chrisoula Andreou of the University of Utah succinctly observes that "Heath's solution to the problem of

indeterminacy is not reflectively stable, since the fore-see-able temptation is not centered by any reason to remain a genuine compromiser".⁹

Steven Hendley in *From Communicative Action to the Face of the Other: Levinas and Habermas on Language, Obligation and Community*, Landham MD.: Lexington Books, 2008, refers to both Levinas and Habermas as continental philosophers. Though, their philosophies are mainly different. They both ground their philosophical thought on the moral authority and the epistemological significance of human communicative community. Steven Hendley anchors his philosophical thought of Levinas and Habermas on the role of language, obligation and world community in intersubjective recognition. Hendley brings to the foreground Levinas and Habermas' conception of Communicative Action and the Face of the Other as that characterized by moral, metaphysical, and epistemological groundings. Although, the continental philosophers Jurgen Habermas and Emmanuel Levinas are both inescapably important to an array of debates in contemporary moral theory, and they are rarely assessed in relation to each other. Levinas' and Habermas' basic agendas are different but they both toed the same direction of contemporary moral and political theory. Habermas' discourse ethics are framed within a general concern for democratic political theory. Levinas' work also anchors in political theory. Levinas' conception of politics is mainly idiosyncratic. Levinas' and Habermas' philosophical styles dramatically contrast as well.

Levinas' and Habermas' philosophy presupposes intersubjective encounter and the prime condition for human communication. Levinas' moral phenomenology is educable sensibility. We all constitute nature and ethics digs into the deepest and innermost nature of reality. Communicative ethics assumes ethical order or rational society and world's dialogue tradition. Ethical rationality comes through the question of social consciousness. Furthermore, Levinas is not mainly concerned with politics but the politics of difference. The politics of otherness showcased the fact that what we owe the other is moral responsibility; what I owe the other is more than what I can contain. He considers human society to be

inherently evil and politics has contributed to this plethora of hopeless amorality. The individuals live in multiple social associations, which imposes a host of responsibilities on them. Levinas' and Habermas' philosophy is a reflection on epistemological significance, intercultural dialogue, socio-rational relation, intersubjective recognition and constitutive-transformative interaction. The face of the 'Other' is characterized by human sociality. Levinas' phenomenological account of the face of the 'Other' serves as the basis for his communicative ethics and the rest of his philosophy. Levinas considers the rational relation with the 'Other' as something inherently asymmetrical. The "face" gives priority to the self; its first demand is: "thou shall not kill me".

The face, in its nudity and defenselessness signifies "do not kill me". This defenseless nudity is therefore a passive resistance to the desire that is my freedom. Levinas splits ethics from morality. Ethics envisages our social life world. Ethics liberates us from the totalization of the state. The state as a macro institution no matter what period of its history we examine, decides question of security and property, life and death. The state is the organism of politics. The face of the 'Other' posits ethical freedom or order and universal solidarity or the the need for the sacredness of our humanity. Politics means not war but a real possibility of peace, freedom and social order. Levinas' and Habermas' philosophy emphasizes the correlation between ethics and politics. Levinas' and Habermas' philosophical tradition showcases a distinctive political, epistemological and moral dimension. Levinas' remarks on politics are rare, and, at times, idiosyncratic. Levinas and Habermas reveal in their philosophical import that politics is synonymous with universal humanity. The ethical relation is not something mystical. The ethical relation is essentially rational, discursive and normative in character. Levinas' and Habermas' ethical subject is engaged in a complementarity thesis, sincere and sober discourse.

Steven Hendley's book is based on the conviction that beneath the surface there is in fact a remarkable degree of convergence in the two philosophers' work that is usually overlooked. Steven Hendley discovers and explains the complementarity thesis of Levinas'

conception of discourse as rational relation to the 'Other'. Habermas' theory of communicative action is the normative basis for intersubjective recognition of universal moral norms. Steven Hendley succinctly presents a clear defense and validation of Levinas' ethico-existential position on the construction of metaphysico-moral groundings and political theory. Steven Hendley argues that *From Communicative Action to the Face of the 'Other'* is a unique endeavour that achieved new and important connections in the contemporary scholarship in philosophy and political theory.

Furthermore, Steven Hendley reflects on Conversational Deference and Communicative Action. Steven Hendley argues on the idea of Care Justice and the Face of the 'Other'. Steven Hendley's work explores The Metaphysical Ground of Moral Authority. Steven Hendley reflects on The Liberties of the Ancients and Moderns. Steven Hendley showcases The Moral Relevance of Judaism to Modernity. Steven Hendley argued that communicative ethics in the Levinasian and Habermasian tradition reflected on The Epistemic Viability of the Appeal to the Face of the 'Other'. Levinas and Habermas are important figures in continental philosophy and they have been able to leave their footprints on the sands of time in terms of their contemporary legacies on moral and political theories.

Erik Oddvar Eriksen and Jarle Weigard in *Understanding Habermas: Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004, focuses on Habermas' conception of political theory and social theory vis-à-vis his critical theory of society. It is virtually a compendium of a recent and comprehensive introduction to Habermas' mature theory and his political implications reflects on both national and global perspective. Habermas' mature theory envisages a normative ideal social order in terms of the national and in terms of a global perspective when talking about the psychology of globalization based on political, economic, social, cultural interests of countries of the global world. Dialogic communication correlates with a globalized system of economic, political, cultural, social integration of various countries of the world. What comes into 'central foci' is the phenomenon of global inter-dependence. This

book encourages that the ethics of dialogue and the problems of global justice in new world order have become a normative question.

This book focuses on Habermas' contemporary political theory. It focuses on a more recent social analysis which underscored the aesthetic power of inter-subjective communication in Habermas' theory of communicative action. This book is mainly based on the fact that we communicate and therefore we are in society to paraphrase Descartes words. It is basically the human conception of unlimited dialogue in Habermas' critical theory of contemporary society. Human contemporary society is characterized by a reasoned communication and deliberative democracy. It is a highly regarded interpretation in English translation of Habermas earlier work, written just as Habermas is developing his full pledged communicative action theory in German version in 1981. This book explicated the understanding of Habermas' theory of communicative action and deliberative democracy. This book stresses the crucial importance of communicative action theory in the contemporary political philosophy of Habermas. Erik Oddvar Eriksen and Jarle Weigard argued that the fact that Habermas' theory of communicative action preceded his theory of politics as a procedural concept of basic rights of human beings.

Deliberative democracy is an institutionalized model of democratic setting that stressed the need for public deliberation. Public discussion becomes very crucial form in the contemporary Habermasian perspective. Habermas' philosophy demands a 'strong communicative action' whereby voting in an election is not just enough but public deliberation or public discussion becomes paramount in our constitutionally democratic setting. According to Lain Mackenzie, "deliberative democracy is a model of democratic government that seems to overcome the failings of the purely representative model by placing a large emphasis on the value of 'deliberation'. Deliberation, in this context, refers to a process, or more often processes, of rational argumentation...and the central claim, therefore, is that voting is not just enough to sustain democracy".¹⁰ According to the Habermasian picture, argumentation represented a flow of communication processes.

Habermas describes public conversation as very vital and is concerned with reaching mutual understanding with one another in a rational discourse process of communicative rationality or reasoned communication. Habermas turns to practical everyday language as the means through which we re-construct this novel world of ours and it presupposes properly dialogical commitment of human rationality. Habermas' theory of '*Communicative Action*' and '*Deliberative Democracy*' is a typological theory. This book basically explores the instrumental conception of communicative rationality. Communicative action opens out to reaction or a rational search governed by a particular set of normative standard. Max Weber gave out a characteristically socio-theoretical twist of rationalization. The rational choice theory reveals the crucial importance of rule-following and human deliberative process.

These scholars are of the view that we are held accountable for our conduct by other human agents and the publicly shared dialogical commitments and the monological conception of public deliberation. This book provides an illuminating and comprehensive overview or insight of Habermas' work. It explores the way in which his sociological theories have developed and changed overtime in the past two decades, leading to a critical exposition of his more normative core, complex ideas, theories and his theory of communicative action is analyzed, as his key themes. Habermas examines some critical contemporary issues such as rights, public deliberation, morality, politics, global order, rational society, social change, normative ideal social order, law, democracy, and how they interrelated. This democratic question of how institution can be designed to formulate problem solving and conflict resolution in a communicative manner is also discussed, and so is Habermas' contribution to the theory of international relation. Philosophy pitches its tenth on the penetration and the interpretation in the social sciences. This book explores the fact that practical discourse is deeply rooted in a social program of philosophical justification of human communication in contemporary society.

Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr (eds.) in *Communication Ethics Controversy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, reflect on Habermas' conception of

democracy as public deliberation. The section one of the book presupposes the Normative Perspective and Institutional Perspective Framework of Contemporary Society. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr argued that Habermas' communicative ethics explored on the Political Legitimacy and Democratic Deliberation and justice. It describes the multicultural conception of societies, neutrality, perfectionism, and public deliberation. Furthermore, Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr reflected on the Five Arguments for Democratic Deliberation, and the process of public deliberation has an educative power.

Public deliberation is a community-generating power, the procedure of public deliberation and it improved the fairness of democratic outcomes. Public deliberation revealed constructively the practical rationality of democratic legitimation and normative outcomes. Deliberative democracy brings to the foreground the sensible educability of citizens in their democratic process of decision making. The ideal of democracy is most congruent with 'who we are'. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr explicate the Conception of Deliberation, Citizenship, Personal Identity and Deliberative obligation. Argumentative deliberation of citizens and personal identity connoted the flow of communicative processes in a democratic setting. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr talk about Rawls and Deliberative Democracy, Rawls on Public Reason and the Rawlsian Mirror. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr explicated the Idea of Deliberation and Decision Making, and the Discontinuity in the Two Tract Model of Democracy. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr deliberate on Citizenship Juries and Deliberative Democracy. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr argued that communicative ethics is characterized by Deliberative Democracy and Cultural Rights, Deliberative Democracy, Deep Conflict and Rights to Equal Opportunity of Citizens. Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr conclude on the Question of Deliberative Democracy as Unfair to Disadvantaged Group.

Finally, what is quite glaring in this book is the way and manner Seyla Benhabib and Fred Dallmayr brought to the foreground a comparison between Habermas and Rawls in their

conception of political legitimacy, international justice, human rights and reasonable democracy even at the global level.

Amy L. Buzby in his book *Communicative Action, United Kingdom: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2010*, stresses that we now find ourselves at a critical juncture or cross road, faced with familiar moral and epistemological quandary, but under the auspices of a new administration that has opened the door to multilateral action and progressive change. Since we are at a cross road and we are at a crisis point, Amy Buzby believes that we ought to redefine our history, humanity and global politics. We need to redefine global justice and the crisis situation in our global world order. Amy Buzby's conceptualization of Habermas' notion of communicative action is the contemporary reflection on the philosophy of universal brotherhood or complementarity thesis or global interdependence. Our humanity will remain disconfigured and the planet earth will become inhabitable if the current global crises are not drastically reversed or addressed. The current global challenges should be addressed with all sense of sincerity or collective effort. It is pertinent to redefine human history because human beings are agents of history and history is not static but cyclic and progressive.

This book offers challenges and wonderful insights by the interviews of the major contribution in improving the quality of our response to this critical moment of opportunity and charting a new course or hope for our global world order. This book provides a unique and necessary vantage point on the dilemmas and frustrating tendencies that mark our limits in this global world order characterized by moral quicksand and epistemological quandary. Amy Buzby sets out the Declining State of Politics and Cultures in the global arena. Amy Buzby reflects on the Rise of Neo-liberalism, International Imperialism and American Hegemony. Amy Buzby explores the Crises in the Middle East. Amy Buzby reflects on the Alternative Visions and Modes of Resistance. Habermas' political theory has to do with the clear distinction between the state and society, and secondly, the "globalization of politics" and democratization of reason. Habermas' conception of politics has had to do with democracy and global order, radical or deliberative democracy should be characterized by

communicative system of global integration and social integration. Politics in contemporary perspective should be based on a systematically undistorted communication or an unlimited dialogue based on reasoned communication characterized by a progressive assimilation of collective individuals or emancipated global society. Guaranteed reasoned communication is only made possible when there is the prevalence of a normative assumption of our global order. The democratization of reason, globalization of politics, rationalization of actions and forms of life, and the rationalization of worldviews ultimately belong to the Habermasian picture of society. Moreover, this book brings to the foreground the disconfiture of the project of humanity and how we can get out of this quagmire of global crisis or threat caused by fundamentalism and human senselessness.

Amy Buzby's philosophy of communicative action is in line with Kenneth G. MacKendrick's project of human communication, reason and the hermeneutic circle of critical theory. Kenneth MacKendrick discussed the Struggle for Recognition from the Philosophical Perspective of Jurgen Habermas, Axel Honneth, and Jessica Benjamin. Kenneth MacKendrick focuses his concerns on the plausibility of Habermas' effort to base the normative formulations of critical theory upon the solid bedrock of a moral theory of practical discourse. Habermas' conception of communicative rationality is the keystone for global dialogue and dialogical reflection. Habermas' critical social theory is a sustained critical analysis of communicative rationality and the normative ideals of the Enlightenment vision.

According to Kenneth G. MacKendrick:

In the most general terms the critical social theory of Jurgen Habermas is a sustained analysis of practical rationality and enlightenment from a social theoretical perspective, a perspective setting out to chart the distortions and malformations of the human use of reason in society and history... Habermas's philosophy constitutes sustained and systematic defence of the cognitive and normative ideals of the Enlightenment.¹¹

Habermas' philosophical justification presupposes the progressive analysis of emancipated global society. According to Kenneth G. MacKendrick, "in brief, Habermas thought provides a philosophical justification of the separation of value sphere, and world

orientations, the progress of scientific knowledge, the material possibility of justice and the propensity for moral autonomy, and even extends to reflections on the relevance of art and the failure of religion within modernity”.¹² MacKendrick viewed Habermas’ philosophical work to be thematically consistent contemporary thought. This scholar presents a critique of Habermas’ theory of communicative rationality and practical discourse or discourse ethics.

Habermas’ writings have continued relevance even in our contemporary time both nationally, or locally and globally. Habermas’ earlier work, *The Theory of Communicative Action* is a conceptual apparatus which draw out the social, legal, political, and institutional frameworks or global implications of this earlier work or endeavour we can then understand the theory of communicative action. Habermas is constitutive of communicative action theory as that which showcases an orientation to reaching mutual understanding and reaching mutual understanding revealed criticizable validity claims that serve as a logical mechanism for global integration or global interdependence.

Giovanna Borradori in *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003, starts with an introduction to global terrorism and the legacy of the Enlightenment period. Borradori talks about Habermas and Derrida who are very perchant on the elusive concept of “terrorism”. Giovanna Borradori explores the idea of fundamentalism and terrorism. Borradori’s work *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: A Dialogue with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida* reflects on the deconstruction and the reconstruction of global terrorism. Giovanna Borradori reflects on the concept of Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides. A dialogue with Jacque Derrida and Jurgen Habermas is the reconstruction and the deconstruction of terrorism. These scholars x-ray their concerns for Europe and the European philosophical tradition, of which Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida are arguably the two greatest living forces or exponents. Giovanna Borradori’s focuses on *Philosophy in a Time of Terror* has the guiding thread of global dialogue. This scholar opts for a philosophical analysis of dialogue as the most urgent normative and

legitimate questions regarding terror and terrorism. The dialogue with Habermas and Derrida express their unique styles of philosophical thinking and also bring into play or focus the very normative core of their philosophical theories.

Giovanna Borradori argues that Habermas and Derrida advance on global terrorism showcased larger contexts of their critical reflections or theoretical frameworks of the imminent danger of terrorism to global politics. Giovanna Borradori believed that Habermas and Derrida both expose the theoretical frameworks of their thought as the hardest of all tasks: the evaluation of a single historical event – threat of global terrorism. These scholars are of the view that despite the marked differences between Habermas' and Derrida's contemporary approaches to philosophy, both of them held that terrorism is an elusive concept that exposed the global political arena to imminent dangers as well as future challenges. Giovanna Borradori adumbrates that Habermas decries the potential loss of political legitimacy on the part of the liberal democratic governments which he sees systematically exposed to the danger of the militarization of our practical everyday ordinary life that could undermine the workings of the constitutional states and restrict the possibilities of democratic participation even at the global level.

Habermas, from his reconstructive position, and Derrida, from his de-constructive position understands global terrorism as politically irresponsible course of human action and they both understand the meaning of the term "terrorism" as that which is problem-ridden. Giovanna Borradori argues that both Habermas and Derrida obviously deny that terrorism has any stable meaning, agenda, and political content. Giovanna Borradori posits that Habermas and Derrida saw terrorism as an attack of humans and dialogue should be seen as the only globalized system of communication. Giovanna Borradori observes that terrorism is a traumatic experience of the project of humanity both locally and internationally. Giovanna Borradori argues that terrorism is a devastating peril and an eruption of an archaic theater of violence destined to strike our human imagination. Giovanna Borradori asserts that in the face of this global devastating peril of terrorism both Habermas and Derrida call for a

planetary or global response of a new cosmopolitan order in which multilateral institutions and continental alliances would become the chief political actors. The political and philosophical notion of dialogue presupposed a diplomatic reach.

Dialogue is so crucial to every diplomatic strategy and it is a universal tool of human communication. On the theoretical front, Habermas and Derrida demand a critical re-assessment of the meaning of territorial sovereignty, and in this respect, both Habermas and Derrida affirm the value of Enlightenment ideals of global or world citizenry and cosmopolitan right. Giovanna Borradori alludes to the fact that Habermas and Derrida's call for a new cosmopolitan order is akin or in tandem with Kant's state of a universal community or international (perpetual) peace in which all members are entitled "to present themselves in the society of basic normative orders by virtue of their right to the communal possession of the earth's surface". Only under this universal condition that we all as humans to paraphrase Kant's position that perpetual peace can only be advanced and continually attainable in our attempt of emancipated global society. The battle against terrorism and terror can only be resolved by dialogue process. Philosophy has been the home of conceptual clarification of this sort.

Giovanna Borradori opines that "carrying out its field of competence as it moves along, philosophy should know better than any other discipline how to re-orient itself even as the familiar points of reference seem to have been pulverized".¹³ Habermas and Derrida clearly lay out and x-ray the conceptual complexity underlying the notion of global terrorism. Terrorism has been an elusive concept and radiates traumatic experience and terror itself. In the course of this global perspective of terrorism, philosophy found itself in the face of a single historical event of world wide significance.

Giovanna Borradori puts it quite succinctly:

Habermas and Derrida approaches to philosophy have been molded by the traumas of twentieth century history, including colonialism, totalitarianism, and the Holocaust... My suggestion is that if global terrorism is the opening trauma of the new millennium, philosophy may yet be unaware of the extent of its involvement with it... philosophy has become the fundamentally rational aspiration to understand our universal community.¹⁴

In the light of Giovanna Borradoris' theoretical submission: "philosophy provides the ground for reason to play its active role in the philosophical analysis of universal principles and reason has an intrinsic moral and social responsibility and whether, on that ground, philosophy ought to develop a more active relationship with history".¹⁵ According to Giovanna Borradori, "for Kant and other Enlightenment philosophers it becomes clear that the self-affirmation of reason has a historical impact, for only reason can indicate how to reshape the present into a better future".¹⁶ Yet, reason remains for them a mental faculty with which every individual is endowed simply by belonging to the human species and whose force is entirely independent of the contingencies of history. Reason grows out of the way in which the individual understands himself as part of a global community. The ability to think is indelibly shaped by time, space and culture and making our global world a better place is evident on the human ability to think or reason. According to Giovanna Borradori, "if the ability to think is indelibly shaped by time and culture, only the study of history can disclose our nature and place in the world. Reason itself is history dependent...this reveals the fact that reason is closely related to history".¹⁷ Put differently, philosophy and history are closely related. Giovanna Borradori opines that, "the relationship between history and philosophy has a direct impact on the meaning of responsibility and freedom".¹⁸

Giovanna Borradori discusses in grisly detail, Habermas' philosophy in terms of its contemporary global relevance. The philosophy of Habermas has a janus- face. It is like two sides of a coin. It is both philosophy and sociology. It is the philosophy of communication or language and the philosophy of social interaction and social practice or discursive practice. Habermas' reasoned communication reflects on the philosophy of social reconstruction or rational reconstruction of the system- life-world. Habermas' philosophy of social and rational reconstruction of the system-life-world is as clear as crystal. It presupposes the critique of instrumental rationality and strategic rationality. Reason plays a critical role in the individual as well as the collective destiny or collective affairs of the human community and this

reflected on the lifting out of things out of the local context of social interaction in dealing with the system-life-world. Habermas' philosophy reflects on game theory and rational choice theory. It reveals the basic normative core or structure of human society. The language use in Habermas' communicative action theory is a cognitive structure snowballing into the local context of interaction and how people deal with their system-life-world through a dynamic force of social interplay. Society becomes the dynamic interplay of rational behavior through norms and values. What make the basic normative core of human society are guided norms and cultural values. The society is a custodian of customs, traditions, norms and values. Society is governed or guided by rules and regulations. The notion of rules and regulations become the basic normative core of rational human society. Society is 'ipso facto', not a free- rider- system. Society abhors every carnivorous tendencies of dog eat dog situation. The human person is not only flesh and blood but represents the whole of humanity. Society is a collection of members of human persons living in a particular geographical area.

The vision for the ultimate organization of society rests on a conceptual basic normative foundation that is compatible with the collectivist outlook. Habermas' social, ethical, political positions or existential dimensions are premised on the market economic structure and administrative rationalization of the social structure of society. Habermas is of the view that there is a troubling ambivalence in the scale of human civilization. Habermas has been a staunch supporter of the exaltation of the ideologies of social rationalization, including social engineering and social cooperation. The human community is the home of social life and moral guarantor-ship. The advance of any group of person in civilization is the extent to which they are able to organize and systematize their collective efforts for the common wheel of human progress. The highest expression of organized life is the rational organization for purely benevolent and social reformatory purpose. Habermas' contemporary political ideal is the main thrust of communicative action theory. A practical influence of Habermas' philosophy is the main- streaming of the liberal collectivist social programs.

Habermas frowned at the transgressions of social evolutionist rationality, a sense of social cohesion among rational people in human society. Habermas' philosophy is a fundamental constitutive element of social interaction. It is communicative sociation, transformative consociation or dialogue, constitutional patriotism, constitutive association and "consociational democracy".¹⁹

The aim of this work is to bring to the fore the continued contemporary relevance of communicative action theory in the political philosophy of Habermas. The idea of ensuring reasoned communication is to remove all the ideological distortions of sets of beliefs, monetization of society, and ruthless power. Communicative action theory brought to the foreground the broad scope of social interaction and the rational nature of normative ideal social order. The normative assumption of social order and social change brings the fore the idea of social engineering and social cooperation. Communicative action theory brings to the fore the basic normative ideal of symbolic interaction whereby the cognitive structure of the mind plays a critical role. The pragmatics of social interaction and dialogic communication is only possible through the use of language through signs and symbols, and verbal or non-verbal and proper reason. The Habermasian picture reflects on the fact that through reasoned communication, we human can get beyond our prevailing prejudices and biases or pre-conceived ideas and as Mitchell Stephens observes Habermas shares with Socrates utopian belief in the wholeness of public debate and discussion. According to Mitchell Stephens:

His critics find this view rosy. Habermas persists, for example, in maintaining that "in our everyday knowledge of how language is properly used we find a common ground among all creatures with a human face." That's called "cultural humanism". That's called "universalism". These are beliefs any self-respecting postmodernist rejected decades ago. Moreover, Habermas is convinced- and this really gets the postmodernists calling for the violins- that through reasoned communication we humans can get beyond our biases.²⁰

Habermas' philosophy is cultural rationalization, reciprocal/rational relation and a re-visitation of the theoretical and practical questions and historical experience of the powerful reverberation of early modern science in the sphere of religion, morals, and politics.

However, the Habermasian picture showcases the limit of political obligation and it is the Achilles heel of his political theory. Habermas points out the internal connection between the theory of rationality and social theory. According to Thomas McCarthy, in his introductory remarks of Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action* (TCA) observes that:

Habermas point out the internal connection between the theory of rationality and social theory: on the one hand, at the metatheoretical level by demonstrating the rationality implications of sociological concepts of action current today; on the other hand, at the methodological level by showing that similar implications follow from approaching the object domain by way of interpretive understanding...this argumentation sketch is meant to demonstrate the need for a theory of communicative action that arises when we want to take up once again, and, in a suitable way, the problematic of societal rationalization, which was largely ousted from professional sociological discussion after Weber.²¹

Habermas' philosophy is virtually the theory of society and it explains the stubborn connection of sociology to the theory of society. As observed by Thomas McCarthy, Habermas' philosophy questions how the paradigmatic conceptualizations of "lifeworld" and "system" relate to one another. Habermas' philosophy reflects on myriad of contemporary sociological issues such as social integration, symbolic interactionism, cultural anthropology, or cultural humanism, cultural homogeneity, purposive-rational action, and the rationalization of society. Thomas McCarthy posits quite succinctly in *The Theory of Communicative Action* that:

Alone among the disciplines of social science, sociology has retained its relations to problems of society as a whole. Whatever it has become, it has always remained a theory of society as well. As a result, sociology could not, as other disciplines could, shove aside questions of rationalization, redefine, them, or cut them down to small size. As far as I can see, there are two reasons for that. The first concerns cultural anthropology and sociology equally. The correlation of basic functions with social subsystems conceals the fact that social interactions, in the domains important to cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization are not at all specialized in the same way as interactions in the economic and political domains of actions. Both sociology and cultural anthropology are confronted with the whole spectrum of manifestations of social action and not with relatively clear-cut types of action that can be stylized to variants of purposive-rational-action with regard to problems of maximizing profit or acquiring and using political power.²²

Furthermore, Habermas' philosophy reveals a critical assessment of proper explanations of rational society. He took both the metatheoretical and methodological levels to deal with a piecemeal process of ensuring proper explanations of concepts. Habermas

tends to examine the thesis of internal colonization or the ideological distortions and to also examine the present inherent distortions of our contemporary social systems and social structures. Habermas navigates through theoretical water and practical frameworks on how this ideological distortion in our paradigmatic conceptualizations of social system and the lifeworld can be removed. He proffers logical mechanisms or pragmatic and normative contexts of how a society can progress even in the midst of inherent contradictions. Habermas' philosophy reflects on the need to rectify the ideological distortions and the ethical quicksand in rational society in order to guarantee human flourishing. Habermas and John Dewey share the same avowed affinity in their conceptions of pragmatics as it relates to human flourishing. Habermas and Dewey built their theoretical frameworks on the progressive or pragmatics of human communication and empirical laws that tend to advance human flourishing in society. Human flourishing reflects on functionalist perspective, an embodiment of rational account of society and this function in a systematic approach in evaluating the evolution of moral judgment in society such as the validity or truth claims. Habermas' philosophy reflects on the teleological aspects of human activity. For Stephen Carden, "the most general end or purpose of human activity is progressive rather than static...our rational human nature is a purposive social activity...that human activity is teleological".²³ This teleological aspect of human activity envisages the notion of philosophy as a practical discipline. For Finn Thorbjorn Hansen, "philosophy-at its best-is a practical exercise in presence".²⁴

Habermas' philosophy of social reconstruction showcases the rationalization of society and the theory of social change. Habermas' philosophy of rational reconstruction is the critique of reason, ideology, politics, society and political praxis and this is animated by normative sentiments. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "the fact that Habermas normative sentiments (free and open communication) are overt and clearly stated makes the source of his critiques of society clear, and provides the base for political praxis".²⁵ Habermas' communicative action can only occur in our system- life-world.

Habermas is concerned with the rationalization of the system-life-world, which involves, for one thing, increasingly rational communication in the system-life-world. Habermas believes that the more rational the lifeworld becomes, the more likely it is that interaction will be controlled by power of communication. The life-world is composed of culture, society and personality. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky sees the system-life-world as that defined by its complexity and structural characteristics. Social theorists see society as that which is integrated through social integration and began with communicative action and they see society as the system-life-world and society is defined as a self regulating social system. The politics of social integration and system integration showcases a micro-macro integrated sociological paradigm and achieved rational consensus. Thus, Habermas concludes that although each of these broad perspectives (social and system integrations) has something to offer, both have serious limitations. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky agree with Habermas who sees society as a system that has fulfilled conditions for the maintenance of socio-cultural life-world.

Nevertheless, Habermas sees society as being composed of both lifeworld and system. System in the modern world has come to control the life-world. The rationalization of the life-world involves the growth in the practical rationality of communicative action. Life becomes monetized and bureaucratized through money and power. Like Karl Marx, Habermas also sees deception within the system-life-world. The problem of domination and self deception has created a systemic failure or systematic crisis; it might be noted that by linking the deformities to capitalism, Habermas continues, at least in this sense, to operate within the neo-Marxian terms. Habermas sees modern complex society as subject to recurrent systemic crisis. In seeking to deal with these systemic crises, ideological distortions of institutions such as the state as the site of class struggle and political dominations the economic undertakes actions that adversely affects our system-life-world leading to ideological paradoxes, international patterns and pathologies and crises within the system-life-world, what we may refer to as the thesis of internal colonization. Basically, the life-

world has been denuded by these systems, and communicative action comes to be less and less directed toward the achievement of rational consensus. For Habermas, in order to guarantee free and open communication, society must engage in a rational dialogue of universal brotherhood or moral universalism. The rationalization process that has occurred in both system and life-world made it possible that the future re-coupling will produce a level of system-life-world and their dual inter-relationship is unprecedented in human history.

For George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky:

We currently suffer from an impoverished life-world and that problem must be overcome. However, the answer does not lie in the destruction of systems (especially the economic and administrative systems), because it is they that provide the material pre-requisites needed to allow the life-world to rationalize. One of the issues Habermas deals with is the increasing problems confronted by the modern, bureaucratic, and social welfare state. Habermas does think that the problems could only be solved by the relationship between system and the life-world.²⁶

However, the project of modernity is an unfinished project waiting to be completed by the power of communicative rationality and rationality has its own limitations which simply denied us the enrichment of life.

For George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky:

The result is that while we may be enjoying the fruits of system rationalization, we are being deprived of the enrichment of life that would come from a life-world- a life-world that was allowed to flourish. In analyzing the way in which the system colonizes the life-world, Habermas sees himself in alignment with much of the history of social thought...the hallmark of modernity to Habermas, as well as to most classical theory, has been, in Habermas's terms, the colonization of the life-world by the system.²⁷

Our existential social conditions have been distorted and our humanity reduced to nothing and our social life situation is governed by a deeper existential wonder and it required aesthetics appeal to intersubjectivity, a deeper understanding of the logics of legal morality and the dialectics of society and the tendency to put aside all ethical quicksand and epistemological quandary. For Finn Thorbjorn Hansen, "deeper existential wonder required a three dimensional approach, that is, aesthetical, dialectics, and an ethical approach".²⁸ A rationalized society should be one in which both system and lifeworld are permitted to

synergistically rationalize, following their, own internal logics. Habermas' theory of communicative action rests on the premises of political economy. Thomas McCarthy, in his survey of the writings of Habermas, sums up the matter:

As political economy, economic still held fast at the start to the relation to society as a whole that is characteristic of crisis theories. It was concerned with questions of how the dynamic of the economic affected the orders through which society was normatively integrated. Economics as a specialized science has broken off that relation. Now it too concerns itself with the economy as a subsystem of society and absolves itself from questions of legitimacy from this perspective it can tailor problems of rationality to considerations of economic equilibrium and questions of rational choice.²⁹

Politics and economics presupposes the progress of rationalization of society heralded by the monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power. It is society that impresses upon the individual a sense of perpetual dependence. Society does not only constrains but confers strength and life on the individual. Society is sacred, and society is involved in human morality. Society is more concerned with moral validity. Law and order are essential to the maintenance of social life. Human beings are thought to be able to learn the laws by which they are governed and to reduce, by foresight, the possibility of accidental collision or social conflict. Society should be united by virtue of organic solidarity. For Joan Ferrante:

A society with a complex division of labour is characterized by organic solidarity— social order based on interdependence and cooperation among people performing a wide range of diverse and specialized tasks. A complex division of labor increases differences among people, in turn leading to a decrease in common conscience...specialization and interdependence mean that every individual contributes a small part in creating a product or delivering services....a curious feature of organic solidarity is that although people live in a state of interdependence with others, they maintain little awareness of it, possibly because of the fleeting and impersonal nature of the relationships created.³⁰

Some kind of collective consciousness is essential to the idea of any society. Collective consciousness is the prime source of society's unity and collective consciousness brings to the foreground what Durkheim calls common conscience. The needs of human persons as social beings mean that no one is able to lead the totally ego-centred life. All societies must induce their members from egocentric and ethnocentric tendencies. In the meantime, the struggle against egotism, which is everywhere the very life of society, has become much more difficult problems of *contemporary* socio-political world. Collective

representation is a social fact the product of society rather than of individual experience. The basic normative framework of individual life is established by objective factors which are wholly independent of their social activities. The globe retains basic framework or normative dimension of ideal social order as it has always had. Culture determines rationality. Social tension, it may well be the price of social progress. Human beings in society can modify their social environments. The establishment of a world community is an ideal deeply rooted in the nature of human beings. The Habermasian picture is cultural rationalism and homogeneity. No culture has absolute value and each must give way in favour of the greater good of a world community.

The Habermasian picture consists of basic normative framework. His theory of communicative action is characterized by the indispensability of dialogue. The communicative action theory of Habermas' contemporary political philosophy revealed the indispensability of dialogue and the political task of collective social transformation. Politics concerns the social. Liberal dialogue is social practice or practices of liberty are inextricably linked with liberalism. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy emphasize on the more nationalistic ideological tendency and a more basic normative core of reasoned communication. Habermas' theory of communicative action does not reject democracy because the rejection of democracy can definitely lead to fundamentalism which can necessarily lead to political violence. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that "by rejecting democracy, fundamentalism necessarily leads to violence".³¹ Habermas' philosophy reinforced the cultural context of life which is very critical in our contemporary human society. Habermas thinks of political struggle in terms of a politics of mutual recognition, appeal to inter-subjectivity and communicative action theory. Habermas' theory of communicative action is apologetic or eclectic and has been to the extreme in his exaltation of reasoned communication and his philosophy of society showcases social progress and the hermeneutics of society.

Furthermore, Habermas' theory of communicative action itself can only make sense within the global perspectives of the indispensability of dialogue. Kant, for instance, asserts that an ethical principle must be universally applicable if it is to be considered as having objective validity whatsoever. We argue in this discourse that the indispensability of dialogue can not be overemphasized and it reflects on world politics. Habermas' communicative political action has the inability to grasp the current social and political quagmire facing contemporary global world. Communication is an integral part of democracy. Communicative action is 'ipso facto' communicative cooperation. The current global challenge has been a very complex one and it required fundamental change and solution. Our planet earth or objective social world will become inhabitable if global crises such as crises in North Africa, Middle East and other part of the world are not curtailed.

Having reviewed these scholars it is germane to take a theoretical sweep into the lacunas that are embedded in this Habermasian perspective. Habermas' communication model and political theory has some weaknesses. Some have criticized Habermas' theory of communicative action as mere appearance and that it has not been able to grasp the present complexities of our global vision or the Enlightenment democratic vision. Habermas' strategy is the communicative rational exchange. Understanding both the interpretation of violence and global terrorism characterized the defects of communication as well as the solution that he envisaged for the problem of exploring the vulnerability of complex systems. Some scholars praised him that the theory of communicative framework reflects real world situation. It cuts across business ethics, law, sociology, philosophy, linguistic, social and cognitive psychology. We can see some lacunas which none of these scholars have not been able to pinpoint in their literature review. They do not touch two things in Habermas' theory of communication model and political theory.

Habermas' communication model and political theory lacks the tenets to solve global insecurity. Global insecurity is raging our sacred humanity putting us in asunder. We are already at a cross road because global terrorism such as Islamic fundamentalism is taking us

unawares. The series of crises and political instability (ies) in North Africa and the Middle East calls for immediate concern or scholarly attention. Habermas' philosophy lacks the rigor or comprehensive examination of tackling human predicaments caused by the problems of ideological distortions in contemporary society.

In addition, it is proper to conclude that Habermas' philosophy, on the one hand, does not meet the Kantian pragmatic account or paradigm of reconciling theoretical reason with practical reason, on the other hand, it is deeply rooted in the epistemological question of political realism. The Habermasian communication model and political theory lacked methodological component. Giovanna Borradori believes that "communicative action is Habermas' name for the residue of rationality built into our everyday exchange...communicative action is emancipatory".³² Giovanna Borradori, therefore, asserts that "the dialogical voice of communicative action speaks in the first person plural ("we")".³³ Habermas' theory of communicative action has accrued political currency and learning processes. Gillian Howie sees "learning to be a moral agent in a moral community".³⁴

Habermas' theory of communicative action presupposes political participation and social inclusion. Gillian Howie sees "participation and social inclusion in terms which resonated with liberal and humanist principles of equality and social justice....".³⁵ Habermas' philosophy is based on critical thought, learning to think and good argument. Accordingly, Gillian Howie believes that "philosophy is peculiarly concerned with critical thought, learning to think critically is according to Stephen Clark, learning to discover, order, verbalize, remember and present a good argument".³⁶ Habermas' thought is the "democratization of learning".³⁷ We can see that Habermas' philosophy reflects on the democratization or the exaltation of reason. For Gillian Howie, "reason has become instrumental".³⁸ Habermas frowns at the militarization and the bureaucratization of the modern world and this is resulting into the disenchantment of the world. According to Gillian Howie, "bureaucratic rationality has resulted in a disenchanted world".³⁹

Finally, we can therefore conclude that Habermas' philosophy is characterized by "liberal-humanist ideal of person-hood".⁴⁰

Habermas' philosophy is a dialogical commitment to critical reflection and world citizenship. It is the active engagement of citizens to their real world challenges. It is critical pedagogy which reflects on a deeper philosophical insight or engagement. Habermas' contemporary thought reflects on to use the words of William Edelglass and Howard Gardner "real-world problem solving"⁴¹ and "verbal linguistic intelligence".⁴² Habermas' theoretical framework of real world problem solving to use the words of William Edelglass is all about "holistic engagement".⁴³ Habermas' communicative ethics is the theory of rationality. For Giovanna Borradori, "rationality provides the structure as well as the scope of communication".⁴⁴ Habermas' philosophy provides the platform for fundamental change and the dynamics of resolving disagreements through rational arguments. For Giovanna Borradori, "this dynamics between participants renders communicative action fundamentally emancipatory because it affirms the need to resolve disagreements through argument".⁴⁵ Habermas in his theoretical analysis of cognitive development believed that psychoanalysis is part of critical sciences. Kenneth G. MacKendric asserts that "Habermas demonstrate that the critical sciences simultaneously embody two kinds of understanding: explanatory-dynamics (descriptive) and historical-hermeneutics (normative)".⁴⁶

Finally, "Habermas has remarked that: what many critics have simply overlooked is Habermas' left- Hegelianism. He is not seeking to demonstrate conceptually that what is rational is (or will be) real and what is real is (or will be) rational, but to identify empirically the actually existing possibilities for rationality structures in concrete forms of life".⁴⁷

Endnotes

1. Alan, T., *Value and Context: The Nature of Moral and Political Knowledge*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) , p.258.
2. Martin Plot, *Communicative Action Democratic Deficit: A Critique of Habermas's Contribution to Democratic Theory*, International Journal of Communication, Vol 3, California Institutes of the Arts, 2009, pp.825-852.
3. Ibid.,
4. Ibid.,
5. Ibid.,
6. Paul Healy, *Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue*, Journal of Politics, Philosophy and Social Criticisms, Swinbourne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, May 1, 2012, pp. 295-311.
7. Watson, M.S.A., *An Introduction to International Political Economy*, (London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), pp.9-10.
8. Heath, Joseph, *Communicative Action and Rational Choices*, (Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press, 2001), p.41.
9. Ibid.,
10. Mackenzie, Lain, *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p.
11. MacKendrick, G. Kenneth., *Discourse, Desire and Fantasy in Jurgen Habermas's Critical Theory*, (London & New York: Routledge, 2008), Pp. 6-7.
12. Ibid.,
13. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in the Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jacques Derrida and Jurgen Habermas*, (Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 2003), pp. x-xvi.
14. Ibid.,
15. Ibid.,
16. Ibid.,
17. Ibid.,
18. Ibid.,
19. Jay Richard, Democracy in Robert Eccleshall, Geoghegan, V, and Wilford, R, (Eds) *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), p.177.
20. Mitchell Stephens. "The Theologian of Talk; The Question is whether Justice exists and Reason can benefit Society". Los Angeles Times Magazine, October 23, 1994, p. 5.
21. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984a), p.3.
22. Ibid.,
23. Carden, Stephen, *Virtue Ethics: Dewey and MacIntyre*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006), Pp.80-86.
24. Hansen, Finn.Thorbjorn, *Philosophical Praxis as a Community of Wonder in Education and Professional Guidance* in Andrea Kenkmann (Ed), (2009) *Teaching Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p.207.
25. Ritzer, George and Stepnisky Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory*, Ninth Edition, (Singapore: McGraw-Hill International Edition, 2014), Pp. 510-529.
26. Ibid.,
27. Ibid., p.530.

28. Hansen, Finn.Thorbjorn, *Philosophical Praxis as a Community of Wonder in Education and Professional Guidance* in Andrea Kenkmann (Ed), (2009) *Teaching Philosophy*, p. 208.
29. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, p.4.
30. Ferrante., J, *Sociology: A Global Perspective*, (USA: Wadsworth and Thomson Learning, 2003), p.13.
31. Hoffman, J., and Graham, P, (Eds) in *Introduction to Political Theory*, Second Edition, (England: Pearson Education Limited, 2009), p. 392.
32. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in the Time of Terror*, (Chicago: The Chicago university press, 2003), p. 60.
33. Ibid., p. 61.
34. Howie, Gillian, *Teaching Philosophy in Context: or Knowledge Does Not Keep Any Better Than Fish*, in Andrea Kenkmann (ed,) *Teaching Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p.11.
35. Loc., cit.,
36. Ibid., p.12.
37. Ibid., p.15.
38. Ibid., p.17.
39. Ibid., 18.
40. Ibid., p.20.
41. Edelglass, William, *Philosophy and Place-Based Pedagogy* in Andrea Kenkmann (ed,) *Teaching Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p.71.
42. Ibid., p.78.
43. Loc, cit.,
44. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in the Time of Terror*,
45. Ibid.,
46. MacKendrick, G. Kenneth, *Discourse, Desire and Fantansy in Habermas' Critical Theory*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008), p. 79.
47. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and Rationalization of Society*, Volume 1, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984a), pp. 405-406.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BASES AND INFLUENCES OF HABERMAS' THEORY OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION

3.1 Life and Times of Jurgen Habermas

This research discusses so far that Habermas' theory of communicative action presupposes real life situation and problem solving mechanism. The World War II which Habermas experiences in 1937 is a case in point. Habermas is a social thinker and could be referred to as the last rationalist. For George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, Habermas is arguably the most important social thinker in the world today. He was born in Dusseldorf, Germany, on June 18, 1929, and his father used to be a middle class and rather traditional. Habermas is profoundly affected by the World War II. The end of the war brought new hope and enthusiasm and opportunities for many Germans, including Habermas. The fall of Nazism brings optimism about the future of Germany, but Habermas is disappointed in the lack of dramatic progress in Germany. With the end of Nazism, all sorts of intellectual opportunities arose, and once-banned books are available to the young Habermas. There are Western and German literatures, as well as tracts written by Karl Marx and Engels. Between 1949 and 1954 Habermas studies a wide range of topics such as philosophy, psychology, sociology, communicative studies, including German literature. Habermas studied in Gottingen, Zurich, and Bonn. He receives his doctorate from the University of Bonn in 1954 and works for two years as a journalist. In 1956, Habermas arrives at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt and he becomes associate with the Frankfurt School. Habermas demonstrates a Marxist background in his philosophical and sociological theory. He has been an associate of the Institute for Social Research. Habermas demonstrates from the beginning an independent intellectual orientation. Furthermore, Habermas, in his political and philosophical notion urged that critical thought and practical action was crucial for social reform.

In 1961, Habermas completes a second dissertation required by German Universities at the University of Marburg. Having already published a number of notable works, he has been recommended for a professorship of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg even before he completes his second dissertation. He remained at Heidelberg until 1964, when he moved on to the University of Frankfurt as a Professor of Philosophy and Sociology. He becomes the director of the Max Planck Institute from 1971 to 1981. He returns to the University of Frankfurt as a Professor of Philosophy, and in 1964 he becomes an emeritus Professor at that Institute. He wins a number of prestigious academic prizes and has been awarded honorary Professorships at a number of Universities. He is a neo-Marxist and for many years the world's leading neo-Marxist.

Furthermore, over the years his work has broadened to involve many different theoretical inputs. Habermas continues to hold out new hope for the future of the modern world. He believes in the project of humanity, the Enlightenment democratic vision and the modern world. It is in this sense, that, Habermas writes of modernity's unfinished project. Habermas' vision of society's comprehensive social practice anchors in a systematically undistorted communication. He is concerned mainly with communication. Habermas is concerned with the way the structure of modern society distorts communication. Habermas envisages a future society characterised by free and open communication. Thus, there are startling similarities between the theories of Marx and Habermas. They are generally referred to as Modernists. The startling similarities of those who are referred to as modernists are that they are concerned with freedom of the individual and the freedom of the state; they see freedom to be a fundamental value of human society.

Modernists believe that in their time modernity's project (creative and fulfilling work for Marx; free and open communication for Habermas) has not yet been completed. They both have faith in the completion of modernity's project. Habermas have strong commitment to modernism. The future of modernity's project set Habermas apart from many leading contemporary thinkers and post-modernists. Post-modernists believe or are often driven by

nihilism but Habermas continues to believe in his lifelong modernity's projects. The distinction between modernism and post modernism was that modernism, on the one hand, is used as a synonym for liberalism; it has been an ideology that has made freedom to be the fundamental value. They regard individuals as naturally equal. Post modernism on the other hand, challenges the dualisms and onesidedness in the modernist tradition.

Habermas has absolute faith in the most notable grand theory in modern social theory. Habermas has been seen as the last great modernist thinker. Habermas may be seen as the saviour of the modernist project and of grand theory in the social sciences. Habermas also lay emphasis on Talcott Parson's problem of social action to systems theory of society. Habermas makes a paradigm shift from normative theory of social action to systems theory of society. The development of social or systems theory and the theory of rationality and modernity is Habermas' major theoretical commitment and intellectual agenda. Habermas and Marx share the same great theoretical cum philosophical affinity on the idea of the thesis of internal colonization in the system-life-world which is the task of a critical theory of society. Habermas' theoretical frameworks of social theory and philosophy are drawn from a number of intellectual traditions.

The German philosophical thought of Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Schelling, G.W.F. Hegel, Wilhelm Dilthey, Edmund Husserl, and Hans Georg Gadamer influenced the philosophy of Habermas. The Marxian tradition both the theory of Karl Marx himself as well as the critical neo- Marxian theory of the Frankfurt School, i.e. Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, the sociological theories of Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, and George Herbert Mead had a great influence and significance in Habermas' philosophy. The linguistic philosophy and speech act theories of Ludwig Wittgenstein, J.L Austin, P.F Strawson, Stephen Toulmin and John Searle, the developmental psychology of Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg, the American pragmatist tradition of Charles Sanders Pierce and John Dewey, the sociological social systems theory of Talcott Parson and Niklas Luhmann and the neo- Kantian thought has great influence on Habermas' philosophy.

3.2 Wittgenstein's Philosophical Approaches to Communication

Habermas in his book, *Theory and Practice* aligns himself with Wittgenstein in the conception of language. According to Habermas, "Wittgenstein has remarked that the concept of reaching an understanding lies in the concept of language".¹ Linguistic communication aims at reasonable consensus. Habermas shows a lot of gratitude to Wittgenstein. However, they differ, in the sense that Habermas works has been more "transforming and liberating" as opposed to Wittgenstein's "quietist approach". Wittgenstein gives the feeling of wonder at the very existence of the world. Wittgenstein believes that there is really nothing to say about ethics. Wittgenstein wants his reader not to think too much but to look at the "language games" (any practices that involve language) that gives rise to philosophical (personal, existential, spiritual) problems. His approach to such problems is painstaking, thorough, open-eyed and receptive. Wittgenstein's emphasis on language and human behaviour, practices, etc. made him a prime candidate for anti-realism in many people's eyes. He has been accused of linguistic idealism, the idea that language is the ultimate reality.

The idea of Wittgenstein's realism, equate objectivity with inter-subjectivity (universal agreement). Wittgenstein is neither a realist nor an anti-realist, at least with regard to ethics and metaphysics. The *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*, the ethic matters are located by Wittgenstein in the region of "mystic" and ineffable. Wittgenstein, in spite of his main idea of an ethics and perhaps on moral philosophy in general forms the core of Wittgenstein's moral philosophy. In Wittgenstein's moral philosophy, we face two levels of ethics: the one of the ethical propositions and, the one of moral-ethical use of language. We consider the main issues.

Ludwig Wittgenstein is one of the most influential philosophers of the twentieth century and regarded by some as the most important thinker since Immanuel Kant. *The Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*, the only philosophy book that Wittgenstein published during

his lifetime is based on the idea that philosophical problems arise from misunderstandings of the logic of language, and it tries to show what this logic is. Wittgenstein's later work, principally his *Philosophical Investigations*, shares this concern with logic and language, but took different, less technical approach to philosophical problems.

Wittgenstein's work on rule-following and private language is still considered important, and his later philosophy is influential in a growing number of fields outside philosophy whereby Habermas logically fits in. Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* was ethical. The book certainly does not seem to be about ethics but that of linguistic analysis. Wittgenstein said about his work, the "picture theory" of meaning. According to this theory propositions are meaningful insofar as they picture states of affairs or matters of empirical facts.

Wittgenstein's aim seems to have been to show up as nonsense the things that philosophers (himself included) are tempted to say. Philosophical theories, he suggests, are attempts to answer questions that are not really questions at all (they are nonsense), or to solve problems that are not really problems. Most of the propositions and questions of philosophers arise from our failure to understand the logic of our language. Philosophers then, have the task of presenting the logic of our language clearly. Wittgenstein takes philosophical puzzlement very seriously. Wittgenstein's philosophy of language presupposes the critique of social practice. The critique of social practice is a connotation of social liberation. In this process, the parties involved define, interpret, and attach meaning to the existential encounter of human linguistic processes. Wittgenstein's conception of language corresponded with Habermas' conception of existential – political philosophy. It reflects on the linguistic analysis of the social world. Language is necessary in human social interaction. The conceptual clarification of language is anchored on society. Society is characterized by a vast human relationship and the cosmic network of human association. According Joan Ferrante, "Society is a large complex of human relationships; a system of interaction".² Wittgenstein's conception of language justifies 'empirical variability' normative reasons of physical world. According to Jeremy Winsewski, "normative reasons are required to justify

normative conclusions: to claim that ordinary use ought to count as a criteria of meaning is to move beyond ordinary usage; to claim that empirical statements are the only ones that ought to count as meaningful as to move beyond empirical statements”.³

The problem here is not merely that one cannot justify the above approaches. The problem is that a commitment to the above approaches predicts the possibility of normative justification. This possibility of normative justification is what Habermas calls “criticizable validity claims”. Wittgenstein’s conception of language permits the critique of social practice. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, in his book *Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry: A Defense of Ethics as Clarification*, believes that “once we demonstrate that Wittgenstein’s approach to philosophical issues not only permits critique but demands it, it will be possible to defend a robust, and critical, clarificatory ethics”.⁴ Wittgenstein’s conceptual clarification of language is akin to Habermas’ theory of communication as role playing and that of emancipatory project, transformation, and enrichment of our socio-political position. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “philosophy thus aims at emancipation and at the enrichment of our socio-political position”.⁵

Wittgenstein’s influence on Habermas reveals the conception of language and just as an ordinary usage of semantics but it reflects on the evaluation and the transformation of social life. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “transformation is not to occur willy-nilly; rather, the aim of the theorist is to identify areas of social life that are replete with ideology that are repressive of true human interests and then to attempt to change this area of social life through positive intervention”.⁶ Jeremy Wisnewski believes that language from its philosophical perspective has a transformational value. According Jeremy Wisnewski “... philosophy not only aims at action and the transformation of political reality is ultimately idle – and hence not worth doing”.⁷ Wittgenstein’ and Habermas’ conceptualization of language emphasizes on ultimate considerations, the formation and transformation of character. Accordingly, Jeremy Wisnewski opines that “considerations of ultimate should focus on social institutions, as social institutions explain individual actions”.⁸ Wittgenstein’s

philosophy of language reflects on critical social theory. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, ‘one might respond by claiming that the rigour and tension brought to bear on questions of linguistic significance provide the point of departure required for any critical theory’.⁹ Language use clarifies the need for human practices and the bearing in our socio-political existence. According to Jeremy Wisnewski “... philosophy robs itself of any bearing on our socio-political existence”.¹⁰ Philosophy is not all ‘what is’ but what can be. According to Jeremy Wisnewski “the aim of philosophy, then, is not merely to document what is, but also to highlight what can be”.¹¹ Language is the medium of communication and the process of the transference of knowledge. Communication showcased the use of verbal and extra verbal means. Accordingly, Godfrey O. Ozumba believes that “language is the means of communication of knowledge”.¹² Emotions can also be communicated through language.

Wittgenstein’s conception of language does not reflect misunderstanding and contradictions. It connotes how human beings can use language to reinforce their culture, undergo formation of their personality, appropriate patterns of social relations (society). According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “engaging in communication and achieving understanding in terms of each of these themes lead to the reproduction of the life world through the reinforcement of culture, the integration of society, and the formation of personality”.¹³ Communicative action presupposes knowing. According to Ozumba, language is a means of communicating ideas and thought.¹⁴ Wittgenstein’s conception of philosophy of language is to guarantee clarity, and it serves as a prophylactic against linguistic abuses. According to Godfrey Ozumba, “the end of philosophy of language is to ensure clarity, distinctions and cogency in our picture of reality through language”.¹⁵

The use of language game clarifies social criticisms, practice and social order of human society. According to Edmund Igboanusi, “one of the major contentions regarding language is that it is the most direct sense making mechanism of human society, which is recognized to harbour political ideology, and is critically endangered in Africa”.¹⁶ The meaning of human language is dependent on language as a means of communicating ideas

and thought. According to Edmund Igboanusi, “one of Wittgenstein achievements is that he insists that the meaning of human language is its use that is to say, communication”.¹⁷ Language is a fundamental perspective or role and it is characterized by the Meadian symbolic interactionism’s theory of communication of intention, meaning and socio-political existence or experience. Language is a carrier of culture. Ludwig Wittgenstein believes that human thinking operates with signs and symbols. The idea of human thinking reveals the need for social activity. Wittgenstein’s conception of language game showcases the simpler form of language than the highly complicated everyday language. Language is a form of which a child begins to make use of words.

Accordingly, Richard Velkly postulates that “the study of language games is the study of primitive forms of language or primitive languages. If we want to study the problems of truth and falsehood, of the agreement and disagreement of propositions with reality, of the nature of assertion, assumption and question, we shall with great advantage look at primitive forms of language in which these forms of thinking appear without the confusing background of highly complicated processes of thought”.¹⁸ Richard Velkly observes that these simple processes forms of language gave us the impetus to see activities, reactions, which are clear cut and transparent. The Wittgenstein’s rethinking of Habermas’ philosophy actually showcased the linguistic transparency of language. Richard Velkby rightly observes that our craving for generality is closely connected with philosophical confusions. Language helps us to describe things just as philosophy reflects on the descriptive mode of things in the world. According to Richard Velkly, “Philosophy really is purely descriptive”.¹⁹

What defines the essence of things are their properties; like sweetness and hardness. Wittgenstein often speaks of ethics and religion together. Wittgenstein writings on ethics and religion: goodness, value or meaning are not to be found in the world: living the right way involves acceptance of or agreement with the world, or life, or God’s will, or fate; one who lives this way will see the world as a miracle; there is no answer to the problem of life – the solution is the disappearance of the problem. Wittgenstein believes in mystical truths that

somehow cannot be expressed meaningfully but that are of the utmost importance. It is hard to conceive, though, what these 'truths' might be. An alternative view is that Wittgenstein believes that there is really nothing to say about ethics. If we cannot reduce talk about God to anything else, or replace it, or prove it false, then perhaps God is as real as anything else.

Wittgenstein's view of what philosophy is, or should be, changed little over his life. Jeremy Wisnewski in his Wittgensteinian tradition of language believes that "Philosophy aims at the logical clarification of thoughts". Philosophy is not descriptive but elucidatory. Its aim is to clear up muddle and linguistic confusion. The philosopher's proper concern is with what is possible or rather with what is conceivable. This depends on our concepts and the ways they fit together as seen in language. What is conceivable and what is not, what makes sense and what does not, depends on the rules of language, and the rules of grammar. Ways of life and uses of language change overtime, so meanings change, but not utterly and instantaneously; we lose all grip on meaning. But we cannot escape language or the confusions to which it gives, except by dying. Meanings are sometimes interpreted as doing. The meaning of any word is a matter of what we do with our language, not something hidden inside anyone's mind or brain. What is essential to a concept depends on us, on how we use it. To Wittgenstein, what matters to you depends on how you live (and vice versa), and this shapes your existential experience. Understanding another involved empathy which requires the kind of similarity that we just do not have with dogs, and that many people, do not have with other human beings.

Without sharing certain attitudes towards the things around us, without sharing a sense of relevance and responding in similar ways, communication would be impossible. Moreover, language involves rules establishing certain linguistic practices. Certain things one might want to say about language are ultimately incoherent. Relevant linguistic community accepts rule following. So whether two plus two equals four depends not on some abstract, extra-human rule of addition, and depends on our past experience. Truth conditions are replaced by the conditions of validity claims. Wittgenstein's last writings are

on the subject of certainty. Two central discontinuities in his work are these: Whereas the *Tractatus* is concerned with the general form of the proposition, the general nature of metaphysics, and so on, in his later work Wittgenstein is very critical of “the craving for generality”; and, in the *Tractatus* Wittgenstein speaks of the central problems of philosophy, whereas the later work treats no problems as central. Another obvious difference is in Wittgenstein’s style. The *Tractatus* is a carefully constructed set of short propositions. There is not a full-frontal assault on the problems of philosophy. Wittgenstein influences twentieth century philosophy enormously. The Vienna Circle logical positivists were greatly influenced by what they found in the *Tractatus*, especially the idea that logic and mathematics are analytical, the verifiability principle and the idea that philosophy is an activity aimed at clarification, not the discovery of facts. Language functions in so many ways and it opened up new approaches to ethical sphere.

Wittgenstein’s 1929 “A Lecture on Ethics” reveals that to solve ethical problems, one must clarify certain misunderstanding of ethical concepts. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “to solve an ethical problem, one must clarify a misunderstanding one has concerning some specific ethical concepts”.²⁰ Jeremy Wisnewski alluding to Kelly’s submission believes that “we must view ethics, in Wittgenstein, as an ultimately personal endeavour”.²¹ Wittgenstein’s philosophy is a global vision that gives rise to linguistic transparency. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “Wittgenstein, early and late writing always seems to have thought of ethics, not as an assortment of disconnected goods, rights, and obligations, but as a global vision which gives meaning to life”.²² Language showcases facts and values. It reflects on the holistic principle. Language should not be seen from a disoriented perspective. Language showcases strong philosophical commitment, normative structure, transparency and complete global re-orientation. Language expresses underlying semantic structures of thoughts and ideas. Language is an integral part of human existence. Language makes us humans. The most important function of language is to communicate. Wittgenstein and Habermas dwell on nature, functions and power of language as it affects contemporary global order. The role of

language narrows down to human interaction. Language is seen as a form of medium of communication. The primary function of language is communication which involves dissemination of information and exchange of ideas among a people in any speech or communication community. Language serves as the basis for social order. Language provides us aspects of our social identity or some kind of social experiences.

Language functions as the basis for social or cultural learning processes and seemed to be aimed at learning about the world. Language has a social structure. Comfort I. Eberinga, rightly observes that “the linguistic structure of any society may influence or determine its social structures”.²³ The linguistic structure of any society aims at the world unification. According to Comfort I. Eberinga, “we can then say that linguistic uniformity is a very vital aspect of the social order of a given society”.²⁴ For language reflects on the continuous learning process and the survival of every given society. Accordingly, Comfort I. Eberinga concludes that “language plays very vital roles in the survival of every given society”.²⁵ Comfort I. Eberinga rightly concludes that “any society or community that overlooks the power of language in general is bound to crumble because it is not something that can easily be swept under the carpet”.²⁶ Language is crucial in the philosophical enterprise of the world. Language expresses the deeper concerns of human association. According to William Lawhead, “... philosophy is an attempt to speak accurately and coherently about our deeper concerns”.²⁷ The free analysis of experience reflects on our “common form of linguistic usage”.²⁸ Language reflects on the questionable inferences about the external world. Wittgenstein and Habermas attempts to remedy the situation by developing broader notions of both language and experience. Language helps to clarify concepts. According to William Lawhead, “experience ... is an arena for action in which we face practical problems, seeks solutions, and carry out our projects and aims”.²⁹

Wittgenstein, Husserl, Habermas and others depict the role language plays in our intercourse with the world. William Lawhead concludes that “language is just one way in which we break the world up into intelligible units and fashion it after our own image”.³⁰

Jeremy Wisnewski believes that “as Wittgenstein correctly thought, our language is much more fluid than philosophers are generally willing to admit”.³¹ Wittgenstein believes that an ethical theory aimed at providing us normative considerations. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “... normative considerations are part of our form of life ...”.³² Ethical propositions are seen as ways of clarifying our sense of the good life. The essence of the ethical is value. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “value lies beyond the empirical world”.³³ An ethical theory aimed at clarifying our normative understanding of practical everyday life. According to Jeremy Wisnewski, “the practice of everyday life is solely based on the aspect of normality”.³⁴ The practice of everyday life and our knowledge of the ultimate ground of value need to be based on the business of clarification and assertion. The ethical vision embraces the fact that “we are normative beings”.³⁵ Normative judgments make it possible for something to be moral or immoral. The significance of our ethical theorizing lies in our normative judgments. The normative dimensions of our form of life involves how we offer the adjudication of the instruments of moral conflicts and how we clarify our conception of the ultimate value of the world. Jeremy Wisnewski concludes that “the language game of knowledge involves the ability to give reasons/evidence for the claims one makes”.³⁶

3.3 George Herbert Mead’s Theory of Symbolic Interactionism and the Philosophy of Communicative Power

George Herbert Mead’s book *Mind, Self and Society* has great influence on Habermas’ philosophy. The philosophy of communicative power as a result of systematically undistorted communication freed society from its complexities. Meads’ work has a powerful influence on sociological insight and on the development of contemporary thought, especially symbolic interactionism. Mead’s profound thought influences his sociological insights of social reforms and social psychology. Mead’s conception of symbolic interactionism actually reflects on Habermas’ theory of communicative action as in role playing. Mead’s symbolic interactionism became clearer through his conception of dog fight analogy. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “Mead labels what is taking place in this situation as

“conversation of gestures, one dog’s gesture automatically elicits a gesture from the second; there are no thought processes taking place on the part of the dogs”.³⁷ Humans sometimes engage in this conversation of gestures. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “humans sometimes engage in mindless conversation of gesturers”.³⁸ It is only through significant symbols that we can say that communication is truly possible. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “only when we have significant symbols, can we truly have communication. Communication in the full sense of the term is not possible among ants, bees, and so on”.³⁹ Language showcases the set of vocal and symbolic gestures.

Nevertheless, with language the gestures and their meanings are communicated. Significant symbols bring to the foreground stimulus – response analysis. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “significant symbols allow people to be the stimulators of their own actions”.⁴⁰ Mead’ and Dewey’s conception of language as a pragmatic orientation just like Habermas’ functionalist perspective of language in human society. Language makes human thinking possible. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “significant symbols make human interactions possible. People can interact with one another not just through gestures but also through significant symbols. This ability, of course, makes a world of difference and makes possible much more complex interaction patterns and terms of social organization than would be possible through gestures alone”.⁴¹ George Herbert Mead’s communication theory is seen as the notion of ideal role playing and role taking. Communicative action is made possible through the process of the mind. Communicative action elicits response of the other, but the response, broadly speaking, is the communication as a whole. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “the mind has the ability to respond to the overall community and put forth an organized response”.⁴²

The mind has a thought process and it works in a pragmatic way. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “Mead also looks at the mind in another pragmatic way. That is, the mind involves thought processes oriented toward problem solving”.⁴³ For Mead, the mind and the self are characterized by a process. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey

Stepnisky, “for Mead, the self is determined as a process”.⁴⁴ The idea of the mind, and the self reflect on some regulative principle of society. The self has the ability to act and it is seen as an object. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “the self, then, has the ability to both act as a subject (a source of action) and to take itself as an object”.⁴⁵ Selves are a product of social processes. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “rather, they are a product of social processes, in particular the process of communication among human beings”.⁴⁶ As George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe, “Mead embeds the self in social experience and social processes”.⁴⁷ Mead gives a behaviouristic sense of the self. The self allows conversation with others. The standpoint from which one views one’s self can be viewed as that of the societal group as a whole. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky “selves are deeply social in their make-up and character”.⁴⁸ At the most general level, Mead believes that society precedes both the mind and the self. As George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe, “given its importance in shaping the mind and self, society is clearly of central importance to Mead”.⁴⁹ Society is characterized by the need for cultural learning processes. Mead also deals with the evolution of society as a learning process. Mead’s central importance of symbolic interaction showcased the learning of meanings and symbols. Mead’s conception of societal interaction has a pragmatic presupposition. He focuses on human action and interaction.

3.4 Kant and Communicative Ethics

Contemporary philosophical debate extends to several different topics. Communicative ethics represents the trend consolidated in the wake of Kantian insights. In the case of Habermas’ communicative ethics, reflects on moral universalism, cognitivist and formalist theory. A study of Habermas’ departure from Kant is a preliminary step in any exploration and critique of discourse ethics. Communicative ethics is an attempt to reformulate and re-modernize Kantian pivotal notions like the categorical imperative, autonomy, happiness, publicity, practical reason and maxims of action. Discourse ethics is a cognitivist, formalist and universalistic theory. As a reformulation of Kantian premises via

language, however, Habermas supersedes Kantianism to a large extent, and reflected on the idea of universalistic understanding. Therefore, Habermas' attachment to Kantian theory is evident and indisputable. Kant and Habermas' philosophy is an attempt to shift it from the framework of the philosophy of consciousness to that of the philosophy of language. Habermas' idea about the unfulfilled expectations raise the normative question of linguistic paradigm. The Kantian consideration of inter-subjectivity and equal participation in public life, aims at the genuine feelings of care and solidarity. Central ethical questions like the moral self, morality and law, autonomy and happiness, publicity, and the application of norms are dealt with by Habermas. A pragmatic philosophy of language such as the Habermasian picture assumes a very different legality and morality.

Discourse ethics questions precisely this Kantian assumption of a bad matter to be tamed by the good reason. Discourse ethics automatically leaves space for reconciliation of reason and feelings. Communicative action theory reflects on the deep insight of the Habermasian suspicion of any extra-linguistic world. Kant defined the "*categorical imperative as an act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law*". For Kant, a rational being has to test his or her 'principles in terms of their cognitive capacity to fulfill universalized premises. Pragmatic philosophers of language shares and sharpens the critique of the Kantian version of formalism. Despite Kant's emphasis on the inter-subjective commitment claims that norms have to be met, and the testing of a norm is something that is carried out for human solidarity. Autonomy and empathy imposes a norm which you have test for inter-subjective acceptability. Discourse ethics grounds moral norms in communication. Habermas' conception of Discourse Ethics reformulates the Kantian project. We think of universal-ability as a test of communicative agreement. Categorical imperative is replaced with a procedure of moral argumentation.

The influence of the Hegelian critique is obvious, since Hegel is the first to expose the formalism of Kantian ethics by showing that the mere principle of universal-ability cannot generate determinate moral norms, and is dependent on the actual practices of a society.

Reformulation that may prove exceptionally important for radicalizing and re-democratizing world politics, and the relevance of which extends to several domains of research, international law included, to embody in an ethics concerned of a normative core or universalistic character. The linguistic paradigm will purge Kantian ethics of its weakness, thus, unlike Kant, Habermas sees in discourse principle a yardstick of actual or inner dialogue, and the medium of expressing thoughts and actions. Communicative ethics privileges “real talks” situation, and the institutionalization of democratic procedure. Communicative ethics presupposes and requires a communicative ability that is free of power relations or ideological domination. The Kantian insight reflects on moral order and the existential condition that requires directly the agreement with others on binding norms. Moral responsibility or obligation involves the way our actions affect other human beings. Such is the character of some cases of responsibility to otherness which do not avail themselves to public regulation but however present themselves as moral issues. Communicative ethics does define its main moral principle in a differential relation to its antecedent theory. Communicative ethics emphasizes on the importance of moral autonomy and mutual independence. Individuals understand and relate to the world through language, while they form themselves through language and communicative interaction. Habermas asserts that ‘discourse ethics gave up Kant’s dichotomy between an intelligible realm and a phenomenal realm.

Nevertheless, from a communicative ethics point of view, an assimilation of law and morality would be equally misleading. Kant appears inconsistent in his rational account of the relation between morality and law. Habermas’ moral and political theory is traceable to Kant’s philosophy of history which, in Habermas’ view, presupposes an already existing natural basis for a juridical condition, and therefore led Kant to separate the welfare of the state from the welfare of the citizens. Discourse ethics accepts a distinction between morality and law. Morality is distinct from law, but they are compatible and complementary. Universalistic normative claims are Habermas’ attempt to undo the public-private sphere as

the oppositional couples of the social structure. Questions of law and politics are directly and self-evidently relevant to the questions of public wealth and happiness. There has been a paradigm shift from the philosophy of consciousness to the philosophy of inter-subjectivity or language. The happiness of the members of a society is a problem that can be dealt with by both materialistic and idealistic means. Kant, as a good Enlightenment thinker, shares his theoretical insights with the Enlightenment democratic vision of Habermas. The Enlightenment philosophers reflects on the confidence and optimism that goes along with the belief in the progress guided by an emancipatory ideal. Thus, Kant has to purify his idea of happiness by identifying it with a rational happiness – a stable, fixed, compulsory happiness, not far from the idea of duty. Habermas remarks that Kant’s ethics cannot be dispensed with the question of happiness and the end of any public utility is happiness”.

Discourse ethics generates its own conception of autonomy, universalistic quasi-naturalistic laws or to a supposedly inescapable linguistic and cultural construction. In discourse ethics, the idea of autonomy is inter-subjectivity. From a communicative theoretical point of view, Kant is right to define freedom negatively, as an absence of determination by alien causes, but he was wrong to connect freedom with an exclusively self-embedded reason. Problems of social action, to use Weber’s terminology, the crucial matter is how one bridges the gap between theories and praxis as well as the relation between the ‘Is’ and the ‘Ought’. Discourse ethics does not follow in Kant’s steps so long as it does not conceive reason as the other of experience but justified reason by considering it as a trans-historical linguistic pragmatic event. Concerning praxis, Kantian theory assumed a morality that resembles purposive rational activity. The Habermasian perspective has an avowed affinity with Marxism, development psychology, Mead’s social anthropology, and Peirce’s pragmatism, hence all the developments of thought since Kant, served as a basis for a critique of the implications of some Kantian reason.

Habermas follows a different path: the domains of decision making, ethical existential problems of self realization and normativity have an analogous status and thus are not

absorbed by morality. Habermas limits the province of ethics to the inter-subjective justification of norms. Discourse ethics is the revision of the role of publicity in a theory of emancipation. Kantian conclusion suggests that 'a cosmopolitan order emerges from natural necessity alone. A peculiar affinity between politics, law, and morality stem from a cosmopolitan order issued from both natural necessity and moral insights. Publicity becomes the sphere 'where an intelligible unity of the empirical ends of everyone was to be brought about, where legality was to issue from morality. Categorical imperative and his criticisms of the Kantian treatment of issues of autonomy, happiness, and publicity have been shown to derive from the Habermasian dismantling of the binary opposition of morality versus legality. Therefore, both the divergence from Kant and the debt to him are at least of equal significance and any attempt by exaggerating the latter while obscuring the former is one-sided and misleading.

Discourse ethics keeps the Kantian distinction between what is practically expedient, ethically prudent and morally right. Moreover, by regarding reason as deeply rooted in language, we have seen how discourse ethics leads to Kantianism. It maintained universalistic, formalist, and cognitivist concerns without their metaphysical dualist presuppositions about identity, reason, and autonomy. Communicative ethics, as a social reconstruction of the moral point of view, assumed in the first place that the moral point of view can be better interpreted by a theory based on the normative assumptions of argumentation. Communicative ethics opts for more pluralistic and symmetrical distinctions that are grounded not in rationalization of each one's anthropological and epistemological status but in linguistically mediated interaction. Morality is absorbed by a functional purposive model of world understanding. Communicative ethics emphasizes the significance of participatory forms of life. Communicative ethics is a contextual model of rational consensus, inter-subjective recognition, social interaction and linguistic mutual understanding of the world. Morality itself is aporetic as a phenomenon, and this seems true enough as long as it corresponds to a perpetually changing social world. The overall discussion of the

communicative ethics points of view reflects on discourse ethics. Discourse ethics does not aim at questioning the influence of Kant on Habermas. The cognitivist, formalistic and universalistic character of communicative ethics or discourse ethics of Habermas' ethics is deeply rooted in the Kantian principle. The linguistic paradigm facilitates a normative transformation of some basic Kantian insights and, consequently, connotes the descriptive process of the human world.

Communicative action reflects on a moral discourse in Kant and Habermas. Communicative action requires a common normative and cognitive structure. Habermas defines "discourse ethics as a well suited to the description of cognitive structures that emerge from learning process".⁵⁰ Communicative action is characterized by moral judgment. According to Habermas, "moral judgments have cognitive content".⁵¹ Habermas asserts that "Kant deals only with problems of right and just action".⁵² According to Habermas, "moral judgments serve to explain how conflicts of action can be settled on the basis of rationally motivated agreement".⁵³ Communicative action is governed by the force of a better argument and moral order. In short, the basic phenomenon that moral philosophy must explain is the normative validity, of commands and of norms of actions. A de-ontological ethics conceived the rightness of norms and communalistic society. Kant's ethics is cognitive ethics. According to Habermas, "a cognitive ethics must answer the question of how to justify normative statements".⁵⁴ Habermas attempts to reformulate Kant's ethics by grounding moral norms in communication; a venture Habermas refers to as discourse ethics. Habermas attempts what is known as the re-Kantianization of ethics that enjoins a separation of "is" from "ought". Habermas believes that the categorical imperative aims at the "actualization of reason and sanctions".⁵⁵ Habermas taking a clue from the Kantian moral philosophy believed that Kant's ethics is deontological, cognitivist, formalist and universalistic. Kant and Habermas believe in the justifiable normative judgment and rationally motivated agreement. As Habermas rightly observes in his book *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*

“classical moral philosophers had dealt with all the issues of the good life”.⁵⁶ The return of the good life has been part and parcel of the human activity.

According to Habermas, “discourse ethics replaces the Kantian categorical imperative by a procedure of moral argumentation”.⁵⁷ Discursive communication presupposed the need for better argument. Habermas’ theory of moral argumentation undertakes “general pragmatic presuppositions that have normative content”.⁵⁸ Kant’s influence on Habermas’ philosophy is quite immense. Kant’s notion of international peace is another point of departure in Habermas’ theory of communicative action as role playing and global vision. Habermas asserts that “George Herbert Mead for his part recommends a procedure that he calls ideal role taking”.⁵⁹ Communicative action showcases role playing. Communicative action has a practical discourse and it is characterized by the Rawlsian and Median constructs. According to Habermas, “practical discourse is an exact form of argumentative decision making”.⁶⁰ This exact form of argumentative decision making reflects on the “cooperative search for truth”.⁶¹ Habermas concludes in his book *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, “practical discourse can also be viewed as a communicative process simultaneously exhorting all participants to ideal role taking”.⁶²

3.5 Hegel’s Conception of Labour and Communicative Interaction in Civil Society

The dialectical interconnection between linguistic symbolization, labour and interaction determined Hegel’s concept of spirit. Habermas posits in his book, *Theory and Practice*, that Hegel believes that “the dialectical patterns of existing consciousness can render spirit transparent in its structure”.⁶³ Hegel influences Habermas in a variegated form. Hegel discusses the categories of language, the formative process of the spirit, family and the objective world. The three equally significant patterns of Hegel’s dialectical relation are symbolic representation, the labour process, and interaction on the basis of reciprocity. Communicative interaction is seen as the basis for reciprocal relationship. Hegel pursues the dialectics of the relation between the ‘I’ and the ‘Other’ within the framework of the subjectivity of knowing. We learn to see ourselves through the eyes of other subjects.”⁶⁴

Communicative action reveals the need for moral consciousness and it is characterized by an intersubjective mutual recognition. Accordingly, Habermas believes that “self consciousness is framed only on the basis of mutual recognition...”.⁶⁵ Strictly speaking, Hegel recognizes the need for morality, reason and mutual recognition in civil society.

Hegel’s philosophy of mind is simply the philosophy of consciousness. Habermas posits that “consciousness exist as the middle ground on which the subjects encounter each other, so that without encountering each other they cannot exist as subjects”.⁶⁶ Communicative action assumes the conception of reason. Hegel develops his theoretical construction of reciprocal recognition, complementary unification in dialogic relation within the framework of the struggle for recognition and the logic of the “praxis of life”.⁶⁷ Communicative action showcases the need for the Aristotelian conception of practical philosophy. The theoretical reconstruction of the dialogue situation is characterized by moral relationship. The logical relation of a communication undistorted exercises practical force. The context of communication is characterized by complementary or responsible interchange of persons. Communicative agreement is the process of reaching understanding and it is characterized by the inter-subjective recognition.

Habermas believes that, “Language does not already embrace the communication of subjects living together and acting; rather here it means only the employment of symbols by the solitary individual who confronts nature and gives names to things”.⁶⁸ Hegel emphasizes that culture is the epitome of the technical control over nature. Habermas and Hegel believe in the formulation of the symbolic forms – morality, culture, politics, language and society. Habermas’ philosophy is the critique of culture. It entails language and practice. According to Habermas, “as cultural tradition, language enters into communicative action”.⁶⁹ Communicative action reveals the importance of rational discourse. Habermas averred that “under the category of actual spirit, interactions based on receptivity appear in the form of an intercourse...”.⁷⁰ Hegel’s philosophy of mind is a critical examination of human emancipation. According to Habermas, “Hegel links together labour and interaction under

the view point of emancipation from the forces of external as well as internal nature”.⁷¹ Communicative action showcases the emancipatory project of the enlightenment democratic vision. Habermas believes that “... the result of emancipation by means of labour enters into the norms under which we act complementarily”.⁷²

Hegel’s philosophy is conceived from the viewpoint of what Habermas calls “moral totality”.⁷³ This ‘moral totality’ represents the need for moral universalism vis- a- vis universal reason. Hegel maintains that labour is the epitome of the human specie. According to Habermas, “Marx maintains that Hegel had taken the viewpoint of modern political economy, for he had comprehended labour as the essence of man, in which man has confirmed himself”.⁷⁴ Hegel addresses the progressive systems of rational goal directed action and the idea of progressive rationalization of labour. Hegelian philosophy is defined within “the form of consciousness in which historical movements are initially reflects on the periphery of daily events”.⁷⁵ Hegel fully develops the theoretical standpoint and philosophical significance of theory and praxis. The idea of the good is defined within the Hegelian system of formality. The good is conceived as a directive for social action. Habermas posits that Hegel saw theory as “a domain of transparent thought”.⁷⁶ Hegel’s philosophy reveals the objectification of reason as a means for unification. Habermas successfully observes that “the principle of reason has entered into reality and has become objective”.⁷⁷ The Hegelian-Habermasian perspective can still be projected onto the plane of the twentieth and twenty-first century philosophy.

3.6 Marx on the Thesis of Internal Colonization, Communication and the System–Life-World

Habermas argues that we should focus on a critique of contemporary society. Human communications have evolved to give us broad systems of symbolic agreement (culture and languages, purposes of these symbolic systems seems to coordinate social action for human survival and human flourishing. The thesis of internal colonization showcases the concept of exploitation and domination. Domination refers to a wide range of social relations

and that of the concept of money and power. This is what Martin Plot calls the “monetary-bureaucratic complex”.⁷⁸ The problem of money and power pose a fundamental problem to human society. Weber, see instrumental rationality as the driving force of modernism, and has accepted bureaucracy, technology and mass culture as an inevitable part of this progress. Capitalism shifts its imperialist model to a post-colonialist global consumerism, giving rise to a long capitalist boom. Habermas represents a certain Marxist background. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky thus summarize the Marxian theoretical orientation as:

While Marx focused on work, Habermas is concerned mainly with communication, which he considers to be a more general process than work. While Marx focused on the distorting effect of the structure of capitalist society on work, Habermas is concerned with the way the structure of modern society distorts communication. While Marx sought a future world involving full and creative labour, Habermas seek a future society characterized by free and open communication. Thus, there are startling similarities between the theories of Marx and Habermas. Most generally, both are modernists who believed or belief that in their time modernity’s project (creative and fulfilling work for Marx, open communication for Habermas) has not yet been completed. Yet both had faith that the future project will be completed.⁷⁹

Habermas sees the enlightenment project as a continuous project. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “Marx and Habermas theoretical evaluation are meant to critique society and its hidden “normative sentiments””.⁸⁰

The critique of society reveals the need for normative orientation. Marx’s influence on Habermas is immense because the Marxist orientation provides the theoretical base for political praxis. The idea of everyday life has an impact on social praxis. Marx’s conception of society reflects on social reconstruction and the concept of equality as a moral good. Marx has become cynical about the emancipatory potential of modern society. There is this fading hope in the enlightenment project of a good society promoted by the exaltation of reason. Modernity is at variance with itself. It has become a shadow of itself. The theoretical synthesis between Marx and Habermas is quite immense. Habermas’ conception of the thesis of internal colonization as a theoretical tool is deeply rooted in Marxian and Weberian orientations. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “thus, while Habermas’ theory has taken some interesting new turns, it retains its theoretical roots,

especially in its Marxian and Weberian orientations”.⁸¹ As George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe the life world and communicative action are complementary concepts. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “Habermas is concerned with the rationalization of the life world, which involves for one thing, increasingly rational communication in the life world”.⁸² Communicative action is the rational method of achieving consensus and it is based on the authority of a better argument. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky conclude that:

Engaging in communicative action and achieving understanding in terms of these themes (system, life world and colonization) lead to reproduction of the life world through the reinforcement of culture, the integration of society, and the formation of personality. The rationalization of the life world involved the growing differentiation between culture, society and personality (Habermas, 1984:288). The system has its root in the life world”.⁸³

The system is distorted by greater complexity and ideological prejudices or pre-conceived ideas. In the thesis of internal colonization there is this dialectical relationship between the system and the life world. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky “the rationalization of the life world involves growth in the rationality of communicative action”.⁸⁴ Language is characterized by rational discourse. Language plays a crucial role in the rationalization of the life world. Communicative action has been a reflection of consensus formation and the hallmark of social integration. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “social integration is achieved more and more through the processes of consensus formation in language”.⁸⁵ Communicative action has made social integration possible. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe that “instead of language coordinating action, it is money and power that perform that function. Life becomes monetized and bureaucratized”.⁸⁶

The contemporary challenges of the ideological distortion of money and power has resulted in the thesis of internal colonization. In the life world, the system restricts communication. Habermas begins to operate within a neo-Marxian framework. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observes that the thesis of internal colonization is in akin to the Weberian thesis “of modernity at variance with itself”.⁸⁷ The system come to triumph

over the rationalization of the life world. The life world is colonized by the system. There is an internal crisis between the economy and the state. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “in traditional terms, Habermas sees modern society as subject to recurrent systemic crisis”.⁸⁸ According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “basically, the life world comes to be denuded by these systems, and communicative action comes to be less and less directed towards the achievement of consensus. Communication has been increasingly rigidified, impoverished, fragmented, and the life world itself seems to be poised on the brink of dissolution. This assault on the life world worries Habermas greatly, given his concern for the communicative action that takes place within it”.⁸⁹ The ideological problem of monetized society and bureaucratized power in a system-life-world has led to system assault. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky:

Social systems have grown increasingly complex, distorted, differentiated, disintegrated and characterized by instrumental reason”. A rationalized society would be one in which both system and life world were permitted to synergistically rationalize, following their own internal logics...the rationalization of system and life world would lead to a society with material abundance and control over its environments as a result of rational systems and one of the truth, goodness and beauty stemming from a rational life world.⁹⁰

We have been denied of the good things of life due to the plethora of irrationalities and the state of anomie bedeviling our contemporary social world. Our social structural conditions have been transmuted into that of ideological distortion of our humanity. We have virtually lost the sacredness of our humanity. The project of modernity is an unfinished project waiting to be completed by the power of rationality, and the rationality structure that has its own limitations which simply denied us the enrichment of life. George Ritzer and Jeffery Stepnisky further assert that:

The result is that while we may be enjoying the fruits of system rationalization, we are being deprived of the enrichment of life that would come from a life world – a life world that was allowed to flourish. In analyzing the way in which the system colonizes the life world, Habermas sees himself in alignment with much of the history of social thought The hallmark of modernity to Habermas, as well as to most classical theory, has been, in Habermas’s terms, the colonization of the life world by the system.⁹¹

For Habermas, the completion of modernity's projects is the rationality of the system and the life world without one destroying the other. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "what, then, for Habermas would constitute the completion of modernity's project it seems clear that the final product would be a fully rational society in which both system and life-world rationality were on the streets of gold".⁹² George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky makes a theoretical synthesis between Marx and Habermas by submitting that Habermas is back to his Marxian roots. Marx, of course, does not look back in history for the ideal state but sees it in the future in the form of communism and the full flowering of species – being. Habermas, too, does not look back to archaic societies where non-rationalized system and life world were more unified but looks to a future state involving the system and the life world. Habermas also reiterates the Marxian theory of basic class struggles within society. Marx, of course, emphasizes on the conflict between proletariat and capitalist and traced it to the exploitative character of the capitalist system. Habermas focuses not on exploitation but on colonization and sees many of the struggles of recent decades in this light. That is, he sees social movements such as those oriented to greater equality, increased self-rationalization, the preservation of the environment, and peace "as reactions to system assaults on the life world. The hope for the future clearly lies in resistance to the encroachments on the life world and on the creation of a world in which system and life-world are in harmony and serve to mutually enrich one another to a historically unprecedented degree. Marx conception of rational society reveals the internal colonization caused by class struggle. This internal struggle of society could only be cured by a spiritual mission. According to William Lawhead, "Marx saw his complex theories as the way to fulfill what could only be called a spiritual mission".⁹³

3.7 Max Weber's Theory of Communication as Rationalization and Social Action

Max Webber (1864-1920) is probably one of the most influential figures in sociological theory. Weber's work is so varied and has influenced a wide range of philosophical and sociological theories. Weber's work has influenced Habermas especially

in the ideas of Marxian orientation of critical theory tradition and the bureaucratization and the rationalization of society. Rational choice theorists are powerfully affected by Weber's work. Weber is a widely influential scholar. Weber's major theoretical interests are in law, history, sociology, philosophy and economics. Weber develops a causal analysis of historical phenomenon. The impact of legal thinking on Weber's theorizing influenced Habermas. Weber believes that sociologists has had an advantage and ability to understand social phenomena. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "Weber underscores the notion that "understanding was a rational procedure of study".⁹⁴

Weber's entire sociology is based on social action. Weber and Habermas have an avowed affinity in the areas of communicative action as rationalization and social action (communicative action is characterized by rational activity). According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "Weber's entire sociology, if we accept his words at face value, was based on his conception of social action".⁹⁵ Weber's conception of social action is basically that of economic action. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "... Weber's thinking on action is found in his discussion of economic action".⁹⁶ This conception of economic action or social system greatly influences Habermas' idea of the thesis of internal colonization whereby society is greatly distorted by the ideological confusion of money and power. Weber's broad and overarching theme is the specific and peculiar conception of Western rationalism and culture. Weber was mainly interested in what George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, call "objectified rationality".⁹⁷ Habermas' theory of communicative action is the rationalization of society.

None the less, just like Habermas, Weber views rationalization in various social settings. Capitalistic economy, religion, law, the state and art forms (aesthetic values). Weber has an insightful analysis based on his conception of societal rationalization and bureaucratization. Weber's insightful analysis of the rational understanding of society has a great influence on Habermas' theory of communicative action whereby dialogue is seen as indispensable. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "others have suggested that

understanding (Verstehen needs to be seen as itself a social process and that our understanding of others always proceeds out of a dialogue (Shields, 1996)”.⁹⁸ Weber believes that economic and political structures have great implications on people’s lives.

Nevertheless, one basic criticism leveled against Weber is that his wide range theorizing lacks a critical theory and constructive change. Weber reflects on the irrational consequences of rationalizing in terms of bureaucratic and formal rationality. Weber believes that the original goals of rationalization – efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control in achieving a given goal (for example, to help the poor) has been forgotten. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “the creation of bureaucracy and the adaptation of formal rationality end up undermining the very purposes that the rationalization was meant to serve”.⁹⁹ Weber was not comfortable with the complexity and the increasingly bureaucratized world. Weber’s unremitting pessimism indicates that we are trapped in an increasingly meaningless and disenchanting world. Weber analyzes the large scale communicative structures of rational society or institutions of society and the three structures of authority – rational, legal, traditional and charismatic (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2014:157).

Weber’s most important theoretical insight and articulated ideas lie in the rationalization of the world and that the world is becoming increasingly dominated by norms and values of rationalization and bureaucratization. Weber makes a majestic sweep from religious ideas to rational economic system (capitalism). The Weberian theory has an enduring influence, basis, insights and significance on Habermas.

3.7.1 The Concept of Structural Functionalism in Talcott Parson and Communicative Action as Social Integration

Parson’s 1937 classic, *The Structure of Social Action* influences Habermas *Theory of Communicative Action*. Like Parsons, Habermas reviews and presents his own theory of action, drawing together bits of their work. Habermas includes sociologists (Weber, Durkheim, Mead and Parsons), Marx and neo-Marxists. According to Habermas the

normative core of any action is communication. The central problem of contemporary societies is not how social order is maintained (Parson's problem), but rather how to create normative conditions for what Habermas calls "*communicative action*". Like Parsons, Habermas believes societies require social integration, but like the neo-Marxists Habermas believes societies are in crisis. The core integrative function of communication has been increasingly colonized. Legitimacy is clearly linked to social order, but there is a paradigm shift of emphasis from Parson's problems of social order.

Habermas' theory is first and foremost about the conditions of legitimation crisis (how communicative action has become colonized, and how that colonization undermines legitimacy). Habermas is more philosophical than being sociological. Habermas seems to align himself with Marxism seriously as a political-economic alternative to democratic capitalism. Habermas views democratic capitalism as, in one of his famous phrases, an "unfinished project". Habermas is trying to use Marx's theoretical ideas or insights to bring about an ideal form of democratic capitalism, not utopian in a classic sense. Habermas has led a social movement in social theory that defends the tradition of Enlightenment reason. Habermas does not abandon the project of Enlightenment reason; he still insisted that holding to the course set by the American Revolution of 1776 and French Revolutions of 1789, reflects on the philosophies of Voltaire and Rousseau, Locke and Kant, among others. Participatory democracy based on the rights of individuals and guided by reasoned discourse remains the best hope for contemporary society. Parsons talks about motivated compliance, as prerequisite for social order. The ideas of quantitative media (money and power) are non-communicative. Communicative action is the process of reaching a common understanding and rational consensus. This process is on-going, understanding will never be final. Legitimacy is assured by the common understandings of influence and value-commitments. Habermas does not want to give up money and power, but the legitimacy of their use depends on the qualitative media of influence and value commitments what he calls the "*mediatization of the lifeworld*".

George Ritzer's book on the *McDonaldization of the Lifeworld* is an excellent description of a fully rationalized system. The principle of rationalization is evident in what George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky call McDonalds as efficiency, calculability, and control. The system colonized the lifeworld and it served as a distortion to communication. By the life world Habermas means the shared common understandings, including values that developed through face to face contacts over time in various social groups, from families to communities or from the individual to the state. Communicative action and it alone has the ability to regenerate influence and value-commitments. Members of the communication community have fewer spheres for communicative action. Habermas observes this same colonization process throughout society. Communicative justice depends on a shared sense of human right. Within a life world, judicial decisions reminds us of our value commitments. Justice becomes juridification. Law as juridification becomes a system that colonized the life world. Citizenship depends on responsibility. Habermas believes that the colonization of the life world by the system reflects on internal crisis. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky describe the internal crisis as that characterized by parasites destroying their host: that is what colonization is.

Habermas updates Durkheim's notion of anomie. Weber's rationalization theory, redefines the conditions of Marx's alienation theory, Mead's communication community of generalized others. It's an incredible work of theoretical syntheses and analyses. The basic idea of internal colonization is one of the singular contributions of contemporary theory. Talcott Parsons' structural functionalism has had great influence on Habermas. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "Talcott Parsons has declined dramatically in importance as sociological theory and recedes into the history of sociological theory. Structural functionalism is characterized by "theoretical tradition".¹⁰⁰ As observed by George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, "the systems theory developed by German Sociologist Nikolas Luhmann has been described as a version of structural functionalism".¹⁰¹ George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe that Luhmann's system theory is synonymous with Parson's

structural functionalism. Structural functionalism is social change and social order. The contemporary philosophical debate of structural functionalism has been traceable to Plato, Aristotle, Marx, Comte, Simmel, Durkheim, Dahrendorf, and Parsons. Structural functionalism is basically concerned with large scale social structures and social institutions. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “some critics have argued that structural functionalism is not a passing fact and it is a theoretical explanation which should be abandoned in favour of a more theoretical perspective”.¹⁰² In structural functionalism, the two basic terms are structural and functional. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky “we could study the structures of society without being concerned with their functions (or consequences), for other structures”.¹⁰³ The life world context is a logical structure characterized by the function of society.

The structural functionalist system of Talcott Parson reflects on the stratification as functional necessity. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky see “stratification as functional necessity”.¹⁰⁴ The conceptualization of structural functionalism showcases the need for the dynamic process of social system. Communicative action presupposes the importance of social function. Communicative action is characterized by the social function of coordination. Structural functionalism is a theological argument whereby we see the social world as governed by social structures and having purposes, or goals, that bring needed structures or events into being. Structural functionalism could serve as a means for coordinating or integrating the process of social integration and system integration. Structural functionalism served as the theoretical yardstick or the basis for the integrated sociological paradigm for our contemporary time. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, society “needs structuralism, and so it brings such a system into existence”.¹⁰⁵

Talcott Parson’s book *The Structure of Social Action* (1937) greatly affects Weber’s work (*The Social System*, 1951). Some critics saw Talcott Parson as a political conservative thinker. Parsons’ work has influenced not only conservative thinkers but neo-Marxists thinkers as well. Habermas falls within these groups of thinkers. As George Ritzer and

Jeffrey Stepnisky has observed “Parsons’ ideas influenced not only conservative thinkers, but neo-Marxian theorists as well, especially Jurgen Habermas”.¹⁰⁶ Parsons’ structural functionalism is characterized by four functional imperatives such as adaptation (A), goal attainment (G), integration (I), and latency (L) or pattern maintenance. These four functional imperatives are otherwise known as the AGIL schema. According to George Ritzer and Stepnisky “a system must cope with external situational exigencies. These scholars assert that

“A system must define and achieve its primary goals; a system must regulate the inter-relationship of its component parts. A system must furnish, maintain and renew both the motivation of individuals and the cultural patterns that create and sustain that motivation”.¹⁰⁷

The structural functionalism consists in both social systems and cultural system. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “the social system copes with the integration function by controlling its component parts. Finally, the cultural system performs the latency function by providing actors with the norms and values that motivate them for action”.¹⁰⁸ The system is also characterized by behavioural organism and personality system. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky explain that Habermas believes that Talcott Parsons’ AGIL schema of inter-systemic inter-change relations is that of comparable complexity. Parsons’ theoretical framework provides a plausible explanation of pathological patterns of development (Habermas, 1984:203) as observed by Ritzer and Stepnisky. Parson provides the dimensions of setting ends and choosing means of action. Action is represented as a process of attaining goals while taking normative standards into account (Habermas, 1984:206). Parsons’ conception of social integration demands for the basic concepts of social order as developed by Durkheim and Weber. Weber and Parsons reflect on the complementarity of interests and value consensus or commitment and the normative question of how is social order possible. Habermas, Weber, Parson, Durkheim, Kant, Rousseau, Plato, Aristotle all reflect on the norm governed system or norm- free social order based solely on collective interests. Language is the exemplary medium for cultural transmission or cultural learning processes (Habermas, 1984b:219). According to Habermas, “cultural tradition plays a critical role, contextual and

background knowledge for communicative action”.¹⁰⁹ Habermas and Parson have one theoretical view on the system of functional integration of society or social structures and what is distorting society is a systematic restriction on communication. Parson and Habermas share same theoretical view that culture is understood as a system that follows its own imperatives of self-maintenance (Habermas, 1984b:237). Habermas and Parsons believe in the idea of reciprocal relation and the free flow of inter-systemic inter-change (Habermas, 1984b:239).

3.7.2 Emile Durkheim’s Theory of Communication as Social Solidarity

Durkheim emphasizes on the priority of the social over the individual and his idea of society is still very relevant today. Durkheim stresses the social dimension of all human phenomena. Society must be studied scientifically through observations and measurements. Durkheim traces the roots of sociology to the ancient philosophers – Plato, Aristotle and the French Philosophers – Montesquieu and Condorcet. Psychology and philosophy have been the two fields that claimed already to cover the domain sought by sociology. Sociology is all about preconceived ideas of social phenomena and the actual study of the real world situation. Durkheim like Habermas in his theory of communication is more concerned with social solidarity or social facts. Social facts are all about the ideas of social structures, cultural norms and values that serve as external constraints. Social facts are external to the individual. Durkheim refers to social facts as subthemes and that social facts have their own unique character. Durkheim gives examples of social facts as legal rules, moral rules and obligations, societal conventions and language. Durkheim refers to language as a social fact which must be studied empirically.

All languages have some logical rules regarding meaning, semantics, grammar, and structures. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky “what follows the rules and what are exceptions must be discovered empirically since language use changes over time in ways that are not completely practicable”.¹¹⁰ Language has its own external constraints to the individual in society. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “Language is

external to the individual”.¹¹¹ Language is, by definition, social and therefore external to any particular individual. Language is part of the system of social facts. Durkheim believes that language and morality are social facts and that just like language, morality can be studied empirically and it is non-coercive on the individual person. Morality is related to social structure. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “morality is intimately related to the social structure”.¹¹² Durkheim believes that morality is identified with society. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky opine that “Durkheim believes that human beings are in danger of a “pathological loosening of the moral bound”.¹¹³

Durkheim and Habermas are more concerned about the moral goods of the collective interest of the society. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky rightly observe that Durkheim and Habermas are of the view that “if society does not limit us, we will become slaves to the pursuit of morals”.¹¹⁴ Durkheim attempts to deal with the issue of collective conscience what can be referred to as common consciousness or collective consciousness. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “collective conscience refers to the general structure of shared understanding, norms, and beliefs”.¹¹⁵ Durkheim’s conception or perspective of society is pedagogical. Modern morality is simply directed at society. Communicative action presupposes rational grounding and irrational grounding is not ultimately social. Durkheim and Habermas’ conception of communicative action as social solidarity is rational pedagogy. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “education is defined by Durkheim as the process by which the individual acquires the physical, intellectual, and most important to Durkheim, moral tools needed to function in society”.¹¹⁶ Durkheim talks about “collective effervescent as those decisive formative moments. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky “collective effervescents are the decisive formative moments in social development. They are social facts at their birth”.¹¹⁷ Durkheim attempts to reflect on the idea of collective representations that society produces and the way proceedings connect with the society and the individual. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky, “religion is what connects society and the individual, because it is through sacred rituals that social

categories become the basis for individual concepts”.¹¹⁸ Durkheim has a point of departure from Habermas because he does not consider himself to be political and indeed avoids most partisan politics.

3.7.3 Sigmund Freud’s Concept of Psychoanalysis, Communicative Freedom and Emancipation

The normative basis for a critical sociology is reasonableness and reaching understanding and rational consensus. The Freudian theory reflects on what Habermas calls “the possibility of carrying the model of psycho analysis over into social theory”.¹¹⁹ The Habermasian picture reflects on that inter-subjective communication aims at the normative basis for a social theory constructed with practical intent. The normative basis and the Freudian theoretical analysis of “psychoanalytic dialogue”¹²⁰ aims at “the logic of undisturbed language communication”.¹²¹ According to Habermas, “reaching an understanding is a normative concept ...”.¹²² The foundations of psychoanalysis is devoted to the hermeneutic interpretation of Freud advances by Habermas and threatens to undermine from the start by getting Freud off the evidential hook. They have been leading voices in the campaign to loose psychoanalysis from its egocentric roots and replanted it, so to speak, in a more hospitable soil of the humanities. Their hermeneutic reinterpretation turned on the idea that psychoanalysis is not a science, even though Freud makes the mistake of claiming it was. Habermas and Freud argue that psychoanalysis seeks the emancipation of the individual self in society. Habermas and Freud urge analysts to abandon the claim to offer objective explanations of human behaviour in favour of more modest interpretative goals. Freud is portrayed as a helpless victim of nineteenth century positivism, and Freud psychoanalytic theory is caught up in the embrace of unreconstructed philosophical materialism. Accordingly, for Freud, the most scientific part of psychoanalysis was its criminal theory – its explanations for various mental illnesses and its ideas about dreams and sleeps, all of which, Freud maintains, rests first and foremost on a “wealth of dependable observations” gathered from the couch.

Habermas gives a grisly detailed analysis of Freud's formulation of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis seeks the objective explanations of human behaviour in a more modest interpretative goal of linguistic community. Psychoanalysis stipulates that the operations of the human mind which is in akin with the life-world or communication action requires rational analysis. Freud's formulation of psychoanalysis is oriented to an emancipatory project. It projects the normative foundation on how the human beings can free themselves from the cathetic dimensions in order to guarantee the need for communicative interaction and communicative justice. The psychodynamic state of the individual or communicative actor is what Habermas calls "interpretative schema".¹²³ Freud and Habermas reflects on communicative competence as that characterized by universal core and a normative structure. The cognitive psychology of any communicator is conceived as a continuous learning process. Psychoanalysis deals with personality structure. According to Habermas "it becomes clear that psychoanalysis also singles out certain personality structures as ideal".¹²⁴ Psychoanalysis seeks to be interpreted as a form of linguistic analysis. Habermas' theoretical work on carthetic social structure and society also follows the same conceptual strategy of basic psychological concepts. The idea of emancipated global society requires the philosophical bases of the hermeneutic interpretation of the speculative structure of psychoanalysis. The speculative super-structure of psychoanalysis requires positive conception of social emancipation and also required what Habermas calls "ego autonomy".¹²⁵

The philosophical approaches to the dynamics of psychoanalysis touched on cognitive structure, motivational anchoring and communicative tasks. The communicative structures anchors in existing systems of norms and ego identity. The Freudian orientation of psychoanalysis reflects on the maintenance of the social order and emancipation. The basic concepts of communicative action showcases communicative-interactive competence and connotes what Habermas calls "generalized behavioural expectations".¹²⁶ It characterizes what Habermas calls "social roles and norms that regulate actions".¹²⁷ Habermas believes that "role identity is replaced by ego identity".¹²⁸ Psychoanalysis reflects on human egocentric

freedom. According to Habermas “the egocentric freedom of each is compatible with that of all”.¹²⁹ The psychodynamics of the formative process of the individual behavior presupposes what Habermas calls “the structures of everyday action in the consensual regulation of action conflicts”.¹³⁰

Finally, psychoanalysis and emancipation of the individual person becomes the basis of communicative structure of contemporary society.

3.7.4 Husserl’s Phenomenological Analysis of the Life world

The concept “*life world*” is a term solely associated with Edmund Husserl. Habermas’ theoretical reconstruction is actually influenced by the Husserlian terminology. Husserl’s conceptual strategy of the life world reflects on the background knowledge of human inter-subjective communication. Husserl’s conception of the life world reflects on the inter-subjectivity of human actions and subjects – objects dichotomy. The life world is the totality of all objective realities. It includes the idealization, normative presumptions, reciprocal anticipation and the formulation of ordinary language communication. Husserl’s conceptual analysis of the life world reflects on both hermeneutic understanding, and linguistic communication. He believes that in rational discourse, we should bracket all our pre-conceived ideas or ideological biases. This form of communication guarantees the possibility of attaining a rational consensus and mutual recognition. Husserl greatly influenced Habermas’ theoretical framework in the light of the inextricable nexus between the life world and the “systematic undistorted communication”. The life world is embedded in the deep normative structures of social systems. Communicative action reflects on the practical knowledge and reassures justification of legitimate/normative expectations. The idea of a theory of society is concerned with a practical intent. According to Habermas, “philosophy has been only too conscious of its origins as something that had ontological primacy”.¹³¹ Habermas sees what he calls incapability between the capitalistic economic systems with a democratic process of discourse formation of the will. Habermas believes that “politics today assumes the appearance of technocracy”.¹³² The theory of inter-subjective

communication anchored on the normative structure of inter-subjective communication. The conceptual strategy of society has practical aims. Society is structured according to an underlying “rule system or role playing”. The conceptual strategy of inter-subjective communication reveals the social co-operation of individuals living together. According to Habermas, “the life world fosters cultural reproduction, social integration, socialization and the background horizon of meanings”.¹³³

We conceive of society as that characterizes by system and life world where inter-subjectivity strives. The life- world showcases the fact that communicative action relies on a cooperative process of interpretation. Habermas posits that “my life world is not my private world but, rather, is inter-subjective; the fundamental structure of its reality is shared by us”.¹³⁴ Habermas believes that “the communality of the life world has to be understood in a radical sense”.¹³⁵

The life world, to use Durkheim’s terminology, is “collective conscience” and it is viewed as the structural transformation of collective consciousness. The life world proved to be instructive for a phenomenological investigation”. The life world is governed by normative regulation and legitimate expectation. According to Habermas, “the life world is characterized by a legitimately regulated inter-personal relation and the experiential domain of normatively guided interaction”.¹³⁶ The life world is sometimes distorted by a social system. According to Habermas, “we experience in situations of disturbed mutual understanding”.¹³⁷ The phenomenological tradition of the life world stems from Husserl and Schutz. Social theory is based on the culturalistic conception of the life world. The life world is the process of reaching understanding and it serves as the negotiation of common grounding or situations.

The phenomenological life world analysis presupposes the coordination of actions and what Habermas called “the stabilization of group identities”.¹³⁸ The life world is characterized by the fact that “individual life histories are in harmony with collective forms of life and the interactive capabilities and styles of life are measured by the responsibility of

persons”.¹³⁹ The Habermasian perspective presupposes the realization of the life world which is basically anchored in the process of reaching mutual understanding through rational consensus of actions. The life world does not restrict the scope of communication. What restricts the scope of communication is the social system. The notions of system and life world reflected on the reconstructive analysis of society. Ego brings alter to continue interaction thereby making the rationalization of the life world possible. The life world is a means of ordering the forms of understanding in a systematic sequence. Habermas concludes that “the life world is ‘the narrative explanations of the orders of the world and society’”.¹⁴⁰ The life world context reflects on the existence of socio-cultural context, social norms and the interpretation of meanings. The life world is marred by the egocentric calculation of utility. Finally, the Habermasian tradition sees the mediatization of the life world assumed by the form of colonization.

3.7.5 Rawls’ Theory of Justice as Communicative Democracy

Rawls’ theory of justice as fairness envisions a society of free citizens. His vision of society seeks to address the redistribution of resources of free citizens. He upholds that free citizens should have equal basic rights and social cooperation within an egalitarian economic system. Rawls’ theory of justice as fairness reflects on the rational account of political liberalism and seeks to address the legitimate use of political power in a democratic constitutional society. Rawls’ conception of theory of justice as fairness reflects a just liberal society. Rawls upheld that political philosophy must be practical, help citizens to orient themselves, must ensure probity and reconciliation. Rawls’ vision of political liberalism is the basis for reasoned agreement in a society and it aims at international liberation and international cooperation. Habermas’ and Rawls’ conception of communicative justice is predicated on democratic legitimacy. Habermas-Rawls political theorizing is basically on a theory of democratic legitimacy, the rule of law and the defense of justice and human basic rights in their contemporary political conceptions. Habermas-Rawls think of justice as a melting point for fairly settling disputes by free citizens and the panacea for the basic

normative structure of society. Rawls' theory of justice as fairness is characterized by "reasonable comprehensive doctrine. Rawls' and Habermas' discourse ethics is presented as a practical moral theory. Moral theory in its general or broader spectrum is the theory of right conduct. Rawls and Habermas both question the normative outcomes of society. As Gordon Finlayson rightly observes, "interpersonal conflicts can be resolved by appeal to valid moral norms". The conception of real social dialogue presupposes the theory of democratic legitimacy. This democratic legitimacy flows from Rousseau's general will understood as the collective act of free associates and equal citizens. Legitimacy played a crucial role in communicative justice. Legitimacy plays a practical and critical role in democratic constitutional states (governments and law). Legitimacy elicits conformity and general compliance in a communicative community. Communicative justice focuses on the normative dimension which lies at the root of social order. Legitimacy brings about the establishment of social order and political stability. Communicative justice elicits a form of deliberative association. The normative dimension of general compliance of society assumes a voluntary association of free and equal associates. Moral reasons are treasured by valid moral norms.

The normative question of communicative justice is justified by pragmatic, ethical, political and moral reasons. Rawls' conception of justice assumes a well ordered democratic society and the basic communicative structure and constitutional essentials of society. Habermas develops his notion of public reason in line with Rawls' theory of justice. Rawls develops his conception of society on normative moral theory. The justification of political norms is based on an overlapping consensus of reasonable comprehensive doctrines. This reasonable comprehensive doctrine assumed normative presupposition and the collective conception of the public good. Rawls' conception of communicative democracy presupposed the principles of political cooperation. Rawls' rational account of the reasonable citizen is in accordance with his view of human nature. Human beings have the cognitive capacity for genuine toleration and mutual recognition. Rawls' solution to this contemporary problem of

human nature begins with the hope of citizens of a democratic society that will be reasonable. The possibility of reasonable pluralism does not simply solve the problem of legitimacy. A political conception of just society elicits moral conception generated from the fundamental ideas implicit in society's conception of public reason. Democratic society is that society where citizens are free and equally characterized by a fair system of political cooperation.

Rawls sees an overlapping consensus as the feasible basis of democratic stability and social order. Rawls hoped for a stable liberal society that rests on an overlapping rational consensus. Rawls' doctrine of public reason rests on certain political activities or fundamental normative and political issues; freedom and equality of citizens and the fairness of on-going social cooperation. Rawls' doctrine of public reason concerns what citizens may say and can do within the bounds of civility. The basic structure of society aims at the institution of a liberal society, a global system, the constitutional system, the legal system, the economy, the political and the family. Rawls' conception of society is defined by justice as fairness. Rawls envisages the great evils of human history and the economic coordination of international system. Rawls' fundamental interest is actually on the international basic normative structure of human history, international law and global justice. Rawls' fundamental interest of justice as fairness is for the sake of greater total global stability, global utility and global order. The stability of the international order is thus the stability of right reason. Rawls' vision of society is of a perpetually peaceful and cooperative international order and to guarantee the normative core of human right, to ensure liberal society. It reflects on setting the pace for decent peoples to settle their moral conflicts even at a global scale. Rawls' vision of global society is realistic and utopian because it assumes the distributive thesis of human society and the re-distribution of natural resources. Rawls opines that the primary aim of justice is the basic structure of society. For Rawls, "society is rightly ordered, and therefore just. Society is regulated by the terms of the original agreement and we would have a just social order. Rawls' views the original position as a situation where individual are looking to reach an agreement but to get on with each other as equal

consociates. Rawls' principle of justice reflects on the plurality of views on the good life that characterized modernity.

The characterization of reasonable citizens reflects on the awareness of the interests of other people. Rawls restricts the scope of justice to the local, national and global level. Rawls assumed that the society to which the principles of justice apply will be "well ordered". According to Lain Mackenzie, "for Rawls, a liberal society is one in which all individuals are treated as ends in themselves, ... and a just social order is one in which the right balance of liberty and equality is enshrined in the basic structure of that society ...".¹⁴¹ Rawls believes that social and economic inequality is only legitimate when it benefits the worst off in society. John Hoffman and Paul Graham observe that Rawls' conception of liberal and decent society is guided by "a common good conception of justice".¹⁴²

The idea of 'a common conception of justice' presupposes the existence of reasonableness of citizens. Decent citizens showcases decent society. Rational citizens revealed the need for rational society. John Hoffman and Paul Graham posit that "Rawls is correct in arguing that a decent society can respect human rights ...".¹⁴³ Human rights, from the Habermasian standpoint transveres national but transnational level. Rawls' conception of justice is applied to the "international behaviour of liberal states. Rawls' concept of justice reflects on the general conditions of human life. Rawls' principle of justice constitutes a philosophical, ahistorical and hypothetical thesis. The theoretical analyses for Rawls' principles of justice reflects on the normative foundation for a well-ordered society. Rawls principle of justice reflected on the fact that economic well- being is embedded in political liberty. Rawls' principle of justice is realistic and rationalistic. Rawls' use of the notion of rationality structure has some Kantian tinges as is founded in Kantian ethics, although not with the same force.

3.7.6 Dewey's Philosophy of Pedagogy and the Pragmatics of Communication

The teleological nature of human conduct showcases practical intelligence, the social nature of morality, and a conception of the good focuses on rational relations with others. Dewey advocates progressive thinking, the liberation of human emancipation in a moral democracy and demonstrates a deep appreciation for innovation and creativity. Dewey demonstrates a comprehensive view of the explanation of human conduct in terms of habits, impulse and intelligence. Dewey's conception of social growth offers a compelling vision of human flourishing. Dewey and Habermas advocate the conception of inquiry of problem solving mechanism in response to particular human needs. Both philosophers have a great deal to say about problem solving in response to human needs. Dewey' and Habermas' conception of ethics is radical. Dewey and Habermas hold moral virtues in human rational conduct to be a key element in the development of human social character. Dewey and Habermas recognize the importance of living a good life. Both philosophers recognized the value of liberalism in the modern world, the conception of human flourishing and moral inquiry. Dewey and Habermas recognize the impact of social relations in human culture. Dewey and Habermas ground their pragmatic ethics in human social practices. Dewey' and Habermas' notions of the self have been seen as a social construction. Dewey and Habermas agreed that human activity is purposive rational activity and it reflects on the means – ends structure. Dewey's empirical account is less dependent on language. Dewey's and Habermas' liberal approach reveals some sort of radical stance.

Dewey and Habermas agree that the rational relation of mutual dependency among people have been the keystone to social growth and moral validity. Dewey's conception of growth serves the utilitarian purpose of human flourishing. Dewey and Habermas agree that human experience is in constant flux. Both philosophers recognize the development and exercise of scientific inquiry in a participating democracy and they recognize the social platform of liberations. Mutual dependency reflects on the increase in communication. Both Dewey and Habernas advocated for the most tolerant social and

political order. Dewey and Habermas believe in social interaction, free and open communication. According to Stephen Carden, “Dewey’s version of liberalism calls for increased social interaction through free inquiry and open communication and the mind is characterized as the “adequacy of re-presentation”.¹⁴⁴ Dewey and Habermas emphasize knowing as the universal human relationship to the world. The mind requires radical perspective outside the natural world. Moral inquiry serves as the yardstick for problems solving mechanism and it is experiential as well.

Dewey’s conception of moral philosophy presupposes predominant social and political order. According to Stephen Carden, “liberalism can become a truly democratic order of experiential inquiry into existing social and environmental conditions so that the potentiality of growth among individuals and within society may be realized”.¹⁴⁵ Dewey’s social and political philosophy reveals the need for dialogical engagement or inter-subjective commitment of more people in meaningful rational activity. In a practice, people are engaged together in a cooperative fashion to reach common mutual understanding. The human purpose reflects on a developing conception of human flourishing. Dewey and Habermas emphasize the conception of tradition and it serves as “the framework within which we identify ourselves as unified beings”.¹⁴⁶ Dewey and Habermas agree that what is fundamental to us is a conception of practical rationality. Dewey sums it up that the medium of the renewal of our social community is communication. According to Stephen Carden, “Dewey enjoys the word play among “common, community and “communication”.¹⁴⁷ According to Stephen Carden, Dewey concludes that communication (and hence all genuine social life) is educative. Society promotes “cooperative activity”.¹⁴⁸ Social cooperation make human communication and human coordination possible.

Dewey’s conception of human flourishing has rationalistic tendencies. According to Stephen Carden “rational inquiry is ... interpersonal”.¹⁴⁹ Dewey advocates a kind of innovative, creative and imaginative thinking in human activity. The mind engages in purposive rational activity. Dewey sees social interaction and human communication as that

characterizes by problems solving mechanism. Dewey and Habermas recognize the existence of a social order which required the preservation of traditions and customs. According to Stephen Carden, “when people share experience and communicate freely the barriers among us will be overcome”.¹⁵⁰ Both Dewey and Habermas offer sharp critiques of contemporary society, traditions, values and culture.

Dewey advocates or attempts to revitalize liberalism. According to Stephen Carden, Dewey understands “liberalism to be a loose collection of social, political, economic, and ethical views that generally value the promotion of freedom, individuality, toleration of individual preferences, and the rule of constitutional law”.¹⁵¹ Liberalism promotes also what Stephen Carden calls the “plurality of values”.¹⁵² Dewey sees the self as a reflection of society. Dewey believes in the balance between the individual and the society. According to Stephen Carden, “the invaluable conception of liberalism is balanced by “the reality of social order”.¹⁵³ The idea of social ordering give impetus to human activity. Dewey and Habermas’ conception of human flourishing is characterized by what Stephen Carden calls the “post enlightenment theories of ethics”.¹⁵⁴ Liberalism is characterized by the emergence of conflict resolution. According to Stephen Carden, “for Dewey, human flourishing results when people have the freedom, resources, and encouragement to continually increase and expand their construction of goods in the natural and social environment”.¹⁵⁵ Communicative action from the Deweyian-Habermasian standpoint is characterized as a social movement of some sort.

This requires the development and exercise of intelligent inquiry in a participatory democracy, and along with it a social platform of liberalism that allows for experimentation of communication, and toleration of a variety of individual interests”. Both Dewey and Habermas seek to construct a response to the problem of modernity. Dewey offers a conception of participating democracy that promotes radical openness and communication. Dewey provides a response to an unrestricted understanding of communication that is both inclusive and enriching. According to Stephen Carden, “communication provides humans the “open space” to share experience”.¹⁵⁶ Communicative action showcases the need for radical

openness and space. Dewey's significance of practical intelligence is the ability to connect experiences meaningfully among rational persons in the world. According to Stephen Carden, "the form of social life that Dewey envisions is simply more promising".¹⁵⁷ Communicative action is predicated on social life context.

3.7.7 Understanding Gadamer's Hermeneutic Dialogue and the Fusion of Horizon

The concept of horizon suggests the perspective of knowing and the limits of knowing that allows one to be open to what is new. Horizon provides the boundaries that new knowledge possible. A horizon, as Gadamer foregrounds, "bespeaks the productively mediated relation between what is distant and near; it enables us to discern both what is close up and what is far away without excluding of these positions".¹⁵⁸ The concept of horizon meaningfully integrates the subject's immediate environment and the more distant world at large. Gadamer stresses the open and dynamic nature of horizon. The 'fusion of horizon' signifies understanding. Misunderstanding can exacerbate the otherness of the other. Gadamer conceives of difference as a means or the basis for transformation which Gadamer terms 'fusion of horizon'. The tendency to see difference as impossibility reflects on a superficial response and affirms a rigid notion of horizon. From the Gadamerian standpoint, true understanding is anchored on the politics of difference. The expanding of our horizon is not what we can fully control. Fusion refers to active and the on-going process or nature of understanding that is not static but dynamic. Understanding is a continuous process that is not static or never ending. To defend a mono-culture is akin to positing a single and definite horizon that denies the role of difference. Gadamer's account of horizon emphatically maintains that only where one is open to new horizons emerging- and hence difference- can one claim to understand. Difference is only an occasion and not an impediment to understanding.

Furthermore, the conceptual analysis of the fusion of horizon can be deduced from what Lain Mackenzie calls "the canvas of liberal democratic theory".¹⁵⁹ The concept of the 'fusion of horizon' is concerned with the relation between culture and identity. According to

the Mackenzian standpoint, the judgment of worth in multicultural and global politics depends on a 'fusion of horizon'. Accordingly, Lain Mackenzie believes that "the core to treating this 'fusion of horizon; is to presume, in the first instance, that every culture is of equal worth".¹⁶⁰ Lain Mackenzie argues from the perspective of Charles Taylor that "we should always begin by assuming that every culture, at least every culture that has stood the test of time, must be thought to contain elements that express fundamental human needs and that world, therefore, enrich our own".¹⁶¹ According to the Mackenzian standpoint, "to recognize this and to engage with others on the basis of fusing our cultural horizons with theirs is to promote, according to Taylor, a truly liberal dialogue with others that responds to the demands of contemporary identity politics".¹⁶² Mackenzie posits that "the fusion of cultural horizons is just that, a hope, rather than a worked-out political solution to a problem at the heart of liberal democracies".¹⁶³ Accordingly, Lain Mackenzie concludes that "perhaps Habermas' more thoroughgoing account of exactly what is at stake in dialogue may suggest an alternative approach, or a complementary one that nonetheless secures Taylor's hope more firmly".¹⁶⁴ The hermeneutic dialogue of Gadamer's fusion of horizon presupposes ethical and political approach. Gadamer's and Heidegger's political writings are not apparent. Their political writings were closely associated with the German's Nazi conception of National Socialism.

Endnotes

1. Habermas, Jurgen., *Theory and Practice*, trans. John Viertel, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 17.
2. Ferrante, Joan., *Sociology A Global Perspective*, (USA: Wadsworth and Thomson Learning, 2003), p. 545.
3. Wisniewski, J, Jeremy., *Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry, A Defense of Ethics as Clarification*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006), p. 89.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
6. *Loc, cit.*,
7. *Loc, cit.*,
8. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.
10. *Loc, cit.*,
11. *Loc, cit.*,
12. Ozumba, O. Godfrey, *Introduction to Philosophy of Language*,(Ibadan: Hope Publication, 2004), p. 14.
13. Ritzer, George and Stepniski, Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory*, Ninth Edition, (Singapore: McGraw- Hill Higher Education, 2014), p. 530.
14. Ozumba, O. Godfrey, *Introduction to Philosophy of Language*, p. 18.
15. *Loc, cit.*,
16. Igboanusi, Edmund., *Deficiency of Exoglossia as Communication Tools in Africa A Critique of Negritude and Ngugi s Marxist Posture*, An International Journal of African Culture and Communication, Philosophy Department, Imo State University, Owerri, Vol.1 no.1.(2012), p. 1.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
18. Velkly, Richard, *Ludwig Wittgenstein on The Blue and Brown Books*, in Stanley Rosen, (ed.), *Philosophy 101: Selections from the Western World's Greatest Thinkers*, (New York: Gramercy Books, 2000), p. 394.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 396.
20. *Wisniewski, J, Jeremy., Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry, A Defense of Ethics as Clarification, p. 3.*
21. *Loc., cit.*,
22. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
23. Ebiringa, I. Comfort., *The Power of Language, Communication and Social Order*, in Ukagba G, Obi, D, and Nwankwor I, eds, *The Kpim of Social Order, A Season of Inquiry, Meaning, and Significance in the Modern World*, (USA: Xlibris Corporation, 2013), p. 504.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 506.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 508.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 509.
27. Lawhead, William, *The Voyage of Discovery, A Historical Introduction to Philosophy*, Second Edition, (USA: Wadsworth Group Limited, 2002), p. 456.
28. *Ibid.*, 457.
29. *Loc., cit.*,
30. *Ibid.*, p. 458.
31. *Wisniewski, J, Jeremy., Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry, A Defense of Ethics as Clarification, p. 20.*
32. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
35. *Loc., cit.*,

36. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
37. Ritzer, George, and Stepnisky Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory*, p. 340.
38. *Loc., cit.*,
39. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
40. *Loc., cit.*,
41. *Ibid.*, p. 342.
42. *Loc., cit.*,
43. *Loc., cit.*,
44. *Loc., cit.*,
45. *Ibid.*, p. 343.
46. *Loc., cit.*,
47. *Loc., cit.*,
48. *Loc., cit.*,
49. *Ibid.*, p. 347.
50. Habermas, Jurgen, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. Christian Lenhardt and Shilden Nicholse, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1983), p. 120.
51. *Loc., cit.*,
52. *Loc., cit.*,
53. *Loc., cit.*,
54. *Ibid.*, p. 197.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 196.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
57. *Loc., cit.*,
58. *Loc., cit.*,
59. *Loc., cit.*,
60. *Loc., cit.*,
61. *Loc., cit.*,
62. *Loc., cit.*,
63. Habermas, Jurgen., *Theory and Practice*, trans. John Viertel, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 143.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
66. *Loc., cit.*,
67. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 152.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
72. *Loc., cit.*,
73. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
78. Plot, Martin., *Communicative Action Democratic Deficit, A Critique of Habermas s Contribution to Democratic Theory*, *International Journal of Communication*, California Institute of the Arts, Volume 3, (2009), p. 841.
79. Ritzer, George, and Stepnisky Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory*, p. 559.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 560.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 530.
82. *Loc., cit.*,
83. *Ibid.*, p. 531.
84. *Ibid.*, p.532.

85. *Loc., cit.,*
86. *Loc., cit.,*
87. *Ibid.,* p. 533.
88. *Loc., cit.,*
89. *Loc., cit.,*
90. *Ibid.,* p. 556.
91. *Ibid.,* p. 557.
92. *Loc., cit.,*
93. Lawhead, William, *The Voyage of Discovery, A Historical Introduction to Philosophy,* p. 383.
94. Ritzer, George, and Stepnisky Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory,* p. 117.
95. *Ibid.,* p. 125.
96. *Ibid.,* p. 126.
97. *Ibid.,* p. 136.
98. *Ibid.,* p. 155.
99. *Ibid.,* p. 156.
100. *Ibid.,* p. 237.
101. *Loc., cit.,*
102. *Ibid.,* p. 238.
103. *Ibid.,* p. 239.
104. *Loc., cit.,*
105. *Loc., cit.,*
106. *Ibid.,* p. 241.
107. *Ibid.,* p. 243.
108. *Loc., cit.,*
109. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action, System and Lifeworld, A Functionalist Critique of Reason, Volume 2,* trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987b), p. 209.
110. Ritzer, George, and Stepnisky Jeffrey, *Sociological Theory,* p. 78.
111. *Loc., cit.,*
112. *Ibid.,* p. 80.
113. *Ibid.,* p. 81.
114. *Loc., cit.,*
115. *Loc., cit.,*
116. *Ibid.,* pp. 105-106.
117. *Ibid.,* p. 103.
118. *Loc., cit.,*
119. Habermas, Jurgen., *Communication and the Evolution of Society,* trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979), p. 16.
120. *Loc., cit.,*
121. *Ibid.,* p. 17.
122. *Loc., cit.,*
123. *Ibid.,* p. xiii.
124. *Ibid.,* p. 70.
125. *Ibid.,* p. 72.
126. *Ibid.,* p. 85.
127. *Ibid.,* p. 82.
128. *Ibid.,* p. 86.
129. *Ibid.,* p. 90.
130. *Ibid.,* p. 91.
131. Habermas, Jurgen, *A Berlin Republic Writings on Germany,* trans. Stephen Rendall, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 2.
132. *Ibid.,* p. 5.

133. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action, System and Llifeworld, A Functionalist Critique of Reason, Volume 2*, pp. 121-124.
134. *Ibid.*, p. 131.
135. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
136. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
137. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
138. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
139. *Ibid.*, p. 141.
140. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
141. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*,(London Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p. 88.
142. Hoffman, John and Graham Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition*, (England, Pearson Education Limited, 2009), p. 420.
143. *Ibid.*, p. 421.
144. Carden Stephen, *Virtue Ethics Dewey and MacIntyre*, (London and New York, Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006), p. 5.
145. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
146. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
147. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
148. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-107.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
150. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
151. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
152. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
153. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
154. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
155. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
156. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
157. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
158. Gadamer., H Georg., *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, (New York: Crossroad, 1992), p. 302.
159. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, p. 136.
160. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
161. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
162. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
163. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
164. *Ibid.*, pp. 137-138.

CHAPTER FOUR

COMMUNICATIVE ACTION IN THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF JURGEN HABERMAS

4.1 Communicative Action as the Democracy of Everyday Speech

The philosophical orientations of Wittgenstein theory of language, Mead's theory of symbolic interactionism, Kant's categorical imperative, Freud's conception of psychoanalysis and emancipation, Husserl's phenomenology of the life world, Marx's thesis of internal colonization, Weber's theory of rationalization, Parsons' structural functionalism, Durkheim's theory of solidarity, Hegel's conception of labour, interaction in society and reason, Rawls' theory of justice as fairness, and Dewey's pedagogical theory and pragmatics of communication and Gadamer's hermeneutic dialogue and fusion of horizon has influence the ethical and political theory of Habermas' philosophy. Habermas' theory of communicative action is a social *construct*. To understand Habermas' mature position such as his contemporary legacies of political philosophy, we must start with his Theory of Communicative Action (TCA). In The Theory of Communicative Action (TCA), we find Habermas' conception of the task of philosophy and its relation to the social sciences as a conception that guided much of his work. The Theory of Communicative Action (TCA) defends the emphasis on the normative core and the theoretical framework of social analysis found in the philosophical Western tradition. It does so within a social framework that include particular sort of empirical social research, with which philosophy must interact. Philosophers, that is, must cooperate with social scientists if they are to understand normative claims within the current historical context, and the context of a complex, modern society that is characterized by social and systemic process. Habermas' distinctive definition of the theory of rationality is anchored on epistemic, rational, and dialogic communication of practical everyday existence or discursive-social practice and the aesthetic appeal to inter-subjective ends.

For Habermas, communicative rationality consists not so much in the possession of particular knowledge, but rather on ‘how speaking and acting subjects acquire and use linguistic analysis or knowledge to affect their immediate social environment or system-life-world. For Habermas, language or ideal speech act has been characterized by a pragmatic function. Most importantly, a pragmatic approach developed a rational account of practical knowledge in the performative attitude of language, that is, from the point of view of a communicative competent speaker. A theory of communicative rationality thus attempts to reconstruct the practical knowledge necessary for being a knowledgeable social actor among other knowledgeable social actors. Language assumes a performative or functionalist character because it is a medium for coordinating action, although not the only medium.

The fundamental form of social coordination through language, according to Habermas, requires speakers to adopt a practical stance oriented toward reaching mutual understanding which he regards as the inherent *telos* or purpose (purposive-rational- activity) of speech. According to Habermas, “the concept of communicative action turns our attention to the binding energies of language, to the familiar background consensus, the reciprocal extension of trust and the more or less naïve readiness for understanding on which we count in our everyday praxis”.¹ When actors address one another with this sort of practical attitude, they engage in what Habermas calls ‘Communicative Action’ which he distinguishes from strategic forms of social action and instrumental forms of social actions. In strategic action, actors are not so much interested in mutual understanding as in achieving the individual goals they each bring to the ideal speech situation. But in instrumental action individuals tend to have a dialogical engagement and they are interested in achieving their individual goals through mutual understanding and pragmatics of human communication, what Habermas refers to as “domination-free- communication”.² In communicative action theory, or what Habermas later calls “strong communicative action” in some further clarifications of the concept of communicative rationality, speakers coordinate their action and pursuit of individual (or joint) goals on the basis of a shared mutual understanding that the goals are

inherently reasonable or merit-worthy. Habermas believes that we are governed by the voice of reason. According to Habermas, “we are to be instructed by the voice of reason, in the other by the comparison of our life with the lives of others”.³ Habermas’ defense of philosophy remains faithful to the concept of reason and rationality. Habermas and Levinas share the same view on the politics of otherness and difference.

For a proper grasp of their avowed affinity, it is imperative to understand the crux of Levinas’ philosophy. Levinas’ conception of the other assumes a more ethical outcome. It presupposes a moral space that is opened up within an intersubjective community. Levinas’ ethics is egoism turns into altruism. Levinas called for the radical nature of Otherness. Levinas believes that ethics as first philosophy is the prime condition for human communication. Levinas’ first philosophy just like Husserl set aside empirical prejudices about subjects and objects. The gaze of the Other is interrogative and imperative. The human face impacts us as an affective moment; the face of the Other is expressiveness; it revealed nakedness and defenselessness. Levinas’ ethics of the other is more of accountability and responsibility that unfold into dialogical sociality. Levinas’ project of Being and the face of the other is structured around the reconceptualization of fundamental existential categories. The face of the Other is revealed through presence; it is modalized through our manifold sensations, emotions and states of mind. Levinas observes that Being’s dark aspect horrifies us. Levinas’ depth of dialogical engagement and the trace of the Other poses the question of the meaning of justice. Being is envisaged as existential encounter by way of willing and strife. The implication of Levinas’ dialogical encounter with the Other is radical. The face of the other reflects the possibility of hospitality.

Our humanity is fragile and Levinas’ conception of universality is ethical humanity. Levinas explored the sensible affective moment of the encounter with the Other in the light of moods. Levinas and Husserl reflect on the phenomenological dimension of Being. Levinas’ originality is predicated on his phenomenological existential thought. Levinas prioritized the Other over the Self in all ethical deliberations. Levinas’ ethics discloses our radical

dependency on the Other. Levinas recognizes the asymmetry between the Self and the Other in all human dialogical/existential encounters. Habermas and Levinas share so many things in common in their ethical and political philosophy. Ethics is only made possible through human interpersonal encounter. Communicative action is thus an inherently consensual form of social coordination and rational consensus in which actors mobilized the potential for practical rationality given with ordinary language and their *telos* of rationally motivated mutual agreement. Habermas takes a pragmatic approach, analyzing the social conditions for the success of the ideal speech act. An ideal speech act succeeds in reaching mutual understanding when the hearer takes up an affirmative position toward the truth claims made by the speakers. In the theory of communicative action, the discourse processes of argumentation and dialogue is ascertained in which the criticizable validity claims or truth claims are implicit in the ideal speech situation which are tested as rationally justifiable as true, correct or authentic. Criticizable validity claims are those yes/no claims or positions that usually arise in our ideal speech situation.

Broadly speaking, the practical rationality of communicative action admits the rationality of discursive practice in contemporary human society. Habermas recognizes a broad spectrum of validity claims that also included, at least, those truth claims to ‘moral rightness’, ‘ethical goodness’, or ‘authenticity’, ‘personal sincerity’, ‘purity of motive’ and ‘aesthetic value’. To this extent, validity claims involved a notion of correctness analogous to the idea of truth. The Theory of Communicative Action presupposes the spheres of validity claims, cultural identity and dialogical context. Habermas moves the analysis beyond a narrow focus on the truth conditional semantics of representation to the social intelligibility of human interaction.

We can think of “strong communicative action” in the above as defining the end of a wide spectrum of communicative possibilities in rational human society. Communication investigates an essential part of our everyday practical intercourse especially in speech act. Communication is from the root word “common” which means “same” as opposed to

'difference'. To communicate means to have similar views among all the participants involved in the process of information dissemination or sharing. A simple communication process consists of the interaction of individuals, tools, and functions involved in information dissemination, in order to achieve certain desired common objectives. The individuals in this communication process are the senders and receivers, the tools are the message and the media, while the functions are encoding, decoding, response and feedback. Encoding involve putting thoughts, actions, and expressions together in the symbolic form in order to transmit the intended meaning to the audience. Communication process is an exclusive process, and exclusive means uniqueness, and distinctiveness. Communicative action is interpersonal relation between two subjects in speech and action. Communicative action reflects the critique of the life world. According to Habermas, "communicative action afforded you an opportunity to diagnose and critique colonization of the life world".⁴ The theory of systematically undistorted communication can put to rest the thesis of internal colonization. The thesis of internal colonization is simply the distortion between the system and the life world. Communicative action showcases cultural learning processes.

Habermas describes the communicative process as "a collective learning process".⁵ Communicative action involves both the speaker and hearer in their process of interpersonal relation. Communicative action reveals the need for interpersonal relation. According to Habermas, "the concept of communicative action refers to the interaction of at least two subjects capable of speech and action who establish interpersonal relation whether by verbal or extraverbal means".⁶ Communication has been characterized by the need for two parties to engage in interaction. Habermas believes that "the communication between the two partners is like a net of rational discussion stretching between practice and science".⁷ In 1984, with the publication of his *Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas moves further away from the paradigm shift of consciousness-centered reason to the paradigm shift of language (as an ideal speech situation). This paradigm shift is designed to provide his critical theory of society with new normative foundations, in communication, by entering into an ideal speech

situation, where at least one speaker and one hearer are present. We do not simply utter sentences but we also simultaneously relate to the objective socio-political world, to other members in society, and to our inner private thoughts, feelings, and desire. Habermas believes that “communicative rationality” refers to our socio-existential experience of unconstrained argumentative speech and its unifying rational consensus. According to Habermas, “communicative action is not a system of reference that cannot be reduced to the framework of instrumental action”.⁸ The cultural life context is formed on a level of inter-subjectivity. The cultural life context is best characterized by the existence of the system-life world. According to Habermas, “Communication structure is based on cultural learning”.⁹ This perspective originated in the function of language for social integration or the coordination of plans of different actors in social interaction. Language forms a kind of unifying bond. According to Pantaleon Iroegbu, “language in communicating, unifies, and identifies persons who speak it... as the primary vehicle of communication, language forms the bond of union among (the members of) the people that speak it”.¹⁰ Communicative rationality ensures that our rational efforts are oriented toward inter-subjective mutual understanding and moral agreement. Habermas’ theory of communicative rationality aims at rational consensual agreement and increased within inter-subjectively shared “communication community”. We observe that the expansion of unconstrained social coordination of action and rational consensual resolution of conflicts is one of the fundamentals of linguistic understanding. Our rational consensus of mutual communicative understanding aimed at the bounds of cognitive approach in dealing with the system and the life world. The rationality of everyday communicative practice uses argumentation as a “court of appeal” whereby the use of coercion is excluded in our communication community. Habermas’ main thesis is that we live in a social life world in which we coordinate our social actions through reasoned communication and mutually motivated rational agreement. It is with this social coordination and rational agreement that the human species maintains itself.

The dialogical basis or normative core which underlies all forms of human community is communicative rationality.

Communicative action, however, constitutes an independent type of social action. The goal of communicative action is expressed or realized in an attempt to reach a rational agreement or reaching mutual understanding about something in the system-life world. Habermas also holds that individuals who act communicatively aim at reaching mutual understanding about something in the system-life world by relating their interpretations to three general types of validity claims that are constitutive for three basic types of speech acts: sincerity, normative rightness, and truthfulness. Discourse theory thus calls for a pragmatic analysis of the workability of argumentation as a social practice. Such analysis aimed at reconstructing the normative presuppositions that structure the discourse of communicative competent arguers. Habermas distinguishes three aspects of argument making practices: argument as product, as procedure and as process, which he loosely aligned with the traditional perspectives on argument evaluation of logic, dialectic, and rhetoric.

Nevertheless, robust critical testing of competing arguments depends on the rhetorical quality of the persuasive communicative process. Habermas' discourse theory reveals the fact that criticizable or sincere validity claims such as interior subjectivity, feelings, moods, desires, beliefs, and the like are open to rational assessment and transformative/intersubjective dialogue. Thus, criticizable validity claims about what human beings need are relevant reasons in moral arguments about the obligations of welfare states. Moral rightness claims and empirical truth claims are justified by reasoned communication and that should be acceptable to a basic universal core of audience, whereas ethical claims are addressed to those who share a particular history and tradition of values and norms. Moral and ethical discourses partly depend on empirical claims. Validity claims are patterns, circumstances and consequences of human behavioral expectations, rules and the collective pursuit of the good life. Criticizable validity claims are those truth claims or yes/no claims or positions that are either accepted or rejected by any society. The persistence of normative

question of inter-subjective relationship becomes especially urgent in the contemporary political sphere. The universal pragmatic meaning of truth is defined by the demand of reaching mutual understanding and a rational consensus.

4.2 Habermas' Communicative Action and Normative Theory in a System-Life-world

Habermas reflects on modernization and its pathological form, and he explores the ideas of money and power colonizing the system-life-world. Communicative model forms universal solidarity and inhibit the social reproduction of the system-life-world through a systematically undistorted communication. According to Habermas, "we conceive of society simultaneously as a system and a life world".¹¹ Juridification is another such pathological form and paradoxes. Contemporary society has become distorted or disintegrated. In the life world, communicative action reflects on the process of social cooperation, socialization and cultural reproduction. According to Habermas, "communicative action relies on a cooperative process".¹² The *Theory of Communicative Action* has less of an impact on Habermas' current work, which returns to the theme of improving democratic practice as a means of counteracting juridification and internal colonization. Democratic institutions, if properly designed and robustly executed, are supposed to ensure that the law does not take this pathological form but is subject to the public good, normative social order, public deliberation of citizens, which they are thus authors of the laws to which they are subject. The citizens or what you may refer to as the people are the source of political sovereignty and political legitimacy. After the *Theory of Communicative Action* then, Habermas begins to see law not as part of the problem, but as part of the solution; once he offered a more complete rational discourse and the theoretical rational account of law and democracy. Nonetheless, the theory of modernity still remains in his continued use of system theory and its understanding of non-instrumental communicative interaction or system integration or symbolic interaction. Habermas tries to save the form and substance of radical or liberal democracy. Good democratic setting protects the basic rights of the people and the territorial sovereignty of the political state. Habermas asserts that public opinion does not rule out but rather points out

administrative power in particular directions. It does not steer but counter-steers institutional complexity and social framework. That is, citizens do not control social process they exercise influence through particular institutionalized internal mechanisms and channels of pragmatics of human communication. The life world creates an atmosphere for rational discourse, language and domination free communication. According to Habermas, “language as the medium for the processes of reaching understanding through which their lifeworld maintains itself”.¹³ The life world reflects on the cooperative processes of interpretation. Interpretation for Habermas, is also the process of assimilation (1984:58). According to Habermas, “the life world appears as a reservoir of taken for granted, of unshaken convictions that participants in communication draw upon cooperative processes of interpretations”.¹⁴

Nevertheless, the life world has a political form and successful deliberative democracy is in creating political legitimacy and normative contemporary ideal political order and it cannot gain full control over large scale modern complex societies. Good democratic setting is a necessary condition for the rational realization of normative ideal social order. Habermas’ emphasis on the limiting effect of complexity on democracy is quite impressive. He does not reject a fully democratic form of societies. Habermas continues the basic argument of the necessity of systems integration and social integration in our life world context. Radical or liberal democracy may no longer be the only means to social transformation of modern complex societies. Though, it is as clear as crystal that it remains “the unfinished project of modernity”. The system-life world reflects on the fusion of horizons among communicative actors. According to Habermas, “communicative actors are always moving within the horizon of their life-world; they cannot step outside of it”.¹⁵

Communicative action in the life world context connotes what Habermas calls a flow of lived experience.¹⁶ The problem of democracy Habermas believes has been one of the distorted means of communication and mutual understanding. According to Habermas, “we experience in situations of disturbed mutual understanding”.¹⁷ The life-world is characterized by socialization, cultural reproduction or collective learning processes and the processes of

mutual understanding. According to Habermas, “the life-world appears as a horizon-forming context of processes of reaching understanding”.¹⁸ Communicative action can bring to the foreground legitimate orders and it is characterized by normative context. According to Habermas, “legitimate orders still appear to communicatively acting subjects as something normative...”.¹⁹ Habermas’ communicative, political action is characterized by normative framework. Communicative action constitutes the progress and the process of learning ability and the case of the normative foundation of linguistic communication. Linguistic communication expresses the potential for reasoned action and legitimate expectations. According to Habermas, “legitimacy means a political worthiness to be recognized”.²⁰ Legitimacy means the act of being lawful. Moreover, realizing and transforming democracy is still a genuine goal even for complex and globalizing societies. Habermas considers his major contribution to be the social development of the the life world context and the need for rational democracy. Habermas’ conception of communicative rationality reveals the social and the normative structure of interpersonal relations or linguistic process or the workability of human communication.

The Habermasian picture of communicative action theory vis-à-vis critical social theory advanced the goals of human emancipation, global vision or contemporary social world while maintaining an inclusive and exclusive universal core of moral framework. The objective of critical social theory is the critical understanding of our common-life world. This universal solidarity and moral framework rest on the argument and what Habermas calls “universal pragmatics”.²¹ Universal pragmatics means the telos of human communicative structure or rationality structure, that is, all ideal speech acts have an inherent *telos* (the Greek word for ‘end’) the goal of reaching mutual understanding, and that human beings possessed the communicative competence to bring about reaching mutual understanding in their system-life world.

Habermas’ theory of communicative action is basically a fundamental and functionalist conception of practical reason. Communicative structure reflects on a political

discourse. According to Habermas, “political discourse is understood as a form of communication that is not exclusively defined in terms of interests”.²² Communication is an essential or an integral part of democracy. The human spirit has once again been de-sublimated or controlled by some extraneous forces or internal mechanisms of modern complex societies such as sets of ideological beliefs and societal hegemony of money and power. Subjectivity has been shown to be “infiltrated with the system-life-world in such a way that otherness or inter-subjectivity is carried to the very heart of selfhood. The critique of ruthless power, pecuniary passion and rootless rationalism goes hand in hand with an unmasking of the anthropocentric, egoistic or egocentric utility calculation, possessive, and domineering aspects of Western individualism; together they frequently serves as a prologue to the rejection of central concepts of European humanism. And if the subject is de-sublimated, can we really expect much from general social theory than a historicist conception of the variety of forms of life and of the past; or a hermeneutic dialogue with other cultures and historical epochs about the common concerns of the contemporary political theory of otherness in the system-life world. The life-world/system question and its continued relevance for a theory of contemporary society has a great significance even in this 21st century. We have no one major model of collective rationality or collective decision making process. Our system-life world is simply viewed from a more multi-faceted or multi-dimensional or functionalist perspective. Our system-life world should be integrated with some progressive factors, contemporary social analysis and not contending issues that seemed to be retrogressive to our contemporary society. The life world is governed by reasoned communication and the sustained contemporary relevance of dialogue is a necessary precondition for our social integration and system integration, macro-micro integrated sociological paradigm of our system-life world.

Moreover, if one looks back over Habermas’ corpus of work, one can discern two broad lines of enduring theoretical interests and contextual justification, one having to do with the political domain, and the other with issues of practical rationality, discourse,

linguistic communication, and background knowledge. The negative experience of the relation between philosophy and politics subsequently motivates his search for conceptual resources from Anglo-American thought, particularly its pragmatics and democratic traditions. Habermas' work, *The Theory of Communicative Action* has been a grisly detailed analysis of critical social theory and the history of the development of society and it reinforces constitutive/transformational association of the system-life world. Habermas' interest in a communicative ideal provided the normative core or set standard for his contemporary moral and political theory. The idea of inclusive critical public discussion, free of social and economic pressures, in which interlocutors treat each other as free consociates, equals and rational human persons in a social cooperation attempts to reach a mutual understanding on matters of public concern still retains its contemporary relevance today. Habermas sees that the idea of inclusive critical public deliberation or public discussion as normative ideal social order has contemporary relevance to our system-life world.

Furthermore, society grows into mass or public forms and evolves from a simple society to a more complex modern society in the 19th century. Habermas does not give up on the idea of public reason. Habermas calls for an institutionally feasible conception of public reason, a public will-formation that is critically meaningful, that normatively meet the requirements of the collective social world, and that is theoretically clear and empirically identifiable. Habermas' conception of contemporary society outlines two-level models of democratic deliberation and the elaboration of the rationalization of law. Habermas is greatly indebted to Kant, Rousseau and Husserl whereby he sees the life world as a means of rational deliberation among equal citizens as a mode of reaching consensus. The idea of communicative power is anchored on the democratic principle or legitimation of law and power. Habermas advocates for the rationalization of society and deliberative democracy and the need for the indispensability of dialogue in global world order or international system. This work is saddled with the critical task of reviewing Habermas' work on the discourse theory of law and democracy and the role of dialogue in a changing world which is duly

embedded in his work the “*The Theory of Communicative Action*”. The idea of what Habermas calls “dianoetic appraisal”.²³ is a critical review of the system-life world. The system-life world is characterized by rational discourse and it is saddled with the “dianoetic appraisal” of the concept of communicative rationality. Dianoetic appraisal means critical judgment in our intersubjectively life world. According to Habermas, “dianoetic appraisals are always guided by reasons”.²⁴ Communicative rationality is developed along the line of goal directed action or problem solving mechanism. Communicative practice assures humans common- life- relations, and of an inter-subjectively shared life world. According to Habermas, “life-relations are integrated into an individual life history”.²⁵ The idea of life relation requires reaching understanding. According to Habermas, “reaching an understanding is a normative concept; everyone who speaks a natural language has intuitive knowledge of it and therefore is confident of being able, in principle, to distinguish a true consensus from a false one”.²⁶ The life world is a political totality or social whole of interpretations and presupposes the existential conditions for communicatively achieved rational consensus. The totality of interpretation showcases the need for members to engage in normative background knowledge of their system-life world. Communicative structures are inter-subjective normative framework of practical everyday experience. The systematically undistorted communication between the system and the life world has grown increasingly complex, distorted, disintegrated and characterized by the use of instrumental reason, domination and deceptions. We have been denied of the good things of life due to the plethora of irrationalities and the state of anomie bedeviling our contemporary social-life world. The system-life-world has drastically undergone an internal colonization caused by the ideological distortion of money in terms of the market economic structure and the bureaucratization of power in terms of the political strata or administrative power. Our contemporary human society is characterized by ideological confusions or pre-conceived ideas, social, cultural, economic and political hegemonies and ideological discrepancies. There is absolutely this internal contradiction using the Marxian analysis of social relation

caused by cultural reproductions. Our social structural conditions have been transmuted into that of an ideological distortion of our humanity. We have loss every sense of our humanity. Society has been ideologically distorted due to the preponderance of self deception and lack of consistent internal logic of rationality structure or social coordination. Communicative rationality reveals the need for problem solving theory. This is the limits of rationality in our modern complex society. Society can only improve when there is a synergy between the system and the life world. The concept of the life world espoused by Habermas in his theory of communicative rationality assumes the notion of totality of being in the actual rationalization of society, a term he borrows from the phenomenologist-Edmund Husserl.

We have virtually loss our common human destiny and the sacredness of our humanity. The project of humanity is an unfinished project waiting to be completed by the power of communicative rationality and normatively guided interaction. Rationality has its own limits which simply denied us the enrichment of life and the human quest for emancipated global society. When we use the term “rationality”, we are actually talking about the close connection between knowledge and rationality says Habermas. Truth is related to states of affairs in our social political world or system-life world. Habermas is of the view that the rationality inherent in communicative practice extends over a broad spectrum. Communicative action connotes a reflective means and social cooperation. Communicative rationality has brought to the foreground rational agreement or rational consensus and it brings to the fore argumentative speech. Communicative rationality connotes the mutuality of rationally motivated conviction, the unity of the objective world and the inter-subjectivity of the life world. The system-life world is championed by criticizable validity claims such as truth claims whereby the hearer can accept or reject for good reason. The Habermasian analysis of communicative rationality begins with the the rational analysis of the system-life world, rational discourse and the concept of propositional knowledge and the objective world. Communicative action is aimed at purposive rational

activity. The theory of communicative action is the theory of rationality and the theory of knowledge with emancipatory consequences.

When we talk about normative theory, we are simply talking about norms in society. Society is governed by norms and values. Norms lays the foundation for social coordination and social order. Normative theory has to do with social theory. The normative regulation of purposive rational activity entails a form of human emancipation and social integration. The communicative structure of purposive rationally motivated subjects anchore on the personality system and in the system of social institutions or cultural humanism. Normative theory gives impetus to integrated sociological explanations and the paradigm shift for social coordination. Normative theory as the institutionalization of purposive rational activity is societal/cultural rationalization and emancipatory project. Normative theory is predicated on practically rational conduct of life. The normative theory according to the Habermasian picture is based on rationally motivated agreement and the inter-subjective mutual recognition of criticizable validity claims. Normative truth brings about normative rightness. Normative theory in the Habermasian picture of society is a process of reaching mutual understanding aiming at rational consensus that depends on the inter-subjective recognition of validity claims. As we have seen, life world forms the horizons of processes of reaching mutual understanding in which participants rationally agree upon or discuss something in the one objective world (common social world). Stephen Darwall referred to this in his article *Moral Obligation: Form and Substance* as “fundamental answerability” or “mutual accountability”.²⁷ The rational agent makes his behavior a deliberate choice, and to be right in relation to a normative context is recognized as legitimate. There are communicative actions characterized by rational relations to the common social world and connects with normative rightness. Normatively speaking, communicatively achieved agreement must be based on the ends of reason. The moral practical sphere of rational relations of human persons is a communicative practice of reaching mutual understanding with reference to existing normative contexts. The normative context of communicating aims

at reaching mutual understanding in an objective social life world. The healing power of inner dialogue owes something to the common force of communicative arguments. Normative context of communicative practice makes possible symbolically mediated interaction. The normative context brings to the foreground the concept of social order, otherwise known as the normativist concept of social order. Normative question of communicative action requires social order, virtuous or rational conduct and social interaction. According to Habermas, “the order of virtuous conduct is changed into the regulation of social interaction”.²⁸ Normativistic concept of social order brings about the concept of communicative action, the linguistic communicative structures of social action or social interaction and the normative question of how social order is possible is Habermas’ major concern. According to Habermas “...underlying the setting of ends are orientation to values and norms”.²⁹ Normative context brings about social integration and social coordination. According to Habermas, “social integration demands of individual actors respect for a moral authority upon which the validity claims of collective binding rules can rest”.³⁰ Normative context gives impetus to the Kantian idea of freedom as obedience to laws that one gives to oneself. Law, morality and politics are the bases of normative ideal social order. Normative context results in the complementarity of common interests and value consensus. The basis of Habermas’ theory of communicative action rests on normative outcomes, legitimate expectations and the continuous learning process of subjects in their ideal speech situation and social action. Communicative action takes place between “two subjects in speech and action established through interpersonal relation and this give the rational grounding for purposive rational activity. Communicative action aims at emancipation, what Habermas calls “purposive rational activity”.³¹ This establishment of interpersonal relation of two or more subjects is only possible through rationally motivated agreement and social interaction. Social interaction is a process of rational action and authentic dialogue system. Society is a politically constituted communication community integrated through legal norms. From a normative point of view, society constituted a project

of legal-political order and a rational explanation or mechanism of social coordination. Normative standards accelerates the issues of common concern or common grounding. Society is a normatively integrated social system. Communicative interaction requires meaningful normative social coordination. Habermas' rationality structure of political discourse required normative assumptions and the sanctification of human understanding and its problematic consequences. Communicative rationality seeks to achieve linguistic understanding.

For Habermas, normative standards are restricted to regulating the rational relations between the ends and the means available, and the conditions given. Society is governed by norm-free social order and society explains how social order is possible. The normative context gives the background for communicative action. Normative context presupposes the communicative process of societal rationalization and the connotation of symbolically structured social life world. The normative structure connotes a linguistic communication structure. It raises an ethical, political and social foundation for communicative practice. Normative structure presupposes cultural reproduction of the system-life-world characterizes by reaching mutual understanding and the development of personal identity, social action and goal directed/purposive activity into the objective world. The normative context showcases a contemporary approach to society. Normative theory is a critical social theory of contemporary human society. Normative structure results or requires the rational relation and critical cognitive capacity of a civil society.

Habermas' theory of communicative dialogue is an original formulation of problem solving, social coordination and normative structure. Normative structure of communicative action is characterized by a systematic analysis and methodological attempts to locate a linguistic, extra political source for an emancipated global society. In the normative outline, communicative action requires the process of social, moral, legal, pragmatic, ethical, political and epistemological significance. Habermas' communicative action requires the process of an ideal social order, the project and prospect of normative standards and emancipated global

society. The normative standpoint provides the dynamic interplay of societal rationalization and continuous learning formations. The normative standpoint requires objective meaning and collective rationality. Communicative action theory provides the platform for a rational account of normative relationship. Society is characterized by a social whole and it requires normative standards and legitimate expectations. The normative outcomes provides the presuppositions of practical reason and legitimating force.

4.3 Communicative Action and the Hermeneutics of Social Interaction

Habermas reflects on his research program in formal pragmatics which fulfilled two main functions. It serves as the theoretical basis or pragmatic underpinning for his theory of communicative action and a crucial element in his theory of society. Secondly, it contributes an ongoing philosophical discussion of problems-solving concerning meaning, truth, practical rationality, and social action. By the “pragmatic” dimensions of language, Habermas means those issues pertaining specifically to the employment of sentences in utterances. He has made clear that “formal” is to be understood in a tolerant sense to refer to the rational reconstruction of general intuitions or communicative competences. Formal pragmatics, then, aims at a systematic rational reconstruction of the intuitive linguistic knowledge of competent subjects as it is used in practical everyday communicative social practice or ‘transformative consociation’. His research program may thus be distinguished from empirical pragmatics. For example, it aims at the socio-linguistics-analysis which looked primarily at particular social/existential situations. Habermas’ book aims at the pragmatics of communication. Habermas’ work *On the Pragmatics of Communication* is an anthology that brought together for the first time, a collection of essays that present the main concerns of Habermas’ research program in formal pragmatics. It aims at conveying a sense of the overall purpose of his linguistic investigations and social analysis of contemporary society while introducing the reader to their specific grisly details, in particular to his theories of meaning, truth, rationality, and communicative, political action.

This book *On the Pragmatics of Communication* brought together Habermas' key writings on language and communication vis-à-vis political. This book is a grisly detailed analysis and up- to- date introduction to Habermas' formal pragmatics, which is a vital aspects of his critical social theory. This book underpinned Habermas' theory of communicative action. This book is presents in a chronological order, so that the reader can trace social developments and the revisions in Habermas' social thought. This book includes critical discussions of John Searle's theory of meaning, John Dewey's conception of pragmatics and Richard Rorty's neo-pragmatism. It concludes with Habermas' recent defense of his theory of communicative action, in which he re-affirms his view that interpretative understanding of the system-life world inescapably involves socio-moral evaluation. This book is an indispensable text for contemporary scholars who want a clear understanding, critical assessment and accessible introduction to the development of Habermas' theory of communication and its relation to his broader normative framework of social and political theory. Habermas' pragmatic of communication explores the intrinsic value of human dialogic communication. The pragmatics of human communication has form the theoretical basis and basic normative foundation of contemporary research into interpersonal human communication.

In addition, communicative interaction lays the foundation for normative background of context-based approaches to the psycho-dynamics of human social development. Habermas' book presents the simple but radical idea that social problems in the system-life world often arises from issues of human communication, rather than from deep psychological social disorders, re-inforcing their conceptual exploration with case studies and well known contemporary societies. Habermas' work *On the Pragmatics of Communication* identifies simple properties of the pragmatics of human communication and demonstrates how all communications are actually a function of their social interactional contexts. This wide-ranging book covers the intrigues of pragmatic communication; the idea that all human behavior represents the normative background of communicative rationality; communication

as a workable means of free and open system of contemporary society. The Habermasian picture represents the nature of internal contradictions, the thesis of internal colonization or paradoxical juxtaposition in human existential conditionality and human dialogic communication. The normative foundation or pragmatic presupposition of human communication will create conducive atmosphere or platform or social movement or environment in which we will be able to reach a mutual understanding, rational relation and to critically understand the democratic potential of public debate and public discussion.

Furthermore, there is no gain saying the fact that we can only understand Habermas' conception of democratic model of public discussions or public deliberation without a bird's eye view of his *Theory of Communicative Action*. Communicative Action Theory paves the way for human public deliberation or deliberative democracy and human dialogic communication. Habermas believes that representative democracy is not just enough but the need to engage people in a dialogic process of public decision making and to guarantee the fundamental promotion of the welfare state and the procedural concept of basic human rights and the public good. In this context, we shall discuss as part of our rational critical assessment the great theoretical basis and philosophical/sociological connection between communicative action and deliberative democracy. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a pragmatics of social interaction. Communicative action showcases a reflective communicative competence within the framework of social conventions. Communicative action aims at reaching mutual understanding through language. Communication theory is a reconstructive theory. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action aims at problem-solving mechanism and the rational reconstruction of meaning in an objective social world. Social interaction is the domain important to cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization. Communicative action is cultural anthropology of the everyday practice in the system-life world contexts. Social interaction guaranteed the conceptual framework of mechanical solidarity. Solidarity requires social cohesion and common conscience. According to Joan Ferrante, "mechanical solidarity

consists of social order and cohesion based on a common conscience or uniform thinking and behaviour”.³²

Solidarity is referred to the cultural ties that bind people together in society. According to Joan Ferrante, social interaction is “everyday events in which at least two people communicate and respond through language and symbolic gestures to affect one another’s behavior and thinking”.³³ Society has been characterized by social interaction and psychological dimension. According to George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky alluding to Georg Simmel’s position, describes society as that characterized by “psychological microscopy”.³⁴ Habermas and Simmel share the same avowed affinity in the real life world situation or life world context characterized by social interaction. The hermeneutics of social interaction correlated with the bewildering world complexity of social reality or real life situation. Habermas’ philosophy is a web of myriad presuppositions such as pragmatics, hermeneutics, critical rationalism, moral rationalism, cultural humanism, political theory, linguistics and epistemology. In communicative, political action, Habermas accords “epistemic authority to the community of those who cooperate and speak with one another”.³⁵ Habermas accords higher position to acting and speaking than to knowing. Habermas’ communicative, political action is purposive rational activity or the pragmatic of social interaction and he took into rational account all forms of symbolic interaction. In social interaction context, the paradigmatic and the conceptualization of the life-world and system relate to one another. The objective of Habermas is to critically explore the problematic intertwining of the system and the life world. Habermas is concerned with rational action, rational conduct of life and rationalized worldviews. The theory of communicative, political action aims at the problematic of societal rationalization and rational reconstruction.

One very fundamental issue of social interaction is that it brings about social change and transformative dialogue. Social interaction has become a contemporary issue of global interdependence. Interaction is the rational relation between two or more persons in their interpersonal dialogical commitment. Social interaction brings to the foreground

communicative sociative mechanism or constitutive and transformative association of human persons. Social interaction is built on a normative context of interpersonal human relation. Social interaction has practical relevance to our changing social world. What makes social interaction possible is the inter-subjective shared communicative interaction. Habermas and Dewey share the same avowed affinity in their conception of the pragmatics of social interaction. Dewey places greater emphasis on the broadening of intellect and development of problem solving and critical thinking skills of the individuals in society. Habermas and Dewey develop the idea of progressivism. Habermas' philosophy has been an eclectic nature just like the pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey. Habermas and Dewey apply pragmatism in the context of development of progressivism in the organic nature of society.

Dewey and Habermas attempt to formulate a theory of social change based on the dynamic interplay of habits, impulse and imagination. The whole process occurs within the dynamic space of normative context of their general theory of social inquiry. Habermas and Dewey both formulates a social pragmatism which is described as witch's mirror in which every man may see his sweet heart or the devil. Their pragmatic kind of philosophy describes the cultural context of social inquiry and social process. The continuous shaping of the individual, powers, saturation of the moral consciousness, formation of his habits, the shaping of his ideas, feelings, and emotions presupposes the intellectual and moral resources which humanity has succeeded in getting together. Habermas and Dewey are of the view that the continuous learning or educational process of the individual has two sides...psychological, and sociological. Education is a continuous social process and learning. The task of society showcases the most effective instrument of social progress and reformulation in normative ideal social order. Habermas and Dewey desire the maximization of democracy and individual communicative freedom or human flourishing.

4.4 Communicative Action, Communicative Freedom and Dialogue as Opening up to the System-Life-World.

Understanding is one mode in which the common social world opens up to social beings as rational agents. The understanding of social being is an unprecedented concern for the Other. The philosophy of Otherness marks the crux of dialogical philosophy. Understanding our socio-political world is all about the task of rational dialogue and social transformation. To understand our existential situation in social reality does not mean to define it but to find oneself in an affective attunement; to understand our social being means to co-exist with Others. Broadly speaking, what we call affective attunement is more reasonable, i.e. more perceptive because more open to social being. Society opens up to social beings or political beings. Man is a political animal. Humanity exists because 'Being' in general is inseparable from its opening-up, because there are truth claims, or because, if you like, there is communicative modality and ethical insight into social beings. All non-understanding is only a deficient mode of understanding our socio-political world. The social analysis of our existential condition is thus nothing other than the normative framework of universal truth of reason, the existential condition of transformative dialogue as the opening up to the system-life world and the indispensability of dialogue to our global world order presupposes normative criteria of our social life world. The disclosed or unconcealed truth revealed the fusion of horizons of universal truth of 'Being' in the socio-political world. Man is a holistic being in the world. Man is invariably conscious of the inevitable cosmic law of political order, normative assumption, moral order and rational reciprocity. Man is always conscious of the existence of Others. Man realizes the fraternity of rational relation. The Habermasian picture of transformative dialogue is basically on human ethical discourse, existential/political position and epistemological significance, that is, the indispensability of human existence. What makes man what he is, is his social consciousness as a political animal and how he correlates with Others. Human being is surrounded with Others. He finds himself in the world surrounded by lots of significant things and meaningful subjects and

objects. Dialogical philosophy reveals man's existential position as he correlates with Others so that the possibility of his cultural identity, or personal identity and communicative freedom will be meaningfully realized and guaranteed.

Furthermore, dialogical philosophy perceives communicative freedom as an existentially established social fact by which the nature of man is seen as a conscious being. The indispensability of dialogue presupposes social facts and action. According to Habermas, in his book, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, he defines "action as mastering situation".³⁶ Consciousness is the clear practical demonstration of the awareness of human existence and thus, this self-determination of itself by itself is an essential characteristic of man. Consciousness and intention have inextricable nexus in man's existence and intentions are the essence of man's existence. Man takes full responsibilities for every facet of his moral consciousness and his rational conducts and emotive communication with Others. According to Alexander Mosley, in his book *A to Z of Philosophy*, "consciousness generally means being aware of ones surroundings".³⁷ Emotions are forms of arrested actions. Man's idea about his existence as a social being within the socio-political world involved the idea that there might be other free rational agents and conscious beings that can obscure his self consciousness which defines his existence, freedom and human reality. Habermas' philosophy is invariably an existential-ethical discourse and legal-political system of human beings. Human consciousness and the idea of the mind are like a machine governed by natural forces, and at the same time admitting their motives and intentions behind man's conscious behaviour. Self consciousness defines man's communicative freedom, political action, existence and human reality. Consciousness on a pre-reflective (deep thinking) level is immediate or spontaneous and lived experience. Man is a being with a lived experience in the social life world. The being of consciousness is the consciousness of being. To grow up and live in a complex isolation will result in non-development of human mental faculty, rational or cognitive capacity and our existent world remains veiled to us in an unconscious, that is, it will be unknown; anti-natural and

unbecoming. Consciousness of being in its inner most nature is a rational relation of concrete 'Beings'. The idea of moral dialogue or rational or transformative dialogue as opening up to the social life world constituted the normative background and ethical foundation of existentialist philosophy of Habermas.

Habermas' philosophy of communicative, political action has existentialist strand and the concreteness of inter-subjective mutual recognition is a spatial-temporal dimension of human self-determination. Human's reality embraces the inter-subjective recognition of himself and of Others' existence. The gaze of Others on me makes me an object in the common social world thereby alienating me from myself and at the same time makes my social existence meaningful and obligatory. The looks of the Other disintegrates my own existence, universe and recoups objects including my own body around it. Man requires the Other to be fully aware of the normative foundation and social structures of his existential condition. For man to fully realize the meaning of his existence, man needs to fully appreciate the existence of the Other, and the rational relation of his being to the being of the Other.

Consequently, people who live in society have learned how to see themselves like mirrors as they appear to their neighbours. By implication, the Other sees me or looks at me like a mirror. My existence becomes meaningless or rudderless without the Others' existence. My existence is threatened by the Other's existence. Similarly, my look places him under the same threat to his liberty and the idea of normative structure of the common social world subject us into moral obligation. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a normative core of our practical everyday existence. According to Giovanna Borradori, "Habermas' normative core of a communicative ethics is the experiential relation of the Self to Others".³⁸ Habermas' linguistic communication is experiential relation or intersubjective relation. The Habermasian analysis is a self-reflective understanding of moral reasoning. Communicative ethics anchors on a social theory of intersubjective recognition. Freedom presupposed individuation. Individualization emerges through the realization of the Self with

Others. According to Kenneth G. Mackendrick, “individualization emerges through the realization of Self within a community of Others”.³⁹

Furthermore, individualization is locked within the conventional framework of ego identity. Human rational and cognitive capacity of differentiated behavioural expectations is somewhat normative. According to Kenneth G. Mackendrick, “the individual is locked into a conventional ego identity”.⁴⁰ The dialogical encounter is not a call to share our existence, but is rather the direct social system, normative framework and linked characteristically to an objective experience. We always share our existence on a fundamental, normative background and dialogical, epistemological, existential level by virtue of being here together in a system life world. Although, enfolds into individuality, within the clearing of being’s universal truth, the dialogical encounter does necessarily lead to anything in particular, to specific dialogical commitment in ensuring each other adhere to the act of collective conscience. Dialogue is conscience-oriented and people-oriented. In particular, for the most part it leads to any ethical immediacy or constancy in the sharing of individual existence the possibility of on-going moral responsibility for each other. The dialogical encounter is not merely ethical immediacy but barely lived experience of dynamics inter-play of individual communicative freedom and the normative criteria of the social life world. Individual communicative freedom is the direct confrontation with life relations and rational relation that we as individuals live in the system-life world together. Habermas’ communicative ethics is cultural humanism. Ethics is humanism, but it is humanism of the other human person. Habermas’ philosophy is cultural humanism or cultural homogeneity. It has to do with science, law, politics, arts, technology, philosophy, culture, and aesthetics. For Habermas, it is only in human relations, and rational relation in dealing concretely with other human beings. The dialogical encounter is an ethico-political and existential encounter; it establishes an inter-subjective relationship with the other human person, and in doing so it lays the normative background for human community, international community and its rules. Ethics arises from interpersonal communicative existential encounter.

Nevertheless, such interpersonal humanity will not be satisfied simply with the observation of moral principles and the recognizability of normative structures of communicative power. Interpersonal human relationship called for rational persons to take seriously moral responsibility or Darwallian “fundamental answerability” or “mutual accountability” for the other persons and to ensure concrete world order. Habermas’ notion of moral consciousness has a legitimating force and showcased normative foundation of communicative rationality and deliberative democracy. Habermas calls on each person to fulfill his duties and thus puts him in an existential position of wide-ranging moral indebtedness to communicative interaction. Indeed, according to Habermas, “we as rational human beings must engage in communicative dialogue, and we are in fact responsible for all other persons, each one of us for himself with respect to each other person in the system-life world. There lies the nucleus for the idea of a normative foundation or universal core of global ethics. We must learn to live with one another. The task incumbent on each of us is not only the notion of collectivity, or collective consciousness but the political task of social transformation that calls for international interaction, or global inter-dependence and global intercultural cooperation. What counts is to prevent global war, global terrorism, political violence and human cruelty, in order to open up a normative perspective for global peace, global interpersonal humanity and Global Ethical Report (GER). Habermas’ cultural humanism or homogeneity is a global ethics and the normative foundation of social analysis of dialogical process. The notion of dialogical philosophy best encapsulated the Habermasian picture of cultural humanism, moral rationalism, deliberative democracy, contemporary integrated sociological paradigm, a multi-level analysis of agency-structure relation and rational relation of interpersonal communicative encounter.

Habermas’ political philosophy has global vision or implication. Political ethics is indeed the ethics of political communication and the philosophy of social relation. In each dialogical encounter, the theory of communicative action showcased purposive rational activity or an emancipatory project. The theory of communicative action in every

classification and every political ordering is social totality and human sociality. The radicalization of Habermas' political ethics is evident in his social theory and the very conceptualization of moral consciousness and the deliberative model of human democracy.

Consequently, the monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power are indeed the ideological frameworks or distortion that impedes the normative ideal and the rationalization of complex modern society. Modernity has become an endless project. Habermas' conception of moral consciousness and communicative action presupposes the social fact that human beings are rational animals with superior faculty or cognitive capacity or normative structure through which people deal with the common social world and this seem sufficiently encompassing as a matrix of dialogical/reciprocal relationship, analysis of ethical, moral and behavioural normative assumption of rational agent in our global world order. Habermas' political ethics reveals the need for rational-problem-solving mechanism, pragmatic, linguistic, hermeneutics, and phenomenological approach that get rid of the specter of pure self seeking and the normative foundation of society in order to promote peoples' utility and cultural humanism. It presupposes the complexity of modern society. It is 'ipso facto' a radical ethics or cultural rationalism and moral rationalism and social psychology. It is defined within the normative context of dialogic communication, ethical objectivity and practical rationality.

In addition, Habermas' ethics refers to the moral consciousness as a radical response to a universal human freedom based on normative peace, social justice and dialogic communication. As we have mentioned before, Habermas' ethico-existential perspective is a connection and the greatest expression of people, of human solidarity, network of global interdependence and cultural humanism. His ethical philosophy is existential-political philosophy. Habermas regards communicative ethics as likely that the social- life world consists of a cosmic network of social arrangement, meaning and significance of social order or social change or social system through which we discover the existential wonders of our socio-political world. Therefore, we appeal to the right to disconnect ourselves from the

values of instrumental ethics of the market structure that tries to impose on us instrumental reason. For Habermas, this is not communicative ethics it is the monetization of society, bureaucratization of power, interest based ideology or economic and administrative rationalization of society. We also appeal to the organic solidarity of emancipated global society that envisioned universal human flourishing, transformative dialogue and communicative freedom. The Habermasian picture is a deep thinking of global world order and the radical humanization through moral consciousness and social movement. It is a dialogical implication of a planetary ethical interpersonal human relationship around critical social movement based on phenomenological principle or interpretation, cultural representation and communicative, political action on a global scale. Furthermore, this dialogical reflection, which encompasses the global world order, aims at free and open communication-- a field of rational reconstruction, radical openness, deconstruction, ethical-existential encounter and democratic deliberation about the contribution of global ethics of inter-dependence in drafting the political public sphere of international interactional context premises on the purpose of opening dialogue between rational human agents in ensuring purposive rational activity and global world order. Authentic dialogue is the dialectical sequence of historical progress in an international community of reasonable people. It is a spiritual unity of dialectical sequence and cobweb of network of social connectedness of international relation and international order or global system. The discursive practice of rational relations is the hallmarks of human fraternity or universal brotherhood itself and it is a philosophical foundation, democratic ideals, rationalization of a global system and humanistic dimension of rethinking imagination of global humanity and human flourishing.

Furthermore, hermeneutics inquires into the meaning and significance of understanding for human existence in general. Gadamer elucidates the historical and linguistic situatedness of human knowing. The practical trajectories of Gadamer's hermeneutics are anchored on his interest in Plato and Aristotle. Gadamer discerned the centrality of dialogue as that which is deeply rooted in human understanding. Dialogue is

deeply rooted and committed to the furthering of our common bond with one another. It is all about our radical openness to dialogue with the Other that Gadamer sees as the basis for a deeper human solidarity. From the Aristotelian standpoint, Gadamer affirms the commitment that philosophy actually started from praxis (human practice) and that hermeneutics is essentially anchored on human understanding and practical philosophy. Gadamer's hermeneutics elucidates how Being makes human existence meaningful. Gadamer contended with the limits of human knowing. The radical return to Plato made Gadamer all the more receptive to and excited by Heidegger's thinking. Gadamer follows Plato in insisting on the ontological nature of the Good. The idea of the Good serves as an assumption that made possible all understanding. Knowledge is for the sake of acting and for the sake of living the Good life. Knowledge stems from and must return to praxis. Accordingly, Gadamer's key contribution to philosophy is basically anchored on his thinking of Plato, Aristotle and Heidegger. Gadamer just like Heidegger insists that hermeneutics is practical philosophy. Gadamer clarified that practical philosophy is deeply rooted in human existence which is never solipsistic but communal. Rather, for Gadamer, existence means existing with Others, which requires dialogue born out of humility and radical openness. Gadamer affirms that understanding is inseparable from dialogue.

The dialogical openness aimed at solidarity and presupposes the fact that each part posed good will to understand, that is, an openness to hear something anew. Good dialogic encounter requires a willingness to offer reasons and justification for one's views. Dialogue requires humble playfulness in which we get caught up and lose ourselves in the connection with Others. Gadamer's book *Truth and Method* offers us the foundation of hermeneutics. Gadamer realizes more fully the universalizing tendency in the history of hermeneutics and the myriad ways we interact with and seek to connect with Others. Gadamer is profoundly critical in his eagerness to conceive of the dialogical impetus of hermeneutics as a possible resource for resolving certain contemporary social and political crises in our world. Gadamer stresses the possibility of how we can interact rationally and dialogically in order to listen to

the Other and to advance human understanding that values the whole that is (the community) over the part (the individual). The hermeneutic task of integrating is predicated on the communicative consciousness which includes the task of exercising practical social and political reasonableness. The ethics of this hermeneutics is an ethics of respect and trust that called for universal solidarity. Gadamer concludes that human thinking always requires an acknowledgement of what cannot be fully understood or captured in language and yet language can be understood to function to create our human world and finds meaning to the world. Just like Heidegger, Gadamer believes that language is characterized as part of Being. Language, as that part of Being that can be understood, functioned to create our human world so to speak.

4.5 Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action as Critical Social Theory

Critical social theory is originated from the Western Marxian tradition known as the Frankfurt School. It starts from the year 1929 to 1930. Horkheimer believes that critical social theory must meet three criteria at a time; it must be explanatory, practical and normative at the same time. It seeks human emancipation and it is to liberate human beings from circumstances that enslaves them (Horkheimer 1982, 244). Habermas' theory of communicative action is critical theory of society. Critical social theory is a philosophical approach that extends to ethics, political philosophy, philosophy of history, and philosophy of social science. Critical social theory has to do with the explanation, understanding, structure, agency, regularity and normativity of our objective world. It provides the descriptive and normative bases for social inquiry. It has to do with reducing human domination, ideological distortions and increasing human freedom. Critical theory is the emergence of social movement that identifies varied dimensions of domination of human beings.

Habermas attempts to redefine the nature and limits of democracy in complex, pluralistic and globalizing emancipated society. Critical social theory is replete with definitional difficulties or rife with certain explanatory complexities. Critical social theory is a dimension of normative political theory and it is strikingly similar to American pragmatism.

The focus is on radical democracy as a pedestal for cooperative, practical and transformative activity of human society. It aims to transform contemporary capitalist society into more democratic society. It is the epistemological sweep of transforming capitalism into a more liberal-radical model of democracy. The practical goal of social transformation reflects on psychology, cultural, socio-historical dimension as well as institutional forms of domination.

The interpretive understanding of human society is based on the need for a critical understanding of the rational relation of the social, political and the economic conditions of the culturally transmitted meanings of human life. Habermas' critical understanding of social-epistemological significance is the proper structured restructuring of our system-life world. It presupposes the critique of ideology and reason, the objective validity and normative framework of social and political legitimacy. Broadly speaking, the critique of ideology is a historically oriented analysis of the system-life world. Habermas' philosophy provides a full blown and consistent social development that requires a general theory of systematically undistorted communication. Habermas' conception of systematically undistorted communication encapsulated human competence to communicate and it provides the application of such an interpretive schema and his critical theory of society has hermeneutic content, social, political, global and epistemological significance. Habermas' notion of communicative action reflects on the dynamics and developmental account of society. It is the rational reconstruction of the philosophical hermeneutics of human existential and intersubjective shared encounter of the system-life world.

Habermas' notion of a systematically undistorted communication is a critical theory of society, so to speak, and this has a sustained contemporary relevance of the Enlightenment democratic vision of an emancipated global society. Habermas' theoretical understanding of society has an avowed affinity with Talcott Parson's structural functionalism, Karl Marx's philosophy of social reconstruction, John Rawls' Political liberalism, Kant's conception of international law and Wittgenstein's philosophy of language.

There is convergence between Habermas and Marx in their idea of ‘work’ and ‘interaction’. Habermas attempts to integrate action and thought.

Talcott Parson does not ignore the meaningfulness of social action. Thomas McCarthy believes that the social system is conceived as a functional complex of institutions within which cultural patterns or values are made binding for human action, that is, are incorporated into binding bonds of social norms and institutionalized values. We, as individuals, must discover the social functions, that is, the specific elements we need to fulfill the self maintenance of the social system and the life world. Habermas’ decisive theoretical orientation is a contemporary approach and is mainly concerned or centered on hermeneutics and critical moments of social inquiry. Habermas’ theoretical alternative is a value orientation that is tailored towards a social analysis of historical process, the transformation from traditional to complex modern society and contemporary human society. The critical existential wonder and dimension of social inquiry presupposes a structural functionalist analysis of society. In society, according to the Habermasian picture, language plays a functionalist role. Habermas’ notion of communicative action has normative or objective validity of truth claims or social roles. Habermas’ communicative action theory originates in language. Habermas opined that society can no longer be conceived as a system of self preservation, but its very meaning is in rational relation to the fundamentals of social process or progress. It brings to the foreground the functionalist or normative framework of reason. Habermas’ conceptual analysis of society is understood as the model of biology. Habermas concludes that social system analysis and the critical dimensions of society is transformed and understood as a form of a historically oriented theory of society with a much more practical intent. The critical theory of society is a reflectively grasped formative rational process of society as a whole. Reconstructing the contemporary society with a view not only to its past but to its anticipated future is the final completion of the project of the Enlightenment democratic vision, universal humanity, global citizenship and modernity. This is the sole objective of a critical theory of society and communicative action theory.

Formulating a systematic conception of the critical theory of society has been the sole task and central foci of Habermas' theoretical work for the past decades. Habermas repeatedly reminds us that his volumes are not to provide results in the sense of finished products but his conception of critical theory of society is presented rather as a research program of social inquiry. Habermas's research program of social inquiry is embedded in his theory of social change. Habermas' normative foundation of a general theory of rationalization of society presupposes a form of communicative competence. Habermas' critical theory of society ranges from linguistic communication and cognitive psychology (including moral consciousness) to symbolic interactionism and system-life world. Habermas adopts a theory of communicative competence through the developmental approach of normative foundations of social action theory and his critical task is the rational reconstruction of the increasingly complex stages of the developmental logic of society. Habermas' logic of communicative action is understood as a rational reconstruction of contemporary society and the logic of legal morality. Social evolution is an increasingly complex structural formation and social evolution is concerned as a bifurcal learning process. Social evolution makes the institutional framework of society an embodiment of social structure which showcases continuous learning process. The idea of social movement is drawn upon the fact that the new social structure is based on a social system and a normative context. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is a social movement where unsolvable system problems require a radical transformation of the basic forms of global interdependence, social dialogue and change in the international system, social integration and social analysis. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is a critical social theory. The theory of social evolution aims at the rational reconstruction of political stability. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action aims at legitimate or normative expectations. Habermas' communicative rationality is social inquiry. It is the articulation and the normative presuppositions of social practice and social order. The rational reconstructive analysis of the system-life- world is linked up with specific forms of normative structure and social, moral and political

knowledge in analyzing general conditions of practical communicative rationality manifests in various human cognitive capacities and powers. With the turn to language and reconstructive science, Habermas is heavily indebted to the Wittgensteinian tradition of the roles of language as a rational discourse, rational philosophy and making philosophy as the sole judge in basic normative core of socio-linguistic analysis. In Habermas' view, philosophy must engage in a fully cooperative relationship with the social sciences. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action in the system-life world is characterized by linguistic communication, existential and epistemological significance.

Habermas' philosophy is a mode of social integration and it recognizes both the cultural dimension of modernization, normative standard and critical explanations of the indispensability of dialogue in the international community. Habermas' communication theory aims at normative and legitimate expectations. Habermas stresses the idea of communicative reasoning in the duality of the system and the life world. The contextual justification of Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action*, demonstrates so candidly, the critique of reason, ideology, the idea of public deliberation in democracy and global order. Habermas' theory of communicative action presupposes a legitimate/polico-existential domain and the fact of objective moral pluralism and cultural homogeneity or humanism. The idea of linguistic communication is a distinctive feature of a complex modern society. In this intellectual discourse, we believe that Habermas' intersubjective recognition of an objective validity of the system-life world presupposes the complexity of democratic society and cultural pluralism in complex modern societies. Habermas' thought is a more plausible basic normative assumption and legitimate expectation from which to start the deeper framework of cultural humanism in complex social structure of human comprehensive rational relations. Habermas' philosophy of rational reconstruction is a contextual justification of contemporary human society.

Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action showcases the theory of society and social change. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is communicative

rationality. Rationality has become a common phenomenon to all humans in society. The opposite of rationality is irrationality or human senselessness.

4.6 Habermas and the Problem of Contemporary Political Philosophy

Habermas' communicative action theory is virtually embedded in his political philosophy. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy has both national and trans-national or global relevance. Of course, the Enlightenment, many contemporary scholars maintain, is over, modernism unfinished project. Habermas is a planetary figure and the leading defender of Enlightenment democratic vision, probably the best-known American philosopher. Human attitudes, they insisted, vary as much as human cultures do. The problem of social order is one of the fundamental problems of contemporary global society. The system-life world, postmodernists maintain, is full of egocentric and ethnocentric biases or preconceived ideas, full of complexities and myriad of ideological distortions. In the postmodern age, those who create buildings, clothing, novels and world views are encouraged to throw in a little of this and a little of that without pretending that this or that, one perspective or another, is somehow correct. Post modernism is logical conceptualizations of web of myriad presuppositions. Reason is the tool we use to device what is correct and construct those out-of-fashion generalizations, so in the postmodern age it is particularly suspect. Habermas is against the instrumental use of reason. He takes the idea of reason to be janus-faced, that is, instrumental reason and strategic reason. The late French philosopher Michel Foucault derides reason as just another instrument of oppression, just another form of ideological framework or cultural hegemony, and just another weapon on the battlefield. The term "*field*" for Pierre Bourdieu is the arena of battle. Habermas offers a way out of this corrosive cultural relativism and every form of ideological distortion in human society. Habermas sees reason as fallible, as merely the product of imperfect human discussion and contemporary political debate.

Habermas' unfashionable beliefs, particularly his undisputed philosophical attachment to reason, probably can be traced to a deep awareness where he comes from of the horrors of

unreasoned communication. Habermas believes in what we may refer to as systematically undistorted communication or he is of the view of free and open communication in the system-life world. Habermas admits that there is a strong personal element in his contemporary political thought. Philosophers live finally from their own intuitions of historical era, and he suggests that there should be communicative freedom, or communicative, political action and public deliberation. Habermas believes that one of the fundamental problems of rational society as a result of systematically distorted communication and mutual understanding is actually caused by what he calls the “rights of political participation and rights of communication”.⁴¹ Habermas continues to discuss difficult contemporary problems in social and political philosophy. Habermas, in other words, not only believes in reasoned communication, he believes in discursive everyday practice or reasoned communication or communicative, political action in human society. Habermas stands, "in American terms, somewhere between a radical and a liberal model." He supports, what he calls without flinching, the "welfare state," which has come under renewed attack in Germany and elsewhere in Western Europe. The key words in Habermas' political vocabulary, however, are “deliberative democracy” and “communicative action”. He often has had in mind a more "radical democracy" or “liberal democracy” than that with which most Americans are familiar. Paraphrasing Thomas McCarthy’s position, in the phrase of Abraham Lincoln’s definition of democracy as 'government of the people, by the people and for the people,' Habermas places more emphasis on the 'by' than most of us normally would do in this contemporary political era. McCarthy explains that he wants less unthinking nationalism and more reasoned communication on public debates and his contemporary political thought has a lot to do with cosmopolitan politics.

In line with his cosmopolitan politics, Habermas believes in democratic constitutional state, constitutional patriotism, and cosmopolitan political order. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “the notion of constitutional patriotism is a useful point of departure to address Habermas’ view concerning the possibility of a new cosmopolitan order, which he

recognizes as the most urgent challenge facing the geopolitical scene after the terrorists attacks of 9/11".⁴² He wants more political participation by citizens in government processes, in political parties and economic decision makings in a larger "political public sphere" than can be found in any existing society. He wants more public debate or public discussion in the economic arena and administrative routines of any society. According to Mitchell Stephens, "but Habermas is just dead wrong in terms of his political recipe. In the eyes of most of those on the other side of the political spectrum, that "recipe" includes too much "public" which they read as "state" interference in economic matters. It places too much emphasis on cooperation, not enough on old-fashioned, reliable competition".⁴³

Nevertheless, Habermas' strategies for increasing the scope and power of the "political public sphere" have a significant impact on our contemporary society. Indeed, they are important to those who are fighting state communism in Eastern Europe before 1989. "Habermas' book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* played an extremely important political role in terms of the legitimation crisis of the contemporary human society. It helps to conceptualize the role of the concrete society against the state. Habermas creates the normative foundation of a democratic culture and the inter-subjectively shared recognition of normative validity. Habermas' ideas are absolutely not only useful but important in this democratic process of emancipated global society. Habermas has given himself to one overriding cause: keeping the Global World Order oriented toward global justice, normative peace, international interaction, and Enlightenment values, values that have been most at home in the West. Habermas has worried so much, so publicly, that he has been attacked unfairly as a foe of world reunification. The Western democracies still have great social and contemporary political problems. Moreover, an additional benefit of remembering the past is gaining global momentum or perspective on our contemporary socio-political world. Habermas' theory of democracy has come to stay both at the national and transnational level. According to Michell Stephens, "the key word in Habermas' political vocabulary, however, is democracy".⁴⁴ Habermas indicts our present human society because

of its politically criminal system and systematically distorted communication. According to Mitchell Stephens, “all at once we saw that we had been living in a politically criminal system, Habermas has explained. His political life began with this awakening. It establishes what he labels the major “motif” of his politics; a vigilance against any recurrence of such “politically criminal” behavior”.⁴⁵ In addition, Habermas believes that modernity is an unfinished project. He assumes communicative rational solution to be the problems of modernity. Habermas’ communicative rational solution has a religious implication and political implication. His contemporary political philosophy is a political fight. According to Michell Stephens, “Habermas has been in the public arena fighting to keep Germany heads in the direction of reason, justice and other ideals he hears postmodernists deconstruction. And that fight –a political fight-goes on”.⁴⁶

Habermas’ communicative rational solution of modernity has a normative foundation, a collective life of solidarity, an epistemic viability, the ideals of freedom, universal egalitarianism, collective consciousness, the democratic principle of human rights, social justice, the global ethics of love, and contemporary legacies of political and religious tolerance. Habermas believes in political participation because he believes that we live in a politically criminal society. Michell Stephens asserts that “he wants more of participation by citizens in government processes, in political parties, in economic decisions –a larger “public sphere” that can be found in any existing society. He wants more of debate and discussion”.⁴⁷ Habermas believes in the critical role of religion in civil society and he believes in the conceptions of morality of conscience and the communicative interpretation of complex human society. Habermas’ conception of religion is being referred to as the transcendence within and he is a strong supporter of religious tolerance. The problem of normative ideal social order and social action is a consequent factor to society’s quest for social system, order and social integration. Marxism is a theory of social change and it presupposes the theory of society, class struggle, revolution and history. Habermas and Marx seem to agree on the thesis of internal colonization in contemporary social theory which showcases that complex

modern society is characterized by excessive fragmentation of the social structural conditions. The model of social integration has become a very critical issue in re-defining our contemporary social structure. Habermas and Marx see the thesis of internal colonization as that cause by a distorted ideological framework or political order and contemporary social theory. They tend to examine the present inherent ideological distortions of our contemporary social systems or socio-political world; an ideological distortion in our social system and the life world and to proffer logical mechanisms of how a society should progress even in the midst of inherent social contradictions. Rational society, reveals the model of social integration, and that society can be described as an embodiment of part-whole analysis. Society cannot improve politically, economically, socially, historically, culturally, ideologically, aesthetically, scientifically, technologically without any progressive empirical laws that tend to advance human flourishing in society. Human flourishing presupposes a function in a systematic approach to moral judgment. Habermas' contemporary political problem revealed the problems of social practice, social action, moral dialogue, moral anthropology and integrated social paradigm. It is the problem of agency-structure integration. The micro- macro analysis reflects on our contemporary social world order. The thesis of internal colonization presupposed the limits of human communicative rationality and communicative freedom in our system-life world. It showcases the fact that our humanity has been distorted and characterized by moral quicksand and epistemological quandary. This moral quicksand and the drumbeating menace of our contemporary social world must be rationalized by purposive rational activity. Rationality is a critical issue that is dealt with in philosophy. The theory of rationality and social theory is hinge on reaching mutual understanding in the socio-political world. Habermas posits that the rationality of beliefs and actions is a theme usually dealt with in philosophy. The preponderance of economic power, is followed by, and reflects in, a political change, where by way of reform or by way of revolution; so that the economic change is the original spring board of the movement of history. Democracy is defined within the ideological framework of a well organized

bureaucratic structure. Democracy, with its need for tolerance and its requirement for public rational consensus can only farewell during the periods of economic buoyancy or liberal democracy. Democracy, not market economic structure has survived and it has gained adherents, causing many to rejoice. Habermas further assumes that the principles of practical rationality, that people should adopt what they see to be the necessary means to their most important ends.

Nevertheless, while people do wish to act for their own long term interest, they are short-sighted, and so indulge their current interests without properly considering the effects of their current behavior on their long term interest. This would be a type of systemic failure of communicative rationality. The sum of which is not to treat Others in ways we would not let them treat us. These moral precepts, conclusions or theorems of reason are eternal and immutable always commanding our calmer judgments and assents even when they may not safely be acted upon. Human actions must be constrained by the laws of freedom, as it were and the empirical laws of nature. Without these, human beings will sink below the level of brutes, whose welfare is involuntarily secured by physical laws, and they will remain at liberty only to destroy one another. Humans must as they can, cultivate and maintain toward Others a peaceable sociality that is consistent with the naive character and end of human kind in general. Society cannot manage to survive or strive at all in a completely barbaric and bellicose social existential condition. The common social world is not entirely inhospitable to morality. For without speech and action in the sense of symbolic interaction or strong communicative, political action, human sociality will remain at a primitive and unsustainable level, in that the terms of human cooperation can not be articulated and agreed upon. Speech or language or whatever you may call it is the social construct of human cooperation overtime, through a continuous learning processes rather than contingent, and arbitrary or accidental, instead, humans are obligated to be social and moral in their deliberate human actions.

Furthermore, though humans society is bound by the general conventions of language, reason and by the requirement of not lying to one another, they retain a certain flexibility of reason and action based on Others' varying right to know our thoughts. A fundamental use of speech is to regulate human's use of external things by appeal to the right of appropriation or existential domain. Our epistemological existential, communicative political domain of human intersubjective relations is of huge importance for further consideration about freedom presupposing the rational-relational implication of social practice in our life world and system. The cultural identity of the individual is interwoven with collective identities and can be stabilized only in a cultural network. The political implication of Habermas' argument is that of universal human rights which are quite contrary to Rawls' political theory, grounded in political justice, human autonomy, but that human autonomy itself has a collective dimension which must take into rational account or consideration cultural interpretations of basic human rights. Legality is central to the realization of human rights, and Habermas' theory of law bear some resemblance to Rawls' theory of justice and basic human rights at a global level or the international system of the formation of law, politics, justice, cultural dialogue or discursive process and democratic reasonableness. Habermas' theory is grounded in formal pragmatic aspect of communication. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is practical rationality and it is characterized by normative contexts. This tendency to define practical problems in such an instrumental way is what Habermas calls "technocratic consciousness". Philosophy has to do with the practical consciousness of human reality. Philosophy is a pedestal for unveiling injustices among humans in contemporary society. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action envisaged the pragmatics of social interaction, purposive rational activity, social activity, and the problems of contemporary political world order, social reconstruction and the role of cultural dialogue in global ethics.

4.7 Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy

Habermas stresses the need for the idea of law and democracy in human rational society. Habermas reflects on law as a category of social mediation in his book *Between Facts and Norms*. It talks about the immanent tension between facticity and validity. It reflects on the transcendence from within and the attempt in managing the risk of dissensions through normative life world background. It reflects on the dimensions of legal validity. This work *Between Facts and Norms* gave a grisly detailed analysis of the internal relation between law and politics, the communicative power and the genesis of law and the principles of the constitutional state and the logic of the separation of powers. Furthermore, Habermas discusses the indeterminacy of law and the rationality of adjudication. Modern law is meant to solve the problems of social coordination. Social coordination is effected through language. Habermas' constitutive element of communicative action theory presupposes value orientation to reaching mutual understanding. The logical mechanism for social integration rests on reaching mutual understanding which for Habermas is constitutive of communicative action theory. Habermas is mainly concerned about reasoned communication that is free, open and characterized by human flourishing. If a society is to be a stable one, then, it requires more than explicit agreement as a basis for social cooperation and large areas of social interaction rest on a stable basis of unquestioned rational consensus. Habermas advocates that conflicting parties should involve in a dialogical engagement from instrumental action to strategic action. Habermas is particularly concerned with the need for modern rationalization of law and politics, because with the growth of capitalist market economic contexts dominated by strategic action become increasingly important for social coordination. Positive law is needed in rational society, because modern complex societies are pluralistic and they are governed by a set of shared normative background assumptions. Modern rationalization of law and politics is meant to solve social coordination problems that can arise under the condition of societal rationalization, pluralization, bureaucratization of power and the monetization of human contemporary society. Moreover, society should be

given a structured structuring and should be governed according to the dictates of purposive-social activity or practical rationality. The character of law and politics must provide something like a stable social environment. Habermas proposes a more complex set of discourses that underlie legitimate law making processes. Habermas' discourse approach is the key to his argument that democracy and the rule of law are internally related.

Habermas' discourse theory of law and democracy presupposes the claims of a constitutional democratic state and legal procedure or basic normative order. Habermas finds that the highly normative theory of justice that is not sufficiently appropriate and the social facticity confronting constitutional ideals are being resolved. Habermas shares the same avowed philosophical affinity with John Rawls' theory of justice. Rawl's theory can plausibly appeal to the fact that constitutional democracies have flourished in complex societies in which certain political traditions and ideas of justice as fairness are widely shared both locally and internationally. Habermas owes a lot of philosophical debt to John Rawls, Immanuel Kant and Thomas Hobbes in terms of the idea of justice as fairness, international system, global justice and rational or modern natural law. Niklas Luhmann has radicalized systems theory. Law is characterized by a normative core and it has a rational structure of a systemic language. Law attaches sanctions to the violation of the normative social environment. Law is cognately and cognitively open to its social environment. The social environment is itself the internal constant of the system-life world.

Nevertheless, cognitive openness does not break social subsystems but account for intersystemic effects. Legal communications are said to mediate between functional subsystems and the life world. The characterization of law reveals basic normative understanding. Law is one of the fundamental contemporary issues in an attempt to ensure normative ideal social order or the global world order. The conception of law is very instructive or instrumental and in fact lies behind the complexity and multi-perspectival character of Habermas' own social analysis. Law is embedded in a societal context. Habermas' important debates of law and deliberative democracy in a constitutional

democratic state represents a considerable theoretical advance and contemporary relevance. Habermas' constitutional democratic process is seen as a collective deliberation. That, at least ideally, leads citizens to reach rational agreement on a common ground or good. Law must guarantee the private autonomy of individuals pursuing their personal success and happiness. Laws regulates interpersonal relations in a manner similar to moral norms and characterized by normative standard. Pluralization, notwithstanding, laws provide the legal framework, probably at least some shared understanding of the common good and public order. Citizens must regulate their lives in accordance with legitimate positive law. Habermas recognizes the internal tension between facticity and validity that is internal to the rule of law, namely, the tension between state power and legitimate law.

Furthermore, the functional subsystem is tied to the broader society and wide communicative processes that have a democratic and legitimating force. As a result of law and democracy, the public sphere must not itself be subverted by money and power. Habermas' model places considerable basic normative ideal for the democratic process or legal principle. Law and politics fulfill certain systemic functions. Law must be legitimate through a broader normative framework by citizens and their representatives. Habermas' normative background of law elaborated the procedural understanding of law and politics. The rational account of democracy and law thus far has been normative in character. Habermas' conception of law and democracy speak volume of a procedural approach that can handle societal complexity. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy has a radical content of normative background of democratic ideals and social order. Nonetheless, this radical appeal and content is much more appropriate to the circumstances of a modern complex society. Habermas' communicative action theory is deeply rooted in his political and legal theories and his conception of contemporary political philosophy can be seen as constitutional patriotism and constitutional rationalism.

Habermas' on *Between Facts and Norms* emphasizes on the role of public discourse in law and democracy. It offers a sweeping, sociologically informed conceptualization of law

and the constitutional democratic state, an attempt to bridge normative and a rational account of the social context requires for democratic procedures. Habermas' work *Between Facts and Norms* reflects on both the legal theory and the political theory of democracy. There is no gain saying the fact that both law and politics stand at a cross roads in our contemporary society today. Habermas is heavily indebted to Immanuel Kant's concept of political legitimacy and the Kantian contemporary legacy of international law and peace. Habermas' normative core idea is arguably broader in scope.

Law is a command and has a normative framework. Law is a normative system, promoting certain values, norms and repressing others. Law is an anthropological subject. Law connotes social coordination and social reconstruction. It tends to guarantee the conception of social order. Law regulates the behavior of people in society. Law is not meant to kill or maim but punish or sanction violators of the normative ideal social order. One of the apparent functions of society is to protect its immediate environment from internal or external aggression. It provides maximum security for its inhabitants and it prevents what we may refer to as a free-rider-system. Law and democracy are correlative because they regulate the internal mechanisms of a social system and to provide the platform for social integration and system integration. Democracy is commonly associated with a number of political principles, political practices, legitimating force, communicative freedom and normative framework. Democracy is characterized by periodic election, popular sovereignty; voting; electoral representation; political equality and majoritarianism. Democratic principles seem to require that all affected by a collective decision making should be entitled to such public decision. We, as rational beings must engage in public debate or deliberative democracy and we must avoid breaking heads. Democratic success depends upon the existential conditions under which decisions are taken and the process leading up to them is followed by due process. From the Habermasian tradition, the essence of democracy, lies in public discussion, or public debate, the free communicative interchange of ideas, a mode of tolerance and open mindedness or purity of motives, and it is hoped to ensure the consequent emergence of a

spirit of social cooperation and rational consensus. What really matters in democratic decision making is primarily the discovery of the spirit of public discussion, human betterment and the common shared life world and what it entails is inter-subjective recognition of normative communicative structure. Democracy is thus primarily creating procedures and habits of mind which ensure the elimination of grievances and the harmonization of viewpoints through rationally motivated agreement or reasoned communication. A strong democratic setting or normative structure should be proven with a strong sense of organizational ability or given the political task of social transformation in modern government, and a basic knowledge of economics. In a democratic debate, it is more important to have political equality built on strong economic and democratic structure. Political freedom should simply give rise to economic freedom in order to realize a strong sense of liberal democratic setting. Democracy is concerned with constitutional government or constitutional patriotism, rationally motivated consensus, rule of law and the protection of personal or human rights. The idea of basic human rights transcends national level of the constitutional democratic state. According to Habermas, “human rights have a transnational, universal character”.⁴⁸

Democracy presupposes a limited commitment and the entitlement to political participation. Political decision making should be linked to proof of communicative rationality, communicative freedom and moral competence. Political reform, for instance, should itself ultimately generate the rationality, moderation and wisdom necessary to sustain a civilized liberal society. Representatives are elected to express the opinion of the electorates. In a real democratic setting, the conception of the main function of government is central to the justification of modern liberal democratic procedure and normative structure of social order. From the Habermasian picture, democratic views are therefore normatively and right-based. Persons are obligated as citizens and subjects to bear allegiance to a legitimate government or political order. It radically challenges the idea that law can attain a level of principled generality that gives it a moral, social and political autonomy above the endless

struggle and compromise of conflicting economic and social interests. The legitimacy of the plurality of interests in politics is characterized by the concern for an institutionalized deliberative model of democracy. Democracy, from a contemporary Habermasian perspective should be a means for normative structure, human social, political and economic equality. All ideas about democracy should not be speculative and there should not be a deep ambivalence about democracy in its emergence in 21st century global order. Democratic ideals showcases the ethics of global world order whereby social justice and normative peace both nationally and trans-nationally or internationally prevailed in our common shared life world. Democracy entails the active involvement of the majority of people in political affairs. It is therefore necessary to allow a democratic procedure to strive where there is an effective collective decision making and a high level of political consensus and the rationalization of the democratic principles. Richard Jay believes that democracy exists where no single ruling group monopolizes power and the elites are, in some way, responsive to the mass of the people outside them. Democracy or what Richard Jay refers to as “consociational democracy” allows a plurality of competitive interactions defines within the boundaries of religious, justice and ethnic or cultural identities.

The new democratic theorizing concerns the issue of political participation and the fulfillment of the moral requirements of human autonomy. Having examined and analyzed democratic principles we should not tend to confuse the fact that greater citizen involvement requires a major overhaul of decision making procedures with the view that such involvement is downright possible through the process of communicative rational dialogue or communicative sociation, constitutional patriotism, reasoned communication, or an institutionalized deliberative model of democracy. We cannot ignore the dynamics of the system and that the tendencies of complex modern societies are geared towards even greater rationalization and centralization of power. The blanket coverage of society by modern mass media raised definitely greater possibilities for the manipulation of social consciousness and

the monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power. Democratic control precedes social movement.

Habermas' conception of deliberative model of democracy reveals the fact that democratic enterprise should not degenerate into a bloated structure of irresponsible bureaucratic power and a competitive party struggle to bribe and pauperize the people. When we look at the original definition of the Greeks conception of democracy as rule by the people, it is as clear as crystal that the democratic credentials of most modern states which claim the name are highly complex and characterized by myriad of ideological distortions and cultural hegemonies. Cooperative democratic enterprise should possess institutions designed to ensure a measure of rationally motivated consensus, common good, political accountability, communicative freedom and should incorporate the massive scale of human inter dependence in the modern world and to guarantee the epistemological viability, existential conditions under which the people can effectively rule over their own lives in the system-life world. In *Between Facts and Norms* published in 1996 Habermas returns to the political questions that guides his early studies and outlines in greater or grisly detail some of the implications of *The Theory of Communicative Action* for democratic theory and democratic practice. According to Giovanna Borradori, "politics is thus indistinguishable from the communicative modality proper to everyday exchanges".⁴⁹ A central claim of the work is that the common contrast between democracy (popular sovereignty) and constitutionalism (with its emphasis on individual rights) is overdrawn since each is conceptually dependent on the other. Democracy and basic human rights are co-original in that each derives from an ideal implicit in the notion of communicative reason or communicative freedom; the right not to be bound to norms other than those to which one could give uncoerced rational consent is the central notion of communicative action or freedom embedded in Habermas' contemporary political philosophy.

Moreover, the procedural dimensions of Habermas' communicative reason, is rational democracy. Habermas offers a model of 'deliberative politics' and steered between

the alternatives of liberalism and radicalism. In particular, with the radical model, it rejects the vision of the political process as primarily a process of competition and aggregation of private preferences or interests. Broadly speaking, more in keeping with the liberal model, he regards the radical vision of a world's citizenry united and actively motivated by a shared conception of the good life as realistic in modern societies or pluralist societies. By contrast, as he puts it, the success of deliberative politics depends not on a collectively acting world citizenry but on the institutionalization of the corresponding legal cum democratic procedures and existential conditions of reasoned communication, as well as on the dynamic interplay of institutionalized deliberative processes with constituted public opinions of systematically undistorted communication. Central to this model is not only the institutionalization of different forms and levels of practical discourse but that, which allows for (a reasonable behavioural expectation of) reaching rational agreement or a rational public opinion and will formation. Legitimate law must in some meaningful sense be construed as the will of the people or demos. Democratic process itself requires legal regulation and normative structure. The idea of the rule of law for 'democratic constitutional state' sets in motion a spiraling self-application of legal procedure. Habermas' response to this paradox is twofold. At an institutional level, he pursues a strategy of differentiation; legal discourses are but one (albeit important) normative form of rational discourse that must not simultaneously constrain or impede to other forms of practical discourse. This leads to a reformulation of the classical separation of powers in discourse theoretic terms at a normative level. He advocates a 'public reason' approach similar to the recent proposal by John Rawls' contemporary political philosophy. The ordinary law-making process is subject to a higher law of constitutional order but these essentials are themselves ultimately justified in terms of their ability to realize effectively reasonable citizens and basic moral powers and human rights.

4.7.1 Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy

According to Habermas, in his book, *Between Facts and Norms*, communicative action, then, depends on the use of language oriented to mutual understanding.⁵⁰ The concept of deliberative democracy has to do with the political public sphere. The idea of the political public sphere reflects on the common good of the system-life world. Deliberative democracy connotes the idea of public discussion. Deliberative democracy is borne out of contemporary liberal political values. It aims at human emancipation in modern complex society. The Habermasian conception of deliberative democracy is contemporary liberal democracy. According to Lain Mackenzie, “the plight of contemporary liberal democracies has been and continues to be a source of concern for democratic theorists in political philosophy”.⁵¹

The objective world is a communication community of speaking and acting subjects. The world’s inter-subjectivity is anchored on the international community of human rights and aims at emancipated global society or global community of democratic principle. The Habermasian human world is governed by language. The Habermasian picture presupposes the atmosphere for rational relation and discursive social practice. It reveals the emancipated human world of political order or global democracy. The Habermasian model of communicative theory is borne out of his political theory. Habermas and Kant share the same view of moral theory, political thought and the conceptualization of normative ideal social order at the global level. They both believe in the ideal of world peace and contemporary political order and their moral theories gave birth to their political theory. Habermas’ conception of cosmopolitan politics has continued contemporary relevance in our international arena or global system. Habermas’ discourse theory also has global implications for international modes of deliberation hence for the debate about a potential cosmopolitan political global world order. Habermas’ position in this contemporary debate is moderate. Habermas’ conception of cosmopolitan politics has a normative or universal core of the need for any strong international, legal or political global world order and a strong sense of democratic procedure in a global order. Habermas shares avowed affinity with the

strongly democratic position of David Held's version of cosmopolitan political order and the emergence of international system of public law as central to a just global political order. Habermas is optimistic about the prospects for a global political order as the continuation of the form of deliberative democracy based on human rights and citizen rights typical of any nation-states. Democracy on the nation-state model connects three central ideas; that the proper political community is a normative one. The normative core of this conception of democracy lies in the conception of human freedom or the Habermasian normative cum universal character of communicative freedom. We have articulated Habermas' argument for 'de-centering' democracy under the epistemological, existential conditions of cultural humanism, rationalism, pluralism and complexity. Habermas clearly made self determination by the fundamental normative core of the democratic ideal. Habermas' version of cosmopolitan politics is a conception of global democracy articulated by the critical theory of a complex modern society. For David Held, cosmopolitan democracy is clearly continuous realized within nation-states. Habermas has made central and further recognizes that individuals increasingly have complex and multi layered cultural identities, corresponding to the globalization of economic forces and the reconfiguration of political power.

Habermas' version of dialogue, cultural humanism, democratic rationalism and critical social theory transverses or creates the opportunities for political participation and the rights of communication at the global level. The Habermasian perspective reflects on the fact that "in communicative action, beyond the function of achieving understanding, language plays the role of coordinating the goal directed activities of different subjects, as well as the role of a medium in the socialization of these very subjects".⁵² Communicative action in Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is a clear cut testimony of the role of public discussion or public debate and the conception of 'dialogic democracy' to use the words of Anthony Giddens. Habermas' philosophy is a contemporary political philosophy and the philosophy of linguistic communication or linguistic transparency. Habermas' philosophy dealt with a wide range of areas such as philosophy, law, political science, sociology,

psychology, linguistics, communication studies and cultural history. Habermas' communicative action and deliberative democracy reflects on the ideal speech situation in public debate and the idea of public debate has been in existence since the Greek period of democracy. Communicative action is a connotation of purposive rational activity. Purposive rational action aims at human emancipation. Habermas' theory of communicative action is indeed symbolic interactionism, cultural humanism, anthropology, rationalization of society, purposive- rational- activity and social cooperation or social coordination. Communicative action deals with the system or social-life world. The social- life world is characterized by social integration and system integration. Habermas' theory of communicative action reflects on the deepest appreciation of political debate or communication theory, social theory, public sphere, communicative freedom, constitutional democracy, constitutional patriotism, human rationality, constitutive or transformative human association, critical social theory, and the philosophy of language, dialogue and democracy. Communicative action reflects on human deliberation and human rationality, although, there is a limit to human rationality. Communication is a normative presupposition of the social life world and sociative mechanism. Communicative action is anchored on knowledge and rationality. According to Habermas, "our knowledge has a propositional structure".⁵³ Habermas believes that our human knowledge can be criticized as unrealistic. Communicative action is predicated on normative structure and social cooperation using the Jean Piaget's model. Communication interaction is characterized by normative foundation, epistemological significance and existential criteria. Habermas in his conceptualization of 'communicative action' opined that 'action' is represented as a rational process of attaining set goals while taking normative standard into consideration. Habermas' theory of communicative action showcases the normative character of democratic rationalization. When we talk about communicative action we are simply talking about the deployment of reason in our practical everyday linguistic communication. The term 'reason' is a cognitive process or structure. The whole Habermasian project is simply the critique of reason. Our conceptualization of 'action'

according to the Habermasian-Parsonian principle should be termed as 'rationalistic' and 'functionalistic'. Action becomes a rational process of adaptations to the existential conditions of our social environment says Habermas. Communicative action is a form of communicative modality embedded in democratic setting. Habermas is of the view that in any democratic setting, communicative dialogue or dialogic communication or what you may also refer to as linguistic communication has to do with communicative skills or competences in ideal speech situation. Ideal speech situation has to do with truth validity or criticizable validity claims.

Furthermore, criticizable validity claims are those truth claims that are accepted or rejected in subjects' speech and action. Habermas opines that criticizable validity claims are trans-subjective validity claims and validity claim is claim that the hearer can accept or reject for good reason. When we talk about deliberative democracy, we are simply talking about re-conceptualizing linguistic representation and transparency. Deliberative democracy is 'ipso facto' Giddian conception of dialogic democracy and the process of rational dialogue in politics as a process of bettering humanity. Politics has to do with the betterment of human affairs or human flourishing. It is the service to humanity. Deliberative democracy is a connotation of effective influence on the running of government through reaching rational agreement and public discussion among persons for the pursuit of the common good.

Deliberative democracy reflects on human rights, the rights of political participation, the rights of communication and it is a model of democratic setting that tends to overcome all the failings of the purely representative model. When we articulate the idea of deliberative democracy, we are simply placing much emphasis on the phrase 'public deliberation' or 'human deliberation' in their process of constitutive or transformative human association. The ideal of deliberative democracy reveals normative assumption and ideal social order. Deliberative democracy is a theoretical presupposition and normative character which sounds too idealistic and seems to be impracticable in real practice in our common social world. The conceptualization of deliberative democracy has to do with fairness, equality, intersubjective

recognition, equity and equality, human rights, social justice, political participation, communicative freedom and public discussion. Deliberative democracy is a form of social construct that has to do with properly rational course of communicative, political action. Habermas turns to this everyday language use to construct the dialogical commitment or linguistic communicative conception of human rationality and transparency. Habermas' idea of deliberative democracy reflects on the notion of public conversation. According to Lain Mackenzie, "Habermas describes conversation where everyone involved is concerned to reach an understanding with one another as "communicative action".⁵⁴ The idea of communicative action presupposes that fact that philosophy is a reflective activity, rational discipline and connotes social activity. Philosophy as far as Habermas is concerned is guardian of rationality. Habermas' theory of communicative action has to do with the idea of language as a constitutive element of social interaction. Language performs a constitutive function. Communicative, political action is simply social interaction. Social interaction forms symbolic and normative structures. Habermas' theory of communicative rationality reflects on problem solving mechanism. Life strives on problem-solving. The Habermasian picture reflects on the philosophy of problem solving and rational reconstruction. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy has a radical and liberal content of a democratic ideal. This radical and liberal content is much more appropriate to the circumstances of a complex rational society. Habermas' philosophy promotes a political culture that stabilizes the legitimate or behavioural expectations in democratic constitutional state. Habermas' idea of deliberative democracy reflected on ideal speech situation of inter-subjective communication and rational consensus. For Habermas, reason cannot be reduced to mere instrumental use. Furthermore, the Habermasian picture is of the view that the feasibility of a common democratic consciousness cannot be taken for granted.

The conceptualization of politics has to do with a process. Law, for instance, cannot be reduced to morality and politics. The idea of politics reflects opinion-formation and will-formation. According to the Habermasian picture politics reflects on will formation and

opinion formation. Politics assumes a systemic character. It should be analyzed in terms of theory of action and the theory of system. Politics is characterized by a process of social mobilization. Politics and law are coterminous. Politics, law, and morality reflect the normative character of human emancipated society. Politics, law and morality serve as the hallmark of normative ideal social order. Normative ideal social order presupposes the optimal and maximization of human flourishing and ensuring that social order made progressive dimension of human society possible. Society cannot progress when there is a state of acrimony and social conflict or rancour. Politics, law and morality serve as the basis of normative ideal social order. The essential feature of law is normativity and obligation. Obligation has a moral nature because the normative foundation of all laws is the principle of natural law. The concept of law assumed the system of rules but although the concept of law does not consist only a system of rules. Man has the moral obligation to obey law of human society. Law does not rest on naked force or brute force. Politics, law and morality presuppose the normative structure of society. Morality tends to ensure normative peace and social harmony in society by regulating human conduct and human interaction within the society. Politics, law and morality are the necessary conditions or normative foundation for peaceful coexistence in society. Habermas believes that for politics to be successful law and morality must serve as an instrument of social control and political ideal social order. The idea of law showcases the idea of basic human rights. Rights and morality are common features of law and morality. Law and morality bring to the foreground the idea of rationality and freedom. Rationality and freedom are like two sides of a dubious tossing coin. According to the Habermasian picture, communicative rationality brings to the foreground communicative freedom or communicative association (sociation/interaction). From the normative imperative viewpoint law and morality assumed the role of social functions or social control or transformation, and political order. The idea of social justice is central to law and morality. The idea of the common good is also central to law and morality. Law and morality reveal the need for utilitarian principle. Morality presupposes universal principle.

The normative foundation of Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is the theory of social order and social change.

4.7.2 Habermas, the Politics of Recognition and the Appeal to Inter-subjectivity

Habermas' politics of recognition and the aesthetics appeal to inter-subjectivity is understood as the theory of personal identity, politics of difference, cultural autonomy and the theory of rights. The theory of rights required a politics of recognition. Habermas' politics of recognition and system of rights is modeled through a set normative standard. It is geared towards a kind of a paradigm shift by consistent actualization, and by reconstructing the idea of personal identity. Habermas' ideal of communicative interaction is on the idea of individual autonomy; it is inter-subjectivity rather than a subjective model of autonomy. According to Lain Mackenzie, "Habermas argues that the contemporary dilemmas surrounding the politics of cultural recognition in contemporary liberal states are also symptomatic of a failure to see the real intersubjective basis of our identity".⁵⁵ Democratic deliberation brings to the fore the normative criteria of cultural identity and the ideal of personal identity or rights. According to Lain Mackenzie, "Habermas argues that cultures should not be artificially sustained. If the members of those cultures do not themselves sustain them as they engage in democratic deliberation".⁵⁶ Habermas' philosophy is akin to the Rawlsian definition of rights as primary goods and the Rawlsian tradition of primary goods can do the work of ensuring just society and the correct extent of rights to cultural membership, Habermas argues that this task must be achieved by a fully functioning deliberative democracy, because it is through rationally motivated deliberation that personal identity is formed. Politics is far wider than the state. Politics takes account of social or human activity that focused on the state. Politics is not simply all about human activities that focused on the state. It is about conflict and the medium of conflict resolution because conflict occurs at every level of society. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "politics is a public process that involves resolving conflicts of interest...politics is undermined by force, and is inherent at every level in all societies".⁵⁷ Habermas' conceptualization of politics connotes the theory of normative ideal social order

and resolving the conflict of interests in contemporary human society. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham “politics is about conflict and its resolution and resolving conflicts of interest occurs in all societies, at all level”.⁵⁸ The idea of liberal dialogue encapsulated liberalism, dialogue and multiculturalism.

Politics is a process and politics starts from the rational relations of persons. Ball throwing is part and parcel of political activity. Political activity is a reflective way of human states of affairs. Liberal dialogue presupposes the normative presuppositions of moral and political theory. Liberal dialogue is a retrospectively oriented philosophical reflection and rational discourse between private and public autonomy. The concept of politics as liberal dialogue reflects on the social facts that human society is characterized by the improvement of human affairs and human emancipation. Politics as liberal dialogue reflects the political concept for human emancipation. Liberal dialogue is a form of liberal democracies or human emancipation from all prevailing prejudices. Liberal dialogue encapsulates the central idea of egalitarian dimension of normative political conception of liberal democracy or democratic ideals. Liberal dialogue is fundamentally a defense of individual freedom or collective freedom and the promotion of a free welfare state. Democratic ideals reflect the idea of welfare state. Democracy is borne out of the political expression of the individual liberty and the characterization of equal consociates in the deeply rooted task of political, social and economic transformation. The concept of politics as liberal dialogue is characterized by normative structure and intercultural recognition. Politics as liberal dialogue encapsulates the Habermasian conception of communication community bound together by shared common interests. Liberal dialogue connotes the inter-subjective recognition of human communicative freedom. Liberal dialogue presupposes a normative contexts and political heteronomy. Liberal dialogue allows differences to flourish in communication community. Liberal dialogue assumes normative presuppositions and liberal democracy allows the state authority to flourish. Politics is dialogue of some sort. It is a process of human flourishing and the service to humanity. Liberal dialogue reflects on basic human rights as a “transnational and

universal character”. Liberal dialogue, in a sense, is a normative dimension of subjects as reciprocally recognized moral legislators. Liberal dialogue requires a democratic principle and it is nothing more than a rational and complementary relation of persons. Liberal dialogue is characterized by normative presupposition and it is seen as a tool for social mobilization or communicative interaction. Communicatively competent subjects are characterized by the communicative interaction and governed by normative context of a concrete society. Liberal dialogue rests on a tacit act of reaching mutual understanding or rational agreement even in the midst of differences. Liberal dialogue makes differences flourish. The politics of difference is not anathema to concrete society. Politics is a theme that has to do with the broadening and deepening of public engagement in political life. To think of politics, is to become part of a public conversation devoid of any political bickering. The idea of politics has to do with the theory of justice and the dialectics of normalization of human expected behavior. It demands reasonable citizens in their public conversation. Politics is focused on human emancipation and it constitutes a kind of communicative interaction or public deliberation or conversation what we may refer to as communicative, political interaction. Political activity is understood as particular way of reaching understanding or reaching rational agreement where disagreements exist and impacts on other people. Politics is understood as social activity of some sort where differing interests are harmonized. Politics aims at the establishment of a set of norms and standards whereby future disputes are resolved. Politics is geared towards common good or public happiness. According to Lain Mackenzie, “politics is best thought of as the pursuit of the common good”.⁵⁹ Political activity (ies) aims at first and foremost a way of binding together group of people with common shared interests. Politics connotes the reflection of political or public discussion. Politics allows differences to flourish. According to Lain Mackenzie, “according to Habermas, the idea of communicative interaction is precisely that which enables differences to flourish”.⁶⁰ The idea of politics is transmuted into the level of social practice and by virtue of the underlying normative frameworks and social structures that shape who we are as

rationally motivated individuals. Politics is understood as reaching rational agreement through political discussion and it is characterized by a norm governed human interaction.

4.7.3 Habermas and the Procedural Understanding of Law in the Modern State

Deliberative politics reflects political self understanding and the social process of collective learning process. Habermas believes in the re-establishment of the democratic constitutional state and the fundamental improvement in economic conditions of rational human agents. Habermas strongly believes in the political significance in the normative structures of the social life world. Habermas believes in the “beneficial primacy of interior politics”.⁶¹ Habermas believes in the development of a welfare state and the rational reconstruction of the economic and administrative normative structure of the democratic constitutional state. Habermas believes in the epistemological significance of normative contemporary political order. According to Habermas, “thus, in an increasingly prosperous society, citizens were able to acquire confidence in their political order”.⁶²

Habermas opines that the normative substance of contemporary political order is paramount to democratic constitutional state. Habermas believes in the widespread transformation of a system of the democratic mentality. Habermas opines that “we have to learn to publicly confront a traumatic past”.⁶³ Habermas considers human rights and democracy to be the heart of cultural humanism. He believes in the “simple expectation that no one will be excluded from the political community and the integrity of each individual will be similarly respected”.⁶⁴ This subsection is saddled with the sole objective of the basic normative foundation of the theoretical framework of Habermas’ conceptualization of communication community and deliberative democracy. According to Lain Mackenzie:

The general plight of contemporary liberal democracies has been and continues to be a source of concern for democratic theorists in political philosophy. Running of government, democracy enhances neither one’s freedom nor one’s equality. Representatives are supposed to represent the whole of society but it seems unlikely that this could ever be the case especially as the global movement of people makes nation-states more internally heterogonous. We should therefore consider whether our politicians should be seen as representatives at all.⁶⁵

Furthermore, Habermas' conception of deliberative democracy is a political method of democratic government. For Lain Mackenzie, "deliberative democracy is a method of democratic government that seems to overcome the failings of the purely representative model by placing a large emphasis on the value of 'deliberation'. Deliberation, in this context, refers to a process, or more often processes, of rational argumentation... the central claim, therefore, is that voting is not enough to sustain democracy".⁶⁶ Deliberative democracy as a method of democratic method involves a dialogical process of reasoned communications or reaching mutual understanding among human persons through rational consensus. According to Lain Mackenzie:

The ideal of deliberative democracy may sound too idealistic to ever come to fruition. But it is worth examining the theoretical framework that most deliberative theorists appeal to, as developed by Jurgen Habermas, whose theories of communicative action and discourse ethics provide the core normative basis for the deliberative model of democracy. Habermas's conception of deliberative democracy is to rescue the Enlightenment democratic ideal or democratic vision whereby reason reigns supreme, and to make the normative presupposition of human communication as the proper democratic potential of public debate and discussion.⁶⁷

Habermas' normative structure of communicative, political action is an attempt to rescue the Enlightenment democratic vision. Habermas' communicative, political action is a normative presupposition and it assumes the idea of a rational solution to the problem of contemporary society. Habermas' communicative, political action is a normative constitution of the dialogical conception of human rationality. We understand the normative presuppositions of human communication community, as that which is based on the democratic potential of public debate and public discussion. Habermas is of the view that deliberative democracy is only attainable through reasoned communication or reaching mutual understanding of an ideal speech situation in complex modern society. Lain Mackenzie puts it quite succinctly:

As Habermas expresses it, if we are genuinely looking to reach an understanding with others through communication then we will be. Communicative action, therefore, is premised on a non-instrumental use of reason: reason is not treated as a means to any other end, but as a good in itself. A communicatively reached agreement is not about one person treating another as an object; in philosophical terms it is not based on a subject-object relationship, but rather on a genuinely intersubjective relationship: a relationship, between people.⁶⁸

The main claim is that language use oriented towards rational understanding must be given a theoretical priority over language use oriented towards a strategic end. Communicative action is the source of our system-life world. The “life-world” is a term Habermas borrows from Edmund Husserl. Habermas is heavily indebted to Edmund Husserl in his conception of the system-life world. The system-life world is a normative background horizon of meanings that fosters cultural formations and social interaction. Democracy presupposes the normative core or background of institutionalized rational consensus but it is germane to assert that dissensus is also necessary in any democratic process and it is premised on disagreement.

Habermas' works resonate within the traditions of Kant and the Enlightenment democratic vision and of democratic socialism through his emphasis on the potential for transforming the world and arriving at a more humane, just, and egalitarian society through the realization of the human potential for reason, in part through discourse ethics. Habermas' theory of communicative action is premised on the theory of society. His idea of public reason indicated his theory of deliberative democracy; a discourse on politics, ethics and reason. Habermas' ethics and dialogue presuppose the persistence of normative question of modernity. Habermas' theory of deliberative democracy is a more substantive political beliefs and ideology even in our contemporary global order. Habermas' contemporary political theory seeks to really decentered democracy devoids of money and abusive power. From the standpoint of Habermasian perspective the contextual justification of modernization, rationalization and democratization of society should be based on the theory of communicative reasoning. The difficulty here is not one of developing political consensus but, rather, an epistemological problem of knowing what we need to act upon in order to guarantee the hermeneutics of communicative ethics, dialogue in global order, to distinguish between private reason and public reason.

Habermas' philosophy is cultural humanism. Jim Herrick believes that "humanism is an approach that is neither optimistic, nor pessimistic, but realistic. Humanism is a philosophy of life to be found across the world".⁶⁹ Humanism has to do with the possible transformation of our system-life world or socio-political world or world community. For Jim Herrick, human beings demonstrate both our cognitive capacity to experience the world and also how small is the importance of each individual. Humanism is concerned with the possible transformation of the common social world. Habermas believes that "state power is based on a threat of sanction backed by instruments of force held in reserve; at the same time, however, it is authorized by legitimate law".⁷⁰ Law regards two validity claims of moments of coercion and normative validity coupled with collective binding force of political decision. Law inherently claims normative validity. The idea of legal power and the disposition of a political will is a means for achieving collective goals. From the Machiavellian point of view, society must break away from the normative contexts shaped by sacred traditions. The state establishes itself on the basis of civil contract. Law has a normative and rule structure. Politics has a decisionistic core that separates law from morality. The state-organised power is characterized by institutions of conflict resolution and collective will formation possible. Habermas conceptual reconstruction of law and politics in modern society is characterized by social order. Habermas opines "thus every social order with relatively stable behavior patterns must rely on mechanisms of actions coordination-in general, on influence and mutual understanding".⁷¹ The coordination problem of society is resolved through the pursuit of collective goals, and programs. The state is organized by political will formation. Political power is not juxtaposed to law. Political power can only develop through a legal code and it is constituted in the form of basic human rights. Discourse theory explains how private and public autonomy are internally related. Law receives its full normative sense and gets political legitimacy. The communicative power is characterized by public discussion and publicity. Law becomes legitimate when it is rationally accepted by all citizens in a public discussion process of opinion formation and will formation. The communicative power forms

the normative character of the horizontal (citizen to citizen) or vertical (citizen to state) association of equal consociates who reciprocally accord rights to one another. The communicative, political action is characterized by normative assumption and procedures. Government is characterized by discourse-theoretic conception. Political power is differentiated into communicative power and administrative power is reconstituted by a circulation of reasonably structured deliberations and decisions. Communicative power has radical democratic content and normative structure. The idea of private and public autonomy is a perspective which becomes broadened when we introduce the idea of the constitutional democratic state.

Interpersonal action coordination takes place through rational consensus and balance of collective interests. There seems to be a balance of interest and compromise-readiness in the discursive practice of reaching mutual understanding. The disagreement about goal attainment can be resolved through the principle of will-formation. Communicative power renders authoritative interpretations of shared value commitments. Communicative power brings to the foreground a condition whereby disputing parties can reach a tolerable compromise. Politics and law depend directly on a normative complex in which they symbolically interpenetrate. Law represents a source of justice and community recognize law as sacred and equal consociates must be morally obligatory. A simultaneous transformation of sacred law presupposes binding law. Habermas opines that political party and binding law emerges as the two components that make up a legally organized political order. Society is characterized by proceduralist conception of law and the structuralist-functionalist conception of realizing normative objective and collective goals through legally binding decisions. Politics and law address the issue of human basic rights. Communicative freedoms of citizens guaranteed human basic rights. The basic right is the experiments of equal consociates and constitutive element for every human association of free citizens. Communicative freedom of citizens has binding and normative character. The conceptual interpretation of law presupposes normative social order. The use of communicative power is bound to

communicative power. Law and politics has internal relations. Law presents itself as a system of rights. Law is considered in terms of its specific normative function of stabilizing behavioural expectations. Communicative power brings to the foreground collectively binding decisions. Positive law is backed by the threat of sanctions or punishments. The state has a protective capacity to preserve itself against every external and internal aggression. Civic rights grounds equal claims to political participation in democratic legislative processes. Habermas opines that law thus owes to the state its function of stabilizing behavioural expectations that are generalized in temporal, social and substantive respects. Habermas opines that “law functions as a means of organizing governmental authority”.⁷² Habermas is quite concerned about the contemporary ideals of human democracy or the Enlightenment democratic vision and its continued relevance to global world order. Deliberative democracy presupposes a normative ideal social order. Habermas’ communicative model is an empiricist theory of democracy with normative intent. This normative content is a form of argumentation and it arises from the structure of linguistic communication and the communicative mode of sociation. Society develops into political totality. The communicative model of democracy elicits prudential considerations and citizens collective will formation or rational political will formation. Habermas believes that “the constitution is meant to motivate the state”.⁷³

Habermas believes in a state centered understanding of politics in society. Habermas believes that “discourse theory reckons with the higher level intersubjectivity of processes of reaching understanding that take place through democratic procedures or in the communicative network of public sphere”.⁷⁴ Communicative power is transformed through the principle of legitimation in society as a social whole. What steers society as a politically writ large are money, administration and solidarity. Habermas believes that “...democratic will formation has the significantly stronger function of constituting society, as a political community...”.⁷⁵ Habermas views “rationalization as more than mere legitimation but less than the constitution of power”.⁷⁶ Habermas concludes in his normative conception of

deliberative politics that “even on its own self understanding, deliberative politics remains parts of a complex society, which, as a whole, resists the normative approach practiced in legal theory”.⁷⁷

Nevertheless, politics, for Habermas presupposes the domain of human action. Phenomenologically speaking, the domain of human action consists of observation of events and through the understanding of the context of meaning. In this phenomenological approach, Habermas believes in his book *On the Logic of the Social Sciences*, that “understanding is not possible without observation of signs”.⁷⁸ Habermas’ phenomenological approach allows for what he calls the “the intersubjectivity of experience”.⁷⁹ Habermas posits that “communicative experience originates in an interactive context in which at least two subjects are linked within the framework of a linguistically produced intersubjectivity of agreement on meanings that remain constant. In that framework, the “observer” is just as much a participant as the “observed”.⁸⁰ Habermas believes that experience is mediated by the interaction between observing subject and object. Habermas posits that “it seems as though communicative experience can be purged of subjective destruction only by a countervailing suspension of the claims that entangle the observer in the interaction”.⁸¹ Habermas addresses the conditions of intersubjectivity of experience that arose out of communication itself. The conditions of the intersubjectivity of linguistically mediated systems of action presupposed what Habermas calls “the logical structure of the social lifeworld”.⁸² Accordingly, Habermas believes that “the phenomenological approach leads to an investigation of the constitution of everyday life practice”.⁸³ Habermas concludes that “we need a theory that explicates the structures of the everyday life world articulated in ordinary language”.⁸⁴ The indispensability of the basis of communicative experience binds both the subjects and objects together. Habermas alludes that “the things taken for granted in socio-cultural world are that indispensable basis of communicative experience that inconspicuously binds subject and object together”.⁸⁵ Habermas is critical that it is essential that the indispensable basis of communicative experiences are brought to awareness through

phenomenological reflection. Habermas' phenomenological reflection is closely related to Husserl and Schutz's conception of the socio-cultural- life world contexts. In retrospect Habermas believes that "Schutz begins with the intersubjectivity of the world of everyday interaction. On this level of intersubjectivity we are oriented to other people as subjects; we are not involved with them as natural objects, but rather find ourselves speaking and acting with one another in reciprocally interlocked perspectives and reciprocal roles within the same communicative context".⁸⁶ Habermas posits that "thus, the lifeworld is articulated in culturally determined and differentially distributed contexts of meaning that circumscribe the scope of intentionality within which social action can occur".⁸⁷

In addition, Habermas believes from the phenomenological standpoint that we can understand the normality of events in terms of consciousness and as a transcendental condition for the social ordering of a life- historical situation. Habermas alludes to the Husserlian standpoint that "we could return to the private methods of Husserl, who demands that everyday phenomenologists be his own experimenter and vary the conditions of a situation through controlled fantasy".⁸⁸ The idea of understanding is one of the ingredients of the indispensability of dialogue as far as communicative action is concerned. Habermas views self understanding as what he calls "rules for action-related communication".⁸⁹ Communicative action connotes normative dimension and rules formation. Communicative experience is circumscribed within the ambit of individual life world and a social context. Habermas posits that "we grasp the structure of individual lifeworlds only through communication experienced in a social context; one learns the specific rules of communication through systematic participation...".⁹⁰

Nonetheless, communicative experience presupposes role analysis of the social life context and behavioural expectations. Accordingly, Habermas believes that "role analysis presumes that social action is motivated by sanctioned behavioural expectations".⁹¹ The status of transformational rules is established through the constitutive order of the life world with reference to social norms. The categories of rules of interpretation and social norms

Habermas believes “cannot be analyzed independently of one another; both are moments of the same social life context”.⁹² The phenomenologist is interested in mental act as such and the essential structures of cognition. Habermas opines that “the phenomenological approach remains within the limits of the analysis of consciousness”.⁹³ The phenomenological approach presupposes the conditions of the possibility of knowledge in general.

Finally, phenomenology is grounded in what Habermas calls “the representational function of consciousness”.⁹⁴ Habermas’ phenomenological approach or analysis envisages the need for rational society to yield to experience and the observation of things and events. Habermas’ conception of communicative action, democratic theory and the rationalization of society has been grounded on elements of a phenomenological elucidation of human knowledge.

4.7.4 Habermas and the Theoretical Discourse of Justification of Basic Human Rights.

The discourse principle advocates private and public autonomy. Law assumes the idea of human rights. Positive law presupposes a system whereby the basic rights that citizens must mutually grant one another is characterized by the social contract theory. Human basic right is a normative presupposition and the logic of legal morality or social order. The concept of civic autonomy becomes contemporaneously relevant in discourse-theoretic terms. There is an internal connection between human rights and popular sovereignty. There is a complementary relation between law and morality in terms of human basic rights. Rights occupy a prominent position in modern legal orders. Legal persons are bearers of legal rights. Human right is an obligatory context of a shared normative background. Individual liberties must be compatible with the same liberties of others. This form of liberatory and obligatory contexts is what Habermas calls communicative freedom. Habermas believes that communicative action involved moral obligation. Communicative freedom depends on inter-subjective recognition or interpersonal relation of human persons governed by rationally motivated agreement.

Communicative action is an obligation that aims at rational behavioural expectations. Law brings to the foreground the stabilization of behavioral expectations and the voluntary association of free and equal consociates.

The discourse-theoretic principle of Habermas' philosophy presupposes a normative context of a horizontal association of free and equal consociates coupled with vertical association of mutually expected communicative freedom aims at the acknowledgement of reciprocal relation or inter-subjective recognition. Human right to equal liberty is a reciprocally acknowledged and mutually expected communicative freedom of equal consociates. Law aims at normative assumption and stabilized behavioural expectations. Law becomes a legitimate affair of the political state. Law has a coercive and normative character. Law aimed at the normative basis of utility or rational calculations. The discourse-theoretic principle intends to assume the principle of democracy. The principle of democracy appears as the hearts of system of basic human rights. Moreover, basic human rights from political heteronomy assumed communicative freedom of equal consociation. Habermas is of the view that the conditions of communicative association is the practice of legislation, "it mobilizes and unifies the communicative freedom of citizens presumptively oriented to the common good".⁹⁵ Habermas opines that "for political rights ground the status of free and equal active citizens".⁹⁶ Habermas clarifies the internal relation between human rights and popular sovereignty and dissolve the paradox in the emergence of political legitimacy from legality. Habermas believes that "norms appearing in the form of law entitle social actors to exercise their rights or liberties".⁹⁷ Habermas' democratic principle requires that the rights of each person be compatible with equal rights for all-this guaranteed communicative freedom. Habermas' two enduring interests in political theory and rationally shared system-life-world come together in his theory of deliberative democracy. Habermas' theory of deliberative democracy relates to the contemporary communicative ethics of global world order. Morality, politics and law become the bases of normative ideal social order, the bureaucratization and the rationalization of society. Habermas summarizes a "Discourse-Theoretic-Principles" as a

rule of social action or social coordination and rational choice which is justified by criticizable validity claims. In developing his democratic theory, Habermas has been especially concerned with three such specifications: moral discourse, linguistic communication as a rational discourse and legal-political discourse. Habermas tackles the traditional problem of the relationship between law and morality. He also showed how to bring ethical discursive idealizations down to institutional earth. Habermas' discourse theory of morality generally goes by the name discourse ethics, a somewhat misleading label. Habermas' version is heavily indebted to the Kantian-Wittgensteinian tradition. Habermas takes a dialogical approach to practical reason, as his discourse theory required. Habermas' dialogical approach assumes a pluralistic and multi cultural setting. Habermas' discourse principle articulates dialogical requirement. What one gets, according to Habermas, is a dialogical principle of universalization. The universal principle assumes an objective validity; a valid moral rules or norms that allowed for an egalitarian community of autonomous agent as Kant puts it. Habermas' discourse ethics depended on some strong normative assumptions about the cognitive capacity of persons for moral dialogue or interpersonal relation. Habermas recognizes the need for reasonable agreement, conscientious rational account of judgment in practical everyday moral dialogue.

Consequently, moral discourse is structured in a way that linked moral validity with solidaristic concern for both the concrete individual and the morally formative communities. Habermas' discourse ethics is actually a normative context of democratic politics, or as a model for the critical evaluation of moral-liberal dialogues. The central task of Habermas' democratic theory is to provide a normative rational account of legitimate law. His deliberative democratic model rests on what is perhaps the most complex argument in his philosophical corpus. Habermas' discourse ethics is an analysis of the demands inherent in modern legal and democratic systems, which Habermas understands in the light of his political theory. Modern law is fundamentally concerned with the definition, protection, and reconciliation of individual freedoms in their various institutional and organizational

contexts. Thus, the rights that defines individual freedom must also include rights of political participation and rights of communicative freedom, or action. Habermas believes that his theory of communicative, political action enabled his discourse theory to combine the best insights of the civic republican and classical liberal traditions of democracy, which finds expressions in Hobbes, Rousseau, Locke, Kant, respectively.

Kant laid a strong normative foundation for the discourse on human right. Human rights are universal because they are based on humanity as the sole shared aspect in a common social world. Human rights are universally valid in a categorical way. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is the normativity of human rights and civil rights. The full potential of the Kantian contemporary legacy and political theory has not been exhausted yet. It is also embedded in the Habermasian contemporary legacy for legal, social, cultural, rational choice and political theory. Kant identified human freedom as the sole birthright of man, which we are able to recognize through our normative context of communicative reason. We conceived the right to freedom in terms of the reconciliation with the freedom of Others and the cognitive capacity to give ourselves the principles for our rational conduct and determine our human deliberative actions. The fundamental idea of this conceptualization of human rights is that there is a natural limitation in the scope of human communicative interactions, a kind of natural decency which legitimates our protests against certain violations. We have the duty to respect one another, and to recognize each Other's basic moral rights. Human rights are therefore an important normative standard for the moral legitimacy of a social order. But since the moral notion of human rights provides the ultimate meaning of the whole project of humanity and is regulative for their realization, and it is indispensable to ground human rights as moral rights.

Habermas understands these rights of liberty, communicative freedom and political participation as an abstract system of basic rights which is generated by reflection on the nature of discursive legitimation in normative context shapes by the functional demands on modern law. In any case, the system of rights constituted a minimum set of normative context

of institutional conditions for any legitimate modern political order. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, “a human right is an entitlement to treatment that a person enjoys simply by virtue of being a human being...and human rights are universal meaning that possession of such rights is not contingent on belonging to a particular state or culture”.⁹⁸ The system of rights, in other words, articulates the normative foundation for constitutional democracies, within which further institutional mechanisms such as legislatures, executives and the judiciary must operate. Habermas’ theory of democracy is ultimately traceable to robust conception of intersubjectivity or dialogical processes of public discourse that influenced formal decision making in legislative bodies. Decisions about laws typically involves a combination of criticizable validity claims. The democratic principle of political legitimacy articulates the normative core requirement of discursive practice on validity through fair bargaining processes. Habermas’ version of deliberative democracy is an ‘epistemic viability’ or ‘epistemic theory’. Habermas’ communicative, political action theory has an epistemic foundation. This put his democratic principle in a rather puzzling epistemological position. The democratic principle seems to have the character of an idealizing normative presupposition in so far as it presumes the possibility of rational consensus in political decision making process. For Habermas, reasonable political discourse must at least began with the supposition of legal questions or at least a set of discursively validity claims. In Habermas’ version of deliberative democracy, compromise is acceptable to all parties. The democratic principle requires a political discourse with the demands- normative core of institutional realization in complex societies. As such, the democratic principle should refer not to consensus, but rather to something like a warranted normative presumption of aggregate reasonableness. The normative presumption of aggregate reasonable outcomes rests on a sufficiently inclusive deliberative process of opinion-formation and will formation. This means that democracy is decentered and presupposes an epistemic proceduralist condition. The democratic principle or legal position is procedural because collective reasonableness emerged from the operation of the democratic process; it is

an epistemic process that results in collective decision making process and continuous learning process. This discursive-theoretic justification of democratic principle presupposes a fruitful dynamic interplay of three major discursive arenas: the dispersed communication of citizens in civil society; the media-based mass communication in the political public sphere; and the institutionalized discourse of law makers.

Nonetheless, one might want to take a more pragmatic approach to democratic deliberation. Habermas' communicative, political action is the critique of systematically distorted communication. It is the linguistic conceptualizations of the traditional ideas of freedom and justice in society. Habermas' conception of practical discourse becomes the basic paradigm for his analysis of human action. The critique of instrumental reason becomes the fundamental task of Habermas' objective possibility of a truly free and equal society or critical social theory. Habermas' contemporary legacy is the rationalization of society and the epistemological dimension of social interaction according to valid norms. His philosophical-sociological theory is to enhance the steering capacity of societies. Habermas' communicative, political action questions the theory of contemporary social formation and fundamental problems that hope to showcase a justificatory clarification of rational society within the structured normative framework of "communicative competence". Habermas believes that "a society does not plunge into crisis when, and only when, its members so identify the situation".⁹⁹ Habermas' communicative, political action is a strategy towards a radical democratic politics. His contemporary political philosophy of democratic community is based on rational consensus of intersubjective recognition. According to Lain Mackenzie, "...philosophers of democracy emphasizes on community, agreement, consensus and rationality...this concern with deliberative desire for consensus, as we can see, is based on a very different conception of the democratic community".¹⁰⁰

4.7.5 Communicative Power and the Principle of Democratic Legitimacy

Communicative power is allowed to circulate throughout society via the reasonable application and administrative implementation of legal programs. Communicative power requires argumentation in any democratic setting. According to Habermas, communication reflects the required patterns of argumentation.¹⁰¹ Communicative action fosters social integration through the stabilization of normative or legitimate expectations and the realization of collective goals. Constitutional order aimed at a communicatively structured life world because the constitutional democratic state institutionalizes the public use of communicative freedom. The sociological concept of the communicatively structured life world aimed at normatively expected behavior. Communicative action aims at social collectivity and social solidarity. Habermas argues that fair bargaining is a special form of communication. Communicative action requires comparatively high degree of rationality. Communicative action gives a society binding character and procedural reliability. Procedural rationality is inherent in the logic of argumentative process and gives birth to reasonable decisions making and force of law. Communicative power engenders citizens in common. Communicative action is characterized by horizontal and vertical association of human persons. The principle of separation of state and society requires a civil society and network of voluntary association. Social power can both facilitate and restrict the formation of communicative power. Communicative freedoms are transformed from social power into political power. Habermas advocates for the principle of democratic legitimacy: the general acceptability of governing laws. Communicative potential is anchored in deep-seated social structure.

The constitutive elements of the system of rights presupposes voluntary association of free and equal consociates under law. Communicatively structured system-life world requires competent discussants of disputed issues. The bargaining processes contain a regulated agreement that balance conflicting interests. Fair bargaining does not destroy the discourse principle but strengthens it. Communicative power is transmuted into administrative power. Habermas' discourse theory hinges on the system of rights and the

interpretation of a constitutional democracy. Constitutional democracy passed through the sluices of communicative power formation. Habermas' democratic procedure guarantees a rational treatment of political questions and a practice of problem-solving process. The normative question of communicative power is a question of fundamental significance in our international social order. Communicative reasoning is a normative presupposition of pragmatic, epistemological, legal and moral discourses. Habermas believes that the logic of discourse yields the principle of political pluralism. The unlimited communication commonly has a comprehensive perspective of world view, situation of inclusiveness, self understanding and the practice of ideal role taking. Habermas believes that law-making is interwoven with the formation of communicative power. Communicative power assumes pragmatic issues of compromise formulation and ethical discourse or normative explication of legitimate expectations. Communicative power of inter-subjective recognition reflected on normative contexts and does not require a break with everyday taken-for-granted assumptions. Communicative power assures the pragmatics form of a purposive rational choice of collective goals and strategies according to established value preferences. Fair bargaining aims at compromises. Communicative action constitutes the normative framework of fair bargaining and bargaining aimed at compromise formation. The normative context of communicative framework does not exclude free riders who withdrew from social cooperation. Communicative action is opens up to a pragmatic and an ethical – political use of practical reason. Communicative action aims at reasonable regulation of interaction in an inter-subjectively shared form of life. Communicative action has a normative validity dimension and socially binding character. Democratic constitutional state connoted normative aspects and pragmatic, ethical and moral issues. Ethical – political questions pose themselves the perspective of normative validity. The conceptual explication of communicative power indicates we- identity and not ego- identity. It indicates politico-cultural self-understanding of a historical community. Communicative action emphasizes on the normative components or projection of practical everyday life practice through formative processes. Deliberative processes aim at collective goals. An adequate justification of

policies and laws must, however, consider yet a further aspect, that of justice. Moral precepts have the semantic form and formative processes of categorical imperative. Law has a legitimate force and functions as a normative resource of justice. Law reflects on a social condition for democratic legitimacy of a parliamentary political order. Communicative power has its recourse to practical reason.

Communicative power is recognized in inter-subjective recognition of validity claims and collectively binding decisions. Communicative power engenders legitimate laws. Conceptual explication of communicative power engenders its emergence of political power. Habermas in *Between Facts and Norms*, viewed “law as a medium through which communicative power is translated into administrative power”.¹⁰² Habermas believes that in communicative action reasons also have a motivational force. Communicative power brings to the foreground normative regulations of behavioral expectations. Habermas argues that “political questions differ from moral ones”.¹⁰³ Deontological ethics reflects that we ought to obey moral precepts because we know they are there to regulate our deliberate human action. Communicative power calls for the moral use of practical reason. The condition of communication framework required rational political will formation and the principle of democratic legitimacy. Deliberative democracy requires a fair balancing of interests, the clarification of ethical self-understanding and the moral justification of regulations. Law is a system of rights. Communicative power has a radical democratic content. A consensus is free of coercion and it is characterized by a legitimating force. The normative standpoint in communication model is characterized by unaffected communicative freedom and stabilizing behavioural expectations. Pragmatic discourse is failure to the notion of social engineering and strategic. Habermas’ communication model is a paradigm of instrumental rationality and the possibility of democratic participation. The communication model is anxiety-free and opened to learning. The communicative presuppositions of moral discourse assumed certain pragmatic justification. The practice of reasoned understanding is public. Habermas argues that “the universally accessible, is free of external and internal violence, and permits only the rationally motivations force of the better argument”.¹⁰⁴ The political

balancing of interest is charged with the tasks of compromise formation. The normative context of the public sphere in the communication model is what Habermas calls “*stat pro ratione voluntas* (the will stand in the place of reason)”.¹⁰⁵ Habermas argues that “the communication model starts with rationalist assumption and takes a structuralist approach”.¹⁰⁶ The collective demand for the good life autonomous citizens can understand themselves as authors of the law. Law is normatively a source of democratic legitimacy on and it is not just a medium for the exercise of political authority but democratic legitimacy. The normative law outcomes or conditions legitimacy become conditions for the stability of a generally held belief in the government legitimacy. The normative demanded legitimating force of liberal mass democracies which requires sheer stability of political order. Habermas’ democratic legitimacy is considered a measure for stability. Habermas argues that “legitimacy can range from more toleration to free consent”.¹⁰⁷ Democratic legitimacy takes on the task of protecting society. According to Habermas, in his book, *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, “the political subsystem takes on the task of protecting society from disintegration”.¹⁰⁸ The ideal communication community sums up the expression of what Habermas calls “a common interest, that is, the general will”.¹⁰⁹ Communicative action aims at what Habermas calls “the peculiar form of state sovereignty that is defined by relation to the sovereignty of other states”.¹¹⁰ Communicative action reflects on the process of state building. According to Habermas, “it becomes clear that the process of state building had to react upon the form of collective identity...this kind of collective identity was transformed under the pressure of the modern state”.¹¹¹ Communicative action aims at the Gadamerian ‘fusion of horizon’. The ‘fusion of horizon’ is actually the act of openness and it is a radical process whereby understanding and differences prevail in a system-life world. Communicative action, Habermas believes aims at “influencing the structure of production in a manner oriented to collective needs, and correcting the pattern of social inequality”.¹¹² Habermas avers that “the state thereby programmatically obligates itself to keep dysfunctional side effects within acceptable limits. In this assignment of roles, the state

provides legitimating support to a social order claiming legitimacy”.¹¹³ Communicative action aimed at what we may refer to as legitimate expectations.

Communicative power influences mutual understanding and the need for social order. According to Habermas, “the mode of action coordination itself, sets high demands on the maintenance of social orders”.¹¹⁴ Communicative action reflects on the holistic concept of society and possesses what Habermas calls “spellbinding authority”.¹¹⁵ Communicative action reflects on the linguistic medium through which interactions are woven together. According to Habermas, “what makes communicative reason possible is the linguistic medium through which interactions are woven together and forms of life are structured”.¹¹⁶ Communicative action involves not just the need for democratic legitimacy, or social order but obligation. According to Habermas, “communicative action involves obligation”.¹¹⁷ The power of communication and dialogue cannot be undermined. Communicative power and democratic legitimacy aim at what Habermas calls “political democracy”.¹¹⁸

Democratic legitimacy aims at the objective of law. According to Habermas, “law must regulate the private autonomy of individual pursuing their personal success and happiness”.¹¹⁹ The idea of law presupposes sanctions and served as a means to regulate human behavior in their process of interpersonal relationship. Habermas goes further to assert that “law regulate interpersonal relations in a manner similar to moral norms”.¹²⁰ Communicative power and democratic legitimacy served as a means of social coordination and characterized by what Habermas calls “objectivating reality”.¹²¹ The objectivating reality of what Hannah Arendt calls ‘communicative power’ presupposes the need for normative dimension and legitimate expectation.

Communicative action aims at everyday exchange. According to Borradori Giovanna, communicative action is Habermas’s name for the residue of rationality built into our everyday exchange.¹²² Communicative action is characterized by the notion of human rationality. Communicative action aims at what Giovanna Borradori calls “the democracy of everyday speech”.¹²³ The conception of the Habermasian communicative action seems to address the plethora of fundamental challenges of the public sphere. Giovanna Borradori duly

observes that “Habermas has devoted a great deal of attention to the question of legitimacy, which he sees inextricably relates to the workings of the public sphere”.¹²⁴ The conception of the public sphere seek to address the correlation between the freedom of the individual and the state. The public sphere was profoundly critical of the issue of the bourgeois/capitalist ideology. Democratic legitimacy aims at social emancipation. According to Giovanna Borradori, “democracy, in its structural perfectability, is both the means and the end of individual and social emancipation”.¹²⁵ Communicative action aims at the Enlightenment democratic ideal and the emancipatory project. Communicative action has been characterized by the central notion of role playing and as far as global world order is concerned.

Finally, the findings that emanated from this preceding chapter have been that law and democracy constituted legitimate political order, behavioural expectation and normative foundation of social structures. Communication, law and democracy aim at structural perfectability, normative ideal social order and human emancipation. Communicative action and deliberative democracy are deeply rooted in the rationalization of society through radical reforms and human rationality. Communicative action reflects on “*spellbinding authority*”. ‘Communicative action’ in practice especially in the use of language by politicians/statesmen at the national/international level requires systematic approach and high level of caution. Certain utterances can spark up or ignite socio-political and ethno-religious violence. The use of language vis-a-vis human actions at the international/diplomatic level requires a strong sense of the principle of complementary relations. The use of language in war torn areas requires a system of dialogue through contact; it should be a win-win situation.

Endnotes

1. Habermas, Jurgen., *A Berlin Republic Writings on Germany*, trans. Stephen Rendall, with Introduction by Peter Uwe Hohendahl, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1997), p. 71.
2. Ibid., p. 70.
3. Ibid., p. 9.
4. Ibid., p. 154.
5. Ibid., p. 162.
6. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Volume 1, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984a), p. 86.
7. Ibid., p. 71.
8. Habermas, Jurgen., *Knowledge and Human Interest*, trans. Jeremy Shapiro, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 137.
9. Loc., cit.,
10. Iroegbu, Pantaleon., *Kpim of Personality Treatise on Human Nature*, (Owerri, Eustel Publishers, 2000), p. 193.
11. Habermas, Jurgen *The Theory of Communicative Action, System and Lifeworld, A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Volume 2, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston Beacon Press, 1987b), p. 120.
12. Loc., cit.,
13. Ibid., p. 125.
14. Ibid., p. 124.
15. Ibid., p. 126.
16. Ibid., p. 128.
17. Ibid., p. 134.
18. Ibid., p. 135.
19. Ibid., p. 195.
20. Habermas., J., *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979), p. 178.
21. Ibid., p. 1.
22. Habermas, Jurgen., *A Berlin Republic Writings on Germany*, p.ix.
23. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, p.12.
24. Loc., cit.,
25. Habermas, Jurgen., *Knowledge and Human Interest*, p. 152.
26. Habermas., Jurgen., *Theory and Practice*, trans. John Viertel, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 17.
27. Darwall, Stephen, *Moral Obligation Form and Substance*, Proceedings in Aristotelian Society, Yale University, November 9, (2009), p. 1.
28. Habermas., Jurgen., *Theory and Practice*, p. 43.
29. Habermas, Jurgen., *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. Christian Lenhardt, and Sheiden W. Nicholson, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1983), p. 9
30. Op. cit.,
31. Habermas, Jurgen., *Towards a Rational Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, Boston Beacon Press, 1970, p. 91.
32. Ferrante, Joan., *Sociology: A Global Perspective*,(USA: Wadworth and Thomson Learning, 2003), p. 145.
33. Ibid., p. 142.
34. Ritzer, George., and Stepnisky, Jeffrey., *Sociological Theory*, (Singapore, McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2014), p.166.
35. Habermas, Jurgen., *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, p. 19.

36. Ibid., p. 134.
37. Moseley, Alexander, *A to Z of Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008), p. 36.
38. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), p.60.
39. MacKendrick, G. Kenneth., *Desire, Discourse and Fantasy in Habermas Critical Theory*, (London and New York: Routledge 2008), p. 148.
40. Ibid., p. 150.
41. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, trans. William Rehg, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1996), p. 32.
42. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, p. 52.
43. Stephen, Mitchell., *The Theologian of Talk The Question is whether Justice Exists and Reason Can Benefit Society*. Los Angeles Times Magazine, October 23, (1994), p. 10.
44. Loc., cit.,
45. Ibid., p. 3.
46. Ibid., p. 2.
47. Loc., cit.,
48. Habermas, Jurgen., *A Berlin Republic Writings on Germany*, p. 151.
49. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, p. 52.
50. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, p. 18.
51. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006), p. 112.
52. Habermas, Jurgen., *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, p. 5.
53. Loc., cit.,
54. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, p. 115.
55. Ibid., p. 138.
56. Ibid., p. 139.
57. Hoffman, John., and Graham Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory*, (England: Pearson Education Limited, 2009), p. 500.
58. Ibid., p. xxvii.
59. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, p. 5.
60. Ibid., p. 162.
61. Habermas, Jurgen., *A Berlin Republic Writings on Germany*, p.163.
62. Loc., cit.,
63. Loc., cit.,
64. Ibid., p. 164.
65. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, p. 114.
66. Loc., cit.,
67. Ibid., pp.114-115.
68. Ibid., p. 112.
69. Herrick, Jim., *Humanism*, Ibadan, Gadfly Publisher, 2006, p. 8.
70. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, p. 136.
71. Ibid., p. 139.
72. Ibid., p. 143.
73. Ibid., p. 298.
74. Ibid., p. 299.
75. Ibid., p. 300.
76. Loc., cit.,
77. Ibid., p. 302.

78. Habermas, Jurgen., *On the Logic of the Social Sciences*, trans. Shierry Weber Nicholzen and Jerry A. Stark, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1988), p. 92.
79. Loc., cit.,
80. Ibid., p. 93.
81. Loc., cit.,
82. Ibid., p. 95.
83. Loc., cit.,
84. Ibid., p. 104.
85. Ibid., p. 105.
86. Ibid., p. 106.
87. Habermas, Jurgen., *On the Logic of the Social Sciences*, p. 107.
88. Ibid., p. 111.
89. Loc., cit.,
90. Ibid., p. 113.
91. Loc., cit.,
92. Ibid., p. 116.
93. Loc., cit.,
94. Loc., cit.,
95. Ibid., pp. 128-130.
96. Loc., cit.,
97. Loc., cit.,
98. Hoffman, John., and Graham Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory*, p. 408.
99. Habermas, Jurgen, *Legitimation Crisis*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1975), p. 4.
100. Mackenzie, Lain., *Politics Key Concepts in Philosophy*, p.119.
101. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, p.180.
102. Ibid., p. 150.
103. Ibid., p. 151.
104. Ibid., p. 182.
105. Ibid., p. 184.
106. Ibid., p. 185.
107. Ibid., p. 290.
108. Habermas., J., *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, p. 180.
109. Ibid., p. 185.
110. Ibid., p. 190.
111. Ibid., pp.190-191.
112. Ibid., p. 194.
113. Ibid., p. 196.
114. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, p. 8.
115. Ibid., p. 24.
116. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
117. Ibid., p. 119.
118. Habermas., J., *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, p. 192.
119. Habermas, Jurgen, *Between Facts and Norms, Contribution to the Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, p. xxv.
120. Ibid., p. xxvi.
121. Habermas., J., *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, p. 22.
122. Borradori, Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, p. 60.
123. Ibid., p. 59.
124. Ibid., p. 56.
125. Ibid., p. 45.

CHAPTER FIVE

TOWARDS A GLOBAL WORLD ORDER

5.1 The Need for a New Global Order

Communicative action as this research discusses so far has a great role to play as far as international interaction and the conception of global political order is concerned. Communicative action aims at role playing. The conceptual analysis of role playing has occupied prominence in international relation and global world order. The ethics of dialogue is a global ethics and it is an ethical humanity. Dialogue constitutes the internal regulatory principle of rational human society. Dialogue is a practical engagement of everyday reality which is involved by a critical questioning of the model of democracy. Dialogue reflects on normative criteria of rational society or emancipated global society. Communicative action theory constitutes a necessary epistemological significance or socio-existential condition for the possibility or the indispensability of dialogue. The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' communicative action theory reflects the need for a new global order. Habermas' theory of society is the theory of social change. Dialogue creates good neighborliness and change. Camille Marquis believes that "Habermas views change as social change aiming for human emancipation through the creation of a cosmopolitan society".¹ The Habermasian picture considered change as social change towards an emancipated world society. Dialogue and communication impact every human in our daily social lives, in order to assess what it can mean at the national and supranational levels. Dialogue entails the theory of social change and change in the international system. Habermas' conception of dialogue seems to trigger change, this change may not be as optimistic as Habermas says it could be. Dialogue can be put in relation with change in a more pragmatic way. For Camille Marquis, "we make life choices as a result of dialogues. When we disagree with someone, we do not take out our gun and shoot this person... We will enter in dialogue and express a series of arguments and counter-arguments".² For Camille Marquis, "we create relationships through dialogue and communication, which may in turn change our behavior and influence our choices".³

Dialogue, brings to the fore global democracy, or global interdependence, and dialogue among nation-states have an important potential for global change. There is a great connection between dialogue, change and the international system, because dialogue makes the world narrower, whereby the notion of international interaction strives. Communication occurs in personal life as well as in public life, in domestic politics as well as in international politics. Without dialogic communication, the international community will not be a place of tranquility.

Communication is geared towards achieving, sustaining, and reviewing rational consensus and human deliberate actions—and indeed a rational consensus that rests on the inter-subjective recognition of criticizable validity claims. The idea of criticizable validity claims is inherent in communicative rationality, and rationality is inherent in human discursive practice, and this discursive practice is seen in the fact that a communicatively achieved agreement must be based on the ends of reason. Communicative rationality assumes argumentative dialogue of universal pragmatics. The dialogic approach rests on world citizenship, and the protection of basic human rights and basic human rights is gradually eroding from the modern phase of globalization. The dialogic relation is established at the global level. The dialogic approach to globalised world citizenship rests on the possibilities of human emancipation. Dialogue leads to emancipation of world democracy or cosmopolitan politics. Finally, the Habermasian picture aims at human emancipation within a cosmopolitan society and normative ideal social order. Dialogue has a great role to play in the international system. It brings to the foreground the idea of social change in the international system. Dialogue brings to the fore the idea of social change and global change. The system-life world reflects on the hermeneutics of rational dialogue. Dialogue is conscience-oriented and people-oriented. Man's use of communicative reason is a structural, epistemological, non- instrumental, moral, political, and existential social condition. This social structural condition implied the use of reason – the logos; but reason has its own limits. The exercise of the use of the logos is instrumental, and at the same time non-instrumental.

The political, ethical, and existential condition refers to the Socratic dialogue according to which one has to know oneself in order to practice virtue, but it is the epistemological condition that enabled the individual to recognize himself in his attempt to enter into rational dialogue or discursive practice with the socio-political world. The conceptualization of the rationalization of society is geared towards the hermeneutics of liberal dialogue in a system-life world and towards a stylization of rational conduct, attitudes and an appeal to intersubjectivity in a global world order. The intensification of social relations is a system of reciprocal moral obligation and dialogical engagement. Habermas, Foucault and Rawls are committed to dismantling institutionalized inequality throughout our lives and in the global world order. The indispensability of dialogue brings to the foreground the idea of international interaction or global interdependence. According to Joan Ferrante, global interdependence refers to a “state in which the social, political, financial, and cultural lives of people around the world are intertwined such that one country’s problems-unemployment, drug abuse, environmental pollution, the search for national security-are part of a larger global situation”.⁴ The indispensability of dialogue is a web of a complex strategic network of rational relations shaped within the normative framework of social, historical, economic, political, cultural, linguistic-normative structures or inter-subjective communicative contexts. Habermas’ theory of communicative action is shown within the normative framework of epistemological significance, social and political transformations, internal connection between individual self realization or self determination, mutual communicative understanding and public deliberation or collective rational- action. The Habermasian dialogical conception is a discernible trace of basic normative core of human universal solidarity, and reaching mutual communicative understanding. Human organic solidarity is governed by rational principle and therefore acts as a rational regulative principle in our moral universe.

The perpetuity of the drama of our socio-political existence in our international system is based on complementarity thesis or a contemplative praxis of rational relation and

dialogical engagement among countries in the world. Habermas' social and political theory seems to refer to the cumbersomeness of our social structural and political transformation of the political public sphere which we all are part and parcel of the reasonable discursive everyday practice. In the dialogical encounter, the ethical interaction is a social relationship, a reciprocal nature between human beings and it strengthens mutual generosity and radical openness among countries of the world. The fundamental contemporary feature of mutual dialogue or corresponding- rational-dialogical relationship presupposes free and open society. The political dimension of ethics is deeply rooted in the primordial relationship between nation-states and human beings in the world.

The idea of a modern normalizing power structure is kept in force by initial interpersonal relation and the normative peace aims at by global politics and which is based on a compromise of interested forces governed by universal reason. The ethical dialogical encounter or dialogical relationship is predicated on communicative understanding or practice and discursive practice is social activity, a rational discourse of everyday practice and it is just the simple attribute of human being but the essential, primary and fundamental normative structure of inter-subjective being. The dialogical encounter is an ethico-political engagement in the global (international) system. The ethical relation heralds the beginning of complex modern society. Reason in a system-life world of modern or contemporary global politics can be inherently justified and it is the normative foundation of an objective world. The Habermasian – picture is a normative formulation of aesthetic appeal to inter-subjectivity and indispensable to global ethics. True sociality only comes into prevalence if the dialogical human encounter is essentially carried out. To satisfy these needs we reach things in the objective world. The realistic portrayal of our social interaction is based on true ethical behaviour and dialogical human communicative encounter – a discursive practice of everyday reality in our system- life world.

Moreover, it is a process of radical openness, and this gives meaning to our objective world, human existence and our existential wonder. The extent of stylizing a life aiming

towards full self realization or self-determination and coincidence showcased ethical discursive practice in our objective world. Language, for instance, is semantically transformed into an ethical sensible responsibility or political socialization. According to Joy Eyisi, in her article *Language: A Foundation for Political Socialization*, believes that “language is as old as human race”.⁵ She believed that “language permeates all aspects of human endeavours, including political activities”.⁶ Language reflects on the human objective world. For Joy Eyisi, “language is basically the raw material with which any political achievements can be made manifest”.⁷ Language objectifies the world therefore objectifies things in the world, and ethics thus precedes the work of truth. Language performs constitutive function or language has constitutive significance, and social interactions form symbolic structures. In Habermas’ view, “language has constitutive significance for the socio-cultural form of life”.⁸ The linguistic structures formed a social whole of complex activities. Language performs the functions of mutual understanding, social integration, system integration, socialization, and normatively guided interaction. The money and power structure of free and open society is an ideological framework of rationalization and bureaucratization of society. Those at the helm of affairs take absolute seizure of the economic and political powers and ideology of the modern state. Everything that takes place here, between us concerned everyone of us in our global world order and the answer does not contain the principle of a political constitution but rather showcased how the dimensions of global society and global politics emerged from the ethico-rational relation of intersubjectivity, social change, and dialogue in our international system.

Furthermore, the North African Revolution presupposes the need for the indispensability of dialogue instead of war or violent revolution. The concept of revolution has definitional difficulty. Violence brings about distorted communication. Violence can disrupts the whole project of humanity. The world order requires peace, universal brotherhood and the respect for the sacredness of our humanity.

5.2 The Hermeneutics of Global Peace and Global World Order.

Broadly speaking, terrorism has been the unthinkable that breaks out of our glorious world. Terrorism is distinctly modern political and economic danger. Giovanna Borradori believes that “Habermas and Derrida submitted to philosophical analysis the most urgent questions regarding terror and terrorism”.⁹ Terrorism has been characterized by political content. Giovanna Borradori opines that “terrorism is acquired by a political content...terrorism has no stable meaning, agenda”.¹⁰ Habermas envisages a globalized system of communication. Habermas disqualifies the political content of terrorism and he posits that terrorism is evil and it has a mechanistic machination-life against life, threat to the lives of children, women. Habermas is of the opinion that communicative action revealed the possibilities of democratic participation. The idea of terrorism from the Habermasian-Derridarean model reflects on the fact that terrorism is problem-ridden. Derrida, on his part, believes that human history required critical reflection. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “both Habermas and Derrida affirm the value of the enlightenment ideals of world citizenry and cosmopolitan rights”.¹¹ Habermas just like Kant advocates a state of a universal community or world’s democratic community. Giovanna Borradori asserts the Habermasian position that “a violation of rights in one part of the world would be felt everywhere”. The discussion of global terrorism demands critical reassessment of the political ideals of the Enlightenment democratic ideal. Habermas believes that philosophers just like the social scientists needed to have the tools to critically examine the adequacy of the existing framework of global terrorism. Habermas believes that the world is faced by the conceptual complexity underlying the notion of global terrorism. Habermas took after the Hegelian model of universal reason believing that we as individuals in the world must abide by the instrument of reason for our world to be a better place. Giovanna Borradori affirms that “reason, for him, is not an abstract mental faculty that all human beings become equipped with and can affirm autonomous grounds; rather, it grows out of the way in which the individual understands herself as part of a community”.¹² Terrorism has contributed to

global crisis and has had an impact on our understanding of the world political order. Habermas iterates a number of normative assumptions of which we can envisage global political order. Habermas believes that philosophy has a great role to play in world political order. Borradori aligns herself with Bertrand Russell's position that "philosophy is committed to the pursuit of timeless truth".¹³

Moreover, the Habermasian standpoint stipulates that communicative action framework offered a theoretical justification of democratic community. One very fundamental problem of global world order is the problem of human nature-the problem of human specie. Giovanna Borradori alludes to the Habermasian model that we cannot approach the normative question of global order without referring to the notion of semantic spectrum of human specie- this problematic of the human specie has been the problem of humanity and man's inhumanity to man. Habermas believes that to ensure global political order, tolerance should be the universally binding character. Tolerance has been a necessary tool for our political, ethical and legal front in order to co-exist within a pluralistic society. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that "modernity brings about a plurality of nations".¹⁴ Modernity, as it were has its own paradoxes. According to Habermas, modernity is characterized by what he calls "effective historical consciousness".¹⁵ The problem of modernity has led to the problem of globalization. Globalization has brought about the violent uprooting of our way of life. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori reiterates the Habermasian position that "globalization has accelerated the defensive reaction that accompanies the fear that Habermas defines as the violent uprooting of traditional ways of life of which modernization is generally accused. We cannot deny, Habermas says that globalization has divided world society into winners, beneficiaries, and losers".¹⁶

Nevertheless, Habermas believes that one of the problems of world political order is the problem of the modern phenomenon calls fundamentalism. Giovanna Borradori, believes that the problem of fundamentalism and terrorism has led to what Habermas calls "communicative pathology".¹⁷ Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori opines further that "the

relation between fundamentalism and terrorism is mediated by violence that Habermas understands as a communicative pathology".¹⁸ Habermas in his response to world political order and the global public challenges of our time advocates for change in our mentality and the need for trust. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that "the spiral of violence begins as a spiral of distorted communication that leads through the spiral of uncontrolled reciprocal mistrust to the breakdown of communication...trust must be able to be developed in communicative everyday practices. The remedy against systemic distortions of communication leading to cross-cultural violence is to rebuild a fundamental link of trust among people, which cannot take place while oppression and fear dominate".¹⁹ Habermas places so much importance on the use of reason as far as human quests for an emancipated global society is concerned. According to Giovanna Borradori, "for Habermas reason, is understood as the possibility of transparent and non-manipulative communication, can cure the ills of modernization, fundamentalism, and terrorism among them...".²⁰

In addition, our global world today is faced with the reality of what Giovanna Borradori calls "an asymmetrical conflict".²¹ Habermas believes that globalization plays a crucial role and that an increase in inequality due to accelerated modernization. This accelerated modernization has been a global challenge. Habermas understands globalization under the rubric of inequality. Habermas has been worried about the effects of globalization on the dynamics of conflict and war. Habermas' concern for a globalized system of communication is anchored in international cooperation. Habermas' concern for a globalized political order is geared toward what Giovanna Borradori calls "a moral tendency of humankind".²² Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that Habermas attempts "to advance the transition from classical international law to a cosmopolitan order".²³ The global public must pursue a program that goes beyond the engineering of destruction and insecurity. The Habermasian model anticipates or corroborates what Giovanna Borradori calls "the creation of a worldwide coalition of countries against terrorism".²⁴

Philosophically speaking, Habermas sees tolerance as a key concept of both the Enlightenment and the global political order. The notion of tolerance is indispensable to both political and ethical concept. Tolerance is also deeply rooted in religious overtone and it is subsequently appropriated to secular politics. Habermas' conception of secular politics is idiosyncratic. Habermas is specifically concerned with the global challenges of our time. Habermas defends tolerance as a key concept to political situation. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that "his defense of tolerance emerges out of his conception of constitutional democracy as the only political situation that can accommodate free and uncoerced communication and the formation of a rational consensus".²⁵ Habermas' conception of global political order can be referred to what Giovanna Borradori calls "reasonable universality".²⁶

Habermas considers fundamentalism to be the very incarnation of religious intolerance and appears to be modern phenomenon. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that "fundamentalism is a violent reaction against the modern way of understanding and practicing religion...it is a panicked response to modernity perceived as a threat rather than as an opportunity".²⁷ The global network of communication is envisaged by what Habermas calls "rational morality".²⁸ Habermas believes that the global network of communication has been systematically distorted and he posited that "history is experienced as a crisis ridden process".²⁹ The conception of enlightenment as an unfinished project envisages the fact that modernity rejects all forms of ideologies that are not aimed at the common grounding of global political order. The kind of ideology propagated by the terrorists group is antithetical to our humanity and modernity. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori, believes that "the explicit ideology of the terrorists who attack the Twin Towers and the Pentagon on 9/11 is a rejection of the kind of modernity and secularization that in the philosophical tradition is associated with this concept of Enlightenment".³⁰ This explicit ideology of the terrorists group is characterized by what Giovanna Borradori believes that Habermas calls "diabolical machinations".³¹ Habermas believes that our world is

characterized by what Borradori calls “delicate political ramifications”.³² The perfect sense or standpoints of Habermas’ cosmopolitan beliefs have been so tremendous as a philosopher and as a public intellectual figure. The depth of Habermas’ public commitments has been extraordinary. Habermas foregrounds the constitutive role of global political order and subsequently defended a notion of constitutional patriotism. Habermas’ conception of global political order is characterized by humanism. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori alludes to the Derridarean model that “humanism remains loyal to what Derrida has calls the unity of man”.³³

Nonetheless, anchoring human reality on the interdependence between the human being and the world is understood to be a logical necessity. Habermas is of the view that there is a whole new dimension to the concept of a globalized world. For Habermas, philosophy’s commitment is to human laws and institutions as they evolved through time. Habermas believes that the Enlightenment democratic vision has not failed as an intellectual project but that its original critical attitude to use the words of Giovanna Borradori, “has opened up the way for political barbarism”.³⁴ Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori, taking the Habermasian standpoint believes that “the praxis of our daily living together rests on a solid base of common background conviction, self evident cultural truths and reciprocal expectations”.³⁵ The hermeneutic model of understanding functions in everyday conversation. Habermas favours what Giovanna Borradori calls “a normative legitimation and a gradual transformation of international law into a cosmopolitan order”.³⁶ Habermas believes that one of the challenges of global political order is that terrorism has led to the vulnerability of a complex system and a globalized system of communication. The idea of cosmopolitan order has been drastically challenged by global terrorism. Giovanna Borradori aligns herself with Habermas by positing that, “global terrorism is extreme both in its lack of realistic goals and in its cynical exploitation of the vulnerability of complex system”.³⁷ Tolerance, according to the Habermasian tradition, is characterized by the universalistic nature of the legal and moral foundation of a liberal order. Habermas’ conception of a globalized political order is moral

universalism; it demanded what Giovanna Borradori calls “the mutual recognition, the sense of equal respect and reciprocal consideration for everyone”.³⁸

Habermas’ conception of a globalized world or global political order is usually the advancement of democracy. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “democracy, in its structural perfectibility is both the means and the end of individual and social emancipation. Habermas’ theory of global democracy envisaged an emancipated global society, globalized system of communication and new cosmopolitan order. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “emancipation means the process of civic maturation and the interdependence between self-knowledge and freedom”.³⁹ Habermas sees the global network of communication as the function of reciprocal interchange and reasonable universality. Habermas envisages a global political order and the possibility of what Giovanna Borradori calls “actors capable of reaching transnational agreements...Habermas has defended universalism in his writings on moral and political philosophy”.⁴⁰

The Habermasian standpoint is anchored on the realm of individuality and otherness. Giovanna Borradori assumes from the Habermasian standpoint that “we learn who we are as autonomous agents from basic relations with others...the most basic among these relations is the act of communicating through language. Habermas’ standpoint is thus that the substance of communication is mutual understanding...”.⁴¹ Communication is all about rational practice which allow for the formation of a freely achieved rational consensus among people in a well ordered and just society. Habermas envisages a well-ordered and just society whereby philosophy aims at offering a reconstruction of the global condition of communication that is not only possible but effective and productive. Habermas believes that terrorism has been a defect to the level of global communication. Communication is embedded in what Giovanna Borradori calls “democratic deliberation”.⁴²

Furthermore, the conceptions of democratic reasonableness or deliberation and reasonable universality have been one of the Rawlsian paradigms of ensuring global order. Rawls’ vision is realistic and it is also utopian. Liberal people tolerate peoples, and indeed

treat them as equals. Rawls' vision is a normative core of human rights which includes rights to subsistence, global security, personal property, and formal equality before the law, liberty of conscience. From the Habermasian picture, there is the right to democratic participation. Rawls' theory of rights guarantees human rights to be immune from coercive intervention from other peoples. Societies that violate human rights overstep the limits of toleration. The normative core of human rights are the minimal conditions require for persons to be able to engage in social cooperation in any real sense, so any well ordered society must protect them. The role of human rights in the law of peoples is thus to set limits on international toleration. Rawls' contemporary political philosophy represents liberal societies. Rawlsian definition of rights is synonymous with the Habermasian definition of rights because it presupposes normative core or basic universal character. Rawlsian version of rights showcases the fundamental interests for the sake of greater total global utility. The stability of the international political order will thus be stability for the right reasons. Rawls' vision of concrete world order is of perpetually peaceful and cooperative international order, the redistribution of international resources and to secure the normative core of basic human rights globally. The practical goal of Rawls' laws of peoples is the elimination of the great evils of human history; unjust war, oppression, and religious persecution. Every human society has some form of normative ideal social order and social dislocations. Hans Kelsen maintains that law is characterized by a normative system. International law is seen as a normative core and the basis for international order.

Habermas' discourse ethics and its inextricable nexus of the imperative or dialogical philosophy works upon the premise of existence as encounter and dialogical communication and dialogue expands the understanding of the social life world. A world is not just the totality of everything that is in it, but it is this totality in it radical openness as such in which all of us stands out and the world is open to us all. Social beings are always given in their truth claims, and their radical openness to criticizable validity claims. Authentic dialogue articulates expressly in language, being in their being is communication from one human

person to another through the use of language. This communication or principle of rationality can be taken in by the conceptualization of global justice because the global justice brings to the foreground international or inter-regional unity and the openness of the world to international human rights, justice, economic, cultural, political, and social integration of nation-states. We share things in common and there is common openness of life.

We agree on how things show themselves, but, prior to this possibility of unraveling things in the world, phenomenology showcases the need for us to bracket all our preconceived ideas or prevailing prejudices. The conception of phenomenology centred on the presence and the objects of representation; all consciousness is consciousness of something. The objective content of things is the basis for inter-subjective world. The constitution of things basically assumes the act of representation. Representation presupposes the world corporality. Phenomenologists reveals the fact that truth is to be found in the self, and that this truth is universal and necessary. The rational and deliberate structure of language is addressed by the overflowing of consciousness of things in the world. There is this underlying truth that the possibility of rational moral agreement and disagreement among nation-states is truly possible. We share in common the radical openness within which nation-states are united. This normative grounding of radical openness is common to us and also allows differences to flourish as social beings.

Consequently, countries share common interests in their quests for economic, political, social, cultural, legal and basic human rights. Dialogue originates from language and language summons things (which are themselves grounded in being through the power of language). In line with the Heideggerian perspective, dialogue allows the sharing of the truth of being in the world community. Heidegger's existentialist philosophy tends to deepen our phenomenological and critical understanding of Being. The term "*Being*" is what is. Heidegger believes man is a social being; a being-with-other. Heidegger believes that language is the house of Being. Heidegger regards language as not only tied up with daily human existence but serves as world disclosure. Heidegger sees the indeterminacy of

language as visible in the current decayed state of communication resulting into the forgetfulness of Being; this caused an inauthentic relationship with human existence. In Heidegger's *Being and Time* regards language as fundamentally as a means of interaction and communication between human beings in an already established world. In line with the Heideggerian standpoint, the function of language is projection and disclosure. Heidegger believes that language presupposes revealing and concealing. Language brings being into existence. Language, which is prior to all human expression and communication, is deeply rooted in the world. Language is prior to human speech, and he acknowledges that this relationship is invariably reciprocal. Heidegger's conception of Being is '*hermeneutic disclosure*'. Heidegger views human possibilities in terms of disclosure. Heidegger understands Being-in-the-world in terms of struggle. The movement of opening up a particular world is only one of instance of the general movement of truth. Heidegger explains the power of disclosure in terms of arts. Arts stabilized the nature of things in the world. We shared the socio-political concrete world order in common through language. Language evokes Being through the process of communicative action. Beings in their totality is a unity not only for the beings but thus unifies under the universality of reason in a concrete world order. The dialogue that arises among nation-states revealed or invoked international interaction. Communicative action connotes social beings from various angles and basic normative perspectives or intersubjective recognition.

Nevertheless, hermeneutic dialogue allows the matter at hand to come to ethical presence. Usually it is assured (hopefully) that dialogue will lead to a convergence of interpretations of the phenomena concerned. Dialogue is the reflection on the sharing of the truth of being in the world community. Communication involves social activity, inter-human- dialogue and rational relation. Countries at the international arena must have an inter-subjectively shared communicative understanding and this communicative understanding can be shared and re-formed or re-defined in concrete world order. Dialogue expands the understanding of the world. Political dialogue connotes the compromise of

interests among nation-states. One very fundamental question we need to ask is that can there be dialogue without contact? There cannot be dialogue without contact. Dialogue envisages contact between two subjects. Dialogical ethics is a matter of disinterested relation (it simply means that in the process of communicative interaction between two subjects in their interpersonal relation, personal interest should not be the sole objective of their intersubjective relation and what should bind them together is the return of the Platonic conception of the Good or common interest). Broadly speaking, talking about matters of dialogue is of international concern.

Nevertheless, the values we can rightly adduce to help give birth to Global World Order apart from communicative action and dialogue are the respect for the sacredness of our humanity. We should take the Levinasian tradition of not seeing in the other human person as flesh and blood but the whole of humanity. We should respect the sanctity of human lives because human life is sacred. We must continue to abhor violence in order to keep our planet earth safe. Violence does no one any good. Violence fuels more violence. Violent acts are irrational and distort the totality of the human project. What we owe the other human person is moral obligation and responsibility. Moral obligation becomes a logical necessity for our intersubjective mutual obligation. Let us make our world a better place or habitable and to live in peace or tranquillity and where prosperity reigns supreme for all a sundry and for the sake of an emancipated global society.

5.3 Understanding Dialogue and Communicative Action as the Ethics of Global World Order.

North Africa and Middle East has had a fair share of the current global crisis. Egypt, Somalia, Tunisia, Syria, Algeria, Sudan and Libya are seriously facing some social unrest. Social unrest may reflect a variety of factors such as poverty, unemployment and social injustice in North Africa and the Middle East. Despite the many possible contributing factors, the timing of violent protests in North Africa and the Middle East from 2008 till date coincides with large peaks in global food prices. We identify a specific food price threshold

above which protests become likely. These observations suggests that protests may reflect not only long-standing political failings of governments, but also the sudden desperate traits of vulnerable populations. If food prices remain high, there is likely to be persistent and increasing global social disruption. Avoiding global food crises and associated social unrest required rapid and concerted effort of global dialogue. In 2011 protest movements have become pervasive in countries of North Africa and the Middle East. The failings of the political systems, the fragrant violation of human rights in the global arena is increasing and it is central role that global interdependence is playing in human survival and well-being. We can understand the appearance of social unrest in 2011 based upon a hypothesis that widespread unrest does not arise from long-standing political failings of the system, but rather from its sudden perceived failure to provide essential security to the population even at the global level. Failure to provide security undermines the very reason for existence of the global political system. Human beings depend on political systems for collective decision making and action and their acquiescence to those systems is paramount to global order. The idea of global security and dialogue become fundamental issue of human rights and global existence. Thus, individuals depend on a good global system of security and political system for adequate decision making to guarantee expected standards of human survival.

Warning of the link between food prices, social unrest and political instability are part of the fundamental problems affecting global security and order. When the ability of the political system to provide global security for the population breaks down, popular support disappears. Conditions of widespread threat to global security are particularly political instability and when food is inaccessible to the world population at large. Global food supply system must be given global attention because we as humans are at a cross road due to drastic food shortages, social unrest and political instability. Broadly speaking, high food prices have become a threat to global security and should be a key concern to policymakers worldwide. Social unrest and political instability of countries can be expected to spread as the impact of loss of security persists and becomes pervasive, even though the underlying causes are global

food prices and are not necessarily due to specific governmental policies. A breakdown of social order as a result of loss of food security has been predicted based upon historical events and the expectation that global population increases and resource constraints will lead to catastrophe. The importance of food prices for social stability points to the level of human suffering that may be caused by increased food prices. Deterioration in food security led to conditions in which random events trigger widespread global violence. Commodity market regulations should be an urgent priority for policy makers. The current problem transcends the specific national political crises to represent a global concern about vulnerable populations and social order. Our analysis of the link between global food prices and social unrest supports a growing concern that it is possible to build mathematical models of global economic and social stability. Identifying a signature of unrest for future events is surely useful. Tunisia demonstrates that it is possible to identify early warning signs before events occur. Prediction is a major challenge for socio-economic analysis. Understanding when and whether prediction is possible is important for science and policy decisions. Our predictions are conditional on the circumstances, and thus allows for policy interventions to change them. Forging a fuller dialogical communicative ethics requires some level of global interdependence and contemporary global relevance. Rational communicative exchange aims at an emancipated global society. Dialogue reflects on the universalization principle of Kantian conception of duty as the necessity of an action out of respect for moral law. The moral law is deeply rooted in the natural law. It envisages a cosmological order or perhaps a rational rule of human conduct as universal normative core.

5.4 The Rationalization of Society and the Critique of Modernity.

Habermas believes that the vitality of modern time consciousness has to be renewed by what he calls “radical historical consciousness”.⁴³ Habermas tends to renew modern time consciousness. Accordingly, Habermas believes that “radical thinking can be characterized by the idea of effective history”.⁴⁴ Modernity is characterized by what Habermas calls “effective historical consciousness”.⁴⁵ Habermas’ conception of effective historical

consciousness has been characterized by what he calls “the communicative context of a universal historical solidarity”.⁴⁶ The critique of modernity has been characterized by what Habermas calls “the task of a critique of the misuse of our cognitive faculties”.⁴⁷ Habermas makes it emphatically clear in his book, the *Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, and he tends to address “the source of normative orientation”.⁴⁸ Habermas emphasizes that the critique of modernity has become problematic and it is at variance with itself. Accordingly, Habermas believes that “modernity...is at variance with itself”.⁴⁹

Moreover, just like Hegel, Habermas wants to respond to the crisis of modernity itself. In the course of addressing the crisis of modernity, Habermas believes that “reason must be brought forward as the reconciling power against the positive elements of an age torn asunder”.⁵⁰ The idea of reason has been idolized by many philosophers and the Hegelians. According to Habermas, “as it seemed to the young Hegel, a positivity of ethical life was the signature of the age”.⁵¹ The Enlightenment ideal is characterized by what Habermas calls “the objectivity of rational command...”.⁵² Habermas’ *Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* reflected on the Hegelian tradition. Habermas asserts that, “Hegel now calls a social condition in which all members receive their due and satisfy their needs without injuring the interest of others”.⁵³ Habermas is actually reflecting on human existence, rationality, freedom and equality for all. Habermas calls this human rationality “their common life context...and in this context they recognize the basis of their existence”.⁵⁴ The common life context of human rationality was emphatically stressed by Giovanna Borradori. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “modernity is for Habermas the very emblem of the political promise of rationality”.⁵⁵ The projects of modernity is an emergence of social dynamics. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that modernity “emerged as an evolutionary social dynamics”.⁵⁶

Borradori concludes by aligning herself with the Hegelian perspective that “philosophy is the name for the emergence of this historical consciousness, which is uniquely emancipatory. For Hegel, as well as Habermas, because it discloses the possibility of critically appropriating the present”.⁵⁷ Modernity is characterized by the human existence or

social solidarity. The basis of human existence or social solidarity is what Habermas calls “intersubjective equilibrium”.⁵⁸ Accordingly, Habermas believes that “communicative mediation of subjects...the living spirit is the medium that found a communality of the sort that one subject can know itself to be one with another subject while still remaining itself”.⁵⁹ Accordingly, Habermas, “the isolation of subjects then sets in motion the dynamism of a disrupted communication whose inherent telos is the reestablishment of the ethical relation...”.⁶⁰ The dynamism of disrupted communication can only be addressed by what Habermas calls “ethical totality”.⁶¹ Accordingly, Habermas believes reason represents “the absolute power of unification”.⁶² Habermas has been trying to address the problem of subjugating subjectivity, political unfreedom and what he calls “a bifurcated ethical life in general”.⁶³ Habermas’ project of modern world emancipation is what he calls “an objective determinacy”.⁶⁴ Our modern world is experiencing what Habermas calls “hypothetical sentimentality”.⁶⁵ Communicative action contexts formed the foundation for a comprehensive political order. The ethical relationship is characterized by what Habermas calls “reciprocal dependency”.⁶⁶

Habermas posits that “the absolute can demonstrate itself as the power of unification”.⁶⁷ The unrest and movement of modernity was ready to explode and it is characterized by what Habermas calls “the decadent existence of social and political life”.⁶⁸ Modernity is at a crisis point and it is characterized by what Habermas calls “objective violence”.⁶⁹ Society itself, to adopt Durkheim’s terminology, approves the palpable subordination of reason to emotional need. In this sacrificed ways of seeing life, human beings are thought to be able to learn the moral laws by which human beings are governed, and to reduce, by foresight, the possibility of accidental collision. The universe is somewhat a network of vast engine, ticking over in neutral until a human hand engages the gear. There are in comprehensible and unpredictable areas in every human life. A genuine theory of the nature of human reality will have to take into rational account the whole web of human social reality. Human beings control social, economic and political events and we have to add in

true social practice the rational universal principle which is reduced to the formula and all human misfortunes is due to human agency what Kant calls “immaturity”.

According to the Habermasian picture, science has its own ideology, and science grows out of philosophy and science begins as an exercise in contemplation. Religion plays a very important role of social function and it is not reduced to moral and social objections. The more meticulous and complex the normative ideal social order, the more comfort it affords to the human emancipation and contemporary moral philosophy of society. The human life is the highest form of life in the observable universe. In every philosophy, the human is the crown of creation. Human beings are in a kinship relation with all that is. Society is presented as a collection of undifferentiated units or whole. Some kind of collective and moral consciousness is essential to the idea of any society. Law and the moral system is the only incentive for constructing a wider rational society. Morality is essential to human beings, and it should be enforceable and determined by the concept of the highest good of the highest number. The human being could survive in society only if the legal and moral system is absolutely enforceable in ensuring the basis for a normative ideal social and global order. The problems of contemporary global democracy and the global order is to reinvigorate the decaying societies of mankind, and in the main time, the struggle against egotistical measures or calculations, is everywhere the very life of modern complex society, and has become much more very difficult in a world which often tends to glorify a crude kind of selfish individualism.

Habermas and Rawls seems to agree that rational society is governed by a conception of justice as fairness and the basic human rights even at a global scale. John Rawls’ conception of justice as fairness influences the contemporary political philosophy of Habermas and his theory of rational society. The basic normative framework of human lives is solely established by objective factors which are wholly independent and the globe retains the existential dimension it has always had. The environment plays a big part in fashioning human society and it is also true that human beings in society can modify their social

environment and social existence. People associate because they are impelled to do so by natural necessity. In human society, no culture is absolute. No culture has absolute value, and each must give way in favour of the greater good of a world community.

The establishment of a world community is a normative ideal deeply rooted in the nature of human beings, although it also encounters obstacles in their nature as ego-centered beings. The primary function of government is to protect the lives, properties, rights and liberty of the citizens. The business of government is to defend the liberty of the citizens and it seems now nearly everywhere to be on the decline in our world community. The machinery of government is not simply described as negative and repressive power, but it simply operates for the benefits of the operators. The principal causes of the states of affairs in the world community are the collapse of moral standards or normative core of social order. Money has its own power relation and it is the well spring of life. Warm community life is the envy of the rest of mankind. One of the wellsprings of any society is culture. The natural law is superior to all men. It is binding not only on individuals, but also on communities. The theory of the natural law implies that what is right and wrong is basically the same for all mankind; every human being is subject to the same basic normative core of fundamental law. There are certain cultural identities or normative assumptions which the individual receives from his society.

In human society, language is the carrier of culture. In the rationalization of society, language plays a crucial role to culture. Language articulates the linguistic baggage of a social group. Language identifies culture and culture is a way of life of a people. Language is a generic base common to all culture. Man is a cultural being. Culture is an essential property of man. It is described as one of the basic element or spiritual form of any society. The element of culture presupposes the conclusion of the constitution of a social group. Culture is understood as the property of society and it is essentially defined as the spiritual form of society. The fundamental element of culture is language and communication leads to the progress of a social group. Language owes its origin and its progress to our freedom. Some of

the instruments of any society are norms, values, cultures. The cultural life is influenced by a more complex society. Scientific culture is an ally of humanistic culture. By humanistic culture is intended to give preferences to philosophy, art, technology, science, politics, morality and law, history, literature, language. Culture takes the form of sectarianism, ideology, religion, humanism, science. Battista Mondin believes that “culture is another great window (together with language and work) that has been opened in our century to overlook the mystery of man”.⁷⁰ Language is a carrier of culture and man is culture-bound. For Battista Mondin, “man is cultural being in two senses: first of all in that he is the artifice of culture, but also, as we have seen, in that, he himself is the prime receiver and the greatest effect of culture. Culture, in its two principal accepted meanings---of formation of the individual (subjective sense) and of society’s spiritual form (objective sense)—has the goal of the realization of the individual in all his dimension, in all his capacities.”⁷¹ The term “society” is broader than ‘human society’. Society can be defined as system of communication.

Communication must be capable of operating independently of and at a more primitive level than the degree of rationality and mutual awareness assumed by game theory. Thus, Habermas distinguishes between instrumental action which is oriented to success and communicative action which is oriented to reaching mutual understanding. Habermas also stresses that, in a cultural context of shared standard of correct acts of communication takes on the force of legitimacy claims. To see society as a system of communication is to see it as an arena of battle or the normative background of conflicting interpretations of reality in which the price of failure to win agreement is inclusive in our social interaction. The idea of a plural subject offers us a less individualistic conception of social cooperation than that which emerges from game theory. The idea of the rationalization of society is seen from a communication system perspective. The idea that ‘we’ constitute a plural subject is just one of the agreed ways of defining social reality which can serve to facilitate coordination and cooperation. Emile Durkheim’s philosophy talks about the notion of collective consciousness, moral values and the notion of social facts. What bring people together are

practical forces such as sharing the same common resources such as land and having the same normative traditions. Some scholars are guilty of disregarding the important social truth, that society predates the individual. Human beings, however, are almost free of their environment, but dependent on social causes. Social causes constitute organic causes.

Habermas' theory of communicative action and the rational choice of human society focused on George Mead's symbolic interactionism. Martin Cohen posits that "in essence, the key to social life is symbolism. It is the way that individuals communicate most effectively, and their social values are preserved and embodied in the sacred symbols... we might observe that language itself consist essentially of symbols".⁷² The individuals in societies share a powerful sense of shared purpose and normative function and this result in a kind of social cohesion. The cohesion of organic society is fundamentally one of social interdependence. An organic society targets at a sense of shared aims and collective aspirations. The rationalization and the integrated sociological paradigm or normative foundation of any society is based on a sense of common security and shared purpose. Like Weber, Habermas builds an existential or rational model of society, in which social science is deeply rooted in values, which is ultimately inter-subjective. Like Weber, Habermas has made the individual perception of the world the key to understanding society through the power of an unlimited equal dialogue. Rationality, from the Weberian perspective is good. Weber assumes dangerously that an action with a rational purpose must be good, and if an action is not good, it cannot be rational. The first novelty of Weberian sociology concerned the organization, bureaucratization, rationalization, of modern complex societies, rationality and knowledge, and the explanations of human behavior. Weberian sociology has a normative outcomes and a political landscape or political recipe. Weber, from his sociological perspective, still expects the normative structure of his society to be essentially democratic and rationalistic. Similarly, with the liberal ideas of citizenship and equality espoused by the likes of John Locke, Jurgen Habermas, John Rawls, Immanuel Kant, and Thomas Paine, society is built on so many physical forces such as ethics, economic, the

political, social, global justice, and culture. The theory of communicative action presupposes phenomenological sociology of Alfred Schutz and it is the key to understanding social life. In any social system of human society, the welfare of the people is to be the measure of the success of any system. The rationalistic principle of any society is based on normative order and common interest.

Thomas Paine opines that:

Great part of that order which reigns among mankind is not the effect of government it has its origin in the principles of society and the natural constitution of man. Common interest regulates their concerns and forms their law; and the laws which common usage ordains, have a greater influence than the laws of government. Society performs itself almost everything which is ascribed to effective government. No man is capable of developing without the aid of society of supplying his own wants, acting upon every individual impel the whole of them into society, and as naturally as gravitation acts to a center. There is no period in life when the love of society ceases to act, it begins and ends with our being.⁷³

In any society where internal order and harmony were to be preserved as inviolate there is a general association where common interest produced common security. Society creates the atmosphere for social life where different humans reciprocally accommodating the wants of each other, and consequently to preserve the advantages resulting from it. Thomas Paine holds that “man is so naturally a creature of society that it is almost impossible to put him out of it, and man, with respect to all those matters, is more a creature of consistency than he is aware”.⁷⁴ Thomas Paine opines that ‘all the great laws of society are laws of nature’ and the laws of mutual and reciprocal interests. Paine adumbrates that “government generates or engenders discontents and disorders instead of creating a natural cohesion of people or consolidating society as a whole”.⁷⁵ Thomas Paine believes that government is nothing more than national association of human persons acting on the principles of rational society. Habermas’ notion of the rationalization of society is a philosophy of social change, purposive rational activity or human emancipation and rational reconstruction. It is post-modernism of some sort that characterized by normative standards and ideological sentiments. Theorists who believe that society is integrated through social integration, system integration, and begin with communicative action and saw society as the life world and

society is defined as a self-regulating system. The politics of system-integration and social integration showcased an achieved rational consensus. Thus, Habermas concludes that although each of these two broad perspectives (social and system integrations) has something to offer, both have serious limitations. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky agreed with Habermas who view society as a system that has fulfilled conditions for the maintenance of socio-cultural life-world. Moreover, Habermas sees society as being composed of both life-world and system. System in the modern world has come to control the life-world. The rationalization of the system-life world involved growth in the rationality of communicative action or communicative understanding.

Life becomes distorted by ideological constraints, monetized and bureaucratized through money and ruthless power. Like Marx, Habermas also view deception within the social life world. The problem of domination and self deception has created a systematic crisis; it might be noted that by linking the deformities to capitalism, Habermas continues, at least in this sense, to operate within a neo-Marxian terms. Habermas sees modern complex society as subject to recurrent systemic crises or systemic failures. In seeking to deal with these systemic crises, institutions such as the state as the site of class struggle and political domination, the economy undertakes actions that adversely affect the life world, leading to pathologies, paradoxes and crises within it. Basically, the life world comes to be denuded by these systems, and communicative action comes to be less and less directed toward an achieved rational consensus or goal directed action. Communicative action aims at purposive rational activity. Purposive rational activity aims at human improvement. Societies embody a rational normative order and they express the essential rationality to the fullest degree possible. The chief task of philosophy as far as Marx and Habermas are concerned is the critique of modernity. This state or society produces religion, which is an inverted world consciousness. In this way, religion preserved the normative ideal social order of which it is a by-product of rational society. Michael Rosen believes that “once the criticism of religion has done its work, philosophy must move on to unmask human self alienation in its secular

forms”.⁷⁶ Marx and Habermas contend that philosophy has both a critical role to play in exposing the illusions of religion and an affirmative one in establishing an ideal human fulfillment. Marx and Habermas tend to address the problems of modernity.

Habermas, too, does not look back to archaic societies where non-rationalized system and life world are unified but looked at a future state involving the far more satisfying unification of rationalized system and life world. Habermas also re-interpreted the Marxian theory of basic struggles within society. The hope for the future clearly lies in resistance to the encroachments on the life world and in the creation of a world in which system and life world are in synergy or harmony and serves to mutually enrich one another to a historically unprecedented degree. Habermas’ theory of communicative rationality is based on social interaction, moral order and the normative ideal social order. The conceptual justification of the rationalization of society championed by Marx and Habermas is basically anchored on normative social structures and the critique of modernity.

George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky believe that “social systems have grown increasingly complex, distorted, differentiated, disintegrated and characterized by instrumental reason”.⁷⁷ A rationalized society should be one in which both system and life world are permitted to synergistically rationalize, following their, own internal logics. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky posit that “the rationalization of system and life world lead to a society with material abundance and control over its environments as a result of rational systems and one of the truth, goodness and beauty stemming from a rational life world”(2014). We have been denied of the good things of life due to the plethora of irrationalities and the state of anomie bedeviling our contemporary social world. Our social structural conditions have been transcended into that of ideological distortion of our humanity. We have virtually loss the sacredness of our humanity. The project of modernity is an unfinished project waiting to be completed by the power of rationality, and rationality has its own limitations which simply deny us the enrichment of life. For Habermas, the completion of modernity’s project is the rationality of the system and the life world without

one destroying the other. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky argue that Habermas' contemporary problems cannot be solved by systems learning to function better. Rather, impulses from the life-world must be able to enter into the self steering of functional systems. The system life world has drastically undergone an internal colonization. Marx believes that human society is characterized by internal contradictions. Society has been distorted due to the preponderance of self deception and lack of consistent internal logic of rationality in society- in our modern or contemporary society; this is the limits of rationality. Habermas' theory of communicative action is embedded in his theory of the rationalization of society and it has Marxian orientation. The Marxist doctrine is a strand of its own ideology. Lawhead opines that, "to summarize, ideologies are (1) cultural expressions, that, (2) represents a society's self understanding, but that, (3) present a distorted view of reality and (4) that serve to maintain and justify the power structure" . In Marx's view, philosophers are nothing but the unwitting tools of the reigning power structure...Marx suggests that in all ideology human beings and their circumstances appear upside down".⁷⁸

In addition, rationalization is an historical fact of socio-cultural processes. Rationality tends to understand the world as a meaningful cosmos. Rationality is embodied in the normative ideals and social structures. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky (2014) argue that rationality is seen as the key process in the world today. Philosophical sociology's problem is that of excessive fragmentation of the system and the life-world. The rational being makes a model of social life possible which it expects to actualize through institutionalize deliberation. Broadly speaking, in order to achieve moral consciousness, public happiness and deliberative model of democracy, rationalization of society is the key to human emancipation. Social theorists remind us that the individual is thus sent fort into a social world whereby his spirit seeks the collective happiness through a pragmatics of communicative action and social interaction. The Habermasian analysis of communicative reasoning presupposes an undistorted communication and moral order as a normative ideal social order.

Rationalization bears on the social and physical environment and is directed towards a regulations, control, and ultimate mastery of the collective body. The process of rationalization represents the progress of reasoning in society and signified an increase in awareness of the Enlightenment democratic vision. The critical analysis of rationality is the realm of values, norms, of justice, freedom, beauty, and goodness that lie beyond instrumental reason.

Rationalization has precipitated ideological discontent and disenchantment in an enchanted world and with the present as it has constantly holds out the promises of a better future. Its focus has been the cultural reproduction of efficient forms of social organization, rather than a construction of the preconditions necessary for individual or collective moral progress. Rationalization has been a global process and a process of social analysis or critical social theory. The idea of rationalization of society reveals the progress of man's contemporary social world, human emancipation or improvement or human flourishing. Rationalization occurs only in the medium of symbolic interaction. According to Habermas, "rationalization at the level of institutional framework can only occur in the medium of symbolic interaction itself, that is, through removing restrictions on communication".⁷⁹ Man, is defined by his interaction with his society governed by the complex structures of various institutions that make up that society. The relations among institutions and between individuals are regulated by a normative order that enabled them to interact successfully under a variety of contractual or conventional or rational agreement. What makes the structure of social positions come to life is role behavior or normative or legitimate expectations.

This scholar believes that "communication simply means the interchange of meanings among people. Habermas believes that "meaning has a systemic character".⁸⁰ It occurred mainly through language and is possible to the degree to which individuals have common cognitions, wants and attitudes. Our study of communication and language can best be described as critical examination of the functions of words, which make up the vocabulary of

a language. Communication occurs mainly through language. Language reflects on both the personality of the individual and the culture of his society and in turn helps shaped personality and culture. Language is the key to culture. Language makes possible the growth and transmission of cultures, the continuity of societies, and the effective functioning and control of social groups. Rationalization is the process of justifying one's wants, beliefs, and behavior when they are challenged by one self or others. The rationalization of society is characterized by complex processes including science and technology as democratic codetermination. Science and technology have an ideological underpinning. For Habermas, "the progressive "rationalization" of society is linked to the institutionalization of scientific and technical development".⁸¹ The justification takes the form of inventing reasons which the individual believed are the real reasons. Communication or language becomes the ultimate symbolization of society. A great society is that society that is built on the solid bedrock of free and open communication to use the words of Habermas. We must indeed in a collaborative effort comprehends the whole vast interlocking transformational mechanisms of politics, law, economics, aesthetics, science, and religion. Human society can only be complete and fully operational with all the necessary cogs and wheels, if we must uncover the laws which governed all human society. These societies should be regarded as laboratories, not to be studied for their sake of humankind in general, with a special eye to the needs of humanity in a global scale. The workings of society can only come to fruition or to the foreground if we can reveal the basic principles of all human social life. Society can only be fully operational if people are duly treated as persons that are rational. People want to be treated as persons, not as data, not as ends and not as means. Our humanity can only be defined by a phenomenon of free and open communication which is based on rational dialogue. The normative core of micro-macro level analysis of society (the individual vis- a-vis the community) is based on social relations and discursive practice. The complexity of human existence has an ideological underpinning. Dialogue is not crisis-driven or crisis ridden but result-oriented.

Furthermore, contemporary human society is only meaningful in the dialogic communication context of the actualization of the ideals of the common good which in turn is the proper ground for achieving the ends of complex society or social stability, progress, justice, social development and tranquility. Human society is made up of collective individuals and individuality that conduces to a proper mutual understanding of the moral and dialogical imperative of the human person. The human person is the most noble and most perfect being in all of nature and in the whole of creation. W. Barnett Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce argue that, “communication is inherently and fundamentally social. By recognizing the social nature of communication, dialogic communicators are alerted to recognize openings to invite others into dialogue”.⁸² It is the activating force of man’s freedom and reason. This interpretation of the social nature of communication reflects on purposive rational activity, and it invariably aims at human improvement, lived immediacy of the social life-world, and interpretation spurred interpretation (of itself), and a hermeneutic circle arises from this. Dialogue is the signifying signification of human sociality. Habermas accords Rawls his argument that justice affects us always on the verge of overcoming crisis ridden society even at a global scale. Habermas demands of us the inevitable thematization of inter-subjectively shared social life world from the stand point of linguistic communication or linguistic transparency. Habermas also demands of us; conceptualization and performance of our social practices. These are epistemological questions that required a systematic perspective. The notion of a just politics has meant different things according to the form of the state (absolute, totalitarian and liberal). Given his occasional evocation of a pluralistic being, Habermas argued that justice is marked by the trace of inter-subjective moral responsibility which accords relatively well with liberal theories of political justice and protection of individual or basic human rights.

Furthermore, Habermas is not mainly concerned with politics because he considered human society to be inherently evil, deceptive and politics has been overburdened and contributed to this plethora of hopeless amorality in our global- world-system. Accordingly,

Habermas believes that “clearly, politics has become overburdened by problems that are worldwide, and now also internally proliferating”.⁸³ The individuals live in multiple social associations, which imposed a host of responsibilities on them. Habermas’ ethical philosophy is indeed cultural humanism and cultural pluralism or cultural rationalism. This pluralist cultural existence is inevitable to individuals in their social relation and transformative international interaction. In the area of global politics, Habermas never decide whether politics meant war or a real possibility of normative peace. In his theory of politics, Habermas’ communicative ethics is more favourable to the democratic constitutional state, which is characterized by radical-liberal model, and evinces palpable aspects of the trace to international politics. Habermas’ theory of democracy has a normative background and is applicable to the Anglo-American tradition.

Justice forms the normative core of complex modern society. In that respect it has a distinctive political dimension. Habermas’ remarks on global politics were contemporaneous and, at times, idiosyncratic. Habermas’ ethical philosophy is political but it is embedded in political inclinations. Politics is largely synonymous with humanity, the monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power.

Habermas insists that the rational relation is on the premise of moral agreement and epistemological significance. The communicative relation is essentially rational and a normative character. In society, ethical subject is engaged in a sincere and sober political discourse. The idea of global politics does not violate, but conditions non-violence, that is, it established the ethics of global peace. Philosophy aims at human emancipation, normative reason which required the justification of normative conclusions. For Jeremy Wisnewsky, “philosophy thus aims at emancipation and at the enrichment of our socio-political position”.⁸⁴ However, Habermas concludes that “rationalization means, first of all, the extention of the areas of society subject to the criteria of rational decision”.⁸⁵ The hermeneutics of global peace or global order assumed the exaltation of basic human rights and the justification of the nonmilitarization of the international community for the sake of

the flow of communication among reasonable citizens. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that, the term “‘global justice’ encapsulates debates over human rights, the justification of military intervention, and the international distribution of resources”.⁸⁶ Communicative action as role playing reflects on the significance of international relation or international interaction. It showcases global action of peace. According to Habermas, “action becomes a process of rational adaptation to conditions”.⁸⁷

5.5 Dialogue, Social Change and Global Democracy

Dialogue can bring about change in terms of the idea of global politics. Politics tends to serve humanity as a process. Global politics leads to global order. Habermas’ conceptual explication of deliberative democracy reflects the idea of global democracy. Global democracy constitutes the tendency whereby different countries in the world are interdependently connecting with one another in their political, educational, social, cultural and economic interests. Global democracy is a cross border movement of contemporary ideal political world order and comparative politics among countries in the world and how they can benefit from one another through social cooperation and the normative context of international interaction. Global democracy aims at global order and social change in the international systems. Its major objective is to aim at an emancipated global society of human flourishing and international justice; the protection of human rights as a “transnational and universal character”. Global democracy aims at ensuring human progress at a global level and human emancipation across the globe. The contemporary global politics focuses on the continuous protection of basic human rights, the global movement as a result of climate change, the perpetuation of international peace and international cooperation at the social, economic, cultural and political spheres. The world is a global village and it should be seen as such; a global village where rational or authentic dialogue prevails by doing away with all forms of prevailing prejudices or ideological biases or pre-conceived ideas facing various nations of the world. Global democracy reflects on international dialogue, social change and democracy. Social change is a significant aspect of human transformation in contemporary

society. According to Joan Ferrante, in his book *Sociology: A Global Perspective* defines social change as:

Any significant alteration, modification, or transformation in the reorganization and operation of social life... Social change has become a very important sociological and philosophical topic. The lists of topics in social change are virtually endless. It involved changes in how people communicate; changes in how people govern themselves, changes in the goods, and services produced by various nations of the world.⁸⁸

Change takes place through the human agent whereby labour becomes the epitome of specie-being. Karl Marx explains that the liberty or freedom of man is expressed in labour activity. Habermas believes that the liberty or freedom of man is based on free and open communication. There is no doubt that human liberty and freedom is the agency of growth, progress, development and civilization. Man, through his exercise of freedom can change his environment and the global society itself. In global society, change results from human and non human events. For Joan Ferrante, “change results from a sequence of events”.⁸⁹ The idea of social change correlated with the notion of globalization and global politics what is otherwise known as Giddian dialogic democracy; although globalization has tactically fueled communicative violence. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “globalization seems to inject fuel into spiraling movement of communicative violence”.⁹⁰ Social change is predicated on cross border movement what is otherwise known as global interdependence or global dialogue. The story of globalization is embedded within a virtually endless stream of an interrelated chain of events. We can nevertheless identify some key factors that facilitate cross border movements of goods, services, money, people, information, and culture. Global democracy is the politics of transnational or universal integration of different countries of the world to forge ahead with a common purpose of social coordination, ideal contemporary political order, economic improvement of society, human emancipation at a global scale, and intercultural dialogue. Communicative action aimed at emancipation. Communicative action aims at what Giovanna Borradori calls the “delegitimizing the authority of the state”.⁹¹

Furthermore, the earth is a globe whereby people thus becomes what Giovanna Borradori “calls members of a universal and cosmopolitan community. Habermas’ defense of

universalism in ethical and political theory stems from the possibility of rationality justifying individual as well as public consensus".⁹² One very cardinal themes in Habermas' conception of a new cosmopolitan order is the question of legitimacy and nationalism. The impediment to global change is terrorism. For Giovanna Borradori, "the question of nationalism lies at the center of Habermas' discussion of terrorism. Global terrorism is epitomized by paradoxical and tragic implications and does not express realistic political objectives".⁹³ For global democracy to thrive, Habermas establishes the boundaries between truthful communication and mendacious communication. Giovanna Borradori aligns herself with the Habermasian model that "solidarity and the social bond are a structural function of communication-the nature of our interests in others and the reach of political involvement. Rational communicative exchange aimed at or reinforced both engagement in the democratic process and commitment to social justice".⁹⁴

5.6 Contemporary Relevance of Dialogue and Systems Paradigm for Rational Society.

Dialogue brings to the foreground the medium of conflict resolution, social consciousness and it is two way human communications. Dialogue bring to the fore dynamic interplay of interpersonal human relationship, the quality of interpersonal communicative reasoning and the nature of the underlying shared normative background of meanings in which humans interact. Dialogue has been regarded as the social nature of human intersubjective existence. Habermas' conception of communicative action aimed at conversation and dialogue. According to Giovanna Borradori, "Habermas' approach to the political and ethical realms of communicative action is ruled by dialogue and rational argument. The emphasis on rational argumentation as the ultimate condition for justice is the central theme of Habermas' philosophical approach".⁹⁵ Habermas concludes that communicative exchange is aimed at what Giovanna Borradori calls "the democracy of everyday speech".⁹⁶ Communicative freedom aims at the formulation of rational argument. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that," rationality provides the structure as well as the scope of communication. Communicative action is Habermas's name for the residue of rationality

built into our everyday exchange”.⁹⁷ Communicative action is emancipatory and it is all about rational discourse. Accordingly, Giovanna Borradori believes that “Habermas makes the term “discourse” the corner stone of his communicative approach to ethics and political philosophy”.⁹⁸ The conceptualization of dialogue presupposed one of the theories of communication. The virtue of dialogue includes optimal strategy and normative possibility, peace making, conflict resolution, community building, inter-personal relation, global world order and personal development. Dialogue can bring about change in our international system. Authentic dialogue can bring about the normative background for the communication models of liberal democracy. Dialogue brings to the fore the possibility of communicative consociation (the ability to associate via the use of language), constitutive/transformational association or sociative mechanism and seeing this as a first step in exploring the potential for enriching dialogic practice from the basis of communication theory. Taking the communication perspective involved deeply textured clusters of persons-in-conversation. Dialogue has been a form of communication pattern with principled disinterest toward rational society. In rational society, dialogue brings about significant change in the social worlds of political participants. The dialogic argument is the argument that events and objects are only patterns of communication. Dialogue is a normative assumption that everything is a matter of polarized opposites. Dialogue is a multi-level analysis and bi-polar analysis of human conversation. The dialogic perspective constitutes a pattern of reciprocated communicative action. Dialogue brings to the foreground open-mindedness and deep expansive collective thinking. The dialogic communication embodies expansive thinking and the simplification of complex issues. Dialogic relation represents or produces social structure, normative texture, and it represents cultural values, beliefs, goals, and the like are formulated and lived. Dialogue constitutes basic normative structure and direct our attention on how the events and objects of our social world are made. The idea of dialogue brings about change in our global society. Dialogue is seen as a means of social interaction and the social construction of global reality of human interpersonal relation.

Moreover, our world society has undergone gross stratification and divided lines showcases by the problem of culture. Giovanna Borradori concludes and aligns herself with the Habermasian standpoint that “Habermas views the rigid stratification as the root of the collapse of intersubjective dialogue. The world politics is undergoing an important shift. The driving and mobilizing force in today’s conflicts apart from power and money is culture”.⁹⁹ Communicative dialogue is emphatically anchored on the force of better argument. Giovanna Borradori concludes in her book *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida* that “...the force of a better argument can thus only flourish in a democratically regulated context in which individuals feel empowered enough to discuss the validity of the rules by which they abide”.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, we have made some few references to Kant, Heidegger and Levinas in relation to the Habermasian picture. Although, Habermas do not devote any full text on the issue of global world order, his distinctive contributions toward envisaging global world order has been clearly demonstrated in all of his sociological and philosophical works.

5.7 Amartya Sen’s, John Rawls’ and Robert Nozick’s Entitlement Theory of Justice and the Nigeria Paradox

The Habermasian project has a great role to play in terms of its relevance to the Nigerian society. Habermas has provided the norms for Nigerian society to key into the process of global order. This discourse attempts a comparative analysis of the idea of the common good and entitlement theory of justice in Amartya Sen, Robert Nozick and John Rawls and their contemporary relevance to the Nigerian society. Sen’s and Rawls’ and Nozick’s conceptual analysis of entitlement theory of justice presupposes an economic and political implications of the causes of democratic failures in the Nigerian society in particular and African societies at large. The major problems with Nigerian society is lack of equal distribution of natural resources due to the menace of corruption and greed.

Amartya Sen's economic analysis has a political implication. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "Sen's emphasis on the political is important in allowing us to see that what may be required of us as individuals does not necessarily correspond to what is required of us as citizens"¹⁰¹. What these scholars are postulating is that countries like Nigeria does not really care about the people's welfare which supposed to be the main objective of any reasonable government. The Nigerian person as an individual is usually sideline by a selected few who try to hijack the politico –economic system.

John Hoffman and Paul Graham assume that democratic societies have both the information flows and the political incentives to respond properly to food shortages or crises. The present Nigerian society is facing an economic instability or drawback and Amartya Sen maintains that purchasing power of an affected group of peoples like Nigerians is understood out of the context of the entire social, economic, and political structure. According to Amartya Sen's position cited by John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "what matters is not food production but entitlements. (Amartya Sen; 1999:162). However, John Hoffman and Paul Graham, adumbrate that, "what matters is not food production but entitlements, meaning the ownership and command of commodities. Entitlement is determined by endowment, production possibilities, and exchange conditions"¹⁰². John Hoffman and Paul Graham looking at Amartya's translation believe that "politics and mutual sympathy are important"¹⁰³. The empirical analysis of Amartya's political dimension presupposes his moral questions and economic theory.

Amartya Sen tries to make explicit the idea of moral questions in all of his political cum economic writings. The empirical analysis of Amartya's Sen's political implications presupposes the fundamentals about economic development and morality. Nigeria is a complex nation-state and it requires interpersonal coordination or concerted effort in terms of her social interaction and economic planning and national development. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham, "following Amartya's Sen's position believe that "complex

situations require coordination. We have to hand over responsibility to the state”.¹⁰⁴ Amartya Sen’s analysis of moral theory and its political implications presupposes the global redistribution of human and material resources. Nigeria’s redistribution of resources or basic needs of the people falls short of the economic theory of these scholars discussed in this subsection. The issue of redistribution of resources in the Nigerian society has been a fundamental issue in her political and economic processes.

John Hoffman and Paul Graham, conclude that “our every day lives does not translate directly or straight forwardly into duties to redistribute goods across national communities”.¹⁰⁵ Sen’s analysis of moral theory can be said to be too demanding and a comparative analysis between Sen and Rawls is quite relevant and critical to the Nigerian situation in terms of need for the redistribution of primary goods due to prevailing prejudices and ideological distortion and biases. The burdens of ethnicity, corruption has been the bane to the Nigerian project for national development and economic growth. John Hoffman, and Paul Graham believe that “the derivation of politics from morality is simplistic.”¹⁰⁶ As observed by John Hoffman and Paul Graham that:

Famines do not occur in democratic countries. Even when there is enough food in a country to feed everyone there can be starvation because it is that capacity to buy food rather than its availability that is the key determinant of adequate nutrition in a competitive democracy, with a free press and media, pressure is placed on the government to put in place measures to deal with the immediate food needs of the population and institute longer – term economic measures to restore.¹⁰⁷

Rawls idea of the primary good, has ethical and political implications to the Nigerian situation. Rawls theory of justice as fairness has huge impact on his political thought and economic/moral theory. He advocates a moral explanation on the redistribution of resources in human society. This Rawlsian ethical and political implications has not been able to address the existential situation of the Nigerian state where corruption and greed has eaten deep into the fabric of the Nigerian society. Rawls’ conception of the redistribution of resources does not only showcase just distribution of material resources but the freedom and the political rights/power of the Nigerian people. Rawls’ conceptualization of justice

presupposes an egalitarian society. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham (2009), “Rawls tries to revive the classical idea of the social contract traditions of Locke, Rousseau, and Kant. Rawls’ moral and political theories border on the justification and the distribution of the ‘benefits’ and ‘burdens’ of cooperation under a political state.”¹⁰⁸

Furthermore, John Hoffman and Paul Graham, rightly observe that, Rawls’ moral and political theory aims at unanimity. The provision of the primary goods or what we may also refer to the basic need, if applied to the Nigerian society is problematic due to the existing or prevailing injustices and prejudices amongst the different ethnic groups in Nigeria. Using the consensus approach is not feasible. What is required of us is change in Nigeria’s value system and attitudinal change. The personhood of the Nigerian person has been distorted, balkanised and dehumanized. What is important to us as Nigerians is the re-evaluation of our value systems, norms, cultures and traditions. There is nothing wrong with Nigerian cultures. Infact, Nigeria has one of the best cultures in the world. Although, no culture is subservient or inferior to another. What is important to us as Nigerians is to harmonise our culture and differences. Nigerian problem of social, economic and political problems is based on the human factor of egotistical calculation, greed and corruption. The idea of the common good which is a Rousseauian moral code is problematic in Nigeria because the primary goods which are human basic needs are not properly or equitably shared or distributed by the Nigerian people due to man’s inhumanity to man. Is there anything fundamentally wrong with Nigeria or in particular and the African community in general? The fundamental answer is emphatically ‘no’.

My position is that the ways Nigerians can improve in the sharing of the common good is what John Hoffman and Paul Graham in their book *Introduction to Political Theory* (2009) will call “mutual empathy”¹⁰⁹ the Nigerian predicament should be resolved through persuasion, mutual trust, tolerance, mutual empathy, solidarity, purity of motives, honesty of purpose and dialogue. We should be honest with ourselves, scholars should not stop at the

point of theorizing but to see how their theories can be dialectically linked with practice. What are those factors that can mitigate the myriad of problems of social order in Nigeria? These include putting aside the spirit of pride, taming the human nature, imbibing the spirit of solidarity or common front and rational dialogue. Dialogue can only help to resolve myriad of crises in Nigeria if we as Nigerians imbibe the spirit of trust, empathy and tolerance.

Furthermore, dialogue, for instance, is not really feasible due to the complexities of the Nigerian structures vis-a-vis the causes of religious bigotry and ethnic crises or clashes as the underlining conditions that is destroying the basic structures in Nigeria. However, the drawbacks to African practice of deliberative democracy has been the inability to address the basic normative structures of the contemporary African Community. A comparative analysis of Rawl's and Nozick's entitlement theory of justice has a meeting point with Sen's conception of re-distribution of resources. Their meeting point presupposes the theory of justice and entitlement. Every human being must be endowed to meet certain entitlements. *Nemo dat quod non habet* (you cannot give what you do not have). John Hoffman and Paul Graham (2009) posit that "the right to private property is that the legally sanctioned (or morally legitimate) appropriation of things."¹¹⁰ For Nozick, the entitlement theory of justice presupposes three parts;

Part 1: just acquisition

Part 2: just transfer

Part 3: rectification (Hoffman and Graham; 2009:89).

Finally, Sen's, Rawls' and Nozick's entitlement theory of justice presupposes the promotion of the common good. One string runs through these scholars in their entitlement theory of justice, this is what John Hoffman and Paul Graham (2009) call "the promotion of the common good."¹¹¹ Nigerians should deem it fit to promote the common good or the primary good as the basic needs of the Nigerian people. The Rawlsian conception of equal

liberty and equal opportunity and his difference – principle should be applied to the Nigerian situation.

In addition, Robert Nozick provides an alternative to Rawls' liberal and egalitarian theory. Nozick's emphasis has been on the importance of private property rights (2009:89). Nozick in his book *Anarchy, State and Utopia* defends a minimal state. According to John Hoffman and Paul Graham "a minimal state is a monopoly provider of security services. A more extensive state –one that intervenes in the economy and supplies of welfare benefits – can not be justified. 'Utopia' would be a world in which diverse lifestyles and communities would flourish under the protection of the minimal state".¹¹²

Rawls' liberal, egalitarian, and moral conception of justice as fairness justifies the institutions of a constitutional democracy. Rawls' conception of a just social, economic and political system is developed within the idea of an impartial social contract. Rawls' posits that the most reasonable basis for social unity is a public conception of justices. Rawls' and Habermas' democratic social contract condition seems to anchor on a strong equality condition along sole moral conditions in agreement (that principle be universal, general, publicly known, final and so on). (Samuel Freeman; 1998:106).

The idea of justice as fairness designates a common good that provides the end of democratic legislation. Rawls' conception of justice as fairness reflects on the fact that justice has priority over efficiency (Samuel Freeman; 1998: 108). The role of Rawls' conception of justice is to maximize aggregate utility (Freeman; 1998: Ibid). Rawls' appeals to principles of moral psychology to show how citizens in a well-ordered society can acquire a settled disposition to act on and from the principles of justice (Samuel Freeman; 1998:108).

Rawls' moral psychology assumes the common good of justice and the benefits of social cooperation. It reflects on the circumstances of a well ordered society that describes optimal conditions for exercising one's sense of justice, it is rational to want to cultivate the virtue of justice for its own sake and achieve moral autonomy (1998:108). Rawls' conception

of justice as fairness does not only showcase a metaphysical conception of rational persons, but a practical account of the conditions of political exigency; but that which is grounded in the moral powers of persons (Freeman; 1998:108). Rawls' conception of justice is politically justified (Freeman; 1998:109) and "it showcases citizens of a well-ordered democracy and comprehensive ethical doctrine"¹¹³.

Samuel Freeman (1998:109) assumes that the reasonable comprehensive doctrines of rational society is gaining adherents in a well-ordered society.

Jonathan Wolff (1998:45) believes that "the centerpiece of Nozick's libertarianism, however, is his theory of distributive justice. Jonathan Wolff concludes that Nozick instead gives most attention to the principle of justice transfer, which essentially states that a transfer is just if, and only if, it is voluntary. Its contention is that only his theory properly respects liberty"¹¹⁴. Jonathan Wolff, therefore, asserts that, libertarianism is intended to provide a set of background rights and duties for society, but people may enter into whatever voluntary arrangements they wish.

The Nigerian paradox is caused by the problem of leadership and loss of values. A good leadership structure determines the direction of any society.

Wangari Muta Maathai posits that:

What has held Africa back, and continues to do so, has its origins in a lack of principled, ethical leadership. Leadership is an expression of a set of values; its presence, or lack of it, determines the direction of a society, and affects not only the actions but the motivations and visions of the individuals and communities that make up that society.¹¹⁵

Finally, the Nigerian paradox can only be addressed or resolved through the possibility of shared common understanding or mutual understanding and common good in Nigerian contemporary society.

5.7.1 Dialogue, Culture and Identity in Kwame Anthony Appiah's Cosmopolitan Ethics and the Nigerian Situation

Appiah's cosmopolitan ethics is understood from his moral and political theory. Appiah's philosophy of language presupposes the Habermasian picture. Appiah believes in the issue of cultural identity, world citizenship, intellectual and cultural interchange. Appiah's conception of culture is ultimately preceded by the efficacy of intellectual and cultural interchange. Appiah's philosophy is similar with the philosophy of Amartya Sen, John Rawls, Robert Nozick to a great extent. He believes that Nation-states must assume social, moral, political and economic responsibility for their citizens. Nigeria as a country must key into this Appiah's take on cosmopolitan ethics. Appiah's conceptual analysis of cosmopolitan ethics is very appealing and normative. The Nation-states must respect, provide for and protect their citizens. Appiah's cosmopolitan ethics reflects on the idea of moral accountability

Appiah's conception of cosmopolitanism as "universality plus difference" summarizes the need for the ethics of global dialogue whereby difference is allowed to flourish. Building from this precedence, different cultures are to be respected. Practicing a world citizenship and conversation is not only helpful even in the aftermath of 9/11 world. Appiah's take on ideology, cultural differences are to be respected in so far as they are not harmful or injurious to people. In his book *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (2006), Appiah introduces two ideas to the notion of cosmopolitanism. The two ideas are;

- (1) we have obligations to others more than just sharing world citizenship.
- (2) we should not take for granted the value of life and become governed by the practices and beliefs of others.

Appiah's cosmopolitan ethics reminds us the need for Nigeria's quest for moral reevaluation or moral revolution and rebirth. Nigeria as a Nation-state has virtually lose every

elements of her cultures and identity. What Nigeria is experiencing today is identity crisis, loss of our value system and crisis of relevance. Appiah's cosmopolitan philosophy reflects on the need for Nigeria as a country; philosophy reflects on the need for Nigeria as a country to look inward and to place its search light on moral rebirth, cultural identity, value-system, the provision for, the promotion of the common good and respect for the life of the other human person. The idea of the common good presupposes reciprocal relationship. Accordingly, Asouzu I (2003) believes that:

It is one thing to refer to the common good as the legitimizing foundation of our interests and another thing for it to be really so... it is within the context of reciprocity as we encounter it in every situation of interaction that the idea of common good shows itself as the necessary condition for any form of meaningful interpersonal relationship. This exploration seeks therefore to remove the difficulty that might be associated with our understanding of our interests in relation to the common good. This difficulty arises because of over-concentration on a persons' interest alone. Over concentration on one's interest raises the impression that human interaction does not necessarily aim at reciprocity, while in the final analysis the aim of interaction is reciprocity. The common good is the foundation on which any form of reciprocity is erected.¹¹⁶

However, reciprocity is defined "within a common framework of action and meaning."¹¹⁷ Finally, the findings that emanates from this chapter has been that normative questions of democratic legitimacy and nationalism reflected on Habermas' conception of terrorism. Dialogue requires contact. Dialogue should be the fundamental instrument of the ethics of global peace. Violence is a disruption to the project of humanity. International communicative interaction requires synergies among nation-states across the globe. The radical transformation of the progress of humanity requires a systematic approach of global political order.

Endnotes

1. Camille Marquis, *Habermas, Dialogue, and Change in the International System*, King's College London, March, 2013, pp.1-7.
2. *Ibid.*,
3. *Ibid.*,
4. Ferrante, Joan, *Sociology: A Global Perspective, Fifth Edition*, (USA: Wordsworth & Thomson Learning, 2003), p.512.
5. Eyisi, J., Language: *A Foundation for Political Socialization in Odimegwu I et al*, (Eds), *Philosophy, Democracy and Globalization*, Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, 2006, p. 120.
6. *Ibid.*,
7. *Ibid.*, p.124.
8. Habermas, Jurgen, *Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Life-world and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987b), p.5.
9. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. x.
10. *Ibid.*, p. xii-xiii.
11. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
15. Habermas Jurgen, *The Philosophical Discourses of Modernity*, trans.Fredrick G. Lawrence, (Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1987) , p.14.
16. *Op., cit.*,
17. *Loc., cit.*,
18. *Loc., cit.*,
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.
20. *Loc., cit.*,
21. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
23. *Loc., cit.*,
24. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
25. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p. 17.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
28. Habermas Jurgen, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, p.50.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
30. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p.14.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
36. *Ibid.*, p.40.
37. *Op., cit.*,
38. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

39. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p.46.
40. *Op., cit.,*
41. *Op., cit.,*
42. *Ibid.,* p. 47.
43. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, p. 13.
44. *Loc., cit.,*
45. *Ibid.,* p. 14.
46. *Ibid.,* p. 15.
47. *Ibid.,* p. 18.
48. *Ibid.,* p. 20.
49. *Loc., cit.,*
50. *Ibid.,* p. 22.
51. *Ibid.,* p. 25.
52. *Ibid.,* p. 26.
53. *Ibid.,* p. 28.
54. *Ibid.,* p. 29.
55. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p. 75.
56. *Ibid.,* p. 77.
57. *Ibid.,* pp. 77-78.
58. *Op., cit.,*
59. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, p. 30.
60. *Loc., cit.,*
61. *Ibid.,* p. 32.
62. *Loc., cit.,*
63. *Ibid.,* p. 33.
64. *Loc., cit.,*
65. *Ibid.,* p. 36.
66. *Ibid.,* p. 38.
67. *Ibid.,* p. 41.
68. *Ibid.,* p. 43.
69. Habermas, Jurgen, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nicholse, (Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press, 1983), pp. 4-5.
70. Mondin, Battista, *Philosophical Anthropology*, (India, Bangalore.: Theological Publication of India, 1985), p.145.
71. *Ibid.,*
72. Cohen, Martin, *Political Philosophy from Plato to Mao, Second Edition*, (London: Pluto Press, 2008), pp. 228-229.
73. Paine, Thomas, *Rights of Man*, (Great Britain: Wordsworth Edition Limited, 1996), p.123.
74. *Ibid.,*
75. *Ibid.,*
76. Rosen, Michael, Karl Marx in Edward Craig, (Ed), (1998) in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Volume 4, (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), pp.118-133.
77. Ritzer, George, and Stepnisky, Jefferey, *Sociological Theory*, Ninth Edition, (Singapore: Mc-Graw Hill Higher Education Limited, 2014) p.514.
78. Lawhead, William, *Voyage of Discovery: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy, Second Edition*, (USA: Wadsworth Group Limited, 2002), p.390.
79. Habermas, Jurgen, *Toward Rational Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), p.118.
80. *Ibid.,* p. 81.

81. *Ibid.*,
82. W. Barnett Pearce and Kimberly A. Pearce, *Taking a Communication Perspective on Dialogue* in Anderson, R, Baxter, L.A, and Cissna, K.N., (Eds) (2003). *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage, pp. 39-56.
83. Habermas., Jurgen., *A Berlin Republic: Writings on Germany*, trans. Steven Rendall, Introduction by Peter Uwe Hohendahl, (London: The University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p.157.
84. Wisnewsky, J. Jeremy, *Wittgenstein Ethical Enquiry: A Defense of Ethics as Clarification*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006), p.88.
85. Habermas, Jurgen, *Towards A Rational Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, Boston: Beacon Press, 1970, pp.80-84.
86. Hoffman, John, and Graham Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition*, (England: Pearson Education Limited, 2009), p. 473.
87. Habermas, Jurgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Life-world and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987b) p. 210.
88. Ferrante, J., *Sociology: A Global Perspective, Fifth Edition*, p. 513.
89. *Ibid.*,
90. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p.64.
91. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
92. *Ibid.*, pp.55-62.
93. *Op.*, *cit.*,
94. *Op.*, *cit.*,
95. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
98. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, p. 68.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
100. *Ibid.*, pp. 180-181.
101. Hoffman J, and Graham, P *Introduction to Political Theory*, p. 476.
102. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
103. *Ibid.*, p. 477.
104. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
105. *Op.*, *cit.*,
106. *Op.*, *cit.*,
107. *Ibid.*, p. 82.
108. *Loc.*, *cit.*,
109. *Op. cit.*,
110. *Ibid.*, p. 90
111. *Ibid.*, p. 89
112. *Op. cit.*,
113. Freeman S., John Rawls' in Edward Craig (ed.,) in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) pp 108 – 109.
114. Wolff J., Robert Nozick in Edward Craig (ed.,) in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (London and New York: Roulledge, 1998) pp 45 – 46.
115. Maathai., M.W., *The Challenge for Africa: A New Vision*, (London: William Heinemann, 2009) p. 25.

116. Asouzu., I., *Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of the Human Interest: The Nigerian Paradox in a Complementary Perspective*, Calabar: The University of Calabar Press, 2003, p. 79.
117. *Ibid.*, p.80

CHAPTER SIX

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Critical Evaluation

This intellectual discourse has shown the inextricable link between language, communication and global political order to human rationality. The central notion of Habermas' work offers fundamental critiques of social condition and the problem of social order. Habermas' work is emphatically the critiques of culture and politics. It presupposes the moral dimension of human activity and epistemological significance; the act of knowing, speaking and acting. Habermas proves to have a more comprehensive view on language and practice in terms of his Wittgensteinian standpoint and his conception of deliberative democracy. Habermas traces the link between discursive communication and constitutional democracy. In concluding this work we will summarize Habermas' discursive communication and democratic theory and point to the problem areas in contemporary global political order caused by terror and terrorism.

The core findings of this research work basically includes the following adumbrated below;

1. Communicative action is characterized by better argument and the need for normative presupposition and criticizable validity claims. The Habermasian tradition can bring about the fact that human society is deeply rooted in linguistic and epistemological significance. Communicative action is all about the establishment of interpersonal relation through speaking and acting.
2. The phraseologies "communicative discourse" or "reasoned communication" cannot be undermined and has been a fundamental tool for global order or new cosmopolitan order; it is the transvaluation of the Kant' categorical imperative and the transnationalization of justice. Habermas' idea on communicative rationality in society showcases the importance of reasoned communication and the need for rational liberal dialogues which cuts across national and global borders.

Rationalization is an historical fact of socio-cultural processes. Rationality tends to understand the system-life world as a meaningful cosmos.

3. Rationalization bears on the social facts and physical environment and it is directed towards a regulation, control, and ultimate mastery of the collective body or collective destiny. Rationalization has been a global process and a process of social analysis. The process of rationalization represents the process of reasoned or dialogic communication and the promises of a better future.

4. The critical analysis of rationality is the realm of progress, values, norms, justice, freedom, beauty, and goodness that lie beyond instrumental reason. Rationalization of society depicts the common social world whereby the community seeks the collective happiness through pragmatics of systematically undistorted communication and social interaction.

Furthermore, human society is only meaningful in the context of the actualization of the ideals of the common good in which the proper ground for achieving the ends of society or social stability, progress, justice, social development and tranquility is attained. The human person is the most noble and most perfect rational being in all of nature and in the whole of creation. Language is a part and parcel of the process of rational discourse. Language is a rational discourse and it involves intelligibility. Rationality is a critical issue that deals with philosophy. The theory of rationality hinges on reaching mutual understanding in a system-life world. Habermas posits that the theory of rationality of beliefs and actions is a theme usually dealt with in philosophy. The ultimate goal of dialogue is the fusion of horizons. The main question is whether such fusion is possible in the dialogical engagement of individuals in society. The truth of dialogical commitment reveals the individualistic normative framework of human basic rights. Dialogic communication is based on a perspective or a normative framework from which the defense of human well being can be formulated. The truth claims behind the notion of basic human rights is the defense of human well being. Even though there can be disagreements on the content of the notion of well being, still it

refers to a certain common understanding of the flourishing of human beings as individuals and as group.

The possibility of the Gadamerian “fusion of horizons” is based on the radical openness, in dialogue, to moral resources and truth claims in which we defend human flourishing in both cultural and anthropological tradition. Moral claims or resources and truth claims are related to the value of humanity found in all cultural traditions. Truth claims are criticizable validity claims. They are criticizable validity claims where there is the yes/no positions that are generally accepted or rejected in society. Reason exists and it is the form and substance of the rational man and the rationalization of society and it is the solid bedrock of free and open communication. Global transformation needs the interpretation of the notion of communicative reason. The global reality is that this new age is faced with the circumstance, events and major changes in the social, political, economic, and cultural environment of one nation-state affecting the environment of many other nation-states and global communities. The world has entered into one of the most critical global crises of our generation. What is very critical or vital to us in our contemporary social world is the human degradation across the globe. There is no gain saying the fact that natural forces, threaten human welfare. We as human beings are facing a world crisis and many of us will be walking through our personal crisis as a result of these broader global crises. The world is in a crisis-state. There is no crisis – free life as far as we are concerned as human beings. The knee jerk system- life world seems to be collapsing. The world economic system is spinning out of control. The whole world is in a crisis – point.

Crisis always caused the slow pace of human development. Crisis creates the opportunity for creativity. It provides a powerful motivation for change.

The critique of reason is crucial in a rational society. Habermas’ conception of the critique of reason within reason itself revealed the need for rational society to be characterized by radical reforms and rational dialogue. Communicative action required

rational dialogue. Dialogue is not just the transference of knowledge but that of double function characterized by communicative interaction in an inter-subjective world.

The critique of reason is geared towards reason itself. In Habermas' terms, a communicative rationality required rational grounding of reaching mutual understanding.

5. Rationality is common to all human persons but there is this philosophical truism that our social world is constrained by the limits of rationality, and what is required of human persons is the use of proper reasoning or cognitive capacity in all their practical everyday activities.

Man should not be as a means to an end but an end in itself. Habermas and Kant believes in international law, global peace and universal solidarity. Habermas believes that “philosophy is the guardian of rationality”.¹ The conditions of mobile, diverse, and dynamic modern complex societies are characterized by the most prominent forms of social theory – developed by the end of the nineteenth century. It is the deliberate practice of liberty and human deliberate action. Communicative action anchors on reflective modification and the cultural context of human dialogue. Communicative action theory has been a discursive rationalization and linguistic structure. Man appears as both the object and subject of contingent normalizing discourses resulting from the Foucauldian tradition of power/knowledge constellation. Communicative action reflects on the social analysis of practical and rational discourse. The normative framework of communicative rationality is a universal core, abstract, reflective, formal, and rationally grounded. Habermas' theory of communicative action reflects on ethico-rational discourse and the ‘ethical’ refers to the question of the good life.

Habermas' communicative ethics reflects interpretive paradigm and normative or rational reconstruction of society. Habermas' communicative ethics have an avowed affinity with Kantian ethics. It is a global ethics. It is the claim of learning theory to provide a universal explanatory model of society. Habermas' communicative ethics offers alternatives to the prevailing objectivism of society. Habermas' communicative ethics reflects interpretive

paradigm and normative or rational reconstruction of society. Habermas' communicative ethics has an avowed affinity with Kantian ethics. It is a global ethics. It is the claim of learning theory to provide a universal explanatory model of society. Habermas' communicative ethics offers alternatives to the prevailing objectivism of society. Rationality is a critical contemporary issue that deals with the philosophy of human association. The theory of rationality, knowledge and social theory is hinged on reaching mutual understanding in the world. Democracy is defined within the ideological framework of a well organized bureaucratic structure. Democracy, with its need for tolerance and its requirement for public consensus can only farewell during the periods of economic buoyancy. Democracy, not market economics has survived and they have gained adherents, causing many to rejoice. Habermas further assumes that the principle of practical rationality is characterized by human society. Human actions must be constrained by the laws of freedom, as it were and the empirical laws of nature. Society cannot manage to survive or strives at all in a completely barbaric and bellicose social condition. The world is not entirely inhospitable to morality. For without speech in the sense of symbolic communication, human sociality will remain at a primitive stage. Speech or language or whatever you may call it is the social construct of humans specie.

Nevertheless, though humans are bound by the general conventions of language, reason and by the requirement of not lying to one another. They retain a certain flexibility of reason and communicative action based on Others' varying right to know our thoughts. A fundamental use of speech is to regulate human use of external things by appeal to the right of disappropriation or appropriation of our moral domain. The social structural condition is the carrying pillars into the ideological and institutional system. The contemporary critical theorists are very accurate on this as it is existentially important for their concept of freedom. Thus, freedom consists in the domination of the self by oneself; it constituted self cultivation and of external nature which is based on the cognition of natural necessity. Freedom is powerful and it is necessarily a product of historical development. Freedom occurs in all

spheres of social life as a whole. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. The emancipation of man from its community formed the precondition for the emancipation of humanity as such. We focus on the contemporary meaning of communicative freedom which revealed that it reflects the nature of human reciprocal relations. Human beings by nature are not purely independent but they are interdependent. This originates in the nature of social relations and reflects the fact that our practical everyday lived experience is dependent on one another through intersubjective recognition. The mutuality makes up the normative core of the concept of interdependence as mutual freedom. The interdependence concept of freedom suggests further that individuals can only be free if the society as a whole is free. Habermas offers the best contemporary statement of logical entailment. Habermas has made a defense of basic human rights against cultural relativism. Habermas has been pessimistic about the consequences of modernity. The growth in consciousness of basic human rights is one of the achievements of communicative rationality. It means that human beings engaged in speech acts. Habermas argues that the emphasis on instrumentalization – or what he called “systematic rationality – ignored the positive achievements of modernity.

None-the-less, the criticizable validity claims are abstract form of our practical everyday life, and so to redeem them required appeal to a stock of culturally specific values, that means the content of basic human rights is dependent on culture and tradition. The criticizable validity claims are explicit in all human communicative action that is, they are universal. The contemporary challenge of systematic rationality seems to erode the system-life world. We assert that the primacy of individual rights is at the expense of cultural interaction or we maintain the authority of the collective over the individual. From a normative point of view, the integrity of the individual life is not guaranteed without protecting the inter-subjectively shared experiences and life contexts in which the individual person has been socialized and has formed with collective identities. The implication of Habermas’ argument is that of universal human rights. Rawls’ political theory is grounded in

human autonomy, global justice but that human autonomy itself has a collective dimension which must take into rational account cultural interpretations of human rights. Legality is central to the realization of basic human rights. Habermas' theory of law bears some resemblance to Rawls' formation of international law and international relation. Habermas's collective action theory is grounded in formal aspect of communication. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is practical rationality. Philosophy has to do with practical consciousness of human reality. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action envisages the pragmatics of social action and the role of dialogue in global ethics and socio-rational reconstruction. Hence, the importance of reason becomes very crucial to the progressive assimilation of any rational society. Reason is like the acid test of any rational society where norms, values, rules and regulations are necessarily the basis of normative expectations. Our social life condition is governed or predicated on the critique of reason. Dialogue is driven by good logical arguments and counter arguments and a discursive rationalization of society. Dialectics has its own motivation and movement. Our social life situation is given by a deeper existential wonder.

6. We have lost every sense of our common humanity. We must respect the sacredness of our humanity. Our humanity is already at a cross road. The present fundamental solution to our contemporary global crises can only be resolved by moral consciousness, universal human solidarity or international system of interaction. The major causes of global crises are economic sabotage, political instability and Islamic fundamentalism, lack of trust or mistrust and lack of tolerance. Communicative action is rational dialogue or practice. Communicative action is epitomized by tolerance and tolerance has been a tool for political, ethical and legal fronts. The fundamental solution to the plethora of human crises requires concerted effort by all and sundry. Habermas explores the implicit characterization of moral consciousness in human communicative action. Habermas reformulates the theory of communicative action in terms of the normative structures of social interaction. *Communicative Action* critically

examines the conceptual clarification and justification of morality and ethical life. The Habermasian and Kantian tradition explicates the idea of calculations of rational choice. *Communicative Action* is a theoretical analysis of Kant's two categories and rational action become transformed into rationality and reasoned communication. Habermas' work showcases the transcendent system of values and normative background of non-instrumental commitment and non instrumental character. Normative action is an organized system of instrumental action. Habermas' work is the critical examination of research in the social psychology of moral and interpersonal development and rational pedagogy. Habermas' work brings to the foreground the intuitive grasp of the basic normative presuppositions of social interaction and constitutional patriotism. Habermas and Kant share the same view on the role of moral psychology and theology to international peace or the institutionalization of international law.

Communicative action just like moral consciousness plays a crucial importance of functional transformation of rational society. Moral consciousness which is implicit in Habermas' communicative action theory brought to the foreground that moral consciousness and communicative action are like two sides of a dubious tossing coin. This brings to the foreground the idea of making the implicit becoming explicit and the explicit becoming implicit.

7. Dialogue is people oriented and it requires good neighbourliness. Dialogue has played a significant role not just at the national level but also at the global level. The indispensability of dialogue in Habermas' theory of communicative action has a way of resolving current global crises. Habermas is concerned about cosmopolitan politics or the trans-nationalization of law. Habermas' communicative ethics reveals an epistemological significance and the normative structure of language and dialogue. Language is used by communicatively competent agents to reach a common horizon of understanding. Habermas has given an explication of the meaning of objectivations that can be understood only from within the

context of communication processes. Habermas' context of communication processes is hermeneutics and rational reconstruction of human society. Although, misunderstanding is inevitable, understanding is the only live wire of any rational society. Habermas' normative validity of dialogical theory is a complementarity thesis (the compromises of interests among human persons). Habermas opines that in communicative ethics what often triggered dialogue efforts in practical everyday life is the breakdown of routine communication. Habermas believes that society is the creation of solidarity through the sacred. Habermas connects communicative ethics to the theory of social action via a critical examination of research in the social psychology, dialogical commitments and interpersonal human relationship. Habermas' critical social theory is predicated on the cultural dimension of social interaction, authentic rational dialogue, free and open communication. Habermas' communicative dialogue has to do with international relation or global system. Habermas' philosophy is intercultural dialogue, moral and cultural humanism and critical rationalism. Habermas' philosophy assumes legitimate, normative expectations, and the interactional contexts between two or more people in a process of dialogic communication in the world.

Dialogue requires contact. Language is a discursive process of human interaction through communicative, political action. Habermas' communicative, political action theory correlated with Pierre Bourdieu's philosophy of social practice. Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the politics of difference is what he refers to as social practice. Bourdieu's conception of dialogue connoted the politics of difference. Society can only progress when it is structured by certain structured re-structuring. The thesis of internal colonization can only bring about ideological distortion to the system-life world. The life world must synergize with the social system. Social system can only lead to social integration. They are like two sides of a dubious tossing coin. Symbolic violence does no society any good. It can only lead to systemic failure of the social structures of our contemporary socio-political world. Hence, the importance of reasoned communication becomes very crucial to the progressive assimilation of any contemporary rational complex society. Reason is like the acid test of any rational society

where norms, values, rules and regulations are necessarily the basis of normative ideal social order and dialogic communication. Our socio-political life world or existential condition is governed or predicated on the Socratic virtues of love, dialogue, wisdom, humility, courage, discipline, and friendship, or what we may refer to as we-feeling or we-consciousness.

Society should be governed by the precept of truth, good and beauty. For Finn Thorbjorn Hansen posits that “the greatest value a human being can ever hope for- only the Gods, Socrates would say, would be able to find and possess the truth, good and the beauty, not human beings”.² Dialogue is driven by dialectics of good logical arguments and counter arguments and a discursive reflection and language. Dialectics has its own motivation and movement. The term ‘society’ is broader than ‘human society’. It is also a reflection of an emancipated global society. In assessing the merits of communicative, political action and moral virtue we attempt to provide a more precise definition of society, we can ask whether the definition succeeded in capturing our intuitive understanding of the term, and also whether it succeeds in identifying those features of society which are most fundamental from an explanatory point of view – whether it captured the Lockean ‘real essence’ of society. One influential contemporary approach seeks to capture the idea of society by characterizing social action, or communicative community interaction, in terms of rational dialogue. Habermas affirms the normative presuppositions of social interaction that belong to the rapprochement of communicatively competent agents in any rational society. Dialogue has a continued contemporary relevance in human society. Dialogic communication serves as paradigm shift for rational society. Dialogue brings to the foreground the ideals of rational reconstruction of society. Dialogue has not been given a clearcut scholarly attention. Dialogue is multidimensional. It is that of double function. It is not just the transference of knowledge but that of achieving attainable goals of normative ideal social order. Dialogue brings about the idea of global peace. Dialogue brings about normative order. It brings about conflict resolution and global peace or social change. Dialogue sweeps epistemology into anthropology. Dialogue is the means of learning new truth. Dialogue arises from language

and Ludwig Wittgenstein discusses something of the limitation of human language in our objective world. Human language expresses things from only one limited perspective. Our understanding of truth statements, in short, has become de-absolutised and relational. There is clearly a fundamental communal aspect to our conception of dialogical commitment. Dialogue is the radical openness to learn from the other human person. The key is the radical openness to learn from the other.

Broadly speaking, dialogue can be defined in a liberal manner. It is an extended joint action or it is the sharing of the epistemological, spiritual or cultural dimension of our tradition. The intellectual and verbal communication is indeed the primary meaning of dialogue. Our existential encounter with the whole human being must also eventually include the depth of episteme viability. The goal of dialogue is to guarantee a continuous learning process. The general goal of dialogue is for each side to learn, and to change. Dialogue has to do with mutual trust, creative imagination, total sincerity and honesty of purpose or what Habermas calls “purity of motives” or intentions. Of course, only equal consociates can engage in full authentic dialogue. An indispensable major means of dialogue is a self – critical attitude toward our selves.

Dialogue reflects on integrity and self – criticism. Self criticism, however, does not mean lack of sincerity, honesty, integrity. Indeed, a lack of self criticism will mean there is no authentic dialogue. Dialogue reflects on creative imagination and a growing transformation of each participant’s life and that of their communication communities. Dialogue brings to the foreground the development of mutual trust and the three main areas of dialogue are; the cognitive, active and spiritual. Dialogue is absolutely necessary in our contemporary common social world. The idea of purposive rational consensus is our basis for the achievement for the indispensability of dialogue. Dialogue is a momentary occurrence and in our case it is usually associated with communicative rationality. Dialogue is that powerful, perfect moment of human communication when there is a mutual understanding, a doing of what is right and finding common ground in rational society. In our differentiating view points, we agree to

disagree and dialogue strengthens our understanding. Dialogue brings about understanding of people. It is value – laden, humanistic, an aesthetic appeal to intersubjectivity and the radical reformation of rational society.

Dialogue brings to the foreground the need for objectivity, prediction of future possibility, normative outcomes, simplicity, testability, sincerity and usefulness. The theory of dialogic communication is a mutual understanding of people, because the people involved in the dialogue understand themselves. Dialogue is an end in itself and it is not a means to an end. Dialogue is the objective understanding of people. Dialogue has importance to our communication community. It plays a critical role to our global world order. When dialogue happens it can not be measured. Dialogic communication is a good theory because it shows the need for moral conscience or collective consciousness. Dialogue places its emphasis on community and it gives new hope to human society. The results of dialogue are respect and understanding of different viewpoints. When people open themselves up to dialogic communication there will be more respect of different viewpoints. The pre-condition for a dialogic communication is that each member can be in a perpetual relation to a common front. Dialogue represents the presence of relationality and as an eternal value. Dialogue opens up the possibility for a reversal and rebirth of the individual and society at large. Dialogue reflects on the fact that genuine community grows organically out of the temporal needs of a given situation and people. Rationality is embodied in the process of discursive rationalization. Rationalization of society and the critique of modernity have become a global importance and a contemporary integrated sociological paradigm. Man is defined by his instincts or cravings for social interaction with his society and is governed by the complex normative structures of various institutions that make up that society. Communication or language through signs and symbols become the ultimate symbolization and rationalization of society.

Dialogue as the ethics of global order brings to the foreground the idea of global ethics or perpetual peace as advocated by Immanuel Kant. Dialogue presupposes global

interdependence or the Rawlsian tradition of global justice. Rawls' conceptualization of justice as fairness is a contemporary reflection of global justice where both the rich countries and poor countries of the new world order are actively engaged in a dialogic communication. Global terrorism is antithetical to the sacredness of our humanity and dialogic communication. Terrorism is a threat and a great evil to humanity. Global terrorism is a calculated attempt to thwart the world of its universality and the intercultural dialogue of universal brotherhood. Terrorism destabilizes the project of humanity and the project of humanity is a sacred norm. Humanity has to regain its sacredness due to a paradigm shift of universal brotherhood. Terrorism is against the sacredness or the ethics of our humanity. Terrorism is a gross violation of global peace and the project of humanity. Our system-life world will be inhabitable if terrorism continues to persist. It is a great threat to humanity. He can wipe the whole of the human race. Terrorism can cause an untold hardship to the members of the planet earth. Terrorism is bad and should be condemned in total because it is a gross violation of the sacredness of our humanity or the ethics of global peace in a new world order. Dialogue is humanistic and it is cross cultural or inter-cultural. Dialogue is the reconceptualization of human rights. Dialogue brings to the foreground the common ground between the basic human values or basic truth claims, defended by an individualistic normative perception of human rights and the truth claims. Habermas' notion of the rationalization of society is a philosophy of social change and rational reconstruction of society. Philosophy, in its essence, is hermeneutics and a rational discipline. Hermeneutics concerned our fundamental mode of being in the world. Understanding is thus the basic phenomenon in our social existence. Habermas reflects on the underlying debate on the primacy of human understanding and the possibility of rational mutual agreement; on which hermeneutics itself rests. The Habermasian tradition leverages on the ideals of rational dialogue, the indispensability of dialogue in society and the dialogical commitment of intersubjective relationship. Theory and practice are not in separation from one another, but are part of a single hermeneutical everyday practice of society. The agent makes his behaviour

to be right in relation to a normative context recognized as legitimate. Society is characterized by normative or legitimate expectations. There is communicative action characterized by rational relations to the world and connected with normative rightness.

Normatively speaking, communicatively achieved agreement must be based on the end of reasons. The moral practical sphere of rational relations of persons is a communicative practice of reaching mutual understanding with reference to existing normative contents. The normative contents of communication aimed at reaching mutual understanding. The healing power of rational dialogue owes something to the common force of communicative arguments. Argumentation assumes the flow of communication process. Dialogic communication is not feasible when our world or the whole of humanity is in a crisis- point. Dialogic communication is only possible in a world of peaceful atmosphere; an atmosphere of universal brotherhood, organic solidarity and normative ideal social order. The idea of dialogue reveals the principle of universal solidarity. The system of rights between private and public autonomy brings to the fore normative grounding and the reciprocal relation of mutual recognition of equal consociates. The communicative freedom of equal consociates is normatively or presumptively oriented to the common good of political community and mutual understanding of reciprocally recognized citizens. Communicative basic human association is oriented to reaching mutual understanding of free and equal legal persons. The existential condition of communicative association is characterized by a liberal political culture. Communicative action connotes basic human association. Communicative, political action has not been able to resolve the plethora of human ethical quandary facing our socio-political world today. Communicative action is embedded in a normative foundation of the moralization of speech act theory.

8. Habermas' theory of communicative action reveals the need for deliberative process of democracy; deliberative democracy is engendered by democratic will-formation and the normative dimension of political and ethical order. Deliberative democracy

can contribute to the advancement of our enlightened democratic vision, human betterment and political engagements, dialogical involvements or commitment.

9. Habermas' vision of democratic society is equally engendered by normative ideal social order. Democratic public life cannot develop where matters of public importance are not fully discussed by the citizens in the political state. Habermas believes that this public discussion and contemporary debates is possible through the platform of systematically undistorted communication. Habermas maintains that truth claims, what we may also referred to as criticizable validity claims is what would be agreed upon in an ideal speech situation. Through reasoned communication, Habermas discerns a hope for the future where representative democracy is replaced by a deliberative democracy, a kind of political organisation that is based on the equal rights and obligation of citizens. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is his major contribution to critical social theory. Critical social theory is all about the proper understanding of society. Communicative, political action, however, constitutes an independent and distinctive type of social action.

The purpose or goal of communicative, political action is not expressed or realised in an attempt to influence others but in an attempt to reach rational agreement or reaching mutual understanding about something in the system-life world. Habermas argues that our ability to communicate has a universal core or basic normative structures, legitimate expectation and fundamental roles that all subjects master in learning to speak a language. Communication occurs mainly through language. A great society is that society that is built on the solid bedrock of free and open communication according to the Habermasian picture. Our study of communication and language can best be described as critical examination of the functions of words, which makeup the vocabulary of a language. Language makes possible the growth and the transmission of cultures, the continuity of societies, and the effective functioning and control of social groups. Communicative, political action comprehends the whole vast interlocking transformational mechanisms of human society.

The theory of communicative, political action plays a functionalist role in the process of the evolution of society. The evolution of society can be seen as creating the Habermasian ideas by using the Marxian orientation as point of departure. The theory of communicative, political action is a critical dialogue or cultural dialogue. Habermas and Marx share the same philosophical views on the idea of the philosophy of social reconstruction or rational reconstruction. Marx and Habermas have an avowed affinity in their conception of social restructuring and social integration. Habermas and Marx's conceptualization of society is exclusively based on the theory of social change, presupposing historical progress of society, social integration and system integration.

Marx and Habermas have the same vision of contemporary society or emancipated global society. Habermas sees the evolution of society from the idea of free and open communication. Marx sees ideal society from the idea of labour (work) as the epitome of the human species. Habermas' idea of social evolution drew on the work of Marx and others by developing a distinctive rational account of moral consciousness and normative structures. Habermas revisits the rational or social reconstruction of historical materialism and took further step by offering a wide-range of rational reconstruction of democratic society.

Habermas' theoretical framework focuses on the question of communicative political framework or communicative power and the democratic legitimacy problems faced by modern states. This legitimation problem is caused by the ideological distortions – economic and administrative rationalization (monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power). Habermas believes that these ideological distortions are caused by money and power. It is also caused by sets of distorted belief-system facing the modern state. Habermas' concern for radical democracy and social evolution anchors on the key normative questions of social and political theory today.

10. One of the major causes of systematically distorted communication is the constraints on communicative freedom of equal consociates. Systematically distorted

communication can only be resolved by the Weberian rational bureaucracy or what may be referred to as effective administration. Rational bureaucracy is only made possible by economic and political stability through drastic reductions of ideological distortions caused by religion, money and power; the Habermasian standpoint seeks the elimination of the monetization of human society and the bureaucratization of power.

11. The thesis of internal colonization caused by money and power has been a reflection on the fact that the system-life world; the ideological distortions of human contemporary society can be resolved by the synergy between the system and the life world. Nevertheless, Habermas sees society as being composed of both life world and system. System in the modern world has come to control the life world. The rationalization of the life world involves growth in the rationality of communicative action. The system-life world becomes monetized and bureaucratized. Habermas also sees deception within the system-life world. The problem of domination and self-deception has created a systematic crisis. It might be noted that by linking the deformities to capitalism, Habermas continues, at least in this sense, to operate within a neo-Marxian terms. Habermas sees modern society as subject to recurrent systemic crisis. The conceptual justification of the rationalization of society is championed by Marx and Habermas' ideals of society and human emancipation. Social structure has not been differentiated from culture.

Habermas' communicative, political action and its normative structures reminds us of the sacredness of our humanity. Society has been distorted due to the preponderance of self-deception caused by an ideological framework and lack of consistent internal logic of communicative rationality in society in our modern or contemporary society; this is the limits of rationality. Rationality is embodied in the social structures into a social world whereby the human spirit seeks the collective happiness. The critical analysis of rationality is the realm of values, norms, of justice, freedom, beauty and goodness that lie beyond instrumental reason.

Rationalization has become a global process and a process of social analysis or critical social theory. Man, is defined by his communicative interaction with his society governed by the complex normative structures of various institutions that make up that society. Communication occurs mainly through language. Language is the key to culture. Language makes possible the growth and transmission of cultures, the continuity of societies, and the effective functioning and control of social groups.

Human society can only be progressive and fully operational with all the necessary conditions of social structure. Social structure showcases the routines of actions, thus, in practice. The problems of social actions and social order have become a very pertinent issue to us in our contemporary social world. It presupposes the emancipation of the specie-being of man and the rationalization of the human social structural conditions, social reconstruction and a transformational mechanism of social practice. Habermas' conception of systematically undistorted communication is embedded in the indispensability of dialogue in contemporary human society. Reason does exist and it is the form and substance of the rationalization of society and the solid bedrock of free and open communication as rational dialogue. The completion of humanity's projects is a very complex one which must culminate at the process of purposive rational activity and systematically undistorted communication. This undistorted communication is feasible through free and open communication. Society is dominated by the evils of economic/capitalist system of money and the bureaucratization of power.

12. Social order is made possible in a society that is characterized by rational order or ethical order. Social order is guaranteed by fundamental social change; change cannot take place by itself but can be heralded by the human agents. Moral order brings to the foreground the form and substance of the idea of basic normative ideal social order. Communicative action is a process of rational consensus, purposive rational

activity, and social activity. It presupposes the existential condition of rational consensus of social interaction by humans.

One crucial importance of the correlation between moral consciousness and communicative action is that it brings to the fore the tenets of the basic normative core of ideal global political order. There is need for the world to embrace the basic normative core of moral order and the need to see communicative action as an instrument of international interaction and the ethics of global peace. Communicative action is seen as role playing in the international system. Habermas and Kant share an avowed affinity in terms of international law and system of ideal political order in their conception of contemporary political philosophy.

Furthermore, in the ethical relationship, the other human person presents himself/herself as a rational animal and a conformist of the normative ideal political order. Social order has made freedom difficult when you are submitted to a prohibitive law or exterior law or the will of another human person or the regulative and constitutive principle or the difficult freedom of heteronomy. The social condition of being under the domination of an authority is the only one possible means of curtailing human excesses. Habermas and Kant have the same avowed affinity in their conception of political freedom, universal morality, solidarity and social justice. Habermas' contemporary moral philosophy is a logical progression or reformulation of Kant's categorical imperative. Both philosophers shared the same universal principle of human solidarity. In a wider project of social theory, law and morality comprised distinctive systems of doctrine of political order or modes of reasoning. It will, however, be wrong to see the enlightenment project of social theory as a dead end; it is an endless or ongoing project and contemporary debate. Habermas' highly influential work has, in large part, been concerned to find the dialogical basis of an underlying rational assessment, normative background and moral foundation of social order.

Habermas sees law and democratic legitimacy as systems of normative social order and social constructions. Habermas has been profoundly critical on the idea of society, law and

social order. Law served as the basis for social order. Habermas treats law as a way of mediating economic, political and other systems within society and its moral potential as a set of institutions expressing the values, norms and understanding that arise in the lived experience or the social existence and social interaction of individuals in a communication context. The search for a science of society applicable to legal analysis is best understood as an ongoing dialogical commitment to make explicit the partial normative character of all existing understandings of social (including legal) phenomena and to subject these communicative understandings to unending systematic questioning or paradigm in the light of broadening social observation and ongoing historical experience, viewed in this way, political, legal and social theory remains interdependent and the project of social theory appears no less important. Legal and social theories have undergone a systematic questioning or critical analysis to guarantee a well-ordered society or rational society based on a functional normative structured moral system. Law in connection with moral theory or social theory should be seen from the Habermasian-Foucaudian-Rawlsian-Kantian tradition as the coercive instrument of universal solidarity or sovereign authority.

Foucault focuses on the institutionalized discursive practice of power relation, the analysis of the internal ordering of human existence and the existing knowledge structures of human existence. Foucault, Habermas, Kant and Rawls share the same ethical sensibility and the prescriptive rules of conduct and the normative framework that is rationally grounded and universal. Habermas, Kant, Foucault, and Rawls anchor their philosophical tradition on human culture and normativity. Habermas, Kant, Foucault and Rawls conceptualization of ethics and politics are hinged on increased political freedom of the individual and the global community at large. Habermas, Kant, Foucault and Rawls believe in open, democratic and emancipated global society. Habermas, Foucault, Kant and Rawls were concerned with the possible transformation of the remaking of the world order. Habermas, Kant, Rawls and Foucault based their theoretical orientations on moral codes which are universally valid and as such, are obligatory for all human beings. Foucault and Habermas share with Kant the idea

that moral behaviors presupposed a rational conception of human action. Habermas, Kant, Foucault and Rawls based their conception of morality on the deliberate practice of liberty. Habermas, Kant, Foucault and Rawls' conception of moral obligation and normative rules reveals ethical pluralism and ethical rationalism. The sole objective of Habermas, Foucault, Kant and Rawls' conception of institutionalize society recognizes moral obligation as the basis of human existence and the concern for normative order. Habermas and Foucault's ethics are articulated by virtue of the rational and deliberate structure of human moral actions.

The dynamics of our collective social transformation do not presupposes an agonistic relation. Habermas, Kant, Foucault and Rawls believe that the ethical life is a necessary condition and concerned with everyday reasonable practice of an ideal society. The moral life is accepted as universal, necessary, obligatory and connoted the practical engagement in everyday reality. The political engagement is developed through a complex relation of reciprocity and mutuality and it is achieved by conducting oneself according to universal, rational principles. Habermas, Foucault, Kant and Rawls believe that we are endowed with reason and freedom. We can and must take care of ourselves through the processes of rational and deliberate decision making and we must have the courage to use our cognitive faculties properly. The ethics of human beings is defined by communication context. The intensification of social relation is a system of rational and reciprocal moral obligation.

The Foucaultian conception of power presupposes a process which through ceaseless struggles and confrontations is exclusive related to the Habermasian standpoint. The power relation is a rational relation or relational character. As such, power presupposes freedom; it presupposes both individual and public freedom. Power is dangerous and the political task is inherently a social existence or a true social practice. The instrument of power offers normative criteria. Habermas and Foucault are committed to dismantling institutionalized inequality throughout their lives. The Habermasian and Foucaultian tradition believes that society can only function within a certain rules and norms. The Habermasian-Kantian-Foucaultian and Rawlsian tradition presupposes dialogical reciprocal relation and is a

discernible trace of human solidarity, and mutuality. Human rationality is governed by rational principles and therefore acts as a regulative principle. The political nature of the individual practices of liberty is therefore bracketed out and as part of the socio-political world shared with others.

We are saddled with the responsibility to conclude this work by positing that Habermas' communication model and political theory is riddled with some weaknesses. First of all, Habermas' philosophy is deeply rooted in the question of contemporary global relevancies. Habermas' philosophy has not been able to address the problem of global insecurity and domination in human society. Habermas' strategy is the communicative rational exchange. Understanding both the interpretation of violence and global terrorism characterized the defects of communication as well as the solution that he envisages for the problem of exploring the vulnerability of complex systems.

Violence brings about distortion of human or global communication. Communicative action and the indispensability of dialogue are fundamental in ensuring the democracy of everyday speech, and global peace. Communicative dialogue serves as the means of conflict resolution. Habermas believes that global terrorism or global violence will put the planet earth at a stand-still. Habermas lamented that global violence disrupt the project of humanity. In line with the Habermasian argument, we have to re-define our humanity and the sacredness of our humanity. The causes of crises in North Africa and the Middle East such as Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria, Syria, Libya, Iran, Somalia, should be quickly addressed by policy makers among these African countries and beyond. Communicative action and dialogue can only bring about international cooperation or global form or network of communication.

Habermas' philosophy fails to meet the Kantian paradigm to address the problem of ethics in human society. Habermas's thought does not express a realistic political objective. Kant is Habermas' point of departure because he actually embarked on the reformulation of Kant's moral and political philosophy. Habermas believes that the Enlightenment democratic vision marks the liberation of humanity. Habermas' strategy is the epistemological sweep and

the transvaluation of Kant's classical international law into new cosmopolitan order. Habermas' philosophy has not been able to address the re-enchantment of nature and disenchantment of an enchanted world. Habermas' theory of communicative action and political theory has a pragmatic account. For social agents to communicate with one another about things they must pragmatically presupposed the objective world. Habermas' work has not been able to address global insecurity, terror and terrorism. The global world today is facing the challenges of Islamic fundamentalism, and the problem of capitalism, and racism in America. Fundamentalism is the demand for a strict adherence to orthodox theological doctrines, usually understood as Islamic fundamentalism, fundamentalist modernist or Christianity fundamentalist. The problem with North/South Korea is not really the problem of Islamic fundamentalism but the problem of economic and political crises.

Habermas' work is characterized by some striking weaknesses. Habermas' theory of communicative action harnessed the potentials of communication for national and transnational development. Communication as a theoretical model is derived from the word "commons". Communication remained the brain box for a verile society. It challenges cultural diversity and multicultural systems of society. Communication can also promote cultural diversity or interdisciplinarity. Habermas concludes that rationality provides the structure as well as the scope of communication. Habermas' thought is deeply rooted in Eurocentric prejudices/biases. Habermas believes that communication is always ambiguous, suspect of latent violence. In line with Carl Schmitt's position, Habermas' thought reflects on what Giovanna Borradori calls the "ontologization of friend-foe relation".³ Habermas favours a normative legitimation and a gradual transformation of international law into a new cosmopolitan order. Habermas revisits the universalistic structure of the legal and moral foundation of a liberal order. Habermas' theory of communicative action is the reformulation of Kant's moral universalism and the question of universality. The theory of communicative action brings to the foreground the inclusiveness of individuality and otherness as the vehicle for self correcting learning processes. Habermas' thought is the key to solve apparently

insurmountable problems. For Habermas, democracy, in its structural perfectability, is both the means and the end of human emancipation and the political task of social transformation. Emancipation is located in everyday communicative practice.

Habermas sees human autonomy as a function of interpersonal exchange. Habermas does not take individual autonomy for granted. Individual autonomy is the theoretical background for human self reflection and self knowledge. It brought to mind the Socratic doctrine 'man- know- thyself'. The issue of autonomy is explicitly embedded in the practice of everyday communication. We learn who we are as autonomous agents from our basic relations with others. Habermas believes that the substance of communication is mutual understanding through the use of language. For communication to succeed there must be truth telling and communication is seen as a rational discourse. In the theory of communicative action, Habermas attempts to draft the requirement for well ordered and just society. Habermas' thought provides the possibility of diagnosing the ills of society. Habermas' philosophy is contextualism of some sort. The notion of contextualism is the defense and possibility of moral knowledge. Moral knowledge is the best reflective account of knowledge. Contextualism has an epistemological model what we may refer to as the context relativity of knowledge. The origin of contextualism is traceable to Wittgenstein's linguistic analysis of the world. Allan Thomas observes that contextualism offers response to philosophical skepticism and that it has a conversational context. Habermas' philosophy is anchored on communicative theory and deliberative democracy. Communication is the integral part of democracy. The practice of democracy in contemporary society is lopsided. Deliberative democracy is not attainable in an atmosphere of social division. There is none that is permanent. None is said to be superior because all forms of theorizing is all about chronological progression of past philosophical discourses. Communicative action theory can not work in an atmosphere of dog eat dog society; a society characterized by social conflict and social fragmentation. There has been plethora of variations of our political life. The trend now in our contemporary society is national and global insecurity. Whenever any political

philosophy any body is propounding, there should be security. What is prevalent in complex modern society is distrust, and insecurity. Political philosophy sets people into an action that is rational. Political philosophy reflects on social order and has to do with moral philosophy. Moral philosophy is applied political philosophy. The contemporary human world is governed by order. This theoretical discourse is actually the need to ask a fundamental question of how social order is possible. Many philosophers have been proffering fundamental solution to the problem of social order.

This research tends to look at the convergence in the ideas of Habermas and other classical social theorists such as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Kant, Durkheim and contemporary theorists such as Giddens, Rawls. What binds Habermas' thought together with other classical and contemporary theorists is the idea of good society or normative ideal social order. They all talked about the theory of society. We intend to look at who influences who in this intellectual discourse. Wittgenstein's philosophy of language, Kant and Rawls' moral and political philosophy influences Habermas' contemporary political philosophy in terms of globalization or the international system of law and order, justice and human emancipation. Globalization has made the whole world narrower and making more conflict to arise due to fundamentalism. Conflict will arise when people begin to ask whose value (s) is operational in our socio-political world. Habermas' rational re-construction of communicative, political action cuts across his contemporary political philosophy and critical social theory. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a conception of discursive rationalization of society or social order and social practice. One of the problems of modernity is the problem of social order. Habermas' philosophy of rational reconstruction talks about the critique of modernity, its complexities and consequences. It is the philosophy of social change, social movement and the rationalization of society. Habermas' thesis of internal colonization presupposes the synergy between the system and the life-world. His philosophy of rational reconstruction is an integrated sociological paradigm of system

integration and social integration. The movement of agency-structure integration is an integrated sociological paradigm.

The Habermasian approach focuses on the theory of social order. Habermas reflects on a form of order that arises spontaneously when rational and mutually aware individuals succeed in solving coordination problems. A social relationship exists 'when several people reciprocally adjust their behaviour to each other with respect to the meaning they give to the normative standards of society. The theory of communicative, political action becomes very pertinent because in consequence, boundaries between public and private, the individual and society, the system and the life world are deteriorating and must be bridged by purity of motives and good theoretical framework.

Society is governed by rational order. Society is not governed by a free – rider-system but that which is anchored on normative presuppositions, legitimate or normative expectations and rational reconstruction of the system- life world. The progress of human flourishing in any society brings to the fore the synergy between system integration and social integration; the integrated sociological paradigm of the system-life world. For Habermas, the completion of modernity's project is the rationality of the system and the life world without one destroying the other. Both the social system and the life-world act as synergy in the project of modernity or the sacredness of our humanity. The system- life world is colonized by the bureaucratization of power and the monetization of society coupled with the distortions of ideological sets of beliefs. Colonization simply depicts a dominant group that tends to consider its own values, goals and beliefs as universal.

It tends to universalize its experience and project it and representing the whole common social world. In this Habermasian perspective, colonization is justified as a mission of selected few. The thesis of internal colonization reflects on the ideological distortions plaguing the project of modernity. What can bring to the foreground a systematically undistorted communication is when the thesis of internal colonization is resolved by the removal of our pre-conceived ideas. There should be an integrated sociological paradigm

where there is a synergy between the system and the life world; a synergy between social integration and system integration. The monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power results in the thesis of internal colonization of our system-life world and the drumbeating menace of social practices. The Habermasian analysis of communicative reasoning presupposes an undistorted communication and contemporary moral order as a normative ideal social order.

Philosophical sociology's problem is that of excessive fragmentation of the system and the life world. The rational man makes the model of social life possible and is actualized through institutionized model of democratic deliberation. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky believe that "social systems have grown increasingly complex, distorted, differentiated, disintegrated and characterised by an instrumental reason".⁴ Habermas distinguishes between strategic reason and instrumental reason. A rationalized society should be one in which both system and lifeworld are permitted to synergistically rationalize, following their, own internal logics. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky reflect on the rationalization of system and life-world of society characterized by material abundance and control over its environments as a result of rational systems and one of truth, goodness, and beauty stemming from a rational life world. The project of modernity is an unfinished project waiting to be completed by the power of communicative rationality and rationality has its own limitations which simply deny us the enrichment of life. The system- life-world has drastically undergone an internal colonization. Society is characterized by some internal contradictions and society has been distorted due to the preponderance of self-deception and lack of consistent internal logic of rationality in society. Habermas' philosophy is a reflection on the contemporary theory of social change and social interaction. Georg Simmel is best known for his deepest articulation of the phraseology "social interaction". Accordingly, George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky believe that "Georg Simmel is best known in contemporary sociology for his contributions to our understanding of the patterns, or forms, of social interaction".⁵ The idea of communicative action correlated with the idea of social

interaction. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky duly observe that we do not need to lose sight of the insight, into the larger scale aspects of social reality. George Simmel like Habermas equates society with interaction. George Ritzer and Jeffrey Stepnisky quoting Georg Simmel believes that “society ... is only the synthesis or the general term for the totality of this specific interaction ... society is identical with the sum total of these relations”.⁶ This social relation is rational relations.

The normative theory of communicative, political action of Habermas is actually the theory of social change and normative ideal social order. Normative theory of communicative, political action reveals the fact that dialogic communication is defined by social interaction, reaching mutual understanding and purposive rational activity. Purposive rational activity aims at human improvement or human emancipation. Communicative, political action is communicative interaction. It guarantees reasoned communication and the prevalence of criticizable validity claims. Habermas’ theory of communicative, political action is a normative core of human social interaction. It reflects on the idea of optimum strategy and normative background of society. Society is governed by value laddeness, norms, rules and regulations.

Moral consciousness reveals that man as a rational being is governed by a moral code. Habermas’ theory of communicative, political action reflects on the implicit nature of moral consciousness. Kant believes that man should not be a means to an end but an end in itself. Man as a rational being reflects on the fact that the idea of instrumental reason makes men not clinging to achieving their personal goals. Habermas believes that morality is one of the enablement of contemporary society. Morality is the normative background and the basis of social order. Morality is derived from the Latin word ‘mores’. It simply means norms and values. Morality reflects on the set normative standards that are inherent in contemporary society. Society is evaluated by the set standards of norms and values. Habermas shares the same philosophical tradition with Kant’s idea of perpetual peace and law at the international level. The Kantian tradition assumes the fact that members of the planet earth must geared

toward international peace. Kant advocates for perpetual peace on a global scale. The idea of international law and perpetual peace is a contemporary legacy of Kant's political theory. One of the questions that interest us in Habermas' political philosophy is the relationship between his communication theory and his political theory in the contemporary world. The Habermasian picture of the conceptualization of communicative, political action presupposes the response to the plethora of conflicts that arise in the world of practice. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that "what makes concepts political is that they respond to conflicts that arise in the world of practice".⁷

Contemporary political theory addresses itself to the kind of issues that are raised and that are part and parcel of public debate. Politics is the study of legitimate, normative behavioural expectations or an analysis of our common social worlds. Politics has to do in its strict sense with the practical everyday discourse of human association. Contemporary political theory addresses itself in a systematic and coherent way. The task of contemporary political theory is to stimulate rather than to persuade. It persuades so that rhetoric is expunged in favour of logic, and sober evidence is offered in place of extravagant emotion. It is primarily geared towards convincing an audience of the ideological correctives of its position. Contemporary political theory can and should seek to raise the tone of public political debate. John Hoffman and Paul Graham assert that "good causes can be strengthened by good arguments".⁸ Kant and Habermas' contemporary political theory can be categorised as right based' because the purpose of the state is not only to realise goodness but, to ensure that people have respect for each other's right. John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that "a political consequence of the priority of the right over the good is that the state's functions are limited... Kant political theory is less commonly formed in the course on the history of political thought".⁹ Habermas' writings provide challenging points of reference to make contemporary political theory more relevant and useful. Habermas' communicative, political action showcases the fact that the relevance of theory to practice represents a paradigm shift of humans' quest for the progress of contemporary rational society.

Broadly speaking, one very powerful reason for studying Kant along side Habermas is that in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries there has been a huge revival of interest among political philosophers in his work. Kant has been an important influence on such major thinkers as John Rawls and Jurgen Habermas. Habermas and Rawls share the same avowed affinity in terms of contemporary political philosophy in their conceptualization of global (international) justice. Rawls' theory of justice as fairness presupposes the fact that there is expressed scepticism about the possibility that normative judgments have cognitive content and political science turned toward statistical methods and behaviouralism. In continental Europe, on the other hand, the Post World war decades saw a huge blossoming of political philosophy, with Marxism dominating the field. Habermas aligned himself with Marxism, and he saw Marxism as a revolutionary ideology. Habermas aligned himself with a number of thinkers such as Hannah Arendt, Karl Popper, Freidrich Hayek, Leo Strauss, Isaiah Berlin, Eric Voegelin, and Judith Shklar in their continued study of political philosophy in the Anglo-American world. The rise of feminism, social movements, and the end of colonial rule and of the political exclusion of African Americans and sexual minorities in the developed world have led to feminist, post-colonial, and multicultural thought becoming significant in Habermas' theorizing. Rawls, for instance, provides the principles of justice for the basic structure of society. Rawls' political philosophy has offered a criticism of utilitarian approaches to normative questions of contemporary political justice.

Furthermore, the rise of globalization creates the need for an international normative framework, contemporary political order and political theory has moved to fill the ideological gap. Habermas' ideas are geared towards the politics of globalization. One of the most prominent subjects in recent contemporary political philosophy has been the theory of deliberative democracy, or what we may be referred to as the Giddian dialogic democracy (GDD). Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is a ground breaking reflection of rational reconstruction of society. For Lain Mackenzie, "contemporary political philosophy is

alive and it is grappling with new ways of thinking about classical problems, wide range of newly identified problems and with innovative theoretical paradigms as well”.¹⁰

Contemporary political philosophy reflects on the resolution of conflicting interests in public life. For Lain Mackenzie:

Political philosophy, in short, is a negotiation between the (often competing) demands to philosophize about political life and to politicize those philosophical claims themselves. Many defenders of democracy have resorted to construct alternative visions of a new democratic system, the most popular being deliberative democracy...deliberative democracy is a model of democratic government that seems to overcome the failings of the purely representative model by placing a large emphasis on the value of “deliberation. Deliberation, in this context, refers to a process, or more often processes, of rational argumentation. The central claim, therefore, is that voting is not enough to sustain democracy.”¹¹

The ideal of deliberative democracy is the dialogical process of settling disputes for the purpose of resolving problematic situations. Lain Mackenzie aligning himself with James Bohman sums up the ideal of deliberative democracy as “a dialogical process of exchanging reasons for the purpose of resolving problematic situations that cannot be settled without interpersonal co-ordination and cooperation”.¹²

The ideal of deliberative democracy is to construct properly the dialogical conception of human rationality where mutual understanding in the democratic potential of debate and discussion is reached. Habermas describes public conversation where everyone is concerned to reach mutual understanding with one another as ‘communicative action’. Deliberative democracy or what Giddens calls ‘dialogic democracy’ is a normative presuppositions or assumptions of human communication. Communicative, political action and its fundamentals of social order required inter-subjective relationship between people. Accordingly, Lain Mackenzie believes that “a communicatively reached agreement is not about one person treating another as an object; in philosophical terms, it is not based on a subject – object relationship, but rather on a genuinely inter-subjective relationship: a relationship between people”.¹³ Communicative, political action in Habermas’ conception of deliberative democracy correlates with the idea of the political public sphere. The political public sphere has to do with the public domain of the collective individual members living in a particular

market economic structure and political environment. Habermas has developed his theories of communicative, political action and discourse ethics which provided the basic normative core for deliberative model of democracy.

The communicative, political action theory has to do with our life world. The ideal of deliberative democracy represents rational discussion and a normative background horizon of political activity. The practical goal or objective of deliberative democracy has to do with effective decision making and rationally motivated consensus of individuals in complex modern societies. The norm of social cooperation is based on reaching mutual understanding and rationally motivated consensus of individuals in society. The fundamental issue of deliberative democracy is whether or not deliberation will lead to better form of collective decisions making and aggregation of interests. Broadly speaking, after the theory of communicative, political action, then, Habermas begins to see law not as part of the human problem, but as part of solution to human predicament and ideological distortion of the system- life world. Law as a command served as a basic normative core for human society. It is the basis of normative ideal social order. Habermas offers a more rational discourse and rational account of law and democracy. Habermas does not reject a fully democratic form of social deliberation. Habermas' communicative, political action is predicated on democracy.

None-the-less, democracy is premised upon disagreement within agreements. Good democratic setting projects basic human rights and rights of communicative freedom. Successful democracy is in creating a form of political legitimacy and normative political order. Good model of democratic setting is a necessary condition for the realisation of normative ideal social order and the theory of social change. Habermas believes that when we reject democracy, the system-life world will be in a state of social chaos which can only be resolved by systematically undistorted communication. What he refers to as public discussion or conversation or debates in the models of democratic setting. Democracy is simply a way of making decisions collectively. Democracy is nothing more than a rational agreement among the citizens of a state. Democracy has a very important theoretical base and

normative foundation of social order. The basic intent and objectives of democracy has to do with certain inalienable rights such as life, property and liberty. The ultimate philosophical goals of democracy has to do with the procedures dedicated to improving the conditions of life for all of its people and that some logical mechanisms exist by which people in contemporary society can exercise a degree of control over their leaders and express their whims and caprices.

Consequently, realising and transforming democracy is still a genuine goal even for complex and globalizing social world. Habermas' theory of deliberative democracy has to do with political principles and practices. Habermas' communicative, political action theory is "consociational democracy" and it reflectss on the process of collective bargaining. Accordingly, Richard Jay believed that:

Theorists of "consociational democracy" abstracted three factors from states which had achieved stability. First, stability was promoted by the very separation of peoples into distinct social and political blocs, since, high fences make good neighbours. Second, the solidarity of these groups promoted a concentration of authority in the hands of their representative leaders, giving them power to control dissidents and freedom of political manoeuvre. Third, the elites recognized that open political confrontation would have disastrous consequences, and hence by a process of bargaining, and accommodation produced agreed policies that reconciled the contending claims and interests.¹⁴

Deliberative democracy is the process whereby the indispensability of dialogue is applicable to political public debate or public discussion. It has to do with the individual and the state. Plato and Rousseau, for instance, opines that the sole objective of the formation of the political state is to guarantee normative peace, tranquillity, order, freedom, justice and the common good. Deliberative democracy hopes for a deeper engagement with political life. Dialogic communication precedes deliberative democracy. In any democratic debate or public discussion, communication becomes very relevant in the normative framework of such society. The aim of all good government is to guarantee the improvement of the people and the stability of the political state. The beneficiary primacy of society has to do with the momentary burst of freedom. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action

presupposes the ideal of democratic government. Democratic government is fundamentally about the equality of each person in the state and to have a say in government decision.

Deliberative democracy is central and encapsulates the egalitarian dimension of the democratic ideal. Communicative, political action theory is a central egalitarian dimension of the democratic ideal. Democracy is a system of government that is practical and it is based on the solid bedrock of constitutional patriotism. This view could be regarded as constitutional rationalism. Democracy is a system of government where political legitimacy is derived from the people's will. Democracy is also referred to as a constitutional government. Deliberative democracy is the end of normative political structure and historical development of mankind. There is no paradoxical relationship between democracy and dialogue. Legitimate government includes both legal procedural elements and prudential considerations. The universal truth of politics is the idea that political powers deal with certain political exigencies and the idea of the common good. Communicative power assumes a general attitude of willing cooperation, will formation, opinion formation and trust. Deliberative democracy does not violate the common good that propels the opinion and will formation of the state. One very crucial element in understanding Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is that, we must first and foremost bring to the foreground interpretation of politics, morality and law as the bases of normative ideal social order.

Politics has to do with political relation. Politics has to do with constitutive and transformative human association. Morality has to do with norms, values, and etiquettes. Morality has to do with the rightness and wrongness of an action in human society. Law presupposes social stability. Law and order are normative assumptions of contemporary human society. Law has to do with reason. Law is a command. Law brings to the foreground a normative ideal political order. Politics constitutes political interaction. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy reflects on politics, morality and law. Habermas and Rawls' notion of politics has to do with the conceptualization of international justice. For Lain Mackenzie, "John Rawls' creative approach to a theory of justice requires the demands

of equally reasonable yet different versions of the good life”.¹⁵ The idea of the good life requires the need for contemporary political order. Mackenzie observes that politics is not a very abstract way of thinking about the task of political philosophy. Politics focuses on the human dimension. Habermas’ contemporary political philosophy focuses on the human dimension of politics. Political activity reflects a kind of social interactions of human persons. Political activity appears as a particular way of reaching rational agreement where disagreement exists and impacts on other people.

Politics involves the preliminary remarks on a public debate and public discussion about how people should resolve their clash of interests. The understanding of politics reflected on the political virtue as the normative framework or structures that shaped who we think we are. Politics literally means norm general interaction. Politics and dialogue in their conceptual framework and theoretical analysis are coterminous. The idea of politics and dialogue are quite relevant at the international level. Politics is dialogue itself. The world can not do without politics and dialogue. Politics and dialogue presupposes a responsible interchange of collective decision making process. Our social world is a world of dialogue and social cooperation. Politics and dialogue have contemporary relevance and both concepts connoted human flourishing or emancipated global society and communicative freedom. Freedom is all about self determination, and it is a very driving concept and a complex idea. The concept of politics presupposes the ideas of liberalism, dialogue and multiculturalism. Dialogue is reflects on individual freedom and the ability to communicate and interact freely among other rational human persons.

Rational society entails free and open communication of equal consociates. Rational society demands free and open communication; an open system and not a closed – system. Liberal dialogue reflects on an institutionalize model of deliberative democracy. The liberal supports the basic features of a complex modern society. For Leon Baradat, “liberals are quick to recognize deficiencies in society and therefore are anxious to reform the system”.¹⁶ Habermas’ theory of communicative action encapsulates the normative assumption of politics

as a social process of human interaction. Politics is a process and it has a definitional difficulty in terms of its conceptual clarification. What are the limits of politics as a process? At what point can politics become practicable or abstract or does it entails an abstract concept devoid of practical relevance? Does it start with two persons in communicative interaction? At what point, can we say that the process or the proceduralist element of politics is bridged? Normative social order requires a strong sense of politics and dialogue.

Broadly speaking, politics and dialogue connotes social order, human existential dimension and the rational process of social cooperation and social co-ordination. Politics and dialogue have utilitarian orientation or the value of public good. It has to do with the existential condition of human affairs and socio-political order. Political activity demands the rational process of politics and dialogue. Dialogue, in its literal sense, reflected on the dynamic interplay of social existence, economic, political order and cultural dimensions. It recognizes the contemporary relevance of cultural identity, normative ideal social order and the politics of difference. Politics and dialogue demand the recognition of unifying force and the aesthetic appeal to intersubjectivity. Habermas' theory of communicative action is the precondition for ethical discourse of an ideal society. For John Hoffman and Paul Graham, observe that "Habermas maintains that freedom of belief and association is a precondition for discourse".¹⁷ Habermas and Rawls share the same idea of basic human rights and contemporary global order. Liberal society ought to tolerate a decent society. Human equality is another concept that the liberal continues to support; but the basis for the normative assumption of equality has changed. Liberal dialogue is a political conception which justifiably argues for different treatment of the domestic and global spheres by stressing the complexity of morality and the importance of intercultural dialogue. The conceptualization of contemporary political liberal dialogue has to do with the consciousness of human rights. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham, believe that "the growth in consciousness of human rights is one of of the achievements of communicative rationality".¹⁸ John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that "politics is a dialogue, in which people bring to bear their

different cultural perspectives, such that what emerges from the dialogue is something pluralistic yet coherent”.¹⁹ Habermas’ theory of communicative action presupposes political participation. Accordingly, John Hoffman and Paul Graham believe that “democracy requires participation, but it would be wrong to assume that this is only possible through direct involvement in political processes”.²⁰ For John Hoffman and Paul Graham, “democratic causes are those that empower people”.²¹ Habermas’ democratic theory is anchored on emancipating people in rational society.

This constitutes the Habermasian, Hobbesian, Rousseauian, Kantian and Rawlsian stand points of an emancipated global network. The dialogical setting is the protection of humanity and the protection of humanity is achieved with the help of the common group or the world community. The deepest aspirations of human beings are the same regardless of cultural situations. Therefore, there exists a common ground where an agreement of human flourishing is possible in the whole world. Such common ground can constitute a shared framework where human rights norms can be formulated. The socio-political data of international relations show that basic human rights have been used as an instrument of domination by the Western tradition. Dialogue brings to the foreground ethical imperative and it is geared towards the hermeneutics of global peace and normative global order.

Habermas’ philosophy is a new wine in an old bottle because the idea of public conversation, discussions or debate has been at the front burner in the Greek era. What made his work philosophical is his philosophy of language, democracy and dialogue, social change, social order, justice, normative peace, and rational society. Language objectifies our world. Our system-life world can only be addressed if all ideological distortions that hampered free and open communication are simply discarded. Habermas’ philosophy of language and his idea of the system-life world are derived from Wittgenstein and Husserl respectively. Habermas’ communicative action and deliberative democracy is dialogical commitment and it aimed at human improvement. Habermas’ philosophy has a political, legal, linguistic, existential, hermeneutic, pragmatic, epistemological and phenomenological dimension. He

believes in the bracketing of our ideological biases, our prevailing prejudices or preconceived ideas in order to pave the way for the progressive assimilation of rational society. Habermas' idea of rational reconstruction of society has had an avowed affinity with the Marxian orientation of the philosophy of social reconstruction. Habermas' moral and political theory has a great theoretical affinity with Kant's conception of international law and John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness.

Habermas and Rawls believe in the upliftment of human flourishing or human betterment and the basic human rights. Habermas and Rawls' notion of justice and human rights have global relevance or international recognition. They believed in the global justice and a new world order or contemporary ideal political order. Habermas' philosophy has contemporary relevance in the area of social psychology. Habermas, Jean Piaget and Freud both believe in the psychological development of the child and the need for continuous learning process which served as the basis or basic import of our social commitment. The notion of continuous learning process becomes a major desideratum for social interaction. The basis or idea of a systematically undistorted communication is for us as rational human beings to begin to engage in a deliberative democracy, linguistic transparency, and mutual accountability, economic and administrative rationalization devoid of any ideological distortions. Nigeria as a country is bedevilled by the evils of corruption, maladministration and interest based ideology. Society is fraught with the ideological distortions of monetization of society and the bureaucratization of power. There is a social gap between the rich and the poor. Our contemporary society cannot develop socially, politically, economically and culturally when we as rational beings subject ourselves to some social - strains, or set of beliefs that are detrimental to the public good. What we need is strategic action although instrumental action is inevitable as far as the progressive assimilation of any society is concerned. Habermas advocates for a free and open communication in order to complete the project of modernity. Habermas' philosophy seems to be apologetic because his theory of communicative, political action is taken to the extreme. The problem with

Habermas' philosophy of communication is that human beings find it extremely difficult to dialogue due to their pseudo – strategic interests. Habermas' notion of instrumental action makes the idea of communicative, political action or systematically undistorted communication, and symbolic violence impossible. Individuals tend to go after their personal goals which is left unabated and at the detriment of public interest. Human beings have always fail to engage in deliberative democracy or public conversation, discussions or debate because larger number of the populace is not always carried along in the scheme of things in an institutionalized model of democracy.

In this regard, contemporary society has been systematically distorted and free and open communication has been bridged or constrained by what we may refer as ideological distortions of money and power. According to the Actionian tradition “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely”. The idea of public discussion or public debate in our democratic question has becomes a wild goose chase. In modern society, public discussions or public debate is just a mirage. The business of democracy is hijacked by the rich and powerful in modern society and the advocacy of communicative action in Habermas' political philosophy has been thrown into the wind or dustbin. Habermas' contemporary political philosophy is the theory of social change, social order and a normative assumption of society and the philosophy of rational reconstruction. Habermas' philosophy has some element of utopianism just like socialism. Socialism is much more than economic system. Habermas' concept of communicative action has the inability to grasp the complexities of democratic political action. Habermas' communicative, political action is the rational-critical capacity of a civil society claiming to possess the key to the ultimate source of democratic legitimacy. Habermas' communicative, political action is an emancipatory type of political legitimacy. Habermas' communicative, political action is the rational critical emancipatory project. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action reflects on the need for an ideal political order free from domination. Habermas' democratic vision guaranteed social peace, social change and political stability. Habermas' contribution to democratic theory is a clear

necessary normative standard. Habermas' communicative, political action is characterized by a systematic and methodic attempt to articulate and locate a linguistic transparency, extra political source for a new type of emancipatory project. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is the dialectics of the normalization of communicative power of rational society. Martin Plot opines that "Habermas first seems to approach the understanding of democracy in a way similar to how it has developed in the theory and practice of modern democracy".²² Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is anchored on critical debate or public deliberation. Martin Plot posits that "Habermas emphasizes the aspect in which violent conflict is replaced, not by peaceful, political conflict, but by critical debate".²³

Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a revisitation of Kant's reformulation of Rousseau's emancipatory project. Habermas' theory of communicative, political action is a contemporary democratic theory. Habermas' theory of communicative action is appropriate to our contemporary world or social conditions and a meaningful normative social coordination. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is well known, a contemporary democratic theory and a rational agreement under the ideal conditions with the communicative rationality of normative outcomes of political discourse. Habermas' notion of communicative action seeks to achieve linguistic understanding. Martin Plot opines that "in sum, reaching understanding is both an end and a means in democratic political action".²⁴ Habermas' notion of communicative action anchored on the basis of rational dialogue and characterized by communicative practice of everyday life. Martin Plot alludes to Lenoble's position that "he valorizes Habermas' vision of a broadened communication and a reinforcement of the space of public debate... He thinks that this objective implies that, contrary to Habermas, we must bring to light the precise, logical nature of human linguistic exchange".²⁵ Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is a the enigma of language and expression; an enigma intrinsic to any human institution, and the communicative normative standards for democratic political actions as such. The system-life world is characterized by economic and political system. The political system

legitimately becomes a field of sheer strategic manipulation without communicative standards.

Habermas' notion of communicative, political action is characterized by monetary-bureaucratic complex. The aim of reaching mutual understanding is to bring to the foreground intersubjective recognition of reciprocally equal consociates. Habermas' theory of communicative rationality implies a continuum between the dialogue of two persons in speech and action, in their interpersonal relation, on the one hand, and the public use of speech on the other hand. Habermas' political and communicative action is a characteristics sociological function. Habermas' communicative rationality is a purposive rational activity and a driven-web of meaningful existence. Habermas' criticizable validity claims refers to the linguistic dimension of speech and action that remains open to the indeterminacy and plurality of meanings characteristics of open communicative process. Habermas affirms pragmatic analysis to speech and action. Habermas' theory of communicative action represents the understanding of democratic politics. Habermas re-integrates communicative rationality into the political public sphere. The purposive rational activity is Habermas' notion of democratic political theory characterized by the potential for opinion formation and common will formation in noncoercive communication. Speech is the human way of acting par excellence. The idea of public deliberation is faulted due to the problem of human nature and subjective interests.

The Habermasian analysis adequately account for the paradoxes of communication and rationality that are revealed by a careful analysis of the intersubjective psychic life. Communicative ethics controversy focuses on moments of social interaction. Intersubjective theory explores the development of mutual recognition. Communicative coordination of action is anchored on the pragmatics of social interaction. Communicative ethics affords subjects the opportunity to reassess their cognitive behavioural expectations. Habermas' theorizing presupposed a wider range of interaction of unlimited communication community or cognitive capacity of intersubjective reciprocal recognition. Communicative action is the

theory of inter-subjective human relationship and the epistemological significance or normative foundation of behavioural expectations of lived existential encounter with others. Habermas' communicative theory is the interpersonal relation with other human person. Habermas' conceptualization of free and open society reflects Giddens's constitution of society as the theory of structuration and Bourdieu's conception of field and habitus. Social order means a social stability in the possession of things; security against any form of violence. Theory must be made practicable. The goal is a completely new social order in which human cooperation is the normative basis of rational conduct and productivity. Morality is the basis of normative ideal social order. Liberalism involves freedom, individualism, economic and political stability. Freedom is a very complex and driving concept.

6.2 Recommendations

Based on the philosophical/sociological significance and the argument force of our Habermasian conception of problem solving mechanism and the real world situation, the following recommendations are therefore offered:

- (i). that philosophers be interested in the theoretical and practical analysis of the real world situation.
- (ii). that they be primarily interested in an unprejudiced, well – informed and veritably considered argumentation and the analysis of language and communication in ensuring crisis resolution and consensus readiness in everyday life activities.
- (iii). that they have the spirit of radical openness and that society should be governed by normative and legitimate expectation and social order.
- (iv). that communicative action in practice should be encouraged.
 - a. that the use of language by politicians/ statesmen should be guided at the national and international level.
 - b. that the use of language vis-avis human action in the international/diplomatic level should be guided.

- c. that the use of language in war- torn areas should be practiced in order to ensure global peace.
- d. that communicative action in practice should be backed by meaningful/transformational dialogue.

6.3 Suggestion for Further Research

Nevertheless, making a philosophical analysis of Habermas' communicative, political action, reveals the need that every research is guided towards some end. Our interest is only on communicative, political action and its implications in real world situation. Habermas' communicative action has some limited sphere of interest, and therefore scope of coverage and; the further point is that in the course of the philosophical, sociological, phenomenological, hermeneutical and analytical flow of this research work, several points of interest (which we could not provide for, because of our context of work and scope), we would invariably like to suggest that further research be conducted on the following topics:

1. The philosophical analysis of Habermas' business ethics.
2. The philosophical hermeneutics of Habermas' theory of social change.
3. The philosophical discourse on Habermas' theory of conflict resolution.
4. A critique of Habermas' contribution to globalization.
5. A communicative framework of corporate legitimacy in business world.
6. A comparative study of Habermas, Marx, Giddens' theory of rationalization of culture, tradition and modernity.
7. A Critique of Habermas' Contribution to Law and Democracy.

6.4 Conclusion

This research work is strictly speaking or exclusively anchored on language, communication and global political order from the perspective of Habermas. Habermas' theory of communicative action reflects on moral theory, critical social theory, and ideal political order. Habermas' "Discourse ethics" attempts to reconstruct a moral point of view from the normative perspective. Habermas connects communicative ethics to the theory of

social action. Habermas' communicative ethics reveals critical examination of research in the social psychology of moral and interpersonal development. Habermas aims at the basic moral intuition that sprang from something deeper. The interpretation of society is a rational interpretation. Habermas' criticizable validity claims presupposes normative rightness, truthfulness and sincerity. Habermas' communicative ethics refers to rational reconstruction of the knowing subjects who are capable of speech and action. Habermas' communicative ethics has an avowed affinity with Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development. It reveals the need for continuous learning processes. The continuous learning process is a problem solving processes. It is the normative assumption of socio-moral and cognitive development. The vision for the ultimate organization of society lies on its moral consciousness as the basis for normative ideal social order. Any strong and viable society is governed by moral laws, and strong normative standards. They tend to question the normative standard of ideal society. The various elements of the cultural world become more and more intertwined in an ever more powerful, self contained world that is, increasingly beyond the control of the actors. Habermas' notion of communicative, political action has an epistemic foundation or is epistemologically viable.

The normative perspective is grounded on equal communicative freedom, basic human rights and emancipatory project. The discourse principle is a normative presupposition of rational agents. The state is a moral agent and it is characterized by liberal basic rights. The Habermasian picture is geared towards what Hobbes and Rousseau's conception of social order found important as the rationalizing character of the legal morality of concrete society. The current world condition is the normative background of his critical reflection. Habermas aims at the radical transformation of society. Communicative freedom takes the form of structured deliberative praxis and the implementation of democratic procedures. Habermas' communicative action is characterized by conception of "global world order" or emancipated form of life, form of radical democracy and increasing social complexity. Habermas seeks a reconstructive analysis of society. Habermas' communicative, political action reflects on normative structures of contemporary society. According to the Habermasian picture, politics is a process of will formation and opinion formation. Politics assumes a systemic or normative

character and norm governed social interaction. Habermas believes that law has a role to play in the normalization and the stabilization of human behaviours. For Habermas, “law is the medium through which communicative power is transformed into administrative power”.²⁶ Habermas believes that “politics has been overburdened and democracy has been endangered...politics has become overburdened by problems that are worldwide and now internally proliferating”.²⁷ Habermas’ critique of society internalized democracy. According to the Habermasian picture, human rights have a “transnational and universal character”. Habermas concludes that “language itself supplies the primary source of social integration...communicative action, then, depends on the use of language oriented to mutual understanding”.²⁸

Our humanity can only be defined by a phenomenon of free and open communication which is based on rational dialogue. A great society is that society that is built on the solid bedrock of free and open communication. Communication or language becomes the ultimate symbolization of society. The complexity of human existence has an ideological underpinning. Habermas’ contemporary political philosophy and communicative ethics has Marxian orientation. Communication occurs mainly through language and language is the key to culture. Language is the carrier of culture. Communicative action is embedded in life world context. In the final analysis, society must be integrated through communicative action through social integration and emancipation. Communicative action is the normative basis of intersubjectively recognized criticizable validity claims. The theory of communicative, political action reflected on norm-conformative behaviour. Habermas opines that “social integration is possible only on the basis of normatively valid rules...”.²⁹ Habermas’ communicative action is anchored on normative contexts and reflects on the thesis of internal colonization. It reflects on hermeneutics, linguistics, pragmatic, social, political, moral, ethical and epistemological significance. Habermas’ theory of communicative action reflects on both the rights of political participation and the rights of communication. Habermas’ theory of communicative action is devoid of personality clashes and is monetary-bureaucratic complex. His idea of system-life world reveals the existence of complementarity-colonization thesis. Habermas’

theory of communicative action is influenced by the democratic ideals developed by Rousseau, Kant and Rawls' conceptualizations of international relation.

Communicative rationality is emotionally motivated solidarity. Human beings are rational authors of norms and values. The moments of practical everyday communicative rationality is the achievements of social integration. Habermas makes a critique on the brash denial of reason and his philosophy is the critique of reason. Habermas' conceptualization of communicative, political action is consociational democracy and constitutional patriotism. It is cultural humanism or cultural rationalism. Habermas believes that "only a democracy that is understood in terms of communication theory is feasible under the conditions of complex societies...a communicative stream of a vital public sphere embedded in liberal political culture".³⁰ Habermas' theory of communicative action brings to the foreground epistemological realism and public dialogue. Habermas opines that "what we may achieved with the successful refounding of the unity of a nation-state that was torn apart decades ago depends first of all on how we assess the future of the nation-state in general".³¹ As we have seen, system-life world forms the horizon of processes of reaching mutual understanding in which participants rationally agree upon or discuss something in the one objective world (common social world). Understanding is an ongoing process, rather than something that is ever completed, so he also rejects the idea that there is any final determinacy to understanding. Communicative action or deliberative democracy is not possible when we have virtually lost our humanity, when the sacredness of our humanity is at a lowest web, when we live our lives at the cost of our humanity. Our common social world has been submerged by human immaturity to use the words of Kant. Human immaturity makes Habermas' moral theory not feasible. Habermas is apologetic in his moral theory and he fails to put other indices of human flourishing into focus. Security is very important in our dialogic communication and deliberative democratic commitment. His philosophical cum sociological theory is utopic. Habermas' philosophy stipulates the fact that society is governed by normative structure and legitimate expectation. The world is governed by ideas and ideas rule the world. Ideas are the most powerful element ruling the socio-political world. The most important thing on earth is an idea. Communicative action is all about social integration and system integration. What made Habermas' theory

philosophical? What made his work philosophical is his idea of the philosophy of language influenced by Wittgenstein. Habermas' philosophy of society is influenced by Parson, Durkheim, Mead, Marx, Kant, Rawls, Hegel, Levinas, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Husserl and Wittgenstein. What formed the basis of Habermas' philosophy is his preponderance on the normative structures of society and his cognizance of human emancipation and human flourishing. The politics of recognition is a modern concept, developing out of the collapse of hierarchies in the eighteenth century. Communicative action is the social analysis of everyday discursive practice and its normative framework is said to be universal, abstract, formal, rationally, ethically and epistemologically grounded.

Habermas' theory of communicative action reflects on his ethical writings and political discussions. Habermas concludes that "reaching understanding in the life world requires a cultural tradition that ranges across the spectrum, not just the fruits of science and technology".³² The Habermasian picture of the normative structure of society reflected that our practical existence has a normative and systemic character. The idea of linguistic communication has to do with normative and systemic character of meaning. We do not fully control the totality of our existence. Habermas believes that "we do not fully control the totality of our practical existence".³³ The Habermasian picture of the human world presupposes the critique of reason and theory of communicative action.

Endnotes

1. Habermas, Jurgen., *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. C. Lenhardt and S. W NicholSEN. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1983) p. 20.
2. Hasen, F. Thorbjorn., *Philosophical Praxis as a Community of Wonder in Education and Professional Guidance in Andrea Kenkmann, (ed), (2009), Teaching Philosophy*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group, p. 204.
3. Borradori., Giovanna, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, (London and Chicago.: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. 38.
4. Ritzer, George., and Stepnisky, Jeffrey., *Sociological Theory, Ninth Edition*, (Singapore: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Limited, 2014), p. 56.
5. Ibid., 165.
6. Ibid.,
7. Hoffman, J., and Graham Paul., *Introction to Political Theory, Second Edition*,(England: Pearson Eduction Limited, 2009), p. 493.
8. Ibid.,
9. Ibid., pp. 187-189.
10. Mackenzie Lain., *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), p. 41.
11. Ibid., p. 114.
12. Ibid., p. 115.
13. Ibid., p. 116.
14. Jay, Richard. *Democracy in Eccleshall*, Robert Eccleshall, (eds) (1992). Political ideologies: An Introduction, (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), p.177.
15. Op. cit., pp. 107-108.
16. Baradat, L.P., *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, Ninth Edition, (New Delhi: Printice-Hill of India Private Limited, 2006), p.19.
17. Hoffman, John. and Graham Paul., *Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition*, p. 429.
18. Ibid.,
19. Ibid., p. 426.
20. Ibid.,
21. Ibid., p.21.
22. Martin Plot. *Communicative Action's Democratic Deficit: A Critique of Habermas's Contribution to Democratic Theory*, International Journal of Communication 3(2009), p. 829.
23. Ibid., p. 830.
24. Ibid., 832.
25. Ibid., p. 839.
26. Habermas, J., *A Berlin Republic: Writings on Germany*, trans. Steven Rendall with Introduction by Peter Uwe Hohendahl, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 134.
27. Ibid., p. 154.
28. Habermas, Jurgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, trans. William. Rehg (Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press, 1996), p. 18.
29. Ibid., p. 29.
30. Op. cit., p. 133.
31. Ibid., p. 168.
32. Habermas, Jurgen, *Moral Cnsciousness and Communicative Action*, , p. 18.
33. Ibid., p.10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appiah K. Anthony., (2006): *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, New York: W.W. Norton Press.
- Alan, T., (2006): *Value and Context: The Nature of Moral and Political Knowledge*: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asouzu., I., (2003): *Effective Leadership and the Ambivalence of the Human Interest: The Nigerian Paradox in a Complementary Perspective*, Calabar: The University of Calabar Press.
- Arthur, John, (1999): *Morality and Moral Controversies, Fifth Edition*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Baradat, L.P., (2006): *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact, Ninth Edition*, New Delhi: Printice-Hill of India Private Limited.
- Bastista, M., (1985): *Philosophical Anthropology*, Bangalore, India: Theological Publications of India.
- Benhabib, S., Dallmayr, F, (eds), (1990): *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berofsky, B., (1995): *Liberation from Self: A Theory of Personal Autonomy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borradorri, G., (2003): *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue Between Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, Allen, (2004): *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buzby, A., (2010): *Communicative Action*, United Kingdom: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers,
- Calhoun, C., (ed), (1997): *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Carden, S., (2006): *Virtue Ethics: Dewey and MacIntyre*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Carroll, W., David., (2004): *Psychology of Language*, Fourth Edition, USA: Thompson and Wardsworth.
- Cohen, M., (2008): *Political Philosophy from Plato to Mao, Second Edition*, London: Pluto Press.
- Craig, E., (ed), (1998): *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Routledge Books.
- Critchley, S., Bernasconi, R., (2002): *The Cambridge Companion to Levinas*, Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.

- Derrida, J., (2006): *Honesty of Thought in the Derrida-Habermas Reader*, Thomassen, Chicago III: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dukor, M., (2004): *Justice, Law and Corporate Ethics: A Philosophical Essays*, Lagos: Frankody & Associates.
- Eccleshall, R, Geoghegan, V, and Wilford, R, (Eds), (1992): *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*, London and New York: Routledge,.
- Edgar, A., (2005): *The Philosophy of Habermas*, Montreal, Mc-Gill.: Queens University Press.
- Elegido, J.M., (1994): *Jurisprudence*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited,.
- Eriksen, E. O., and Weigard, J, (eds), (2004): *Understanding Habermas: Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Ferrante J., (2003): *Sociology: A Global Perspective*, Fifth Edition, USA: Wadsworth and Thomson Learning.
- Fiala, A., (2005): *Tolerance and the Ethical Life*, London: Continuum Internation Publishing Group.
- FinLayson, J.G., Habermas (2004): *A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Orxford University Press.
- Foster, B.M., (2001): *Masters of Political Thought, Volume 1: Plato to Machiavelli*, Great Britain: George Harrap & Company Limited.
- Gadamer, H. G., (2004): *Truth and Method, Second Edition*, trans. Joel Weinshermer and Donald G. Marshall, NewYork: Crossroad.
- Giddens A. (1984): *Constitution of Society: Outline of Theory of Structuration*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Goodwin, E. R., (1992): *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guyer, P., (1992): *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, J., (1979) *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy, Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1984a): *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. T. McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1987b): *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume.2: Lifeworld and System: A Functionalist Critique of Reason*, trans. T. McCarthy, Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1975): *Legitimation Crisis*, trans T. McCarthy, Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1973): *Theory and Practice*, trans. J.Viertel, Boston: Beacon Press.

- (2001): *On the Pragmatics of Social Interaction*, trans. B. Fultner Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (1971): *Knowledge and Human Interests* trans. J.J. Shapiro, Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1970): *Toward A Rational Society*, trans. J.J Shapiro, Boston: Beacon Press.
- (1996): *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, trans. W. Rehg Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1993): *Justification and Application*, trans. C.P. Cronin, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (1996), *Postmetaphysical Thinking*, trans. W.M Hohengarten, Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.
- (1997): *A Berlin Republic: Writings on Germany*, trans. Steven Rendall with Introduction by Peter Uwe Hohendahl, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- (1983): *Moral Cnsciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. C. Lenhardt and S. W NicholSEN, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1989): *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. T.Burger and F. Lawrence, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (1988): *On the Logic of the Social Sciences*, trans. S.W NicholSEN and J.A. Stark, Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.
- (1988): *Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, trans. C. Cronon and P. DeGreiff (Eds). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (1988): *On the Pragmatics of Communication*, trans. B. Fultner, Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.
- (2001): *The Postnational Constellation*, trans. M. Pensky, Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.
- (2003): *Truth and Justification*, trans. B. Fultner, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (2003): *The Future of Human Nature*, trans. W.Rehg, M. Pensky and H. Beister Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2006): *The Divided West*, trans. C.Cronin, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2006): *Time of Transitions*, Cambridge III: Polity Press.
- (2008), *Between Naturalism and Religion* trans. C.Cronin, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2002): *Religion and Rationality: Essays on Reason, God, and Modernity*, ed. Edwardo Menchieta, Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.

- (1987): *Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, trans. Fredrick G. Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Habermas J., and Derrida, J., (2006): “February 15, or what Binds Europeans Together: A Plea for a Common Foreign Policy, Beginning in the core of Europe” in *The Derrida – Habermas Reader*, (ed) Lasse Thomassen, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Heath, J., (2001): *Communicative Action and Political Choice*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Held, D., (1995): *Democracy and Global Order: From the Modern to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hendley, S., (2008): *From Communicative Action to the Face of the Other: Levinas and Habermas on Language, Obligation and Community*, Landham, MD.: Lexington Books.
- Herrick, J., (2003): *Humanism: An Introduction*, Ibadan: Gadfly Publishers.
- Hoffman, J., and Graham, P., (eds.) (2009): *In Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition*, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hofmeyr, A. B., (2005): *Ethics and Aesthetics in Foucault and Levinas*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academics Press.
- Honneth, A., and J. H., (eds.), (1991): *Communicative Action, Essays on Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Iroegbu, P., (2000): *Kpim of Personality: A Treatise on Human Person*, Owerri: Eustel Publications Nigeria.
- Jary, D., and Jary, J., (eds.), (2000): *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*, Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Kahn, V., (1985): *Habermas, Machiavelli, and the Humanist Critique of Ideology in Rhetoric, Prudence and Skepticism in the Renaissance*, USA: Cornell University Press.
- Kenkmann, A., (ed.), (2009): *Teaching Philosophy*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Kim, J., and Sosa, E., (eds.), (1995): *A Companion to Metaphysics: A Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, London: Blackwell Publishers Limited.
- Lawhead, W., (2002): *Voyage of Discovery: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy, Second Edition*, USA: Wadsworth Group Limited.
- MacKendrick, K., (2008): *Discourse, Desire and Fantasy, in Habermas, Critical Theory*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mackenzie L., (2009): *Politics: Key Concepts in Philosophy*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

- Miller, D.G., (2011): *Mimesis and Reason: Habermas's Political Philosophy*. State University New York.
- Muller, H., (2011): *Habermas Meets role Theory-Communicative Action as Role Playing in Role Theory in International Relations* ed. By Sebastian Harnisch *et.al* (London: Routledge)
- Odimegwu, I., (2008): *Philosophic Foundations of Politics*, Amawbia: Lumos Nigeria Limited.
- Omoregbe, J., (2007): *An Introduction to Philosophical Jurisprudence*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Limited.
- Paine, T., (1996): *Rights of Man*, Great Britain: Wordsworth Edition Limited.
- Payne, M, Ponnuswami, M, and Payne, J, (eds.), (1996): *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers Limited.
- Payrow Shabani, Omid A., (2003): *Democracy, Power and Legitimacy: The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rehg, W., (2009): *Cogent Science in Context: The Science Wars, Argumentation Theory, and Habermas*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Rawls, J., A (1971): *Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ritzer, G., and Stepnisky, J., (eds.), (2014), *Sociological Theory, Ninth Edition*, Singapore: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Limited.
- Robert, E., (eds.), (1992): *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Rosen, S., (ed.), (2000): *Philosophy 101: Selections from the Western World's Greatest Thinkers*, (New York: Gramercy Books)
- Thomassen L. (2006): *Introduction: Between Deconstruction and Rational Reconstruction*, Chicago, III: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ukagba, G, Obi, D, and Nwanwor, I, (eds.), (2013): *The Kpim of Social Order: A Season of Inquiry, Meaning and Significance in the Modern World*, USA: Xlibris Corporation.
- White S., (ed.), (1995): *The Cambridge Companion to Habermas*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiggershaus, R, (2004): *Jurgen Habermas*, Reibeck Bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Weinman, M., (2007): *Pleasure in Aristotle's Ethics*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Wisnewsky, J. J., (2007): *Wittgenstein and Ethical Inquiry: A Defense of Ethics as Clarification*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

- Warburton, N., (2006): *Philosophy: The Classics, Third Edition*, London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Watson, M.S.A., (2004): *An Introduction to International Political Economy*, London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Watts, M., (2001): *Heidegger: A Beginner's Guide*, London: Hodder and Stoughton Educational Limited.
- Schechter, M., (2010): *Political Theory-Habermas and Rawls*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schechter M, (2010) *From Rationalization to Communicative Action: The Critique of Instrumental Reason from Weber to Habermas*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Schomberg, V., and Barnes, K., (eds.), (2002): *Discourse and Democracy: Essays on Habermas's 'Between Facts and Norms'*, Albany: SUNY Press.
- Sluga, H. K., and David, G. S, (eds.), (1996): *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sorell, T, (ed.), (1996): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

JOURNAL ARTICLES:

- Adriano, J. L., “*Public Sphere and Deliberative Democracy in Jurgen Habermas: Theoretical Model and Critical Discourses*”, *American Journal of Sociological Research*, Vol.2 No.4, (2012), pp. 58-71.
- Blau, A., “*Rationality and Deliberative Democracy: A Critique of John Dryzek's Democratic Theory*”, *Journal of Politics*, School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, M139 PL, United Kingdom, (2011), pp. 37-57.
- Chang, L., Thomas, J. L., and Weiyu Zhang, W., “*A Communicative Action Approach to Evaluating Citizens' Support for Government Smoking Policies*”, *International Journal of Communication Association*, National University of Singapore, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, (2013), pp. 234-543.
- Cortina, A.,” *Communicative Democracy: A Version of Deliberative Democracy in ARSP Archiv for Rechts-und Socialphilosophie*”, Vol. 96, No.2, (2010), pp. 133-150.
- Duvenage, P., “*Communicative Reason and Religion: The Case of Habermas*”, *Sophia*, Vol.49, No.3, (2010), pp. 343-357.
- Edelglass, “*Philosophy and Place-Based Pedagogy in Andrea Kenkmann (ed.) Teaching Philosophy*”, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), pp.69-80.
- Finlayson, J. G., “*Habermas versus Rawls' Redivivus in Politics and Ethics Review*” 3:1, (2011), pp. 144-162.

- “*The Persistence of Normative Questions in Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action*”, *Constellation*, Vol. 20, No. 4, (2013), pp. 518-532.
- Flynn, J., “*Communicative Power in Habermas’s Theory of Democracy*”, *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol.3, No.4 October , (2004), pp.433-454.
- George, E.E., (ed.) “*An International of Journal of African Culture and Communication*”, Maiden Edition, Volume 1No.1, Department of Philosophy, Imo State University, (2012), pp.1-22.
- Gillian, H., “*Teaching Philosophy in Context: or Knowledge Does Not Keep Any Better Than Fish*”, in Andrea Kenkmann (ed.) *Teaching Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), pp.5-22.
- Hasen, F. T., “*Philosophical Praxis as a Community of Wonder in Education and Professional Guide*” in Andrea Kenkmann (ed.), *Teaching Philosophy*, (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), pp. 192-211.
- Haysom, K., “*Communicating Depth: Habermas and Merleau Ponty on Language and Praxis*”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 37. No. 5, (2009), pp. 649-675.
- Healy P., “*Rethinking Deliberative Democracy: From Deliberative Discourse to Transformative Dialogue*”, *Journal of Politics, Philosophy and Social Criticisms*, Swinbourne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, May 1, (2012), pp. 295-311.
- Hoch,C. J.,“*Pragmatic Communicative Action Theory*”, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, University of Illinois at Chicago, (2013), pp.111-117.
- Kernstock, J., and Brexendorf, O. T., *Implications of Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action for Corporate Brand Management*, *An International Journal*, Vol. 14, (2009), pp. 389-403.
- Kim J.N., and Grunig, E. J., “*Problem Solving and Communicative Action: A Situational Theory of Problem Solving*”, *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 61, Issue 1, Wiley Online Library, (2011), pp. 120-149.
- Lagi, M., Karla Z. Bertrand., Z.K., and Yam, B.Y ., “*The Food Crises and Political Instability in North Africa and the Middle East*”, *New England Complex Systems Institute*, 238 Main St., Suite 319, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA, September 28, (2011), pp.1-7.
- Lester, S., *An Introduction to Phenomenological Research*,’ Tauton UK: Stan Lester Developments, (1999), pp.1-6.
- Mahon, P., “*Habermas and Communicative Power*”, *Journal of Power*, Vol.3 No.1, (2010), pp. 53-73.
- Marquis, C., “*Habermas, Dialogue, and Change in the International System*”, June 28 (2013), pp.1-7.
- Mathieu, D., “*Social Control and the Theory of Communicative Action*”, *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 22(4) (1994), pp. 355-373.

- Muller, H., “*Arguing, Bargaining and All That: Communicative Action, Rationalist Theory and the Logic of Appropriateness in International Relations*”, *European Journal of International Relations*, September, (2004), pp. 395-435.
- Morris, M., “*Social Justice and Communication: Mill, Marx and Habermas*”, *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 22. No.1, (2009), pp.1-28.
- Neil, O. C., “*Understanding Habermas: Communicative Action and Deliberative Democracy*”, *Zotero International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 4, (2005), Pp.1-10.
- Odimegwu I, Godalex E, and Aghamelu F, (Eds), *Philosophy, Democracy and Globalization*, World Philosophy Day, Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, (2006), pp.120-124.
- Outthwaite, W., “*Reconstructive Science and Methodological Dualism in the Work of Jurgen Habermas*”, *Philosophical Inquiry*, Vol.38, No. 1-2, (2014), pp. 2-18.
- Papastephanou, M., *Communicative Ethics: The Un-Kantian Side of Post- Kantian Ethical Project*, Minerva: Department of Education, University of Cyprus, (2000), pp.1-9.
- Palazzo, G., and Scherer, G. A., *Corporate Legitimacy as Deliberation: A Communicative Framework*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 66, No.1, (2006), pp. 71-88.
- Pearce, W.B., and Pearce, A. K., “*Taking a Communication Perspective on Dialogue*” in Anderson, R., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N., Eds (2003), *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, pp. 39-56.
- Plot, M. *Communicative Action’s Democratic Deficit: A Critique of Habermas’s Contribution to Democratic Theory*, *International Journal of Communication* 3(2009), 825-852.
- Prychitko, D. L., and Storr, V. H., *Communicative Action and the Radical Constitution: The Habermasian Challenge to Hayek, Mises and Their Descendants*, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 31, No.2, March 1, (2007), pp. 255-274.
- Risse, T., “*Let’s Argue*”: *Communicative Action in World Politics*”, *American Journal of International Relation*, USA, (2013), pp.
- Sandu, A., “*Deliberative Democracy and Communicative Action of Jurgen Habermas*”, *Romania, Balusescu: Universitatea Mihail Kogalniceanu*, (2013), pp.235-256.
- Schaefer, M., Heinze, J. H., Michael, R., and Claudia, D., *Communicative Versus Strategic Rationality: Habermas Theory of Communicative Action and the Social Brain*, (Ed) Ben J.Harrison, The University of Melbourne, Australia, (2013), pp.145-179.
- Stephen, D., “*Moral Obligation: Form and Substance*”, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Yale University, November 9, (2009), pp.1-17.
- Swidler, L., “*What is Dialogue*”? Accessed {June, 2014}, pp.1-13.
- Thomassen, L., “*Communicative Reason, Deconstruction, and Foundationalism: Reply to White and Farr*”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 41 No. 3, (2013), pp. 482-488.

MAGAZINE CITED

Stephens, M., *The Theologian of Talk*; “*The Question is whether Justice Exists and Reason can benefit Society*”. Los Angeles Times Magazine, October 23, (1994), pp. 1-12.