HABERMAS'S CRITICAL THEORY

MOHAMMAD KHAER FAISAL AHMAD AL-DHMOUR

PhD in Political Science, University of Jordan.

Abstract

The term critical theory is used in the humanities and social sciences to refer to an intellectual evaluation and criticism of society and culture, and theory becomes critical, according to Max Horkheimer, insofar as it seeks to liberate human beings from the conditions that enslave them. This study aimed to identify the critical theory that took on an intellectual character derived from revolutionary Marxist ideas and moved to advanced ideas during the era of Max Horkheimer by denouncing bourgeois consumerist capitalist culture, and focusing attention on Habermas's contributions to it .The study revealed that critical theory aims to change society at all levels and levels, achieve human liberation, reconcile theory and practice, combine knowledge and purpose, reconcile theoretical reason and practical reason, and combine truth and value, and that critical theory is a critical renewal of theories. Marxism and radicalism. Critical theory also aimed to enlighten the committed human being mentally and intellectually and change him positively, after freeing him from his own pressures, by criticizing society by stripping it ideologically.

Keywords: Critical Theory, Habermas Critical Philosophy, Communicative Action, Public Space.

INTRODUCTION

The term critical theory is used in the humanities and social sciences to refer to the intellectual evaluation and criticism of society and culture. Theory becomes critical, according to Max Horkhaimer (Abu Rayyan, 1966), insofar as it seeks to free humans from the conditions that enslave them.

The term critical theory describes the Western Marxist philosophy of the Frankfurt School, which was developed in Germany during the 1930s, and spread widely during the postmodern period in Germany (Ahmed, 2005).

Critical theory took on an intellectual character derived from Marxist revolutionary ideas and moved to advanced ideas in the era of Max Horkhaimer through the abolition of the bourgeois culture of consumer capitalism. The goal of the theory was to change society at all levels, achieve human liberation, reconcile theory and practice, combine knowledge and purpose, reconcile theoretical reason with practical reason, and combine truth and value (Bruner, 2016).

This study will address the most notable contributions of Jürgen Harpermas to critical theory.

Statement of purpose

Critical theory aims to establish a multi-sourced social theory such as the use of Marxism, psychoanalysis, and reliance on empirical research. This theory has exceeded the Cantic theory, the Hegelian idealism, and the Marxist dialectic, as it represents a criticism of reality, and a criticism of society in a negative way.

The concept of critical theory was associated with the book of Horkhaimer, which is entitled "Traditional Theory and Critical Theory, in which he collected all the perceptions of the owners

of the Frankfurt School, whether theoretical or applied, and included all the proposals that they believed in to save and correct literature (Al-Nour, 2005).

Habermas has made great contributions to critical theory, and this is what is centered on the problem of the study, as it seeks to recognize the contributions of Jurjan Habermas in this theory.

Study importance

The importance of this study comes from the importance of critical theory, which aimed at changing society at all levels, achieving human liberation, harmonizing theory and practice, combining knowledge and purpose, reconciling theoretical reason with practical reason, and matching truth and value. In addition, critical theory is a critical renewal of Marxist and radical theories. Critical theory has also aimed at enlightening the committed person mentally and intellectually enlightenment and changing him positively, after freeing him from his own pressures, by criticizing society by ideologically stripping it.

I. The philosophical foundations of critical theory

Max Horkhaimer was the first to define critical theory in his 1937 article entitled Critical Theory and Traditional Theory. According to Horkhaimer, critical theory is a social theory oriented towards the critique and change of society as a whole, and in contrast, traditional theory is directed only to the understanding or interpretation of society (Abu Rayyan, 1966).

Horkheimer wanted to distinguish critical theory as a radical, libertarian form of Marxist theory (Ahmed,2005), criticizing both the scientific model proposed by logical positivism, and what he considered to be the authoritarian positivism of Marxism and traditional communism. For Horkheimer, theory is critical insofar as it seeks to liberate humans from the conditions that enslave them (Bruner, 2016).

Critical theory includes a normative dimension, whether it is its criticism of society through some theories of value and standards, or through its criticism of its values, and the main concepts of monetary theory are as follows (Abu Rayyan, 1966):

1. Critical theory is directed at the whole of society in its historical specificity (i.e., how this society is formed at a certain point in time) (Bottomore, 2004).

2. Critical theory develops an understanding of society through the integration of all major social sciences, including geography, economics, sociology, history, political science, anthropology, and psychology (Al-Nour, 2005).

Critical theory derived the term (criticism) from its Kanto use in the 18th century, and the Marxist use in the 19th century AD.

A feature of critical theory, as explained by Horkheimer and Adorno, is the existence of certain contradictions related to the primary source or the basis of social domination, as this contradiction has led to the pessimism of the new critical theory about the possibility of human freedom and liberation (Al-Yazghi & Al-Ruwaili, 2000).

This contradiction was, of course, rooted in the historical circumstances in which the work was originally produced, specifically the rise of National Socialism, state capitalism, and the manufacture of culture, as completely new forms of social domination, which cannot be adequately explained within the terms of traditional Marxist sociology (Ahmed, 2005).

State intervention in the economy, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, has led to the effective abolition of the tension between production relations and the material productive forces of society (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992).

This tension, according to traditional critical theory, establishes a primary contradiction within capitalism. The market, as an unconscious mechanism for distributing goods, has been replaced by central planning. Contrary to Marx's famous prediction in the Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy, this transformation did not lead to an era of social revolution, but rather to fascism and totalitarianism (Afaya, 1991).

As such, the critical theory has left without something new, when the forces of production enter into a harmful coexistence with the relations of production that were supposed to open the doors wide (Alvesson & Willmott,1992), there is no longer any dynamic for that criticism that can build its hope, and this presupposes the problem of how to explain the apparent stability of domination, in the absence of the extreme contradiction that was a source of domination itself according to traditional monetary theory (Abu Rayyan,1966).

Modernist critical theory was preoccupied with the forms of power and injustice associated with the development of industrial and corporate capitalism, as an economic political system, while postmodern critical theory politicized social problems by placing them in historical and cultural contexts, to commit itself to the processes of collecting and analyzing data, and the relativity of its findings (Bernstein, 1983).

This meaning is seen as unstable as a result of rapid transformations in social structures, and thus the focus of research is on local manifestations rather than broad generalizations (Broadbent et al., 1991).

Postmodern critical research is also characterized by a crisis of representation that rejects the idea that the researcher's work should be an objective description of this stable other (Afaya, 1991). Instead, many postmodern researchers embrace alternatives that encourage reflection on the politics and poetics of their work, evident in approaches to the embodied, collaborative, dialogic, and improvisational aspects of qualitative research (Manfred, 2002).

Jürgen Habermas is considered as one of the most important fundamental scholars at the Frankfurt School who criticize postmodernism, where Habermas' critical theory focuses on language, symbolism, communication and social construction (Abu Rayyan, 1966), which will be addressed later in this study. Critical theory allows public relations practitioners to learn about participatory plans, by opening the way for voices that have never been heard before (Bottomore,2004), allows professionals to create more specialized campaigns using the knowledge of other fields of study, and provides them with the ability to understand and change social institutions by endorsing them (Feenberg,1991).

II. The basis of Habermas's critical theory

Habermas' critical knowledge revolves around principles that distinguish it from the natural sciences and humanities, through its orientation to self-reflection and liberation, and although Habermas is incompatible with the thought of Adorno and Horkhammer presented in the book The Enlightenment Dialectic, (Forester,1992), he adopts the view that the era of modernity is characterized by its distance from the liberation of the Enlightenment and its approach to a new form of slavery according to the formula of servatism (Foucault,1972).

Among the most important ideas of Habermas affecting critical theory are the concepts of the public sphere and the communicative act, as the communicative action is a partial reaction to the new challenges of post-constructivism or the so-called postmodernism in the face of the discourse of modernity (Giddens, 1984).

Habermas is one of the most important second-generation pioneers at the Frankfurt School, and his contributions provide an ongoing response to the critical theory of the first generation of Frankfurt school theorists.

Influenced by the dialectical philosophy of Hegel and Karl Marx, Habermas was opposed to the European approach of neo-Canticism, and the Anglo-Austrian approach of logical empiricism (Habermas, 1984).

Habermas's first work was tagged the structural transformations of public space: questions within the categories of bourgeois society, a constructive critical response to Hurkhier and Adorno's concept of critical theory, and an attempt to solve the critical theory problems of the first generation of the Frankfurt School (Held,1980).

According to Hapremas, the values of historical enlightenment of freedom, synergy and equality lie in the concept of public space and provide the standard of internal criticism, as it is possible to criticize bourgeois society in the eighteenth and 19th centuries for not having its own ideals, and German society can be criticized for not rising to the inclusive society of equality and transparency that these ideals preached, and structural transformations make their way to the theoretical and practical aspirations of the original model of critical theory; which is understanding the social world, and guiding social change by highlighting the potential of social change (Bruner,2016).

Habermas differed from Horkheimer and Urno in his historical diagnosis of the social, political and cultural situation, and his view that rationalization according to them was one-sided and excessively pessimistic, and their concept of the dialectic of enlightenment lacked both empirical and historical justification and conceptual consistency (McCarthy, 1982).

Hence, Habermas's work revolved around saving the original idea of critical theory by blending a more diverse history, a justification for the Enlightenment, and a more consistent model of social theory (Thompson, 1982).

The concept of public space is represented through the structural transformations that draw the formation of the thinking audience whose thought was selected from clubs, cafes and cultural salons after the consolidation of civil rights that guarantee freedom of organization and freedom

of expression for individuals, and the emergence of a free press, where citizens are able to engage in free public discussions, and this crystallized their culture and thought, and a common culture quickly developed that helped participants discover and express their needs and interests, and formulate a perception of the public interest (McCarthy,1982).

With the spread of public power and their influence, public opinion gradually began to play the role of censor over the legitimacy of the unrepresentative and closed government's powers, and by verifying whether or not laws and policies serve the public interest, the public can effectively test their legitimacy (Bruner, 2016).

Although the public space has begun to exercise a political and social function, it cannot be confused with or linked to any specific political institution. It was an informal space for social media settling somewhere between bourgeois civil society and the state or government (Habermas, 1984).

Habermas believes that public space is both an idea and an ideology, as public space is a space in which people participate as equals in a rational discussion in pursuit of truth and the common good. Openness, inclusiveness, equality, and freedom are ideas that were not close to suspicion, but in reality they are pure ideologies or illusions. This is because participation in the public space found in cafés and salons in eighteenth-century Europe was, in theory, always limited to a small group of wealthy, educated men, and wealth and education were the implicit conditions for participation (Thompson, 1982).

In reality, most of them were poor and uneducated, and women were excluded from the public space. Accordingly, the idea of public space remained utopian and merely a comprehensive vision calling for equality among humans for a society worthy of striving to achieve, but it was never fully achieved, just as the concept of bourgeois public space remained ideological; Because the idea of the common good created by the common culture of the masses posited what were in fact the interests of a limited group of educated, wealthy men as the common good of all mankind (McCarthy, 1982).

In summary, the most important point in the Habermas approach was to prove that the idea of the bourgeois public space was beyond the pure illusion; because this space was open to everyone who obtains wealth and education regardless of his status, social status, class to which he belongs or gender, and he was entitled to participate in the public debate, and there was no one who, in theory, excluded from participating in the public space, although many people were actually excluded, and therefore, despite the utopianity of this model, it is such a utopia worth seeking, and then began to be achieved in the social and political reality in Europe during the eighteenth century AD (Held,1980).

The second part of the structural transformations drew the decline of the public space as a result of the popularity of newspapers and magazines that turned into giant capitalist companies serving the private interests of a few influential people, and public opinion gradually lost both its dual independence and its critical function, and instead of promoting the formation of rational opinion and reliable beliefs, the public space became in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries an arena in which public opinion could be directed and manipulated, and newspapers,

mass media magazines, novels, and radio and television broadcasts became consumer elements; freedom and human prosperity were suppressed rather than strengthened, and this gave the power of the state and economic institutions in winning the appreciation and support of the public; which guaranteed them great legitimacy (Giddens,1984).

This pessimistic view of the development of Western capitalist society is consistent with part of Adorno and Horkheimer's views on how to create a homogeneous culture of uncritically entrenched consumers, Habermas adopted the pessimistic analysis of the Frankfurt School that monopolisticism and liberalism of the welfare state in the United States of America ultimately led to the dwindling of human freedom, the hollowing of democratic policies of their content, and did not offer a fruitful alternative to the fragile social order of the German Weimar Republic that acquiesced to the Nazism (Forester,1992).

As a result, Habermas was clear and positive compared to Adorno and Horkhaimer, the public space that had wane should have been deepened, expanded, continued to exercise the task of criticism and legitimizing the political and economic systems, and placed in democratically controlled spheres.

On the other hand, Habermas was optimistic about the final analysis of the "structural transformations" by anticipating the hope that this development has not yet happened, and it may occur in the future on the basis of the current spaces of propaganda integrated into institutions such as political parties, and under favorable political and social conditions, it is possible to bridge the gap between the idea of public space, and social and political reality again (Foucault, 1972).

Habermas's interest in the concept of public space is due to the fact that he views it as a model for democratic policymaking, and the basis for the moral and cognitive values that promote and maintain democracy, namely equality, freedom, rationality and truth.

Habermas has paid attention to individual freedom as a result of his interest in the fate of democratic institutions and the prospects for the renewal of democratic policies, as he has shown a much greater interest in the actual institutional structure of a democratic society than Horkhammer and Adorno. He believes that critical theory should have made its contribution to the types of institutions necessary to protect individuals from the charms of political extremism, on the one hand, and the lootings of the rapidly growing capitalist economy on the other (Forester, 1992).

The main difference in Habermas's critical theory lies in his victory over social theory at the expense of the philosophy of consciousness, through the difference between dealing with communication from the actor's perspective of communication, and dealing with it as if it were an act of dialogue or dialogue in which multiple parties intervene.

In this regard, Habermas believes that the transformation of the perspective that moved from the teleological act to the communicative action began with Mead and Durkham, these, along with Max Weber, belong to the generation of founders of modern sociology (Foucault, 1972).

Habermas defined communicative acts as actions in which the levels of action for the actors belonging to the communicative process are not related to the needs of politics, but rather related to acts of understanding, and no understanding without language; this justifies the words of those interested in Habermas about his linguistic turn, which he himself refers to. Which prompted him to introduce language as a factor to understand communicative relationships, as it is to enhance his perception of communicative action in order to better understand social relationships within society, he argued that the communicative act is distinguished from other acts by not seeking the means that enable him to influence others, but rather looking for how to reach an understanding with him and mutual agreement without coercion (Giddens, 1984).

If understanding is the ultimate goal of the communicative act, it cannot be imagined between the interlocuting parties only on conditions, the most important of which is the non-influence of one party on another because this will inevitably lead to the failure of communication, and in this regard, Habermas says: "The activity of mutual understanding is subject to a basic condition in which the concerned parties achieve a project that is not shared by them... They seek to avoid two dangers, the first is the failure of mutual understanding and misunderstanding; while the second is the failure of the draft act and the complete failure, so the first danger is a necessary condition for avoiding the second" (Held,1980).

As a result, understanding is the communicative reaction in that it aims to achieve agreement; which Habermas calls consensus, as in the absence of consensus between the parties to the communicative act, the communicative act fails.

There are conditions for the success of rational consensus, which are that linguistic use includes built-based arguments, which will lead to the achievement of a common agreement. Because the goal of entering into an argument is to achieve full communication.

Habermas believed that absolute philosophy was an obstacle to the development of rationality when she imagined that it possessed the truth and rationality that Habermas wants in contemporary society, a post-World War II society is not an absolute rationality, called philosophy built on its own but a procedural, critical communicative rationality integrated into the living world. To expand and crystallize the margins of this new rationality, he criticized the new positivist trends that admire science to the point of deleting it. Which is what has been allocated two books, namely: science and technology, kadyology, and knowledge and interest (McCarthy, 1982).

Hence, it is clear that Habermas's theory of communication has been based on a new position of philosophy, redefining its tasks and objectives so that it integrates into a new critical horizon, so it plays a positive and effective role within other topics such as sociology and the whole humanities in an integrative framework, and not within the framework of dominating those sciences. Thus, Habermas has moved away from Kant, Hegel and the philosophy of consciousness.

Habermas proposed an alternative to the philosophy of the self through the communicative rational philosophy that is based on the relationship between the self and seeks to control the relationship of the individual to others and subject the economic, social and political relations

within society to the ethics of discussion and dialogue as an entrance to every social contract that everyone is arbiter. Accordingly, Habermas sought to establish a communicative rationality that has nothing to do with metaphysics, as each mind is the result of interaction between the subjects within society (Giddens, 1984).

The Habermas project aimed at building rationality presented the conditions for understanding as it guarantees the success of daily or deliberative communicative practice, whose importance is to highlight the possible conditions for understanding or what he actually called communicative. To achieve this understanding, Habermas focused on language as an intermediary between selves and through which understanding is achieved within society. On this basis, he paid attention to verbal actions. Habermas has set deliberative tasks, which are: describing things through language, expressing the goals of the speaker, and establishing self-relational relations between interlocutors (Foucault, 1972).

The objectives of any communication process are not achieved unless these conditions are met and adhered to, as the communicative process will take place without coercion or pressure, and in this regard Habermas says: "Each speaker must choose a clear concept expression so that the speaker and the listener can understand each other, as the speaker must have the intention to communicate a real judicial content so that the listener can share his knowledge, and he must also disclose his purposes so that the addressee can believe his statements, and finally the speaker must choose correct phrases that adhere to the limits of the standards and standards being worked so that the addressee can accept these phrases in a way that the speaker and the speaker is in a position that qualifies them to agree (Held,1980).

On this basis, interactive selves can achieve understanding, and Habermas considered that the theory of linguistic verbs is promising in this regard, especially as language is seen in its cognitive dimension and its communicative dimension and deliberative use.

Habermas believes that the ethics of discussion represent a political theory that works to establish a civil democratic society that accommodates pluralism and devotes dialogue, by determining the ethical standards accepted by the members of the communicative community concerned so that they take into account their common interests and have a universal character (Forester, 1992).

Hence the importance of the ethics of discussion and dialogue, as their standards may ensure international balance and support the development of societies. Habermas has presented inferential rules in the ethics of discussion, which are: Everyone who is able to speak and do has a full share in the discussion, and everyone has the right to raise any forms or objection. Within this right is the right to believe and express an opinion, and no one has the right to prevent any of the interlocutors from discussing or using the method of coercing it (McCarthy,1982).

Habermas's discussion ethics were concerned with the standards of communicative action that can only take place within the framework of the constitutional state, where citizens participating in a consultative policy can reach the establishment of standards that are respected and accepted by all.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to identify the critical theory that took an intellectual character derived from Marxist revolutionary ideas and moved to sophisticated ideas during the era of Max Horkhaimer by contradicting the consumer capitalist bourgeois culture, and focusing attention on Habermas' contributions to it.

The study found that the critical theory aims to change society at all levels and levels, and to achieve human liberation, which is composed between theory and practice, the combination of knowledge and purpose, the reconciliation of theoretical reason and practical reason, and the marriage of truth and value, and that critical theory is a critical renewal of Marxist and radical theories, and critical theory has aimed at enlightening the committed person mentally and intellectually and changing him positively, after freeing him from his own pressure, by criticizing society with its ideologically.

The study reached the following findings:

- Among the most important Habermas ideas influential in critical theory are the concepts of the public sphere and the communicative act, as the communicative act is a partial reaction to the new challenges of post-constructivism or the so-called post-modernism in the face of the discourse of modernity.

- Habermas differed from Horkhammer and Orno by his historical diagnosis of the social, political and cultural situation, his vision that rationalization according to them was unilateral and overly pessimistic, and their concept of the dialectic of the Enlightenment lacked both empirical and historical justification and conceptual consistency.

- Habermas's work revolved around rescuing the original notion of critical theory by blending a more diverse and justifiable history of enlightenment with a more consistent model of social theory.

- Habermas's optimistic analysis of the final "structural transformations" through the expectation that this development has not yet happened, and may occur in the future on the basis of the current spaces of propaganda integrated into institutions such as political parties, and under favorable political and social conditions, it is possible to bridge the gap between the idea of public space and social and political reality again.

- Habermas's interest in the concept of public space is due to the fact that he considers it a model for establishing democratic policies, and a basis for the moral and cognitive values that promote and preserve democracy, namely equality, freedom, rationality and truth.

- Habermas was interested in individual freedom as a result of his interest in the fate of democratic institutions and the prospects for the renewal of democratic policies, as he expressed an interest in the actual institutional structure of a democratic society.

- The main difference lies in Habermas's critical theory with his victory for social theory at the expense of the philosophy of consciousness, through a difference between dealing

with communication from the perspective of the actor for communication, and dealing with it as if it were an act of dialogue or dialogue in which multiple parties intervene.

- There are conditions for the success of rational consensus, which is that the linguistic use includes built-based arguments, which will lead to the achievement of a common agreement. Because the goal of entering into an argument is to achieve full communication.

- Habermas believed that absolute philosophy is not absolute rationality, but rather that it is a procedural, critical communicative rationality integrated into the living world.

- Habermas proposed an alternative to self-philosophy through communicative rational philosophy that is based on the relationship between subjectives and seeks to control the relationship of the individual to others and subject economic, social and political relations within society to the ethics of discussion and dialogue as an entry point to every social contract that everyone is subject to.

- According to Hapermas, no communication process is achieved unless it meets the conditions: describing things by language, expressing the speaker's intentions, and establishing bi-permatic relationships between interlocutors.

- Habermas believes that the ethics of discussion represent a political theory that works to establish a civil democratic society that accommodates pluralism and devotes dialogue, by determining the ethical standards accepted by the members of the communic group concerned so that they take into account their common interests and have a universal character.

References

1) Abu Rayyan, Mahmoud, (1966), History of Political Thought, Part 2, Cairo: National House.

2) Afaya, Nour El-Din, (1991), Modernity and Communication, Beirut.

3) Ahmed, Ezzat, (2005), Philosophy and Atypical Philosophy, Notes for Rewriting the History of Philosophy, Al-Ma'rifa Magazine, No. (497), Ministry of Culture, Damascus.

4) Al-Nour, Hisham, (2005), Habermas' Critical Theory, Philosophy as Critical Thinking, Beirut: Center for Arab Unity Studies.

5) Alvesson, M., and Willmott, H. (eds.), (1992), on the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies, Academy of Management Review (17:3) July.

6) Alvesson, M., and Willmott, H. (eds.), (1992), Critical Management Studies, Sage Publications, London.

7) Al-Yazghi, Saad & Al-Ruwaili Megan, (2000), The Literary Critic's Guide, 2nd ed., Beirut: Arab Cultural Center.

8) Bernstein, R.J. Beyond, (1983), Objectivism and Relativism, University of Pennsylvania Press, Pennsylvania.

9) Bottomore, Tom, (2004), Frankfurt School, 2nd edition, (Translated by: Saad Hagras), Tripoli: Oba House.

10) Broadbent, J., Laughlin, R. & Read, S. (1991), Recent Financial and Administrative Changes in the NHS: A Critical Theory Analysis," *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 2.

11) Bruner, Stephen, (2016), A Very Short Introduction to Critical Theory, 1st ed. (Translated by: Sarah Adel), Cairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture.

12) Feenberg, A. (1991), Critical Theory of Technology. Oxford University Press, New York.

13) Forester, John. (1992), Critical ethnography: on field work in Habermasian way," in Critical Management Studies, M. Alvesson, and H. Willmott (eds.), Sage Publications, London.

14) Foucault, M., (1972), the Archaeology of Knowledge, Tavistock, London.

15) Giddens, A. (1984), the Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structure, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

16) Habermas, J., (1984), the Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society, Vol. 1, T. McCarthy (tr.), Beacon Press, Boston, MA.

17) Held, D. (1980), Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas, University of California Press, Berkeley.

18) Manfred, Frank, (2002), The Limits of Communication, (translated by: Ezz Al-Arab Bennani), Casablanca.

19) McCarthy, T. (1982), the Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

20) Thompson, J.B. and Held, D. (eds.), (1982), *Habermas: Critical Debates*, Macmillan, London.