Modernity in Frankfurt: Must a History of Philosophy Be a Philosophy of History?
Critique, Norm and Utopia by Seyla Benhabib
Review by: Benjamin Gregg
Theory and Society, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Jan., 1987), pp. 139-151
Published by: Springer
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/657081
Accessed: 06/08/2014 16:24

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Theory and Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Review essay

Modernity in Frankfurt

Must a history of philosophy be a philosophy of history?

A discussion of Seyla Benhabib, *Critique, Norm and Utopia*
(New York: Columbia University Press, 1986)

BENJAMIN GREGG
Beijing Foreign Studies University, China

Bacon once claimed that a "little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion." By playful analogy one might suggest that precisely those critics of Habermas who know his work best are invariably those most sympathetic towards it. In any case, just such a critic is Seyla Benhabib, who interprets the practical philosophy of Hegel, Marx, Horkheimer, and Adorno from the perspective of Habermas's grand paradigm shift, his "linguistic turn." Habermas seeks to realize finally what this entire tradition's inherent aporia have always blocked: its own emancipatory goals of freedom, autonomy, justice, and happiness. Benhabib finds in his strategy the only possible way out of the multiple crises of this philosophical genre: namely in basing the normative foundations of critical social theory on "communicative ethics." Benhabib's *task* is to make small changes within what she defines as the overall gains in theory-construction made by Habermas. Her *methodology* is itself Habermasian: *Theoriegeschichte in systematischer Absicht*, i.e. the reconstruction of continuities and breaks in the "evolution" of theories within a given intellectual tradition, toward identifying systemic problems and developing alternative strategies to overcome its immanent problems, rescuing a thinker's intentions, now reinterpreted, from a framework precluding their realization. Her *focus* is the labor-model of activity, which she traces from Hegel to Adorno, ending with Habermas's shift from this

Theory and Society 16: 139–151 (1987)
© *Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Dordrecht – Printed in the Netherlands*

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

model to one of communicative action. The former grasps social action in terms of a subject-object relation, the latter as a subject-subject relation; the former conceives of human behavior as "objectification" or "externalization," the latter as "linguistically mediated communication." Her *program* is to apply Hegel's critique of natural-right theories and of Kantian ethics to Habermas's own Kantianism, his rehabilitation of formalism and universalism in ethical theory.

Unfortunately, not all of this is always readily apparent to the reader, for some sections of the book – indeed, whole, long passages – resemble an almost Baroque symphony of arguments and theses, with major and minor themes in elaborate counterpoint, sometimes losing itself in a cacophony of unrelieved complexity. She sometimes multiplies classifications to the extent of obfuscating their relations to one another, and she spends too much time on ancillary arguments, which, while interesting in and of themselves, burden the main account. Benhabib inadequately anticipates the reader's difficulty by extensive résumé of steps taken and foreglimpses of steps to come. The book could be pared down, the relation of the various argumentative strands to each other made clearer, the main theses brought into greater relief, the book's overall project revealed at every step along the way rather than now and then re-emerging at points of recapitulation and programmatic preview. The book's central argument would become clearer as the experience for the reader attained a cogency equal to that of the book's substance. The central narrative might be summarized as follows, in eight steps corresponding to the text's eight chapters.

In the primary step Hegel develops a methodology of immanent critique showing how natural-right theories reify the social status quo and that counter-factual arguments (e.g. the "state of nature") are based on a *petitio principii* (*Natural Law*, 1802/3). Yet the normative foundation of the critique is not itself immanent but transcendent, a vision of a *unified* ethical and political life that cannot be anchored in a modern age characterized by the differentiation of social life into public, private, and intimate spheres, but only by appealing to a retrospective utopia. Marx, who in his pre-1844 writings adopts Hegel's method, avails himself of a prospective utopia of unity; both standpoints are anti-modernist.

In a second step, Hegel replaces his anti-modernist idea of a unified *Sittlichkeit* with a new model: a collective singular subject of history (humankind) that, through labor, transforms the conditions of its existence and then reappropriates what it has externalized (*Phenomenology of Mind*, 1807). This provides the normative foundation for the new meth-

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

odology of defetishizing critique, which reveals the socially given to be not natural fact but a reality socially and historically given, one therefore capable of being changed. The model also entails the identity of constituting and constituted subjectivity; modern individualism emerges when the former (the individual) denies the latter (the context out of which he or she emerges). This model – which provides the normative foundation for both immanent and defetishizing critique, indeed for much of Hegel's, Marx's, Horkheimer's, and Adorno's thought (with vestiges even in Habermas) – is the first full-fledged appearance of the single main antagonist in Benhabib's entire narrative, and the only one providing the book's overall logic: the "philosophy of the subject" (hereafter abbreviated as "subject philosophy"). It has four presuppositions: (a) a unitary model of action that reduces all human activity to "externalization" or "objectification;" (b) a transsubjective subject (a collective singular subject) of history, as humankind or Spirit (Hegel), as species or proletariat (Marx), as the revolutionary subject (Horkheimer/Adorno), or as the species competencies of an anonymous subject (Habermas); (c) history interpreted teleologically as the noncontingent steps in the unfolding of the capacities of a collective singular subject; and (d) the identity of constituting and constituted objectivity. "Subject philosophy" surreptitiously identifies a collective singular subject with the finite individual who labors and produces, confusing a normative with an empirical self, privileging the subject-object relation, and abstracting from subject-subject relations and from the shared, social world where humans attain their identity as persons through linguistically mediated socialization. Already in this early step we see how Habermas's theory predetermines Benhabib's perspective on all other members of her cast (a problem to which I will return).

In fact, subject philosophy's four presuppositions are really two: (a) and (d) are two aspects of the same thing. Human action qua "objectification" or "externalization" (a) entails in the Hegel-Marx tradition the identity of the constituting objectivity (the subject) and constituted objectivity (the object) (d). The establishment of this identity is the very impulse behind all metaphysics of reconciliation. This is also the goal of Horkheimer's and Adorno's concept of "mimesis" (which is why their concept is self-contradictory, seeking an alternative to subject-object relations determined cognitively and instrumentally, yet remaining within the externalization paradigm). Presuppositions (b) and (c) are also merely two aspects of the same idea: a collective singular subject of history (b) is the supposed empirical carrier within a teleological *Geschichtsphilosophie* (c). Habermas speaks of "das Paradigma der Bewusstseinsphilosophie" as "ein die Objekte *vorstellendes* und an ihnen sich *abar-*

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

beitendes Subjekt."[1] This is the externalization model of human action: a combination of idealist epistemology and naturalist action-theory. To this extent, one-half of Benhabib's "subject philosophy" is identical with Habermas's "philosophy of consciousness."[2] Her only discussion of the relation between the "philosophy of the subject" and the "philosophy of consciousness" comes in a brief footnote[3] where she flatly maintains that they are not equivalent. Yet her entire explication of this purported difference is limited to defining "subject philosophy" again by reference to presupposition (c) (and to a further aspect in fact related to presupposition (a): that emancipation entails the reappropriation of the heritage of the collective singular subject of history). Perhaps she means that "subject philosophy" differs from "Bewusstseinsphilosophie" in that the former includes these presuppositions, whereas the latter doesn't. By not mentioning other presuppositions, does she mean to imply their equivalence with Habermas's model? In any case, her "subject philosophy" reduces to Habermas's "Subjektphilosophie" with the addition of a *geschichtsphilosophisches* element.

Progress in theory-construction is then realized with Marx's perspective in the *1884 Manuscripts*, which, while still marked by elements of "subject philosophy," is also characterized by a "philosophy of sensuous finitude." Whereas the first assumes the standpoint of the collective singular subject and views history as objectification and self-expression, the second introduces the standpoint of the individual and views history as self-negation and alienated objectification; the former implies the future *fulfillment* of the achievements of bourgeois revolutions, the latter connotes the *transfiguration* of these achievements and the creation of a new mode of association and sociality. Yet Marx cannot realize the potential of this new perspective as a philosophy of situatedness and embeddedness because he still adheres to the "objectification" model of human activity locating the formation process of social individuals in the medium of production, not in the media of language, culture, and social interaction. This is Habermas's view, and by adopting it at the very outset, Benhabib again reads Marx as an imperfect approximation of Habermas.

Benhabib now interrupts the strictly historical progression and returns, in a third step, to the mature Hegel and chronicles the development of an alternative to another aspect of "subject philosophy": "transsubjectivity" (*Philosophy of Right*, 1821). From the standpoint of "intersubjectivity," the agents' perspective constitutes the validity and meaning of their interactions; the standpoint of "transsubjectivity" locates this va-

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

lidity and meaning in a third person, a thinker-observer external to the shared perspectives of social agents. Hegel's critique of Kantian ethics incorporates both perspectives, yet in his final analysis of society his transsubjective ideal of freedom prevents him from exhausting the (ambivalent) gains of modernity. For Benhabib this means that Hegel fails to extend to the political sphere the right of self-determination, substituting ethical *integration* for political *participation* and thereby limiting the communicative evaluation of political legitimacy by the citizens themselves. The transsubjective perspective (later adopted by Marx) and the work-model of human activity both exclude the category of interaction, of an intersubjective plurality of communicating selves. Habermas, precisely in rejecting the labor-paradigm and introducing the interaction category, realizes the goals of Hegel and Marx – the self-realization of the individual – in a way theoretically not open to them.

Step Four examines Marx's *Capital* (1867), which shows that the two perspectives of intersubjectivity and transsubjectivity are constitutive of capitalist society. But whereas Hegel affirms the latter perspective and reifies its logic, Marx reveals it as a consequence of the capital-valorization law. With the intersubjective perspective he correlates crisis qua *lived* alienation, exploitation and injustice; with the transsubjective perspective he correlates crisis qua failure of the *system's* functional logic. Yet Marx's attempted reconciliation of these two perspectives (in analyzing the dual characteristics of labor power qua commodity) is unacceptable, and the resulting lack of mediation between lived and functional crises has theoretical and normative implications. On a theoretical level, Marx vacillates between economistic objectivism (qua functional crisis) and a culturalist-psychological perspective of alienation (qua lived crisis). On a normative level, in ascribing normative status to the only mode of collective identification that capitalism seemed to create – class (the subject as a collective entity) – Marx adopts a transsubjective perspective, ignoring that of the participant and denying human plurality. According to Benhabib a critical social theory must incorporate both perspectives, the functional (the explanatory-diagnostic moment of crisis) and the experiential (the anticipatory-utopian moment of crisis). Marx's failure to mediate between them is made good, at least in part, by Habermas, though his communicative ethics is not entirely adequate to the latter perspective (more on this later).

Behabib then turns, in a fifth step, to Horkheimer and Adorno in the 1937–1947 period as Critical Theory evolves from a critique of political economy to one of instrumental reason. In 1937 ("Traditional and Criti-

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

cal Theory") Horkheimer develops a concept of "social praxis" as a labor process *cum* critical-political activity, constituting the social world and objectivity as such. It is based on "subject philosophy" in two respects, conflating critique with labor (i.e. a communicative activity with a non-communicative one), and conflating an empirical sense of humanity (as agent) with a normative sense (as goal) in assuming that labor and critique are activities of the same subject. Ten years later Horkheimer and Adorno abandon this search for the *revolutionary* subject, but not for a *subject* as such (*Dialectic of Enlightenment,* 1947). Their rejection of another tenet of "subject philosophy" – labor and reason as inherently emancipatory – is no less aporetic than the rejected tenet, providing no alternative locus for social emancipation and acknowledging the conditions of its own impossibility. *Dialectic* reflects on the genealogy of reason by means of the very reason whose pathological history it would uncover, and it judges Enlightenment reason to be inherently repressive with the tools of this same reason. The outright rejection of discursive reason also precludes a central goal of early Critical Theory: the collaboration of philosophy and the social sciences.[4] Not until Habermas is this cooperation re-established.

Step Six continues with Horkheimer's and Adorno's rejection of one pillar of "subject philosophy" – the unitary model of human activity qua "externalization" or "objectification" – and their retention of two other pillars: the idea of a collective singular subject of history and an interpretation of history as the unfolding of this subject's capacities. Twenty years later Adorno also rejects these latter two tenets with an alternative no less aporetic: the "priority of objectivity." In showing that thought is determined by non-thought, subject by non-subject, necessity by contingency, this model rejects "subject philosophy," but only negatively, not allowing for the plurality and intersubjectivity that "subject philosophy" precludes. Adorno's and Horkheimer's subsequent analyses of social domination and their "mimesis" model of autonomy also ignore the medium of linguistically mediated communication (*Negative Dialectics*, 1966 and *Eclipse of Reason*, 1967, respectively). Again, Benhabib reads them as inadequate approximations of Habermas.

In a seventh step, Habermas develops his model of "communicative action" that overcomes three deficiencies of the "subject-philosophical" models of human action and self-realization employed by Hegel, Marx, and Horkheimer/Adorno (*Legitimation Crisis*, 1973; *Theory of Communicative Action*, 1981). It ends the neglect of human interaction in the work-model by showing that social action entails linguistic communica-

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tion; it terminates the over-emphasis on self-actualization (which undervalues human plurality) by focusing on communication (which reveals plurality); it replaces the model of self-realization (unable to thematize social integration or the relation of human actors to the norms governing their social world) with one of social integration (as a communicative process of norm interpretation and revision). Habermas's alternative to the categories of objectification, self-actualization, and mimesis is the category of linguistically mediated communication. It explains the coordination of social action, the reproduction of cultural meanings, and individual socialization. The goal is now to rehabilitate the concepts of discursive rationality and cultural modernity rejected as inherently repressive by Adorno and Horkheimer. Benhabib raises two objections, not to the project itself, but to the way Habermas carries it out. According to Habermas, Critical Theory's project for an emancipated society entails not the rejection of the cultural legacy of the modern age, but its "completion." The constituents of cultural modernity include the decentration of worldviews, the differentiation of competing value spheres, and growth in reflexivity. Through the institutionalization of cognitive, normative, and aesthetic ideas in cultural action systems, modes of appropriating their respective values become reflexive, i.e., increasingly subject to discourse validation and argumentation. Habermas locates the rationality of such processes in the *procedural* characteristics of acquisition and revision rather than in their substantive content. He further maintains that social individuals can coordinate social action, reproduce cultural meanings, and accomplish individual socialization because of their cognitive ability to judge the validity of certain claims on the basis of reasons advanced in their support. Yet as Giddens has pointed out,[5] proceduralism cannot overcome relativism any more than first philosophy can, because reason that concerns procedures of rational argumentation still needs to be defended by procedures of rational argumentation. A notion of rationality based on the principle of the critical evaluation of beliefs is not itself exempt from this principle, hence its own basis is its own self-evaluation: a case of reason grounding itself.

Benhabib focuses on another of Habermas's contentions: that not only the *process* of reaching an understanding, but that understanding per se is possible only if we know hypothetically what it would mean to redeem the validity claims of certain utterances. This, she asserts, is a misguided cognitivism that overemphasizes an objectifying relation to the exclusion of a more holistic, expressive, performative approach (which she finds in the "new social movements" – to which I will return).

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Second, Habermas maintains that a decentered worldview and the reflexive differentiation of value spheres are constitutive of communicative rationality, whose structure and constituents supposedly are quasi-transcendental, irrevocable, and universally binding. Benhabib counters: the patterns of rule competencies that evolve in the history of the individual and species (and claimed by Habermas to result in the criteria of communicative rationality) may represent an internally compelling sequence, but they are neither necessary nor unique but contingent, hence universally binding at most in a weak sense.

Step Eight examines a further aspect of the thesis concerning the rational potential of cultural modernity: Habermas's theory of "communicative ethics," which maintains that normative statements, although not "true" or "false" in the sense of descriptive statements, do admit of "cognitive validation," namely reasons for their adoption or rejection. For Habermas, the cognitive capacity to engage in the discursive justification of validity claims implies a *universalist* ethical standpoint, and he defines autonomy as the cognitive competence to adopt a universalist standpoint and the interactive competence to act on such a basis. While recognizing that minimal norms like reciprocity and symmetry belong among the rules of universalist-ethical argumentation, Benhabib argues that they entail no specific version of the universalizability principle, hence that Habermas's version cannot follow from the universalist-pragmatic rules of argumentation, and that it cannot be justified in any strong sense. A much greater scepticism that studies of communicative competence can do what transcendental philosophy failed to do in the way of providing "universalistic" criteria unites critics sympathetic to Habermas (e.g., McCarthy[6] and Geuss[7]) with distinctly unsympathetic ones (such as Rorty[8] and Lyotard[9]).

Benhabib raises three further objections to the universalist claim of communicative ethics. First, Habermas's definition of every agent capable of speech and action as a potential participant in a discourse presupposes a specific cultural value: the anti-particularism that considers morally irrelevant all natural and cultural characteristics distinguishing human groups from each other. To this extent the supposedly "universalist" pragmatic presuppositions of human discourse betray a cultural-historical bias. Both Giddens[10] and McCarthy[11] note Habermas's ethnocentric tendencies in another (not unrelated) context: his three-world scheme tends to reflect idiosyncratic traits of Western culture insofar as it focuses on just those three cultural value spheres differentiated out in modern Europe. Indeed, what Habermas identifies as the highest forms

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of human reason duplicate – by chance? – the ideals of the Western Enlightenment.

Second, the goal of discourse ethics – of providing a critical test for uncovering non-generalizable interests – is ambivalent insofar as it implies both a Rousseauan model of discovering "true" needs and interests, and a critical model of discovering the *truth* about needs and interests toward changing previously held beliefs. Habermas blurs these two models. Third, the cognitivist bias of communicative ethics can lead to the rationalistic fallacy of viewing reason as a self-generating faculty determining the conditions of its own genesis and application (the fallacy engendered also, as we saw in Step Seven above, by proceduralism). It ignores factors *external* to the theory: the contingency of discourse ethics upon the willingness and capacity of individuals (and their culture) to adopt such an ethical standpoint in the first place, and the moral sagacity and political insight necessary to concretize the principles of such ethics in action or policy.

Benhabib concludes her book with an argument that communicative ethics sits uncomfortably between a legalistic-juridical and a democratic-participatory ethos. The former, the perspective of self-determination (autonomous action oriented toward universalistic principles), views each individual as being entitled to the rights and duties we would ascribe to ourselves; the latter, the perspective of self-actualization (the capacity to unfold one's individuality in all its uniqueness), views each individual in his or her concrete history, identity, and affective-emotional constitution. In normative philosophy since Hobbes the ideals of the first (such as rights and entitlements) have been radically separated from those of the second (e.g. responsibility and solidarity). Habermas comes close to subverting this bias of separating public justice from private needs by moving need-interpretations to the center of moral discourse and by placing inner nature in a utopian light. But his insistence that the legalistic-juridical perspective alone represents the "moral point of view" precludes any such subversion.

Other commentators suggest the categorial inadequacy of Habermas's formalist, cognitive model to accommodate any *promesse de bonheur* whatsoever. Whereas *Bewusstseinsphilosophie* cannot reach extramental existence very well from within the closed circle of subjectivity, Habermas's linguistic-transcendental model is no less unable adequately to contact extralinguistic reality from within the equally closed circle of intersubjectivity. As Whitebook notes, a model for which (in principle)

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

everything is potentially transparent effectively denies the instinctual substratum of human rationality as well as the dialectic of harmony and disharmony between the two.[12] Nor does Habermas link progress in the realm of happiness to progress in the realm of morality, thus he must anticipate the possibility of an "emancipated humanity one day [confronting] itself in the expanded scope of discursive will formation and nevertheless still [being] deprived of the terms in which it is able to interpret life as a good life."[13] Bohrer even goes so far as to claim that the cognitive-objectifying sphere (like the moral-intersubjective one) by its very nature is inimical to the aesthetic-subjective sphere where alone, he maintains, happiness is possible.[14]

The deeper issue here is whether Habermas's quite affirmative account of the rationalization process of communication dulls the edge of his social criticism in the sense of deradicalizing the utopian aspirations of older Critical Theory – aspirations of happiness *through* Enlightenment, revolution *via* reason, redemption *by* aesthetic experience. In another context I have attempted to show that Habermas's conceptual revisions of Critical Theory fail to recover productively the critical potential – despite all its inherent aporia and fictions – of Adorno's, Marcuse's, and Horkheimer's social critique.[15] What Habermas's strategy for analyzing society wins in terms of *rational* potential vis-à-vis the older theory, it also loses in terms of the latter's *critical* potential, its keen sensitivity toward the manifold and often sublime forms of social repression. Honneth analyzes similar consequences in Habermas's overly affirmative model of society.[16] He maintains that Habermas reifies the social system by presenting it as norm-free, just as he reifies the lifeworld by describing it as free from all forces of power – as though purposively oriented organizations were not subject to any of the integrative processes characterizing the lifeworld, and as if the social lifeworld contained no power structures whatsoever. In fact, the completion of actions within organizations such as those of commerce and administration are dependent on social practices of reaching understanding, on processes seeking normative consensus. Without the mediation of direct conversation these actions could not be tied into a larger network of functions and performances; moreover, the nature, tasks and duties of these actions must be continuously decided upon and revised in social processes. Consequently, Habermas cannot provide a well-founded critique of the organizational forms of economic production and political administration. Nor can he grasp the social order for what it is: the institutionally-mediated communicative-relations of culturally integrated groups, relations that – as long as the disposition over power in society is distribut-

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

ed asymmetrically – will inhere in the medium of social conflict and struggle.

Benhabib completes her book with an eloquent argument for the necessary complementarity of the legalistic-juridical and democratic-participatory perspectives. She sees in this revision of discourse ethics – whose possibility she immediately asserts – the promise of a *new* politics, one avoiding both the "possessive individualist" or "disinterested rational agents" of classical and contemporary liberalism, as well as orthodox Marxism's neglect of democratic institutions. She claims that this – the combining of the logic of justice with that of friendship – is the very politics practiced by the so-called "new social movements." This claim is tantamount to according them nothing less than the status of the main carrier of emancipatory praxis in a more or less Habermasian paradigm. This is no modest claim, all the more surprising because Benhabib presents it as if it were self-evident, offering no empirical or other justification whatsoever. In any case she would seem to be interpreting communicative ethics, even with the envisaged revisions, against the grain. Kallschauer asserts that Habermas's theory is categorially inadequate to even grasp this political phenomenon insofar as Habermas proceeds from the level of communicatively acting *subjects* immediately to the level of organized social *systems*, without allowing for the intermediate level of the praxis of socially integrated *groups*.[17] And even though Habermas himself accommodates these movements within his social theory, his sceptical and even ambivalent appraisal of their emancipatory potential to transform social institutions is markedly different from Benhabib's. At best he sees them as primarily defensive, concerned with protecting the lifeworld against further colonization by economic and bureaucratic-administrative imperatives. The political motif of *Theory of Communicative Action* is that *both* neo-conservatives, who place primacy upon the achievements of economic growth through the revival of market forces, *and* the ecological and other critics of growth repudiate the cultural heritage of occidental rationalism. Habermas acknowledges the critical potential embodied in the new social movements, yet he also sees here post- or anti-modernist tendencies.[18]

The main weakness of *Critique, Norm and Utopia* should by now be clear: it tends toward being a *Geschichtsphilosophie* with Habermas as the immanent telos of critical normative philosophy since Hegel. Benhabib's evolutionary narrative of the historical development of Critical Theory and its Hegelian and Marxist antecedants suggest such a compelling sequence of events in the relation of one man's theory-construction

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

to that of his "successor" as to suggest an almost necessary development and even triumphant "progression." In her analysis of Habermas she is quite sensitive to the generic error she herself makes. She charges in Chapter 8 that he reverts to a philosophy of history where his reconstruction of the species competencies of an anonymous subject – humanity as such – remains not an empirically fruitful hypothesis but assumes the role of a philosophical narrative of the formative history of the subject of history, neutralizing the historical process. This criticism is echoed as well by commentators much less well-disposed to Habermas than Benhabib. Lyotard castigates what he terms Habermas's "metanarrative" of "humanity as a collective (universal) subject,"[19] while Rorty would dispense with what he calls Habermas's "universalistic philosophy" and his idea of "an internal theoretical dynamic" in science.[20] For her part, Benhabib points out that Habermas's historically neutralizing narrative must be rejected inasmuch as we have no models of development with which to compare the history of the species. Yet her own account reverts to the same "subject-philosophical" tendency where her reconstruction of the evolution of a theoretical tradition attributes to earlier thinkers the intentions of later ones, thereby seeing in later thinkers the culmination of earlier ones – by an account that tends to narrate the formative history of *one* theory rather that that of a *plurality* of (related) theories.

Despite this and other problems noted here, *Critique, Norm and Utopia* remains a work as interesting and challenging as it is ambitious. Benhabib's is the scholarship of a superb teacher, affording not so much an original perspective on, as a fine-tuning of Habermas's contributions to theory-construction over the past fifteen or so years. She provides an excellent guide through the rapids and straits of communicative ethics, and to many other themes within the broad range of her discussion as well. Within a plurality of subtle analyses she contributes distinctions, refinements, and considerations on the normative thought of Adorno, Marx, Horkheimer, Hegel, and others. Yet her account of Habermas is the most interesting aspect of *Critique, Norm and Utopia*. Given the prodigiousness of his output, no study on Habermas can long remain definitive, but for normative questions Benhabib's book has about the best shot at that distinction possible.

Notes

1. Jürgen Habermas, *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns* (Frankfurt, 1981), Vol. I, 523.

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

2. Including even the name: while Habermas most often speaks of "Bewusstseinsphilosophie," he sometimes interchanges this term with that of "Subjektphilosophie." Cf. e.g. Habermas (1981), Vol. I, 519, 522. He also uses precisely this term in Jürgen Habermas, *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne* (Frankfurt, 1985), passim.
3. 393, no. 37.
4. The definitive account of this goal, its history and its fate, remains Helmut Dubiel, *Theory and Politics. Studies in Early Critical Theory*, trans. Benjamin Gregg (Cambridge, MA, 1985).
5. Anthony Giddens, "Reason Without Revolution? Habermas's *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*," in Richard J. Bernstein, *Habermas and Modernity* (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 114.
6. Thomas McCarthy, "Rationality and Relativism: Habermas's 'Overcoming' of Hermeneutics," in John B. Thompson and David Held, eds., *Habermas: Critical Debates* (London, 1982).
7. Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge, 1982).
8. Richard Rorty, "Habermas and Lyotard on Modernity," in Bernstein, *Habermas and Modernity*.
9. Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, 1984).
10. Giddens, "Reason," 117.
11. McCarthy, "Rationality," 191.
12. Joel Whitebook, "Reason and Happiness: Some Psychoanalytic Themes in Critical Theory," in Bernstein, *Habermas and Modernity*, 155ff.
13. Jürgen Habermas, "Consciousness-Raising or Redemptive Criticism," *New German Critique*, 17 (1979), 58.
14. Karl Heinz Bohrer, "The Three Cultures," in Jürgen Habermas, ed., *Observations on "The Spiritual Situation of the Age,"* trans. Andrew Buchwalter (Cambridge, MA, 1985).
15. Benjamin Gregg, *Rationalität und Herrschaft. Zur Pathologie der Moderne*, diss. F.U. Berlin, 1985, esp. 11–128.
16. Axel Honneth, *Kritik der Macht. Reflexionsstufen einer kritischen Gesellschaftstheorie* (Frankfurt, 1985), 328–334.
17. Otto Kallschauer, "Auf der Suche nach einer politischen Theorie bei Jürgen Habermas," in *Ästhetik und Kommunikation*, 45/46 (1981), 179ff. Cf. also Honneth, *Kritik*, 313f.
18. Jürgen Habermas, "Dialektik der Rationalisierung," in *Die Neue Unübersichtlichkeit* (Frankfurt, 1985), 181, 184.
19. Lyotard, *Postmodern*, 65f.
20. Rorty, "Habermas," 162, 170.

This content downloaded from 128.83.63.20 on Wed, 6 Aug 2014 16:24:41 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions