Aleph. Langues, Médias et Sociétés Vol. 13, n° 2, mai 2026
ISSN : 2437-1076 · e-ISSN : 2437-0274

From Instrumental Reason to Communicative Rationality : Habermas and the Crisis of Modern Rationality

من العقل الأداتي إلى العقلانية التواصلية : هابرماس وأزمة العقلانية الحديثة

De la raison instrumentale à la rationalité communicationnelle : Habermas et la crise de la rationalité moderne

Hadda Banoun

التاريخ المحلي والذاكرة الجمعية والمقاربات الجديدة

University of Akli Mohand Oulhaj, Bouira

Le pôle universitaire, rue Drissi Yahia Bouira 10000, Algérie.

h.banoun@univ-bouira.dz

Tounsia Hamouche

إشكالية البحث في بناء المجتمع العربي الحديث والمعاصر

University of Algiers 2

2 Rue Djamel Eddine El Afghani Bouzareah Alger, 16032

tounsia.hamouche@univ-alger2.dz

Date de réception	Publication numérique	Archivage ASJP
08/06/2025	25/04/2026	05/05/2026

Référence électronique

Hadda Banoun et Tounsia Hamouche, « From Instrumental Reason to Communicative Rationality : Habermas and the Crisis of Modern Rationality », Aleph [En ligne], Vol 13 (2) | 2026, mis en ligne le 20 avril 2026. URL : https://aleph.edinum.org/16485

Référence papier (archivage Asjp)

Hadda Banoun et Tounsia Hamouche, « From Instrumental Reason to Communicative Rationality : Habermas and the Crisis of Modern Rationality », Aleph, Vol 13 (2) | 2026, 497-515.

Abstrat

This article examines how Jürgen Habermas rethinks the crisis of modern European rationality from within the critical legacy of the Frankfurt School. It takes as its starting point the diagnosis formulated by the first generation of Critical Theory, especially Herbert Marcuse, according to which modern reason, once subordinated to technical efficiency and political control, tends to become an instrument of domination rather than a principle of emancipation. The article first revisits the relation between technology and domination by bringing Heideggerian reflection on modern technicity into dialogue with Frankfurtian social critique. It then analyzes Habermas's epistemological reformulation in Knowledge and Human Interests, where scientific practices are differentiated according to the interests that orient them, against any positivist reduction of rationality. The study further examines Habermas's critique of advanced industrial society, his distance from revolutionary pessimism, and his proposal of communicative rationality as a normative and practical alternative to instrumental reason. Finally, it considers the theory of the public sphere as the political horizon of this reconstruction of reason. The article argues that Habermas does not deny the pathologies of modernity; rather, he seeks to preserve within modernity itself the dialogical, critical, and democratic resources capable of resisting reification, technocratic closure, and ideological domination.Keywords

Keywords

Habermas, communicative rationality, instrumental reason, Frankfurt School, technology, public sphere, modernity

الملخّص

تناول هذه الدراسة الطريقة التي أعاد بها يورغن هابرماس التفكير في أزمة العقلانية الأوروبية الحديثة انطلاقًا من الإرث النقدي لمدرسة فرانكفورت. وتنطلق من التشخيص الذي صاغه الجيل الأول من النظرية النقدية، ولا سيما هربرت ماركيوز، ومفاده أن العقل الحديث، حين يخضع لضرورات النجاعة التقنية ومنطق السلطة، يميل إلى التحول إلى أداة للهيمنة بدل أن يظل مبدأً للتحرر. وتعود الدراسة أولًا إلى العلاقة بين التقنية والسيطرة، من خلال تقاطع التأمل الهايدغري في ماهية التقنية الحديثة مع النقد الاجتماعي الفرنكفورتي. ثم تحلل إعادة الصياغة الإبستمولوجية التي يقترحها هابرماس في كتابه المعرفة والمصلحة، حيث تُميَّز الممارسات العلمية بحسب المصالح التي توجهها، في مواجهة اختزال العقلانية في الإجراء الوضعي. بعد ذلك، تتناول الدراسة نقد هابرماس للمجتمع

الصنـاعي المتقـدم، وابتعـاده عن التشـاؤم الثـوري، ثـم اقتراحـه الـعقلانية التواصـلية بوصفهـا بـديلًا معياريًـا وعمليًـا للـعقلانية الأداتية. وأخيـرًا، تُبـرز أن نظـرية الفضـاء العمـومي تمثـل الأفق السيـاسي لإعـادة بنـاء العقـل عنـده. وتدافـع الـدراسة عن فـرضية مفادهـا أن هابرمـاس لا ينكـر أمـراض الحـداثة، بـل يسـعى إلـى إنقـاذ مواردهـا الحـوارية والنقـدية والديمقـراطية، بمـا يتيـح مقـاومة التشيؤ والانغلاق التقنوقـراطي والهيـمنة الإيديولـوجية.

الكلمات المفتاحية

هابرمـاس، الـعقلانية التواصـلية، العقـل الأداتي، مـدرسة فرانكفـورت، التقنية، الفضـاء العمـومي، الحـداثة.

Résumé

Cet article examine la manière dont Jürgen Habermas repense la crise de la rationalité européenne moderne à partir de l'héritage critique de l'École de Francfort. Il prend pour point de départ le diagnostic formulé par la première génération de la théorie critique, notamment par Herbert Marcuse, selon lequel la raison moderne, lorsqu'elle se subordonne à l'efficacité technique et aux logiques de pouvoir, tend à devenir un instrument de domination plutôt qu'un principe d'émancipation. L'étude revient d'abord sur le rapport entre technique et domination, en croisant la réflexion heideggérienne sur la technicité moderne et la critique sociale francfortoise. Elle analyse ensuite la reformulation épistémologique proposée par Habermas dans La connaissance et l'intérêt, où les pratiques scientifiques sont distinguées selon les intérêts qui les orientent, contre toute réduction positiviste de la rationalité. L'article examine également sa critique de la société industrielle avancée, sa prise de distance à l'égard du pessimisme révolutionnaire, puis sa proposition d'une rationalité communicationnelle comme alternative normative à la rationalité instrumentale. Enfin, il montre que la théorie de l'espace public constitue l'horizon politique de cette reconstruction de la raison. L'hypothèse défendue est que Habermas ne nie pas les pathologies de la modernité : il cherche, au contraire, à y préserver les ressources dialogiques, critiques et démocratiques capables de résister à la réification, à la clôture technocratique et à la domination idéologique.

Mots-clés

rationalité communicationnelle, raison instrumentale, École de Francfort, technique, espace public, modernité

Introduction

The critique of modern rationality occupies a decisive place in contemporary European philosophy. From the moment when scientific reason, technical organization, and political administration became the principal vectors of social transformation, the question arose whether modern rationality still served human emancipation or whether it had been converted into a vast mechanism of regulation, domination, and symbolic control. This question acquired dramatic urgency in the twentieth century after the world wars, the industrialization of destruction, the expansion of bureaucratic administration, and the growing integration of social life into systems of production and consumption. What had once been announced as the promise of the Enlightenment—human autonomy, progress, and liberation from tutelage—now appeared threatened by the very rationalization processes that had made modernity possible.

It is within this historical and philosophical horizon that the Frankfurt School formulated one of the most forceful critiques of modern civilization. The first generation of Critical Theory interpreted advanced industrial societies as societies marked by reification, ideological integration, and the progressive neutralization of negation. Technical and scientific progress could no longer be considered in themselves as signs of freedom, because they were increasingly subordinated to institutions of domination. The very forms of thought produced by modernity seemed to privilege calculation, efficiency, organization, and control at the expense of reflexivity, ethical judgment, and collective self-determination. In such a context, the critique of instrumental rationality became inseparable from the critique of the social order that sustained it.

Herbert Marcuse played a major role in radicalizing this diagnosis. In his view, advanced industrial society had succeeded in integrating opposition into the very mechanisms of production, consumption, and cultural normalization. The individual was not merely coerced from the outside ; he was progressively adapted to a way of life whose apparent satisfactions concealed deeper forms of domination. As a result, modern society no longer reproduced itself only through economic exploitation or political repression. It also reproduced itself by shaping needs, organizing perception, and narrowing the horizon of critique. The technical universe was therefore not simply a collection of neutral instruments. It had become an environment of power, a structure that moulded consciousness and reduced the possibility of authentic negation.

Yet the history of Critical Theory does not end with this pessimistic diagnosis. Jürgen Habermas inherits the critique of instrumental rationality while refusing to identify rationality as such with domination. He accepts the severity of the crisis diagnosed by the first Frankfurt generation, but he rejects the conclusion according to which modernity would have exhausted all of its emancipatory

potential. In his view, the problem is not reason in itself, but its reduction to a single model of validity : a model governed by technical success, strategic calculation, and administrative efficiency. Against such reduction, Habermas seeks to reconstruct a broader concept of rationality—one capable of accounting for interpretation, argumentation, critique, and intersubjective understanding.

The originality of Habermas's project lies precisely in this effort to preserve the normative promise of modernity without denying the pathologies produced by modern societies. He does not abandon the critical heritage of the Enlightenment; rather, he seeks to distinguish between its emancipatory resources and its technocratic distortions. The crisis of Europe, from this perspective, is not only economic or political. It is also a crisis of rationality: a crisis in the uses, forms, and institutionalization of reason. If modern reason is left to the sole logic of control, then society tends toward domination, depoliticization, and alienation. If, however, reason can be reconstructed as communicative, practical, and democratic, then modernity still contains the possibility of self-correction.

The present article therefore examines how Habermas reworks the problem of instrumental rationality in relation to Marcuse and to the broader Frankfurt tradition. More specifically, it addresses three interrelated questions. First, how do technology and scientific development become linked to domination in the critical analyses of Heidegger, Marcuse, and Habermas ? Second, in what sense does Habermas's theory of knowledge and interests constitute an epistemological response to the colonizing claims of positivist reason ? Third, to what extent do communicative rationality and the theory of the public sphere offer a practical alternative to the crises of advanced industrial society ?

To answer these questions, the discussion proceeds in four stages. It first revisits the critique of technology and domination developed by Heidegger and the first Frankfurt generation. It then examines Habermas's differentiation of cognitive interests and his critique of positivism. A third section analyzes his interpretation of advanced industrial society and the theoretical transition from instrumental reason to communicative rationality. Finally, the article studies the role of the public sphere in democratic mediation and in the reactivation of social critique. The central argument is that Habermas neither dismisses the violence of modern systems nor merely opposes them from outside. He seeks instead to identify within language, social interaction, and democratic publicity the normative resources through which modernity may be critically reoriented.

1. Technology, Domination, and Instrumental Reason : From Heidegger to the Frankfurt School

The first generation of the Frankfurt School made the critique of instrumental rationality one of the principal axes of its diagnosis of modern society. What was at stake was not the rejection of science in the name of irrationalism, but the refusal to equate rationality with technical calculation alone. Once reason

is reduced to the capacity to select the most efficient means for a given end, the question of ends themselves tends to disappear. Rationality then becomes formal, operative, and procedural ; it ceases to interrogate the justice of institutions, the ethical legitimacy of power, or the meaning of collective life. Such a reduction is inseparable from the rise of industrial capitalism, bureaucratic administration, and modern forms of technological organization.

In this respect, the Frankfurtian diagnosis intersects at several points with Heidegger's reflection on the essence of modern technology. Heidegger argued that modern technicity cannot be understood merely as a set of instruments. Its deeper truth lies in a mode of revealing that enframes beings as standing reserve, that is, as objects available for extraction, ordering, and use. Nature becomes a stock of resources ; human beings themselves risk being apprehended according to the same logic of availability. The danger of technology therefore does not reside only in machines, but in the metaphysical disposition that transforms the world into an object of calculation and exploitation. This diagnosis profoundly influenced twentieth-century critiques of modern civilization, including several strands of Critical Theory.

Marcuse takes up part of this insight while translating it into the language of social critique. For him, the technical apparatus of modern societies is never separable from the institutions that organize it and from the powers that direct its development. Technology certainly improves material conditions, extends productivity, and modifies everyday life. But this does not make it neutral. The very design, deployment, and social function of technical systems are shaped by historically determined relations of domination. Technology becomes a political rationality insofar as it organizes labor, disciplines bodies, standardizes needs, and produces forms of obedience that are all the more effective because they appear reasonable, efficient, and beneficial.

This is why advanced industrial society cannot be described simply as a repressive order imposed against the will of individuals. Marcuse insists that domination in such societies also operates through integration. The system secures adhesion by distributing satisfactions, by improving living conditions in selective ways, and by narrowing the gap between coercion and consent. The administered society does not abolish freedom in an openly visible manner ; rather, it recodes unfreedom as comfort, adaptation, and normality. Individuals come to inhabit a world in which the technical organization of life appears as the only realistic horizon. The result is not the disappearance of conflict, but the weakening of the capacity to imagine alternatives.

In such a context, reason itself undergoes a mutation. The critical, reflective, and self-interrogative dimension of thought tends to be subordinated to a logic of performance. Rationality is measured by utility, prediction, and operational success. Language follows the same trajectory. It becomes increasingly functional,

managerial, and codified. Public discourse is saturated with technical vocabularies, administrative euphemisms, and ideological simplifications that conceal social antagonisms beneath the appearance of objective necessity. One of the strongest claims of the Frankfurt School is that domination in advanced societies is not only material and institutional ; it is also semantic. It affects the very ways in which reality is named, framed, and made intelligible.

The critique of instrumental reason therefore culminates in a broader critique of civilization. Modern societies are irrational not because they lack science, but because they deploy scientific and technical capacities without subjecting their goals to democratic and ethical reflection. The paradox of modernity is that a civilization endowed with immense productive powers can simultaneously intensify war, exclusion, manipulation, and alienation. Technical progress does not automatically coincide with human progress. Indeed, it can consolidate systems of domination precisely by increasing their efficiency, their reach, and their capacity for internal legitimation. The technological universe becomes the medium through which power presents itself as objective rationality.

Marcuse's political pessimism emerges from this diagnosis. Since advanced industrial societies integrate labor, consumption, mass culture, and administration into a relatively coherent system, the traditional revolutionary subject envisaged by nineteenth-century Marxism seems to lose its historical centrality. The working class is increasingly incorporated into the structures of production and welfare. Opposition does not disappear, but it migrates toward marginal or semi-marginal groups : racialized minorities, students, women, anti-war activists, the culturally excluded, and those whose lives remain insufficiently integrated into the dominant order. Even here, however, the prospects of transformation remain fragile. The power of the system lies in its capacity to absorb critique, commodify protest, and reproduce itself through the management of dissent.

Habermas receives this inheritance but refuses to conclude that reason has become indistinguishable from domination. He fully acknowledges that scientificity, bureaucracy, and technocratic organization can function ideologically, and that modern societies are traversed by processes of objectification and control. Yet he contends that the first Frankfurt generation often moved too quickly from the critique of a historically specific form of rationality to the denunciation of reason as such. If all rationality is assimilated to domination, critique loses its own normative basis. One can no longer explain why domination is illegitimate, nor on what grounds emancipation remains desirable. Habermas's project begins at this precise point : to rescue the critical resources of reason by distinguishing instrumental rationality from other, irreducible dimensions of rational practice.

A key issue in this debate concerns the illusion of neutrality. For Habermas as for Marcuse, scientific and technical practices are not externally related to society. They are embedded in social interests, institutional priorities, and forms of life.

The claim that science speaks from nowhere, untouched by norms or power, is itself ideological. Yet Habermas does not infer from this that knowledge is merely a mask of domination. Rather, he argues that different kinds of inquiry are oriented by different kinds of human interests, and that it is precisely by clarifying these orientations that critique can regain philosophical precision. This epistemological turn prepares the transition from the critique of domination to the reconstruction of communicative reason.

1.1. Knowledge and Human Interests : Habermas's Epistemological Reorientation

Habermas's book *Knowledge and Human Interests* marks a decisive attempt to rethink critique at the level of epistemology. Instead of approaching science as a homogeneous enterprise governed by a single model of objectivity, he argues that forms of knowledge correspond to distinct cognitive interests. The idea is not to psychologize science, but to show that human inquiry is always situated within broader structures of action and life. Knowledge is never absolutely disinterested in the sense imagined by positivism. It is bound to practical orientations, historical needs, and forms of relation to the world. By making this point, Habermas seeks to undermine the expansion of positivist categories into domains where they are inadequate, especially the human and social sciences.

The first cognitive interest is the technical interest, which underlies the empirical-analytic sciences. Such sciences aim at explanation, prediction, and possible control. They deal with processes that can be objectified, measured, and submitted to causal analysis. Their validity is linked to the capacity to formulate testable hypotheses and to manipulate variables within methodologically regulated frameworks. Habermas does not contest the legitimacy of this kind of knowledge. On the contrary, he recognizes its immense efficacy and its indispensable role in relation to nature and material processes. The problem begins only when this model is elevated into the exclusive paradigm of rationality and imposed upon all forms of inquiry.

The second cognitive interest is the practical interest, which structures the historical-hermeneutic sciences. Here the task is not to control an object, but to understand meaning. Human beings do not inhabit the social world as mute things. They act within traditions, languages, institutions, and symbolic forms that require interpretation. Historical knowledge, philology, sociology in its interpretive dimension, and the humanities more broadly cannot be reduced to the procedures of experimental science without distortion. Their rationality lies in the clarification of meaning, the reconstruction of context, and the enlargement of possible understanding between subjects. In this sense, interpretation is not the opposite of reason ; it is one of its essential modalities.

The third cognitive interest is the emancipatory interest. This interest grounds forms of critique that seek to uncover hidden constraints, ideological distortions,

and structures of domination. It concerns those situations in which subjects do not fully recognize the forces that shape their consciousness or their practices. Habermas associates this interest with critical social theory and, in a different register, with psychoanalysis. In both cases, the aim is not merely to describe a situation but to reveal what prevents actors from understanding themselves adequately. Emancipatory knowledge is thus reflexive : it turns back upon conditions of action, communication, and self-understanding in order to loosen the grip of domination.

This tripartite schema has major implications. First, it protects the empirical sciences against irrational suspicion while refusing their imperial expansion into all domains of reason. Second, it secures the legitimacy of hermeneutic inquiry by showing that understanding is oriented by a practical interest in mutual intelligibility. Third, it grounds critique in a specific cognitive interest rather than in a purely external moral denunciation. Critical theory becomes possible because social life contains blocked or distorted potentials for understanding and self-determination. The task of critique is to identify these distortions and to make reflective clarification possible.

Habermas's attack on positivism must be read in this light. Positivism is not merely a method ; it is a philosophy that forgets its own conditions. It presents one historically situated model of objectivity as though it exhausted rationality as such. By doing so, it disqualifies questions of meaning, normativity, and emancipation as secondary or non-cognitive. The danger of such an attitude is not only theoretical. Once scientific procedure is severed from reflection on its orienting interests, rationality becomes available for technocratic appropriation. Expertise may then claim authority without democratic accountability, and social problems are redefined as merely technical matters to be solved by specialists.

The theory of knowledge and interests therefore reopens the problem of rationality from within modernity itself. It shows that modern reason cannot be reduced to instrumental mastery because modern knowledge is internally plural. To know nature, to understand meaning, and to criticise domination are not identical operations, even if they may intersect. This pluralization of reason is central to Habermas's broader philosophical project. It allows him to preserve the legitimacy of science while also defending interpretation, critique, and democratic discussion as rational practices in their own right.

At the same time, the theory of interests prepares the shift toward communicative rationality. If understanding is not merely subjective but oriented toward possible agreement between actors, then language becomes more than a medium of representation ; it becomes the site of a specifically intersubjective form of reason. The practical and emancipatory interests of knowledge point beyond the isolated subject and toward relations among speaking beings. Habermas's later work will deepen this intuition by analyzing the conditions under which validity

claims can be raised, contested, and redeemed in discourse. The epistemological critique of positivism thus opens directly onto a theory of communication.

This is also why Habermas cannot accept the total collapse of reason into domination. Even within societies marked by bureaucratic control and ideological distortion, individuals continue to interpret, question, and justify their actions in relation to others. Everyday communication already presupposes norms of intelligibility, sincerity, truthfulness, and rightness. These presuppositions may be violated, manipulated, or strategically instrumentalized, but they cannot be eliminated without dissolving communication itself. Habermas's wager is that critique can be anchored in these unavoidable structures of understanding. The crisis of rationality can then be diagnosed not as the disappearance of reason, but as the colonization of communicative capacities by instrumental systems.

1.2. Habermas's Critique of Advanced Industrial Society

Habermas shares with Marcuse the conviction that advanced industrial societies cannot be understood solely through the categories of liberal self-description. These societies do not merely guarantee freedom, increase productivity, and organize welfare. They also produce depoliticization, ideological normalization, and new forms of dependence that exceed classical images of overt coercion. The state, the economy, the media, and administrative institutions interact in increasingly complex ways, so that domination is reproduced less through visible repression than through systemic regulation. Social integration is achieved by mechanisms that often appear neutral because they are coded as technical, expert, and inevitable.

Marcuse had emphasized the integration of the individual into the circuits of production and consumption. Habermas does not abandon this diagnosis, but he seeks to refine it by examining the crises internal to late capitalism. In his view, modern capitalist societies are not stabilized once and for all by economic growth or technological development. They remain traversed by tensions between economic reproduction, administrative management, social legitimacy, and cultural motivation. The interventionist state may temporarily regulate contradictions that would otherwise become explosive, yet such intervention also multiplies new kinds of crisis. The system cannot indefinitely depoliticize conflict without producing deficits of legitimacy and motivation.

This analysis leads Habermas to displace the classical Marxist emphasis on the immediate contradiction between capital and labor. He does not deny the reality of exploitation, social inequality, or conflict over wages and working conditions. Rather, he argues that the transformation of capitalism has rendered the crisis process more complex. State intervention, welfare policies, administrative planning, and technocratic expertise partially mediate the direct antagonisms of early industrial capitalism. As a result, domination no longer appears only in the factory or the market. It extends through the management of public expectations,

the bureaucratization of decision-making, and the production of consent by institutional means.

Habermas's account of crisis is therefore multi-layered. Economic contradictions may give rise to rationality crises when the state can no longer effectively regulate conflicting interests. These, in turn, may lead to legitimacy crises if political institutions fail to justify their interventions in ways acceptable to citizens. Finally, legitimacy crises may deepen into motivation crises whenever social actors cease to recognize the normative meaning of the roles assigned to them. In this perspective, modern domination cannot be understood as purely external force. It involves the exhaustion, distortion, or instrumentalization of the very normative resources that permit social cooperation. A society may continue to function administratively while losing the capacity to generate meaningful participation.

This is one of the most important differences between Habermas and Marcuse. Marcuse tends to emphasize the depth of integration and the closure of alternatives ; Habermas focuses on the contradictions that persist within systems of regulation. Even highly organized societies remain dependent on forms of legitimacy that cannot be manufactured by technical means alone. Bureaucratic planning may manage resources, but it cannot by itself produce solidarity, trust, or normative justification. The more political power is depoliticized and transferred to experts, the more the democratic deficit tends to widen. Social actors are transformed into clients, consumers, or administratively managed populations rather than participants in collective will-formation.

Habermas's critique consequently extends to both liberal capitalism and authoritarian socialism. Liberal regimes proclaim individual freedom while tolerating structural inequalities that severely restrict the actual capacity of the majority to shape social life. Authoritarian socialist regimes, by contrast, subordinate individual liberties to collective goals and thereby curtail the communicative conditions of democratic participation. In both cases, the central problem is the same : social integration is increasingly organized from above, through apparatuses that marginalize public deliberation. Habermas therefore rejects the simple opposition between individual and collective. A democratic society must mediate both dimensions through procedures of public discussion and reciprocal justification.

This position also explains his distance from insurrectionary romanticism. If the crisis of advanced industrial society results from systemic colonization and from the erosion of communicative capacities, then the solution cannot consist solely in violent rupture. A purely strategic seizure of power may reproduce the same instrumental logic it seeks to destroy. The task is instead to reconstruct the public, cultural, and institutional conditions under which collective self-determination becomes possible. Habermas's political theory is therefore less spectacular than revolutionary rhetoric, but it is no less critical. Its ambition is to identify

how democratic procedures, public communication, and normative learning can counterbalance the expansion of technocratic power.

At this stage, the critique of advanced industrial society leads directly to a more general theoretical distinction : the distinction between instrumental action, oriented toward success, and communicative action, oriented toward understanding. Without this distinction, one cannot explain why modern societies, even while becoming more rationalized administratively, can become less rational in normative and democratic terms. The crisis is not an absence of rationalization ; it is a one-sided rationalization. Systemic mechanisms grow increasingly efficient, while the communicative infrastructures of the lifeworld are weakened, colonized, or bypassed. Habermas's major contribution is to make this imbalance conceptually visible.

1.3. Communicative Rationality as an Alternative to Instrumental Domination

Habermas's most decisive intervention lies in his reconstruction of communicative rationality. Against the reduction of reason to calculation or strategic adaptation, he argues that language contains a different model of rationality, one that is oriented not toward the technical mastery of objects but toward understanding among subjects. Communicative action occurs when actors coordinate their actions by offering, contesting, and redeeming validity claims rather than by imposing force or manipulating behavior. In this sense, communication is not merely an exchange of information. It is a normative practice in which participants implicitly appeal to truth, rightness, sincerity, and intelligibility.

This reconstruction does not imply that actual societies are governed by pure communication. Habermas is well aware that discourse can be distorted by inequality, ideology, strategic manipulation, and institutional asymmetry. The point is rather that even distorted communication presupposes standards from which it can be criticised. A lie presupposes truth, manipulation presupposes the expectation of sincerity, and coercive consensus presupposes the idea of free agreement. Communicative rationality thus functions both descriptively and normatively : it clarifies the structures operative in ordinary interaction while also providing criteria for judging social and political distortions.

The distinction between instrumental and communicative action is crucial here. Instrumental action treats the world as a field of objects to be transformed in view of a goal. Strategic action, closely related, treats other actors as variables to be influenced or managed. Communicative action, by contrast, treats others as participants capable of speech, response, objection, and justification. Its goal is not success at any cost, but understanding capable of grounding cooperative action. Habermas does not reject instrumental rationality in its proper domain. Scientific research, technical problem-solving, and many organizational tasks

require it. What he rejects is its illegitimate expansion into domains where mutual understanding and democratic justification are required.

This is why discourse ethics occupies such an important place in his thought. For a norm to claim legitimacy, it must be open in principle to discussion among all those concerned. No participant may be excluded a priori, and no argument should derive its force solely from status, coercion, or manipulation. Such conditions are admittedly idealizing, but they are not empty abstractions. They express the normative presuppositions already implicit in practices of argumentation. Whenever speakers argue seriously, they assume that reasons matter more than brute force and that others are entitled to challenge claims placed before them. The ideal speech situation is not an empirical description ; it is a critical standard internal to communicative practice itself.

Habermas's optimism, relative to Marcuse, must be understood in this restricted but significant sense. He does not believe that modern societies are spontaneously dialogical or that domination can be dissolved through goodwill alone. His claim is more precise: the communicative structures of the lifeworld preserve a potential for critique that systemic domination cannot entirely extinguish. Everyday language, legal argument, public debate, and democratic institutions all contain fragile but real resources for resisting colonization. The possibility of critique survives because actors remain capable of questioning the validity of what is presented as necessary, objective, or natural.

The contrast with Marcuse is therefore instructive. Marcuse often presents advanced industrial society as a universe in which opposition is absorbed and in which radical transformation can only be imagined from marginal positions. Habermas accepts the depth of domination but refuses to place all hope in external rupture. He is more attentive to processes of normative learning, public contestation, and institutional reform. His theory does not eliminate conflict ; it relocates conflict within practices of communication, law, and democratic will-formation. Emancipation becomes less a sudden total negation than a cumulative process of decolonizing communication and enlarging participation.

This theoretical shift has immediate consequences for the interpretation of the media and public discourse. Marcuse had already shown how modern mass communication can unify contradictions, normalize violence, and disguise domination through euphemistic language. Habermas extends the analysis by insisting that contemporary societies often suffer from poor communication in the very age of communication. The multiplication of media technologies does not guarantee understanding. Communication can be colonized by propaganda, market

logic, state management, and the spectacle of visibility. The public circulation of messages may therefore coexist with increasing passivity, fragmentation, and semantic manipulation.

The value of communicative rationality lies precisely in providing a criterion for distinguishing communication from its simulacra. Genuine communication demands that arguments be assessable, that speakers be answerable for their claims, and that listeners have the possibility of response. A society saturated with messages but deprived of reciprocal discussion does not realize communicative reason. It merely extends strategic influence through new means. Habermas's theory is thus at once a philosophy of language, a social theory of modernization, and a democratic critique of contemporary media systems. Its central concern remains constant : how can modern societies recover forms of reason that do not culminate in domination ?

Seen from this angle, communicative rationality is not a rhetorical ornament added to the critique of instrumental reason. It is the conceptual key that allows Habermas to preserve critique without collapsing into despair. Because actors are linguistically and normatively related to one another, social domination can never fully seal itself off from the demand for justification. The crisis of rationality can therefore be addressed only by expanding the spaces in which reasons circulate freely, objections can be raised, and decisions are exposed to public scrutiny. This opens directly onto the political question of the public sphere.

2. The Public Sphere and Democratic Mediation

The theory of the public sphere gives institutional and political concreteness to Habermas's reconstruction of reason. If communicative rationality names a form of interaction oriented toward understanding, the public sphere designates the social space in which such interaction can become politically consequential. It mediates between civil society and the state, between private experience and public judgment, between dispersed grievances and collective will-formation. The public sphere is therefore not reducible to physical space or media visibility. It is a normative structure of discussion in which citizens transform matters of common concern into objects of argument, critique, and possible political pressure.

Habermas's central insight is that democracy cannot be reduced to administrative legality or electoral procedure. A democratic order remains hollow if laws, policies, and institutional orientations are produced without the participation of an informed and active public. Modern systems tend constantly toward depoliticization : expertise replaces debate, bureaucracy replaces judgment, and communication is reorganized as one-way transmission. Under such conditions, citizens cease to function as co-authors of the political order and are relegated to the role of spectators, clients, or managed populations. The public sphere is therefore indispensable because it reopens the space in which collective life can be discussed rather than merely administered.

This conception has an explicitly critical edge. Habermas is concerned with the ways in which advanced industrial societies neutralize the political significance of citizens while preserving the outward forms of representation. Laws may be promulgated, institutions may operate, and media may proliferate, yet meaningful participation can still decline. Publicity in the strong democratic sense requires more than circulation ; it requires access, reciprocity, and argumentative accountability. A public sphere distorted by concentrated media power, social inequality, or bureaucratic closure no longer functions as a space of rational-critical debate. It becomes instead a theatre of managed opinion.

The relation between the public sphere and communicative rationality is therefore intimate. Public debate is legitimate only if participants can raise and contest claims under conditions that approximate fairness. The authority of the better argument is never guaranteed empirically, but democracy loses its normative orientation if it abandons that standard altogether. For this reason, ethics is not external to politics in Habermas's thought. Democratic life depends upon discursive virtues such as sincerity, reasonableness, responsibility, and openness to objection. These are not merely moral ornaments ; they are conditions for the possibility of legitimate public judgment.

At the same time, Habermas is fully aware of the fragility of this ideal. The public sphere can be colonized just as the lifeworld can be colonized. Economic power, state administration, propaganda, and symbolic inequality all distort the communicative conditions of publicity. The mass media, which could in principle enlarge public discussion, often function as instruments of concentration, simplification, and ideological framing. Instead of strengthening civic deliberation, they may produce passivity, fragmentation, emotional management, and the homogenization of opinion. Here again Habermas converges with Marcuse : both recognize that communication technologies can serve domination when they are subordinated to strategic interests.

Yet Habermas's response remains distinct. He does not infer from media distortion that public reason is impossible. Rather, he insists that the task of democracy is to create institutional arrangements capable of protecting communicative freedoms against systemic colonization. Associations, civic movements, independent intellectual work, critical journalism, legal guarantees of participation, and spaces of deliberation all contribute to the maintenance of a living public sphere. The public sphere is not a naturally given harmony ; it is a fragile democratic achievement that must be continuously defended, expanded, and renewed.

This perspective also allows one to understand why Habermas rejects the strict opposition between individual and collective. In the public sphere, private persons become public through discussion. Individual experiences of injustice, exclusion, or misrecognition are translated into issues of common concern.

Conversely, collective norms become legitimate only if individuals can recognize themselves in the processes through which they are produced. The public sphere is thus the site where singular voices and common norms encounter one another under discursive conditions. Democracy is neither atomistic nor collectivist ; it is communicative.

The continuing relevance of this theory is evident in contemporary societies. The expansion of digital networks, transnational media flows, and platform-based communication has multiplied channels of expression, but it has not abolished the classical problems diagnosed by Habermas. Visibility can coexist with fragmentation ; speech can proliferate without dialogue ; algorithmic circulation can intensify strategic manipulation rather than public reasoning. In this sense, the contemporary crisis of publicity confirms rather than invalidates Habermas's intuition : communication becomes politically emancipatory only when it is institutionally and normatively organized in ways that sustain reciprocal justification.

Habermas's conception of the public sphere therefore completes his response to the crisis of instrumental rationality. Technical systems, administrative mechanisms, and market logics are not abolished, nor could they be. The question is whether they remain exposed to forms of public reason capable of criticism, correction, and democratic orientation. A society governed exclusively by experts, managers, and strategic actors may function with great efficiency, yet it loses the capacity to justify itself to those who inhabit it. The public sphere is the space in which this capacity for justification is preserved. Through it, critique becomes socially effective, and communicative rationality acquires political form.

Conclusion

Habermas occupies a singular place within contemporary philosophy because he seeks to rescue the critical vocation of reason after the historical catastrophes that profoundly discredited the self-confidence of modernity. He shares with the first Frankfurt generation the conviction that advanced industrial civilization has transformed scientific progress and technological development into instruments of domination whenever they are severed from ethical reflection and democratic control. He fully recognizes the power of reification, bureaucratic normalization, ideological language, and technocratic administration. In this respect, his work belongs unmistakably to the critical heritage of the Frankfurt School.

His originality lies, however, in refusing the conclusion according to which reason as such has become exhausted. The problem is not that modernity rationalizes too much ; it is that it often rationalizes in a one-sided way. Instrumental and strategic forms of rationality have expanded at the expense of communicative, interpretive, and democratic forms of reason. This imbalance generates the pathologies of contemporary societies : depoliticization, legitimacy deficits, semantic distortion, and the colonization of the lifeworld by systemic imperatives. To

diagnose these processes adequately, one must therefore distinguish rather than conflate the different forms of rationality at work in modern life.

This is the decisive role played by Habermas's theory of knowledge and interests, by his critique of positivism, and by his reconstruction of communicative rationality. These interventions re-establish the philosophical conditions under which critique remains possible. They show that knowledge is plural, that understanding cannot be reduced to technical control, and that social life continues to presuppose norms of argumentation and justification even when domination seeks to suppress them. Habermas's theory does not idealize communication ; it treats discourse as a fragile normative resource that must be institutionally protected if it is to counterbalance the expansion of strategic power.

The theory of the public sphere gives this reconstruction a specifically political horizon. Democratic life depends not only on formal rights or administrative procedures, but on the existence of public spaces in which citizens can test reasons, criticise authorities, and participate in the formation of common judgments. The crisis of instrumental rationality is therefore inseparable from a crisis of publicity. Where public debate is weakened, power tends to present itself as technical necessity ; where communicative reason is revitalized, the possibility of democratic correction reappears.

It would nevertheless be reductive to treat Habermas's solution as beyond criticism. The conditions of undistorted communication are difficult to realize in societies marked by structural inequalities, symbolic asymmetries, geopolitical domination, and media concentration. The ideal of equal participation may appear distant, and the ethics of discourse may seem vulnerable to real-world distortions. Yet these difficulties do not invalidate the project. They indicate the magnitude of the political and institutional work required to transform communicative ideals into effective practices. Habermas's importance lies precisely in showing that critique must not abandon reason to technocracy nor leave democracy to procedural emptiness.

In the final analysis, Habermas offers one of the most rigorous philosophical attempts to think emancipation after the crisis of modern certainties. Against resignation, he affirms that modernity remains unfinished. Against technocratic closure, he defends the plurality of rationality. Against domination, he reactivates the promises of dialogue, critique, and democratic publicity. The crisis of European rationality, as he understands it, is therefore not simply the collapse of reason. It is the historical challenge of reconstructing reason so that science, technology, law, and politics may once again be oriented toward human freedom.

Bibliography

Abada, A. (1984). *Sociology of philosophical knowledge* [In Arabic]. National Publishing Foundation.

Abu al-Nour Hassan, H. A. N. (2009). *Jürgen Habermas : Ethics and communication* [In Arabic]. Dar al-Tanweer.

Abu al-Saud, A. (2002). *The philosophical harvest of the twentieth century* [In Arabic]. Al-Maaref Establishment.

Al-Jabri, M. A. (1997). *Issues in contemporary thought* [In Arabic]. Center for Arab Unity Studies.

Bottomore, T. (1998). *The Frankfurt School* (S. Hajras, Trans.) [Arabic trans.]. Oia Printing and Publishing House.

Habermas, J. (1993). *The philosophical discourse of modernity* (F. Al-Jayoushi, Trans.) [Arabic trans.]. Ministry of Culture.

Habermas, J. (2001). *Knowledge and human interests* (H. Saqr, Trans. ; I. Al-Haidari, Rev.) [Arabic trans.]. Al-Jamal.

Habermas, J. (2003). *Science and technology as ideology* (H. Saqr, Trans.) [Arabic trans.]. Al-Jamal.

Heidegger, M. (1995). *Technology, truth, existence* (M. Sabila & A. Muftah, Trans.) [Arabic trans.]. Arab Cultural Center.

Kreib, A. (1994). *Social theory from Parsons to Habermas* (M. H. Alam, Trans. ; M. Asfour, Rev.) [Arabic trans.]. National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters.

Marcuse, H. (1984). *One-dimensional man* (G. Tarabishi, Trans.) [Arabic trans.]. Dar al-Adab.

Mosaddegh, H. (2005). *Jürgen Habermas and the Frankfurt School of communicative critical theory* [In Arabic]. Arab Cultural Center.

Nietzsche, F. (n.d.). *Thus spoke Zarathustra* (M. de Gandillac, Trans.). Gallimard.

Sabila, M., & Ben Abdelali, A. S. (2004). *Rationality and its criticisms* [In Arabic]. Dar Boutakal.

Sabila, M., & Ben Abdelali, A. S. (2006). *Modernity and its criticisms* [In Arabic]. Dar Boutakal.