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During times of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act.

(George Orwell, writer 1903 - 1950).

No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it’s not the same river and he’s not the same man.

(Heraclitus 540 – 470 BCE)

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

(Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900)

The best way to predict the future is to invent it.

(Alan Kay, 1940-).

Unicumque homo est, ibi beneficio locus est
(Wherever there is a human being there is an opportunity for a kindness).

(Lucius Annaeus Seneca).

Three grand essentials to happiness in this life are something to do, something to love, and something to hope for.

(Joseph Addison, 1672 – 1719).

A. COURSE DESCRIPTION

In our sociological discourse, we shall deal fundamentally and generally with the critical theory of society as Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, Franz Neumann, Ernst Bloch, Leo Löwenthal, Ossip Flechtheim, Siegfried Kracauer, Ludwig von Friedeburg, Alfred Schmidt, Jürgen Habermas, Karl Heinz Haag, Helmut Peukert, Edmund Arens, Helmut Dubiel, Axel Honneth, Steven Best, Douglas Kellner, Eduardo Mendieta, Slavoj Zizek, and others have developed it throughout the 20th century into the 21st century in the by now globally recognized Frankfurt School. We shall concentrate particularly on the newly developed critical theories of Jürgen Habermas and of his student Axel Honneth, the present Director of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research, based on the human potential of language and memory and on the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition. We shall compare their critical sociology with that of the epical, or dialectical, theater of Bertholt Brecht, and that of the Slovenian thinker Slavoj Zizek. We shall also include into our discourse the critical theory of society and religion, or dialectical religiology, as it has been developed by R. J. Siebert and his friends in Europe and America throughout the past
half century up to the present, and as it has been structured and summed up in his Manifesto of the Critical Theory of Society and Religion: The Totally Other, Liberation, Happiness and the Rescue of the Hopeless. We define our sociological discourse as future oriented remembrance of human suffering with the practical intent to diminish it. This Syllabus serves us as a substitute for a textbook of the critical theory, which does not yet exist. Copies of the Manifesto are available for each student in the WMU Library, and in the Siebert Library, and on line. Please, see our Road Map A, on the Siebert website: http://www.rudolfjsiebertorg.

**Five World Model and Dialectic**

The critical theory of society, or critical sociology, consists of a Five World Model. It embraces five macro - spheres: I. The World of Nature, including the human organism; II. The Internal World: human subjectivity; private right; personal morality; III. The Social World: family; civil society; political state; world history; IV. The Culture World: art, religion, philosophy, and science; V. The World of Language: logic, grammar, semantics, semiotics, vocabulary, hermeneutics. The critical theorists derived this sociological model from the German idealists from Immanuel Kant to Georg W. F. Hegel, and from the German materialists, from Ludwig Feuerbach to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, up to Max Weber. The critical theorists of society, or critical sociologists, differ from the postivistic sociologists through their dialectical method: determinate negation. One sphere and subsphere of the Five World Model determinately negates the previous one: the World of Spirit, or Freedom, concretely supersedes the World of Nature, or matter, or gravity. According to the critical theorists, the negativity of the older society produces, as it accumulates its negativity, antagonisms, social problems, and social injustices a new social macro-paradigm, which then concretely negates the older society into the new one. The new society does not negate the old one merely abstractly, i.e. totally, but rather concretely: i.e. it preserves, and elevates, and fulfills the progressive elements of the old one. According to Heracleitos, Hegel and Marx panta rei, everything flows, and polemos pataer panton, struggle is the father of all things. Through struggle the slaveholder society determinately negates the primitive societies of hunters, fishermen, and fruit gatherers; the feudal society concretely supersedes the slaveholder society; the capitalist society determinately negates the feudal society; the socialist society concretely negates the capitalist society; the communist society determinately supersedes the socialist one, etc. History moves slowly. There are periods of progression, as well as of regression and restauration, of revolution and of counteer-revolution, of idealism and materialism. While the positivistic sociology is simply concerned with what is the case, and tries to prove, that the glass is still half full, and thus harmonizes the social situation, the critical theory of society contains a critical futurology, which points toward post-modern, alternative, global Future I - the totally administered society; the post-modern, alternative, global Future II - the entirely militarized society; or the post-modern, alternative, global Future III - the reconciled society. What Hegel said in his famous Jena System Designs I and II about the five world model, and the five human potentials contained in it - 1. language and memory, 2. work
and tool, 3. sexual and erotic love, 4. the struggle for recognition, and 5. nationhood - remains of greatest importance not only for Adorno and Horkheimer, but also still for Habermas, and Honneth, as well as for Brecht and Zizek. There had been initial tendencies among the critical theorists, to ground the critical theory with the materialists Marx and Engels in the human potential of work and tool, or with Sigmund Freud in the evolutionary universal of sexual and erotic love, or with Friedrich Nietzsche in the struggle for recognition. After the death of God, all modern thinkers try to find a new ground for union and unification of the world in the humn potentials: Marx in work; Nietzsche in power; Freud in sexual love; Habermas in language; Honneth in recognition; the old and new fascists in nationhood. More recently, particularly Habermas and Honneth, have been engaged - with the help of Karl-Otto Apel - in a linguistic paradigm change in the development of the critical theory, or critical sociology, and have tried to ground it in the human potential of language and memory and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition, and their communicative rationality and action, and from there to critique the instrumental rationality rooted in the human potential of work and tool, which is still dominant in monopoly capitalist and socialist societies. Of course, Adorno and Horkheimer had criticized instrumental rationality and the corresponding positivism long before Habermas’s linguistic turn, but without naming and defining expressively their own theoretical basis in communicative action and rationality. Thus, Habermas and Honneth tended in their reconstruction of historical materialism, to replace class struggle, rooted in the human potential of work and tool, by practical discourse, rooted in the evolutionary universal of language and memory and in the human potential of the struggle for recognition. While Hegel had built his whole system on all five human potentials, Habermas circumvented the whole system, and reconstructed it, on the basis of the potential of language and memory and of the evolutionary universal of the struggle of recognition. While Habermas concentrated on language and memory, Honneth concentrated on the struggle for recognition. Bertholt Brecht's epical or dialectical theater and philosophy remains rooted mainly in work and tool. The same remains true for Slavoj Zizek. In our new critical theory of religion, or dialectical religiology, we use not only the five world model, but also all the five human potentials as foundation and framework of our discourse. Please, see our Road Map A, B, C, D on Siebert website: http://www.rudolfjsiebertorg. For idealists, the Five World Model, does not start with the sphere of nature. Nature is not only immediate but also mediated by the Idea, the Creator God and his divine logic through which nature and man are created. Materialists turn the divine logic into human logic, and secularize it into the fifth sphere of the Five World Model. Thus there is an idealistic as well as a materialistic version of the Five World Model. In our sociological discourse we take seriously the idealistic as well as the materialistic version of the Five World Model. Please, see our Road Map A, on the Siebert website: http://www.rudolfjsiebertorg.
Horkheimer's and Adorno’s students, particularly Habermas and his disciple Honneth, became early on concerned with all spheres of the Five World Model, as well as with all Five Human Potentials contained in it, more precisely in its second sphere of human subjectivity, on its phenomenological level. The five human potentials, or evolutionary universals, had been discovered and developed by Immanuel Kant and Georg W. F. Hegel. While the Left Hegelian Adorno, the genius of the Frankfurt School, had used all five human potentials in his work, he still emphasized, like the other critical theorists, the evolutionary universal of work and tools as it had been used by Hegel, and developed and stressed in the new political economics of Adam Smith, Ricardo, and later on particularly by Karl Marx. Adorno had already together with Horkheimer criticized sharply the instrumental action and rationality, which was rooted in the human potential of work and tool, and which had developed to an extreme in the Western civilization, and had distorted it. But Adorno and Horkheimer had not yet thematized and developed the opposite mimetic, or communicative action and rationality, which is rooted in the human potentials of language, sexuality, recognition and community. Habermas and Honneth did precisely that. Habermas emphasized the human potentials of language and memory. Honneth stressed the evolutionary universal of recognition. Both emphasized communicative and mimetic action and rationality. Both by-passed on the basis of language and recognition Hegel’s system formation, and thus tried to go beyond him. We shall follow Haberman and Honneth unsystematic critical sociology, without, however, neglecting, in the present global economic crisis the human potential of work and tool, and the instrumental and functional action and rationality rooted in it, and the consequential class antagonism in late capitalist society. The new critical theory of society and religion, or dialectical religiology, is based on the whole Five World Model as well as all Five Human Potentials and their idealistic as well as materialistic dialectic. According to this dialectic, work and tool determinately negate language and memory; sexual love concretely negate work and tool; the struggle for recognition concretely superseded erotic love; and community determinately negated the struggle for recognition, and concluded all other evolutionary universals. What gives fascist leaders in the past and present their magic power, is the fact, that they mobilize the human potential of national community and unity and revival, which contains in itself all other evolutionary potentials: language, work, love, and recognition. In so far as Habermas reconstructed historical materialism on the basis of the human potentials of language and recognition, he replaced its elements of class struggle. Dictatorship of the proletariat and revolution by the moment of practical discourse, based in the human potentials of language and recognition. Please, see our Road Map A, on the Siebert website: http://www.rudolfjsiebertorg.
Main Disciplines

Horkheimer's and Adorno's critical theory of society included as constitutive elements several positive sciences: musicology, anthropology, psychology economics, sociology, political science, history, philosophy, religiology, theology. Adorno came from a highly musical, bourgeois family on the Eastside of Frankfurt a. M. Germany. His mother was a famous singer and his aunt a famous pianist. His father Wiesengrund was a Jewish wine merchant, While his father was a Jew, his mother was a Roman Catholic. Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno was baptized a Catholic and educated a Protestant, Later on he became a Marxist. Adorno's first interest was music. He became a pianist, a composer, a critic, sociologist, and philosopher of music. Later on he also became interested in literature: Samuel Becket, Franz Kafka, Valery Proust, George, and Hofmannsthal, Rudolf Borchardt, Thomas Mann, Aldous Huxley, Rolf Hochhut, Bertholt Brecht, etc. He also became devoted to the disciplines of psychology, social psychology, psychoanalysis, historical materialism, sociology and philosophy and even to theology in general. He wrote his doctoral dissertation with the Kantian philosopher Hans Cornelius and his habilitation dissertation with the existential theologian Paul Tillich on Kierkegaard’s construction of the aesthetical. Early on, Adorno explored with Walter Benjamin the works of Kafka, which became the basis of their common inverse cipher or semblance theology. Adorno explored with his older friend Max Horkheimer, the founder of the critical theory of society, the dialectic of myth and enlightenment: a historical - philosophical excursion into Homer’s Odyssey; Odysseus or mythos and enlightenment; Odysseus as the prototype of the modern bourgeois. Adorno composed for Horkheimer, a volume of Nietzschean aphorisms about the damaged human life in the late capitalist society. Adorno learned from Nietzsche even more than from Hegel. Following Hegel, and Nietzsche, Adorno developed a critical aesthetical theory. Adorno broadened Erich Fromm’s social-psychological theory of the revolutionary or democratic and the authoritarian or fascist personality. Adorno wrote a sociology as well as a philosophy of music, After Adorno had dealt intensively with Edmund Husserl’s phenomenology, he criticized his great opponent’s Martin Heidegger’s fascist jargon of authenticity. Following Kant and contrary to Hegel, Adorno emphasized epistemology. Adorno dedicated to his student Karl Heinz Haag, a Catholic theologian, a study about Hegel. Adorno entered together with his student Habermas an intense discourse with Carl Popper and his students about positivism in the German sociology. Adorno produced masses of sociological writings. Adorno discussed publicly with Walter Dirks and Eugen Kogon the dialectic of revelation and autonomous reason, and with Horkheimer and Kogon the totally administered society and the crisis of the individual, and man and terror. Adorno started a book about Ludwig van Beethoven, which he could never complete, because the composer believed like Hegel and Goethe into a return of secular enlightenment and dialectical reason to a reformed religious faith, while he together with his older teacher and friend Walter Benjamin developed a negative and inverse theology, according to which only some semantic and semiotic material and potential of religion would migrate into a secular humanistic form: a materialistic versus an idealistic reconciliation of faith and knowledge. Among the more modern composers Alban Berg and Gustav
Mahler played for Adorno a decisive role. Adorno produced extensive musical monographies. Adorno was continuously critical of the so-called culture industry. Adorno opposed the irrational in mass culture: e. g. astrology in the daily newspapers in the form of sociological analysis. Adorno criticized sociologically compositions for modern movies. Adorno was deeply involved in sociological culture-critique. Adorno and Horkheimer defined theology as longing for the totally Other; for perfect justice; for unconditional love; that the murderer shall not triumph over the innocent victim, at least not ultimately. This definition became the foundation for our new critical theory of society and religion, or dialectical religiology. It is dialectical in the sense that it develops a three-fold dialectics: 1. The dialectic between the religious and the secular; 2. The dialectic of the secular enlightenment; 3. The dialectic of religion. It traces the history of religion from the relative Medieval union of the sacred and the profane, through their modern disunion, to their possible post-modern reunion. In Modernity the antagonisms between the religious and the secular leads to splits in religion between those believers who insist on their revelation and identity, and those who also want to be open to modernity, the modern bourgeois, Marxian and Freudian enlightenment movements and revolutions. In modernity, the discrepancy between the sacred and the profane also lead to splits in the secular, enlightened community between those enlighteners, who are willing to rescue progressive elements from religious myths, and those who consider religion as entirely obsolete, and as mere residual of earlier stages in human evolution, which have to be be abandoned as fast as possible. The critical theory of religion is as interdisciplinary in scope, as the critical theory of society, from which it has been derived. Please, see Road Map A, B, C, D.

**Correspondences**

Horkheimer and Adorno engaged into an extensive correspondence with their parents, Walter Benjamin, Thomas Mann, Alfred Sohn-Rethel. Erich Fromm, Lotte Tobisch, Siegfried Kracauer, etc. In their correspondence, Horkheimer and Adorno unfolded their main interests, and themes, and notions, and problems. Horkheimer and Adorno was interested in the emancipation not only of workers in general, but also specifically of women. Horkheimer and Adorno summed up their critical theory of society in their common work *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Adorno's life work reached its climax in his *Negative Dialectics*. As Hegel wanted up to the end of his life concretely to supersede Kant, so Horkheimer and Adorno wanted up to the end of their lives determinately to negate Kant and Hegel, vascillating between both of them. Adorno struggled particularly with Kant’s critique of pure reason. The main theme throughout the later work of Adorno was expressed in the question: if one can still live, write poetry, or pray after Auschwitz. German idealism had become a problem for Adorno: therefore he moved toward historical materialism. Adorno immersed himself even into the notion and into the problems of metaphysics as rationalization of theology, or theodicee: God, Freedom and Immortality. He struggled with problems of moral philosophy: history and freedom: the dialectic of freedom. He was interested in the relationship between ontology and dialectics. Like Marcuse, so did Adorno
explore the relationship between aesthetics and politics. Adorno and Horkheimer corresponded with Walter Dirks and Eugen Kogon, two Christian thinkers, who became likewise important for the formation of our new critical theory of society and religion, or dialectical religiology. Please, see Road Map A, B, C, D.

Central Notions and Problems

While Horkheimer's and particularly Adorno’s most outstanding student, Jürgen Habermas, belonged to the second generation of the Frankfurt School, the latter has also deeply influenced the third, and fourth generations of critical theorists: Dubiel, Honneth, Gunzelin Schmid - Noerr, Claus Offe, Kellner, Mendietra, Peukert, Arens, and many others. Honneth, the present director of the Frankfurt School, belongs to the third generation of ctotical theorists. We shall explore Horkheimer's, Adorno's, Habermas's and Honneth's thoughts on the following notions and problems: the language and memory-mediated struggle for recognition and personal and collective self-preservation; the linguistically mediated struggle for recognition between the self-consciousness of the one and the other; recognition, conscience, duty and internal harmony; recognition and identity; recognition and self-esteem; recognition between master and servant in different historical stages; recognition between winner and looser; recognition between men and women; recognition between romantic lovers; recognition between races; recognition between national states; recognition and the moral grammar of social conflicts; the struggle for self-preservation; crime and social morality; the structure of social recognition-relationships; recognition and socialization; models and patterns of intersubjective recognition; love, right, solidarity, personal identity and disregard; rape, deprivation of rights; degradation, morality and social development; disregard and resistance; the moral logic of social conflicts; inter-subjective conditions of personal integrity; a formal concept of social morality; critique of power and communicative action; reflective stages of a critical theory of society; struggle as the paradigm of the social; dialectic of enlightenment; interests of knowledge; species history; preventive wars; liberation from majority; the paradoxes of late globalizing capitalism; paradoxes of recognition of work; empowerment and disciplination; responsibility in present capitalism; organized self-realization; paradoxes of individualization; emancipation of women and the children; globalization and human suffering; the limits of humanitarian politics; contradictions, ambivalences and paradoxes in the newer social theories; communitarianism; the moral foundations of modern societies; justice as fairness; communitarian critique of liberalism; patriotism as virtue or vice; the torn - to - pieces world of the social and of symbolical forms; critique of modernity; body-bound reason; ontological rescue of the revolution; inter-subjectivity and struggle for recognition; moral consciousness and class domination and class struggle; normative action potentials; the other of justice; pathologies of the social; the social dynamic of disregard; morality of recognition; between justice and affective bond , tie or binding in the family, love and morality; decentralized autonomy; universalism as trap; conditions and limits of a politics of human rights; democracy as reflective cooperation; negative freedom and cultural membership and belonging; post-traditional communities;
redistribution or recognition or participation; redistribution as recognition; recognition distorted beyond the point of recognition. We shall compare Horkheimer's Adorno's Habermas's and Honneth's teachings on those notions with the thinking of the outstanding Slovenian philosoher and sociologist and Lakan psychologist Zizek. We shall deal with modern scholars, who were particularly interested in the struggle for recognition: from Machiavelli through Hobbes and Hegel to Carl Schmitt, Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Dubiel and Zizek. While the new dialectical religiology takes into consideration all these notions and problems dealt with by four generations of critical theorists of society, it shall, also be interested in the traditional theorists and positivistic critics of Adorno, Horkheimer, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, and of the Frankfurt School in general. Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D.

**Political Ideals**

Not too long ago, after the end of World War II, a generation of young Germans, who had been liberated from the Fascist regimes in Europe by Allied forces, developed admiration for the political ideals particularly of the American nation, that had helped to win the struggle for recognition against the barbarous forces of fascism in Europe and in Asia, and that soon became the driving force in founding the United Nations and in carrying out the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals and trials: the values of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution. As a consequence, classical international law was revolutionized by limiting the sovereignty of nation-states, by abolishing the immunity of state authorities from supra-national prosecution, and by incorporating unprecedented crimes into the penal code of international law and jurisdiction. This young German generation also received Horkheimer and Adorno enthusiastically, when they, now American citizens, returned to Germany, and reconstructed the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, which had been bombed out by the American Airforce. Horkheimer and Adorno, as well as Marcuse and Fromm, became the intellectual leaders of the third great youth movement in 1968, which also reached into Michigan, Kalamazoo, and Western Michigan University. The experiences of all three youth movements before World War I, and between the two wars, and after World War II have been integrated into the critical theory of religion: their longing for new love, new politics, new democracy, new religion, shortly a way out of what Max Weber had called the *iron cage of capitalism*. This longing has not lost its actuality in 2019, inspite of its repression since the Nixon Administration and especially after the victorious neo-liberal counter-revolution in 1989. Like the critical theory of society, the dialectical religiology is driven by he longing for otherness as well as for the totally Other than the horror and terror of nature and history. Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D.
Civilizing Achievements

Today - in 2019 - Adorno’s disciple Habermas, and Habermas ‘s student Honneth , and others, ask in the face of the still going on second war against Iraq and the war against Afghanistan, if this same American nation should now brush aside its enormous success in the international language- and memory-mediated struggle for recognition and its related civilizing achievements of legally domesticating the state of nature among belligerent nations. What recently has disturbed the Adorno students Habermas,and Honneth, and others most, was the Bush Administration’s new National Security Strategy of the United States and its uni-lateralism. According to Habermas, with this provocative document, a superpower assumed the privilege of launching pre-emptive strikes against anyone, who appeared to be sufficiently suspicious: it declared , moreover, its determination to prevent any competitor from even approaching a status of equal power: of equal recognition. Habermas’s critique expressed fully the spirit of his teachers Horkheimer and Adorno, when he protested against this imbalance of recognition in the international and historical sphere. Likewise, the critical theorists are very uncomfortable about the American supported State of Israel’s wars against Lebanon, because of Hesbolah, and the likewise American supported Israeli war against the Gaza Strip, because of Hamas. They remember Horkheimer’s critical, but at the same time loyal attitude toward the State of Israel during the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem. The Obama Adminitration gave new hope to all the Adorno and Habermas followers. The Trump Administration, which had been predicted by the critical sociologists of the Frankfurt School for a long tome,, produced, nevertheless, great confusion. The critical theory of society continues to support the Roosevelt-liberal national and international civilizing achievements, while it is critical of national and international neo-conservative and neo-liberal measures: e, g the move from Keynes to Friedmann. It prefers a social market policy over a free market policy. It is critical of radical deregulation and privatization, which recently has led to a global financial crisis, as well as of central economic administration and planning , which collapsed in the former Soviet Union in 1989. Not only the first book of Adam Smith about the creation of the wealth of nations is to be read, but also his second book about the restraint of greed. Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D. .

Competing Theories

While in our critical sociological discourse we shall concentrate on Horkheimer's and Adorno's and their students Habermas’s, and Honneth’s critical theory of society. and of their disciples in Europe and America, particularly Zizek in Slovenia, and particularly their consideration of the human potentials of language and memory and of the struggle for recognition, against the background of Immanuel Kant's and of Georg W. F. Hegel, particularly his Jena System Design I and II, we shall also take into consideration in our dialectical, sociological discourse the competing traditional theories on the Hegelian Right - neo-conservativism, and deconstructionism, and in the Hegelian Center, and the competing critical theories on the Hegelian Left - the praxis philosophy as well as the neo-Freudian and Neo-Marxist and American neo-pragmatic theories. Our
critocal, sociological discourse will reflect on possibilities of the further development of the critical theory of society, beyond Horkheimer and Adorno, Marcuse and Fromm, Habermas, and Honneth, and Zizek, with a particular emphasize on the evolutionary universals of language and memory and the struggle for recognition, in contact with competing alternative critical theories on the Left, particularly those of Karl Marx, and Friedrich Nietzsche, and with competing alternative traditional theories on the Right, from August Comte to Talcott Parsons and Luhmann, and their followers up to the present – 2019. In our dialectical sociology, we shall try to follow Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Fromm, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek etc. theoretically and practically toward alternative Future III – a society, in which language mediated, mutual recognition of individuals and nations can take place, and in which personal autonomy and universal solidarity will be reconciled, and in which a friendly and helpful living together of human beings will be possible, and in which even animals are not used as mere work- and war machines-, but are recognized in their own vulnerability, mortality and rights; and in which neither men nor animals are tortured. How can that be done? Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D.

Discourse

In our sociological discourse, we understand with Horkheimer and Adorno, Habermas and Honneth and their European and American disciples critical discourse as a privileged form of communicative action and rationality. What is wrong with the positistic discourse is not that it considers, what is the case, but rather that it acquiesces with it, even when it is unjust and crital and inhuman: like Auschwitz and Treblinka, or Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Mimetic action and rationality are mainly rooted in the human potential of language and memory and anticipation, as well as in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition. The communicative action is characterized by five elements: 1. Subject, 2. Text, 3. Context or situation, 4. Logical and grammatical structure, and 5. Intention or goal. Critical discourse can be defined as argumentative dialogue, in which the better arguments should win. We see critical discourse as the self-reflection of communicative action, particularly in times of crisis. Practical discourse is the very opposite of instrumental, functional, or strategic discussion. It is different from any therapeutical discussion. More precisely and concretely, we define critical discourse as future-oriented remembrance of human happiness and suffering, with the practical intent to increase the former and to diminish the latter. There has been a theological, philosophical and scientific phase of discourse in the past 6000 years of world history from the Euphrates-, Nile-, Indus- and Yellow River-cultures to the present modern civilizations. Since Horkheimer and Adorno, in the critical theory of society all three forms of discourse are concretely superseded. The dialectical religiology understands itself as scientific, philosophical and theological discourse, which aims at the diminishment of suffering. Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D.
**Dialectical Method**

In our critical sociological discourse, we follow the critical theorists, and particularly Horkheimer and Adorno, Habermas and Honneth, and also Zizek, in applying the dialectical method, which they inherited from Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* and *Science of Logic*, and which they transformed with the help of Karl Marx from an idealistic into a materialistic dialectic, and which Adorno further developed in terms of a negative dialectic - radical, but still determinate negation - and which they concretely superseded into their own theory of communicative action. The negative dialectic reflects the experience of Word War II, in which the negative fascism, was negated, but this negation did not lead to an affirmation, a new, Post-Modern, world historical paradigm, but rather to the restoration of the old, Modern paradigm, out of which fascism had developed in the first place, and woud develop again not after hundreds of years, as Adolf Hitler predicted, but already after 70 years in the form of Trumpism, or corporatism, in the USA and Europe. We shall trace the history of human life forms and paradigms, as one of them determinately supersedes, i. e. not only critically negates, but also preserves, and elevates, and fulfills the previous one toward a historical goal, that is ultimately imageless, and nameless, and as such unknown. The critical theorists' dialectical method is not only rooted in Greek philosophy, e. g. in Heracleitos' philosophy of Becoming, but also and most of all, in the Jewish *Religion of Sublimity*, in the second and third commandment of the Mosaic Decalogue - the prohibition against making images or naming of the Absolute, and also in Immanuel Kant’s tabu against the penetration of the dimension of the *Thing in itself: God, Freedom and Immortality*. Habermas and Honneth practiced this prohibition even more radically than Horkheimer or Adorno, or any other of the older Jewish critical theorists had ever done. Like the Greeks and the Jews, the German Idealists and Materialists held on to the Idea against its very opposite, the horror and terror of the historical reality and process. We shall continually compare our dialectical method with the different, positivistic methodologies, e. g. that of the Vienna School or of Carl Popper, which are used today by the always more and more formalized, systematized, mathematized, quantified and technified traditional social sciences in their many, extremely detailed, technical tasks. The critical sociologist continues to practice the dialectical methodology, without, however, rejecting entirely positivistic, scientific methods. It rejects them only in so far as they are enslaved to *what is the case* in antagonistic civil society, and do not transcend it toward otherness, and the totally Other. Please, see Road Map A, C.

**The Dialectical Notion**

In our critical sociological discourse, we speak with Horkheimer and Adorno, as well as with Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, and unlike the positivists, still of the originally theological, and now secularized *notion*, understood as the dialectical unity of the universal, the particular and the singular, as Kant had prepared it, and Hegel had developed and formulated it in his *Science of Logic* and in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*: or of the essence, totality, or even truth of society. With Horkheimer and Adorno, Habermas and Honneth, and Zizek, ,
we see modern civil society as a totality that reproduces and realizes itself antagonistically. The social totality is characterized by contradictions or antagonisms, which since Auguste Comte's *Course de philosophie positive* have often been explained away or ideologically harmonized by positivistic sociologists. In the restoration period after the great French Revolution, Comte became the father not only of positive sociology, but also of positivism. Marx did not like him and his positivism, and did not use the word *sociology*. We understand positivism with Adorno as the metaphysics of what is the case. Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek agree with Hegel and Marx, that the totality of modern civil society is driven beyond itself by what they had called its own inner contradictions or negativity: be it by the antagonisms of man and nature, individual and collective, men and women, producers and consumers, owners and workers, rich and poor classes, luxury and misery, sacred and profane, or by what Comte named the dichotomy between the principle of order and the principle of progress, or between the static and the dynamic principle, or by what Marx determined as the contradiction between the productive relations and the productive forces. While Habermas and Honneth agree with Hegel, that the truth is the whole, they at the same time insisted with Adorno most emphatically, that the present social totality is still untrue. Today, the Left-Hegelian critical theorists, disciples of Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek etc., do not agree with the skeptical Right-Hegelian Francis Fukuyama, that present liberal democratic society is the end of history, or that the bourgeois is the last man. The present global economic crisis is proving how wrong Fukuyama has been. Even Fukuyama has become aware of this and has changed his original position. Also the present liberal democratic society is - like all previous social formations - driven by its own inner antagonisms, or negativity, beyond itself not into nothing or anything, but rather into its own determinate negation, hopefully into post-modern, global, alternative Future III - another, more humane, more reconciled life form. Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, etc., do also disagree with the late Samuel Huntington, the student of Hobbes and of Carl Schmitt, the jurist, general council, and political theologian of Adolf Hitler, and former advisor of the Pentagon, that the *clash of civilizations* is unavoidable, and that the struggle for recognition between the different religion-based cultures, - e. g. the Islamic and Christian civilization-, may lead into alternatice Future II - a third world war. According to the Right Wing Fox News we are already in the third world war in the form of the war against Islamic terror. Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, etc. rather promote with Kofi Annan, General Secretary of the UN, and his successor, and with Seyed Mohammad Khatami, former President of Iran, and the Christian theologian Hans Küng a dialogue and the cooperation of cultures. We shall take seriously Habermas’s present critique of Hegel’s and Adorno’s notion of totality on the basis of the linguistic turn, which he introduced into the critical theory of society. The critical religiology is still based on the admittedly secularized dialectical notion, and on its basis traces the world religions in their paradigmatic evolution and history from nature religions, through religions of individuality, to religions of freedom. Please, see Road Map A, B. C. D.
From Liberalism, through Socialism to, Fascism, and Back again

In our critical, sociological discourse, we shall remember, that Adolf Hitler understood in his manifesto *My Struggle*, and in his *Second Book*, and in his *Table Talks*, and in his overall folkish, or nationalistic, and racist philosophy, fascism or national socialism as the counter-philosophy against Jewish Marxism in general, and specifically against the critical theorists, whom he called the *negativists*, namely against Horkheimer’s and Adorno’s critical theory of society of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, the at the time so called *Caffè Marx*, the by now globalized *Frankfurt School*. Vice versa, Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s critical theory of society was from the start most deeply opposed to positivism as well as to fascism in all their forms. Today the third generation of critical theorists in the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research – besides Honneth, its present director, also Alex Demirovic, Gerd Paul, Sabine Grimm, Klaus Ronneberg, Thomas von Freyberg, and Hans-Gerd Jaschke, etc. - discover, that Rightwing extremist groups and movements in Germany, and Europe, and America carry on and practice the same fascist philosophy of life against foreigners - Turks, Gypsies, Yugoslavs, Jews, Arabs, etc. These Rightwing groups and movements are engaged in a nationalist and racist struggle for recognition in Germany, Europe, the USA, and elsewhere. The Aryan race is supposedly in danger, and thus must defend itself! From its very start, Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s critical theory of society understood itself as a counter-philosophy not only against positivism, but also against the fascist philosophy of life, which they considered to be interconnected. Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels would have been recognized as the greatest positivists, if they had won the war. Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s critical theory of society came into existence at a time, when socialism had just won revolutions against nationalism in Russia and Germany, but when also already folkish, tribal, nationalist, and fascist elements began to prepare counter-revolutions, in the name of the resurrection of the Germanic nations and the Aryan race. In 1933, fascism won over socialism, and almost wiped it out by 1942. However, fascism was finally defeated by socialism in Moscow, Stalingrad, Charcov, Kursk, and Berlin in 1943 - 1945: to be sure not without the help by the high-bourgeois liberal nations, and their *Second Front*. In 1989, racism, tribalism, nationalism, and fascism once more defeated socialism, to be sure, not without help of the neo-conservative governments of the liberal democratic societies. That gives Adorno and Horkheimer’s critical theory of society, as anti-positivist and anti-fascist philosophy, a new actuality and importance. The struggle between nationalism and socialism, the fascist philosophy of life based in the *aristocratic principle of nature* on one hand, and the critical theory of society, rooted in the Messianic law, on the other, reflects the inner antagonisms in present day civil society, which push it beyond itself into either a post-modern, alternative global Future I - the totally administered society; or into alternative global Future II - the entirely militarized society; or hopefully into alternative global Future III – the free, just and reconciled society. The successful neo-liberal counter-revolution of 1989 claimed to have overcome socialism and fascism, and to have established once and for all the victory of neo-conservativism or neo-liberalism. The global liberal-capitalist. financial disaster of 2008/2009/2010/2011 has disproven this claim.
New ways must be found to achieve alternative Future III - a concrete formal and material - democratic society, in which, in Adorno’s terms, the free market as well as the centralized economy will both be concretely superseded, and in which in Habermas’s terms personal autonomy and universal solidarity will be reconciled, and to prevent alternative Future I - brown or red fascism, from gaining power in world-history. As qualitatively different liberalism and fascism are, they share nevertheless their hate against socialism and communism. The dialectical religiology aims beyond liberalism and fascism toward alternative Future III - a humanistic socialism, or a not only linguistic, but also an economic, socialist humanism, which is open toward and driven by the longing for the totally Other than the horror and terror of nature and history. Please, see our Road Map A,B,C,D.

**Military, Industrial Complex**

In terms of our dialectical, sociological discourse, informed by the critical theory of Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, and their colleagues, fascism embraces sociologically a racial nation's military-industrial complex, the lower middle classes with a prevalence of the authoritarian personality, religious fundamentalism, and the charismatic leader, and cultural-anthropologically the myth of origin - unbroken by prophetic Messianism, the bourgeois principle of freedom - distorted by monopoly capitalism, and the hostility against all forms of egalitarianism and socialism. To be sure, we have chosen our theme, the critical theory of society, with its specific emphasis on Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, and their concentration on the notions of language and recognition, and the introduction into the dialectical religiology, because of the present historical situation, in which in 1989 liberal nationalism had won a counter-revolutionary victory not only over socialism, but also over cosmopolitanism, and in which thus neo-fascism and Anti-Semitism rise again in many forms in many countries, in the East and in the West. There is the danger in America - long predicted by Adorno, Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm and Alfred Sohn-Rethel - that fascism will be introduced in the name of antifascism, unfreedom in the name of freedom. This danger has gained even greater actuality after September 11, 2001 and the consequent Patriot Act with all its explicit and implicit, manifest and latent implications: particularly the trends toward alternative global Futures I and II. The dialectical religiology takes deadly seriously President Eisenhowers warning against the military industrial complex, as it points to alternative, post-modern Future I – a possibly liberally and formally democratically masked plutocratic society of oligarchs, and to alternative Future II – an extremely militarized society. The military industrial complex, is also a congressional, university, and ecclesiastical complex. Please, see our Road Map A,B,C,D.
**Truth**

In our critical-sociological discourse, we must never forget the fact, that Adorno and Horkheimer and the other critical sociologists are, - unlike the more positivistic and technical traditional social scientists -, still concerned with the truth in an emphatic philosophical sense as the negation of untruth, i. e. ideology and mythology, and what they cover up: abandonment, loneliness, social injustice and alienation. That is particularly true of Horkheimer and Adorno, but also still for Habermas, Honneth and Zizek. Horkheimer's, Adorno’s, and the other critical theorists’ concern with social issues leads them almost automatically to questions about the creation of alternative Future III - a better, or the right, or the true, or the redeemed society, which is characterized by linguistically - and understanding – mediated, mutual recognition of the one and the other, and which is as it ought to be. Horkheimer and Adorno and the other critical theorists do as dialecticians not belong to those skeptical sociologists, who know, that all is swindle anyhow: that there is no revolution, and that there are no social classes, and that all such things are only inventions of certain Left-wing interest groups. It is the very rational of positivistic sociology, to elevate itself above those issues. Horkheimer, and Adorno, and the other critical theorists do not agree with those Right-wing sociologists -, like e. g. Vilfredo Pareto, the teacher of Benito Mussolini -, who resist and negate such theologumena of theoretical thinking like the truth, the essence, or the totality, or redemption, because everything is conditioned by particular social interests anyhow. They do not agree with the late Foucault, for whom everything in social life was a matter of power, rather than as for Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, a matter of mutual understanding and recognition, West-German positivistic sociologists, who have after the successful neo-liberal counter-revolution of 1989 and the annexation of the German Democratic Republic, taken over chairs in East German universities, are driven mad, when their East German students and colleagues still continually ask concerning every project, how it can possibly improve society, instead of simply registering the facts and data, or simply what is the case. Definitely, Horkheimer and Adorno, and the other critical theorists try to promote the long march of man from animality to alternative Future III - the realm of freedom, the truth, redemption. When Horkheimer, Adorno or Habermas study religion, then they do so, because they want to know, what its fragments of communicative rationality and action can possibly contribute to the humanization of man toward alternative Future III. The mass murderer Pontius Pilatus, Roman Governor of Palestine, asked he Rabbi Jesus from Nazareth skeptically: *What is truth*?:

(John 18:28-40). Pilate does, indeed, sound like a very modern man: a true positivist, who mixes up truth with the correctness of protocoll sentences. Often the positive social sciences in late capitalist society do not even ask that truth-question any longer. For them the truth question has become obsolete: a metaphysical residual
from the Middle Ages or Antiquity. For them, truth has shrunk in terms of the correspondence theory into the correctness of protocol sentences about quantified facts and data. Hokheimer and Adorno, and the other critical theorists, tried through the identification of the untruth -, the disregard, neglect, contempt, humiliation, degradation, torture. etc. of human beings -, to open up the horizon for the truth - alternative Future III - the socio-ethical totality characterized by mutual recognition through mutual understanding. Horkheimer and Adorno and their disciples work for the day, when abstract liberal democratic society will change its identity in such a way, that also such human actions and attitudes, which do not carry a price tag, do, nevertheless, have a value in terms of alternative Future III - the free society, in which personal autonomy and universal, i. e. anamnestic, present and proleptic solidarity will be reconciled, and in which friendly living together of human beings -, and even of plants and animals -, will be possible. The dialectical religiology still takes seriously the artistic, religious and philosophical emphatic notion of the truth. Please, see Road Map A, B, C, D.

**Social Technology**

In our dialectical, sociological discourse, we shall be very clear about the difference between Horkheimer's and Adorno’s and his disciples’ critical theory of society, - rooted in the human potential of language and memory and anticipation, and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition -, on one hand, and social technology - based in the human potential of work and tool - on the other. With Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, we shall be aware of the fact, that from Comte on up to Talcott Parsons and Niklas Luhmann sociology had always had a certain technocratic tendency, pointing toward alternative Future I - the totally mechanized, automated, computerized, robotized, and bureaucratized signal society. There was always present in positive sociology a tendency toward social engineering. There always existed the faith and the hope, that scientific experts, who use certain, mainly quantitative methodological techniques, can bring about, - if people only surrender to them openly or indirectly the control over society -, a balanced, stable, well functioning social condition, in which -, through extensions, improvements, ameliorations, and corrections -, the old system of human condition or action system can be maintained for ever, and the truth can be prevented from coming into existence - alternative Future III - a reconciled society. Habermas has discussed this issue with Parsons and Luhmann for many years. Where Luhmann was concerned with social engineering, Habermas spoke of communicative and discourse ethics. Self-preservation is an essential category of social engineering. Language-mediated recognition is an essential category of communicative ethics. The human freedom history consists of a sequence of forms and stages of linguistically mediated, mutual recognition in family, civil society, constitutional state, history, and culture. The dialectical religiology prefers communicative or discourse ethics over social technology or engineering, and the integration of the latter into the former, over the integration of the former into the latter , and the Future III over Future I and II. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.
In our critical-sociological discourse, we shall agree with Horkheimer's and Adorno’s insight, that even Marx, who was very critical of Comte and positive sociology in general, nevertheless, shared not only Saint Simon's but also Comte's faith in the primacy of technical science, techniques, technology, engineering, shortly instrumental and functional rationality and action rooted in the evolutionary universal of work and tool. Marx was on one hand of the very optimistic opinion, that the status of the technical productive forces must assert itself as the key category of society, while on the other hand he considered the specific productive relations, i.e. the order of private property, depending always on their position in relation to the means of production, as the really determining factor of the social process as production process. Marx did not answer adequately the question, what really determined social life: the technical productive forces or the productive relations? It is possible, that this Marxian theoretical ambiguity has something to do with the practical collapse of the really existing socialism in Eastern Europe in 1989, and the victory of the neo-liberal counter-revolution. During my teaching activities in Eastern Europe in the past 35 years, I often had the impression, that the change in the productive relations - the partial socialization of the means of production - had not been able to unfetter the productive forces, but rather chained them, at least to some extent, and at some times. Of course, those thinkers, who worry about the ecological consequences of the unchaining of the productive forces, should really not complain about their socialist or bourgeois fettering. That Habermas and Honneth, - following Adorno and Horkheimer -, shifted from the human potential of work and tool to the evolutionary universals of language and memory and the struggle for recognition, that did not mean that they forgot the former: or at least that one would hope. The price for such forgetfulness would be the transformation of the critical theory into an uncritical one: from the support of revolutionary to the support of counter-revolutionary tendencies in antagonistic civil society. Habermas and Honneth, however, continue in the spirit of Horkheimer and Adorno and the whole first generation of critical theorists to work for an identity change in antagonistic civil society toward alternative Future III. They are optimistic enough to believe that alternative Future I - the totally administered society, and alternative Future II - the militarized society, can be modified or even prevented through critical social movements. Habermas and Honneth’s linguistic turn in the critical theory of society, which included the categories of mutual understanding as well as mutual recognition, remains progressive as long as it does not abandon and is still connected with the category of work and tool. The dialectical religiology tries to reconcile instrumental action and rationality, which is rooted in the human potential of work and tool, with the communicative praxis and rationality, which is rooted in the evolutionary universals of language and memory, sexual and erotic love, struggle for recognition, and community. The neglect of intrumental action and rationality and thus of the metabolism of civil society, would let humanity starve to death. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.
Productive Forces and Relations

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall share with Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek their dialectical conception of society. Their theory of communicative action does not negate dialectics abstractly, but rather concretely: i. e. it critically negates dialectics, but it also tries to preserve and to elevate and to fulfill it. In terms of such a dialectical notion of society, a teaching on the absolute preeminence of the productive forces or of the productive relations is not really possible. In reality, such priority changes all the time, depending on the status of the class struggle in globalizing late capitalist society. As long as it was in the interest of the rising bourgeoisie, to unchain the forces of production, there existed a certain equilibrium between productive forces and productive relations. At that time, Marx was justified to consider the productive forces as the key category. But the present monopoly - and oligopoly - capitalist system is very different from the liberal capitalist situation, in which Marx lived and theorized. Also social theories have a time core. Today, it is in the interest of the capitalist owners, the bankers, the insurance companies, and the industrialists, the corporate elite, the military - industrial complex, the oligarchs -, in spite of all the talk about the industrial society instead of the late capitalist society -, that the productive relations have the supremacy over the technical productive forces. This supremacy reflects itself in the political struggle. Thus, e. g. , on our local level in the 1994 - campaign for the Michigan Governorship, the incumbent Republican Governor, John Engler, called his democratic challenger, Howard Wolpe, a blue-eyed liberal, who is out of step with reality, and Wolpe called Engler a friend of the rich people, and of the large corporations. Wolpe lost! But in 2002 a liberal democratic woman won the Governorship of Michigan. She probably was a little bit more to the center of the political spectrum than Wolpe. But political progress is obviously possible. The Roosevelt liberals can win over the neo-liberals. In any case, Habermas and Honneth stress the political over the economic factor without however, - hopefully -, not neglecting the latter. It is in the political dimension, which Marx somewhat neglected as mere super-structure, that the struggle for linguistically mediated recognition takes place. Certainly, the class struggle is not only one for material gains, but also for political recognition: the end not only of hunger, but also of disregard, degradation, and humiliation and in consequence the life-endangering neglect of the lower classes: e. g. in the case of the miners in the West Virginia mining corporations during the last 130 years. The critical religiology is critical of the productive relations in terms of religious or secular values, e. g. social justice, subsidiarity, solidarity, etc. , and for the time being is more inclined to support Roosevelt liberalism than neo-liberalism, Lord Kaynes than Professor Friedmann and the the Chicago School, federalization of banks, insurance firms, and industries than deregulation and privatization . This inclination continues under the present Trumpism or corporatism, or fascism . Please, see our Road Map A,B,C.
**Inhomogeneity**

In our critical, sociological discourse, we shall see from the ambiguities and problems of positive sociology with Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, why it cannot possibly be such a relatively unanimous science as e. g. medicine, or jurisprudence. The reason for this inhomogeneity of positive sociology lies in the antagonisms of liberal democratic society, which it studies, as well as in its own contradictory character. When sociology begins to deny, or cover up, the antagonisms in civil society or harmonizes them, it turns into bourgeois ideology: understood as false consciousness, masking of class and national interests, or simply as untruth. It becomes untrue. However, the very fact, that the Republican Government of Michigan excluded sociology from the social sciences to be studied in schools, proves, that it still contains some critical elements. Sociology remains critical as long as it connects the categories of language, work, and recognition, and applies them to civil society. Insofar as the dialectical religiology remains critical and does not harmonize the situation in late capitalist society in the name of traditional religion, and remains committed to otherness, ultimately the totally Other than the injustice of this world as nature, society, history and culture, it will be characterized by inhomogeneity like the critical sociology of society. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C.

**Potential for Change**

In our dialectical, sociological discourse, we shall agree with Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, that sociology should not only be positivistically a collection of social data, treated statistically, but beyond that also the insight into civil society in its totality: into what is essential in liberal society. Sociology should be the insight into -, as Ludwig Wittgenstein put it -, what is the case in society, but in such a way, that this insight is critical in the sense, that it measures its facts, by what it, the society itself, claims to be, in order thus to discover in its contradiction between its data and its idea or aspiration, at the same time the potentials for change of the total system of human condition and of the total action system toward alternative Future III. This, of course, is not to be taken as a definition of sociology. Unlike for the positive social scientists, e. g. Max Weber or Emil Durkheim, for the dialectical theorist there can be -, as for Friedrich Nietzsche before -, no verbal definition at the beginning of his research, but at best only at its end: after the research has been done. All things, which have a history, cannot be defined. Society has a history. At best we can have a working definition and can say, that modern civil society is a commodity exchange process, which is supposed to be equivalent. The dialectical religiology shares the working definition of society -, a commodity exchange process, which is supposed to be equivalent -, and of religion -, religion is the longing for the entirely Other, perfect justice, unconditional love, and the triumph of the innocent victim over the murderer, at least ultimately -, with the critical theorists of society. Change is never to be used formalistically in the critical theory. as it is always used in positive sociology and by propaganda and adverticement in the public sphere, in business and politics.
Its formalistic use is ideological and mythological. It needs to be translated into the clear text! Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.

**Theory-Praxis Dialectic**

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall discover, that Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek, when they - unlike the positivists or naturalists - speak theoretically about the essential in society, they are also always concerned with the practical. They hold on to the theory-praxis dialectic. In the critical theory of society, certain subjectively directed, social-psychological questions, which in relation to the structural problems of society may not have great importance, have, nevertheless, great practical relevance, because after London and Coventry, Auschwitz and Treblinka, Dresden and Hamburg, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, etc. there must at least be the interest, that what has happened, shall not happen again. For the critical theorists of society, Auschwitz is prototypical for something that since it happened first, has again and again repeated itself. What is wrong with *Schindler's List*, is not the movie’s assertion, that there are sometimes capitalists, who give their surplus value back to their exploited workers, or that there were also good Nazis - which all fits well into the present Trumpism, or corporatism, or Rightwing-revisionism and harmonization in Europe and America to the point of the assertion, that Adolf Hitler's Aryan cruelty was supposedly only the response to Joseph Stalin’s Asiatic cruelty, or that the Holocaust never took place at all - , but rather the pretense, that what happened then is over now once and for all, in spite of the growing Rightwing extremism, including Anti-Semitism, everywhere: not to speak of Afghanistan and Iraq, Abu Ghrabi and Guantanamo Bay. During the Senate race of 1994, the extremely nationalistic and militaristic candidate Colonel Oliver North, who had been deeply involved in the Iran-Contra-Affair of President Reagan, had at his disposal 20 million dollars. Who pays him? Cui bono? Since that time, North is on Fox News almost every night showing movies about World War II and promoting militarism in direction of alternative Future II. In the present homeland-defense discussions and arrangements the former shadow government behind the Reagan Administration, of which North was a part, has come out of the shadow and threatens quite openly particular human and civil rights on the national and international level. Horkheimer's, Adorno’s, Habermas’s, Honneth’s, and Zizek’s critical theory of society can be understood only against the background of *Auschwitz*, its roots and its present day and future consequences. We shall emphasize with Horkheimer and Adorno, Habermas Honneth and Zizek, the fact, that the critical theory of society is necessarily connected with praxis. It is rooted in the practical human potentials of language and recognition. Christianity introduced into the world the dialectic of theory, word, truth, on one hand, and praxis, making home of teaching, becoming disciples, learning, making free, evil deeds, hating, avoiding, exposed actions, living by the truth, coming into the light, doing in God, on the other. Rgus Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth taught:

*’And indeed, everybody who does wrong hates the light and avoids it,’*
for fear his actions should be exposed;
but the man who lives by the truth
comes out into the light.
so that it may be plainly seen that what he does is done in God.

(John 3:21)

'If you make my word your home
you will indeed be my disciples,
you will learn the truth
and the truth will make you free'.

(John 8:32-33).

The truth makes free only when it is done. The Christians, understand praxis as the liquidation of exploitation, degradation, and humiliation of human beings: the negative forms of recognition, or the lack of it. That precisely is the truth of Christianity. Its untruth is, that it understood theory and praxis only in religious terms. Following Marx, the critical theorists of society continued to invert, translate and secularize praxis as the negation of all forms of exploitation: particularly of the private appropriation of surplus value by the corporate ruling class, the very heart of capitalism. This was not only a matter of work, but also of recognition. The critical theorist moves into praxis, and then carries his practical experiences back into his theory again, and with the enriched theory moves back into praxis again. The critical theory of society continually develops through such theory-praxis dialectic. Contrary to the critical theorists, positivistic sociologists often suppress together with the theory-praxis dialectic also words like praxis, exploitation, or surplus value, or lack of recognition in the interest of the owners: pre-fascist language regulation. It is paradoxical enough, that the critical theorists, who mostly came from the middle German bourgeoisie, used such politically incorrect words, while their positivistic opponents, who often come from the low bourgeoisie and even from the working classes, suppress them. It is possible that the critical theorists by using those words protested - , in Freudian terms - , against their rich fathers in the name of the secularized Jewish, prophetic-Messianic law of mutual recognition and equality, which the latter violated in the process of getting rich from other people's labor. Adorno was the son of a rich wine merchant in Frankfurt a. M. Horkheimer's father was an industrialist in Stuttgart, Germany, His son Max, by working in his father's factory, could observe immediately, how he became rich through his workers sweat and blood: their surplus labor. The young Horkheimer reflected on this experience in a poetical form in his early diaries and plays during World War I. Habermas's grandfather was a Protestant seminary director. His father was a state official. Most critical theorists come from the bourgeoisie. Often positivistic social scientists are not engaged in social action, and social activists have no social theory. We shall explore, why people on the Hegelian Right and Left, and in the Center are forming theories at all, and why they apply them to praxis, or not. The dialectical religiology remains as theory, unlike the traditional theory and like the critical theory of society, dialectically connected with social, and political and religious praxis or community action and movements in the present paradigmatic transition period from Modernity to Post-Modernity. Please, see our Road Map A,B,C.
Theory of Master and Servant

General Chukov, the dialectician, beat the troops of Hitler, who hated dialectics, and his generals, who were positivists, in Moscow, Stalingrad, Kursk and Berlin in the power of his originally dialectical, phenomenological theory of master and servant. General Giap, a dialectian, who had also been trained in the dialectical Chucow school, won one battle after the other in Vietnam. After each battle he withdrew and changed his theory of master and servant in terms of the practical experience, he had just had. General Westmoreland and Secretary of MacNamara interpreted the enemies withdrawal as his defeat, and their own victory. Then came the new attack: the Tet-Offensive. MacNamara was unjustly called a liar. General Giap withdrew again and reinterpreted his theory in terms of his most recent practical experiences. He did this also in the political sphere. He won the war inspite of his inferior armament. Since the Bath Generals, who had also been trained in the dialectical school of General Chucow, were fired by the American administators after the second Iraq war, and the march into Baghdad, and the loss of the Heartland theory, they went over to ISIS. They directed the ISIS war fare in terms of their dialectical theory of master and servant. They attacked and withdrew and changed their dialectic theory in terms of their recent experience. Their rythmical withdrawals are once more interpreted by the Trump Administation as victories in Syria and Iraq. In reality, ISIS withdrew and changed their theory of master and servant in terms of their recent experiences in Syria and Iraq, and went to Africa, where they newly attacked, and were opposed merely by three new drone divions, and not by new dialectical thinking. After a new withdrawal and transformation of theory, ISIS may very well attack again in Europe, or America. During the Great Depression, which should have taught them dialectic, the Americans repressed dialectical thinking in the interest of the stabilization of the bourgeois class system. They had a high price to pay for this repression: defeat in Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria and Libya. It would be less costly to teach the American generals the dialectical theory of master and servant, and praxis, and if it was only, in order to understand the enemy better. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C.

Time Diagnosis

The remembrance of Auschwitz determines Horkheimer’s Adorno’s, Habermas, Honneth’s and Zizek’s attitude toward the rise of the State of Israel. Thus, Habermas, following Horkheimer, and mainly Adorno and the first mainly Jewish generation of critical theorists of society, found himself in agreement with the former German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer’s repeated attempts to get the Quartet, - the United States, Russia, the European Union and the UN –, engaged in a joint effort to arrive at and guarantee a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. Habermas remembered, that this conflict also has roots in German and European history. Recently, - 2008/2009/2010 -, the Iranian and other Governments have stressed this point again in the face of the war of Israel against the Gaza Strip. According to Habermas, since the founding of the German Federal Republic solidarity with Israel has been an unwritten law of German foreign politics, no matter
who ever was in charge, and it will remain so for the time being in spite of strains produced by the Israeli Government’s often degrading behavior toward the Palestinians. In Habermas’s perspective, the recent German national elections have proved again and again, that anti-Semitism is at present, not a danger within the larger German population either. Throughout his work, Habermas has continued Horkheimer's and Adorno’s and the whole first generation of critical theorist’s struggle against nationalism, fascism, and racism, particularly Anti-Semitism. At the same time, Habermas appreciated the Palestinian struggle for political recognition in direction of the establishment of a Palestinian state besides the State of Israel. By the way, neither Horkheimer or Adorno, nor any other member of the first mostly Jewish generation of critical theorists was a Zionist. Horkheimer was critical of the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem. The critical theorist will not forget, that the bombardments of the Gaza Strip in December 2008 and January 2009, which have cost the lives of over 800 Palestinians and injured and wounded over 2000, were provoked by Hamas rocket attacks on Southern Israel. But he will also remember, that the rocket attacks of Hamas from the Gaza Strip into Southern Israel, have been provoked in the past 2 years by the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip, which prevented the development and preservation of its sovereignty. The critical theorists are continually engaged in time - diagnosis and - prognosis in search for the truth. The dialectical religiology practices inner criticism in reaction to the State of Israel: as it takes seriously Israel’s international situation, it also confronts Israel with its own great religious tradition: the Torah, the Psalmists, the Prophets, the Talmud, and their values and norms, the Golden Rule. Please, see our Road Map A,B,C.

**Resistance against the Horrible**

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall share with Adorno, Horkheimer, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, their emphatic longing, hope, and interest, that wherever and whenever the horrible happens again in history, it shall be effectively resisted. Adorno stressed, that even if those terrible things are seemingly non-essentials or merely epiphenomena of the social process in its totality, that the interest to prevent them should, nevertheless, determine the choice of the means and of the problems of sociological research. Adorno thought, that if 6 million innocent people are murdered, because of paranoid fascist delusions, then that is important, even if in sociological terms it is merely an unessential epiphenomenon, a mere derivation, and not the key to the whole of society and history. According to Adorno, such genocide has simply through the dimension of the horror, which is intrinsic to it, such weight, such significance, and such right, that at this point the pragmatism is correct, which demands, that that knowledge is to be promoted and is to receive priority, which aims at the future prevention of such moral catastrophes. Habermas, Honneth and Zizek share such pragmatism with Adorno and Horkheimer, as they develop the categories of mutual understanding and recognition. It is one of the tasks of the dialectical religiology to prepare and sustain the resistance against the horrible as it happens daily in history and is reflected by the mass media. Thus at present, - in 2018- a new wave of Antisemitism in
the context of a massive Rightwing populism climaxed in a horrible shooting in a Synagogue in Pittsburgh, which cost the loves of 12 Jews. Obviously Adolf Hitler was wrong, when he predicted in his last days in Berlin, that it would take centuries, until a new National Socialism, or Fascism, would return: it took only seventy years. That was so, because Hitler could also not imagine the fast restauration of the same type of civil society after World War II, which made his movement of national revival possible, and would probably do so again in the near future: Trumpism, Corporatism, Fascism. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.

**The Aristocratic Principle of Nature**

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall speak with Hegel about five races - the African, Asian, Middle Eastern, European, and Malaysian race - and the tribes and nations, into which each race has differentiated itself on different continents. With Horkheimer and Adorno and the other critical theorists, we shall determine racial tribalism and nationalism as the attitude of a race, tribe, or nation to apply - what Hitler called in his manifesto *My Struggle* - the Aristocratic Principle of Nature: the law of racial and national superiority, self-assertion and self-preservation, the law of the survival of the fittest race and nation, the right of the predator-race or -nation over the prey-race or -nation to enslave, and to exploit, and even to annihilate it, as e. g. in the case of the Shoa, or the Holocaust. The aristocratic principle is of Machiavellian, Hobbesian, Darwinian origin. It is rooted in the human potential of work and tool, of purpose rationality directed toward the survival of individuals and collectives in the metabolism with nature. The symbol of the Aryan aristocratic principle of nature is the *swastika* in whatever form. The Aryan aristocratic principle is the abstract negation of the Semitic, Judeo-Christian, prophetic-Messianic law of the wolf, which lives with the lamb; of the panther, which lies down with the kid; of the calf and the lion cub, which feed together, with a little boy to lead them; of the cow and the bear, which make friends, and the young of which lie down together; of the lion, which eats straw like the ox rather than the lamb; of the infant, who plays over the cobra's hole; of the young child, who puts his hand into the viper's lair (Isaiah 11). The Messianic law is rooted in the human potential of language and memory, aiming at mutual understanding, and in the evolutionary universal of the struggle for recognition aiming at mutual respect and equality between the one and the other. Once in the early stages of the European development, the Judeo-Christian Messianic law concretely superseded the most primitive and archaic Aryan aristocratic principle of nature, at least on the cultural level, and as vision and hope. Fascism is an extremely regressive form of racial nationalism: a return of the repressed. The critical theory resists the Aryan aristocratic principle of nature, and the consequent fascist regression, in the name of the secularized Messianic law. Adorno and most of the earlier critical theorists were assimilated and secularized Jews, who through German idealism, - from Immanuel Kant through Johann, G. Fichte and Friedrich, W. J. Schelling to Georg W. F. Hegel - , found their emancipatory way from orthodox Judaism to the modern bourgeois, Marxist, and Freudian enlightenment, and reconciled Moses with Kant, and thus were able to prepare and to initiate a fourth modern enlightenment, in
which our critical sociological discourse participates, and which it promotes. The second, third and fourth generation of critical theorists is mostly no longer Jewish, but continues, nevertheless, to pursue the realization of the Messianic law inverted into the secular discourse among the expert cultures: particularly into their secular critical theory of society. All this comes to a new climax in the present renaissance of the Frankfurt School in Europe and America, and in our three volumes \textit{Manifesto}. The dialectical religiology works most emphatically on the supersession of the Aristocratic principle of nature by the Messianic law; of the \textit{lex or jus talionis} by the \textit{Golden Rule} as it is present in almost all still living positive religions, and by its inversion, translation and secularization into the Kantian \textit{categorical imperative}, and into the Appelian \textit{principle of the unlimited, universal communication community}. Please, see our Road Map A,B. D.

\textbf{The Authoritarian and Democratic Personality}

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

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall explore through Adorno and Horkheimer as well as through Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek the cultural origin and background of the critical theory of society, particularly its aesthetical and religious components. It is ultimately rooted in the Judeo-Christian, and Greek tradition, in Jerusalem and Athens, rather than in Rome, where fascism has found many of its impulses. The word *fascism* comes from the Latin *fasces*, a bundle of sticks with an ax in it, the symbol of Roman *justitia*, or justice. But also other religious and aesthetical traditions, e.g., Hinduism, Buddhism, or the Egyptian tradition play an important role in the genesis of the critical theory of society. Furthermore, the critical theory concretely supersedes in itself German idealism from Immanuel Kant through Johann, G. Fichte and Friedrich W. J. Schelling to Georg, W. F. Hegel. The critical theory also determinately negates in itself the materialistic philosophies of Karl Marx, Arthur Schopenhauer, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Sigmund Freud. It concretely supersedes in itself German idealism and materialism. In general, the critical theory also understands itself as the concrete supersession of the great world religions and the great systems of philosophy. Finally, it also contains in itself an interdisciplinary program: it determinately negates in itself the positive social sciences, as they have developed since Hegel, Marx, and Comte. Certainly, we cannot understand any of the critical theorists, and particularly not Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, etc., and their critical theory of society without deeper knowledge of Kant and Hegel, Marx and Freud. They are concretely superseded also in the dialectical religiology, together with the world religions and the other world philosophies. Please, see our Road Map A, B, C, D.

**Hegelian Right, Left and Center**

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we remember, that Hegel's school split into the Hegelian Right, Center, and Left. Today, the three main theories of modernity - praxis philosophy, neo-conservativism, and deconstructionism - trace their origin to Hegel. The praxis philosophy is connected with Hegel through Marx. Neo-conservativism is related to Hegel through the bourgeois evolutionists, liberalism, Carl Schmitt, Joachim Ritter, and E. Forsthoft. Deconstructionism is rooted in Hegel through Friedrich Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger. The praxis philosophy stands on the Hegelian Left. Neo-conservativism and de-constructionism are situated on the Hegelian Right. Toynbee and Küng can stand for the Hegelian Center. The critical theory belongs to the wider constellation of the praxis philosophy, together with Marxism, American pragmatism, French existentialism, and Freudianism. Habermas, Honneth and Zizek continue the tradition of Horkheimer's, and Adorno's form of praxis philosophy. Also the dialectical religiology is part of the tradition of the praxis philosophy, and as such is in continual discourse with de-constructionism and neo-conservativism. Please, see our Road Map A, B, C, D.
The Sacred and the Profane

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

Fundamental Conditions

In our critical theoretical discourse, we must, - like the critical theorists, particularly Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, - obey 10 fundamental conditions, if it is to succeed: 1. Ideal speech situation, 2. Power-free zone, 3. Direction toward the unlimited communication community, 4. Ideology critique, 5. Mythology critique, 6. Objections, 7. Mutual understanding, 8. Mutual recognition and respect, 9. The law of universalization, 10. Innovative speech acts. The dialectical religiology affirms as discourse and includes the validity of all ten conditions of a successful discourse. Please, see our Road-Map A. B. C. D.

Inverse Theology

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall follow Adorno and his older teacher and friend Benjamin, as they tried to give their critical theories of society grounding in an other or inverse theology. This theology is different from all the other theologies, that can be found in Hegel's dialectical philosophy, or on the Hegelian Right, or in the Hegelian Center, or on the Hegelian Left: a theology of the insatiable longing and hope for the entirely Other, as the determinate negation of what is the case: particularly what Habermas calls in Adorno’s spirit the human perils. While Habermas, Honneth and Zizek do not emphasize like Adorno and Horkheimer the notion of the totally Other, their other or inverse theology is, nevertheless, concretely superseded in their methodological, - not material or substantial -, atheism. With Adorno’s and Benjamin’s inverse theology Habermas and Honneth still allow semantic or semiotic potentials to migrate from the depth of the religious
mythos into the secular discourse of the expert cultures, and through it into the communicative praxis and the language-mediated struggle for recognition from one stage of social evolution to the next. As new as Adorno and Benjamin’s negative, inverse cipher theology may be, it remains still rooted in the theology of Moses, and in the theology of Jesus of Nazareth, as well as in the philosophy of Kant. Also the dialectical religiology tries to reconcile Moses and Kant in its intrinsic negative, inverted semblance theology. Please, see our Road Map A, B.

**Validity Claims**

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

**Theodicy**

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we cannot avoid the theological core problem of Adorno's and Horkheimer’s critical theory: the *theodicy* (theos - God; dikae - justice) problem. The critical theory shares this core problem with all great world religions, art forms, and philosophies. Thus, we find the theodicy problem present in the Antigone tragedy, in the Job and Jesus story, in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Werther and Faust, in Ludwig van Beethoven’s 9th Symphony, and in Hegel's philosophy of history, law and religion. It is the problem of God’s perfect justice in the face of the injustices of his world. It is the problem of finitude, natural and moral evil, loneliness, abandonment, meaningfulness, fear of illness, aging, dying, and death. The religious theodicy has found its classical expressions in the Buddha story, the Job story, and the Jesus story. A positive religion rises, when it is able to solve the theodicy problem on a certain level of human evolution, as learning and recognition process. A positive religion moves into a crisis, or even into a niche of history, or simply dies, when it can no longer solve the theodicy problem on a higher level of human consciousness,
language, learning, experience, and recognition. The same is true with art. After Auschwitz I, II, and III and Treblinka, Coventry and Dresden, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq, and all the horror and terror of the 20th and 21st centuries, these names stand for, all living world religions, art forms and philosophies have a hard time, to solve the theodicy problem, and are thus in a crisis. It can go both ways: the renewal of a religion or an art form, or a philosophy, or its disintegration, and the birth of a new religion, art, or philosophy. Our globe is the cemetery of many positive religions, art forms, and philosophies, which at a certain point in history were no longer able to solve the theodicy problem, and therefore became implausible and unacceptable, and thus had to die. The theodicy notion has moved from its primitive beginning - human suffering is the consequence of secret sins - through three major paradigm changes: the monistic, dualistic, and dialectical change. The theodicy problem is present also in the secular social sciences. Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud had a theodicy in the sense of the scientific exploration of human suffering, its nature, causes and consequences, and its possible mitigation. Max Weber was concerned with the theodicy problem. Habermas and Honneth take the theodicy problem as seriously as Adorno, Horkheimer, or Benjamin had done. The critical theory of society concretely supersedes, i.e. critically negates, but also preserves and elevates all religious and secular theodicy forms: the talion-theodicy, the test-theodicy, the freedom-theodicy, the shame-theodicy, the love-theodicy, particularly the eschatological theodicy. The critical theory of society is critical in the sense, that it continually uncovers, or discovers, in what is the case in civil society that what ought not to be, what contradicts the will of God, and thus it becomes aware of the truth, the Ultimate Reality, or the totally Other than the horror and terror of nature and society in terms of a negative, inverse, semblance theology. All theology was first of all theodicy, Also the dialectical religiology has the theodicy problem as its central interest, and works on its theoretical and practical resolution. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.

**Social Objectivity**

In our critical - theoretical discourse, we shall agree with Horkheimer and Adorno, that the notion of society has its objective basis in the conceptual essence, or in the abstraction-relationship of the social objectivity itself, which is given through the commodity - exchange process. The social totality, in which we live, speak, remember, work, love, struggle for recognition, and join in community, and which we can feel with every step, which we take, and in each of our communicative or instrumental actions, is not conditioned through an immediate all-embracing being with each other in the sense of Plato’s, or Aristotle’s, or Hegel’s. socio-ethical totality, characterized by mutual recognition, mediated through mutual understanding. This social totality is rather conditioned through our being separated and alienated from each other in modern antagonistic civil society: as it happens through the abstract commodity exchange relationship. This exchange relationship is a unity not only of separated individuals. It is rather a unity, which realizes and constitutes itself precisely through the separation- and abstraction- mechanism of the different markets of modern bourgeois society. Thus,
this social unity is the exact opposite of all traditional organizistic and holistic social ideas and ideals of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Those organicistic representations may in backward projection be applied to agricultural areas, where they have also probably never been entirely valid. Certainly, such holistic ideas are not valid for the today prototypical, highly industrialized countries. If the critical theorist wants to characterize the notion of society, then the concept of the system, of an in a certain sense abstractly imposed order, as we find it in the structural functionalism of Parsons and Luhmann, would be much more adequate than the traditional notion of totality, or of the organic. Of course, the critical theorist wants to make sure, that when he speaks about the system of society, this does not only mean his own subjective systematization of social facts, but that the systemic character is intrinsic to the society itself. The critical religiology takes most seriously the social objectivity. Society, including culture, i. e. art, religion, philosophy and science, is always more than a mere atomistic, subjective construct in the Kantian sense. Here the critical theologists are closer to the Hegelian, objective idealism, than to the Kantian subjectice idealism Please, see our Road Map A. B. C.

**Alienation**

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

**Antagonistic Reproduction**

In our critical-theoretical discourse, we shall take seriously Adorno’s thesis, that precisely through the fact that the totality of modern society does not keep itself alive and reproduces itself through mutual understanding and recognition and universal solidarity, but rather through the antagonistic interests of the individuated individuals, through their contradictions rather than through a unified social total subject, it develops together with its progressing rationalization and integration at the same time also traits of progressing irrationality and desintegration. Adorno and Horkheimer expressed this connection of modern rationalization and irrationality, integration and desintegration, through the notion of the dialectic of enlightenment: the regression of enlightenment into the mythology, out of which it once arose, and from which it once liberated itself. According to Adorno, with the always-increasing integration of modern society, as a visible phenomenon, come along tendencies toward a desintegration of society in certain deeper strata. In that disintegration, different social processes, which are welded together, but which to a large extend grow out of divergent and contradictory interest-situations and - positions, move against each other, instead of maintaining that element of neutrality and relative mutual indifference, which they once had in earlier stages of the societal development and process of recognition. Adorno observes this social desintegration most clearly particularly in extreme situations of the late capitalist society, as e. g. in fascism. Habermas, Honneth and Zizek try to overcome the dialectic of enlightenment, experienced and described by Adorno and Horkheimer in the 1940ties, through their theory of communicative action characterized by the principle of progressing inter-subjective, understanding - mediated mutual recognition. We can experience and observe the dialectic of enlightenment particularly in the present catastrophic, global financial crisis of 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. What does Adorno’s, Habermas’s, or Zizek’s critical theory of society contribute to a possible re-solution of this crisis? What does it have to say to the corporate ruling class of bankers, insurance agents, and industrialists, as their banks and insurance ompanies and industries are federalized, and to the masses of those people ruled by them, who lose their jobs, houses and pensions? The diactical religiology is fully aware of the antagongistic reproduction of civil society, and tries to discover the role critical religion could possibly play in the negation of its negativity, in order to make possible a human life as it ought to be. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C .

**Behemoth or Leviathan**

In our critical sociological discourse, we shall pay particular attention to the critical theorist Franz Neumann, whom Horkheimer and Adorno appreciated very much, and who produced in his work *Behemoth* the most adequate social-economical representation of fascism, which has existed so far. The names Behemoth or Leviathan the Jewish scholar Neumann took from the book *Job*, the Jewish *test theodicy*, as well as from the
bourgeois scholar Hobbes, who defined civil society as the war of all against all, and who invented the concentration camps, practiced later on by the British General Kitchener in South Africa, and by the Union Army in Chicago, and by Hitler all over Europe, and by the American Government against Japanese and German Americans during World War II (Job 40). In his Behemoth Neumann showed, that precisely the social and systemic integration under fascism is a surface issue, and that under the very thin veil of the authoritarian and totalitarian state rages an almost archaic and anarchical struggle of different social groups with each other.

Adorno did not exclude the possibility, that such desintegrative struggles go on also in more peaceful, liberal periods of the late capitalistic society: e.g. today not only under the name of Rightwing extremism, but also under the cover of the notions of neo-liberalism, pluralism, or of multi-culturalism. Adorno considered such pluralism or multiculturalism to be ideological: i.e. false consciousness, masking of national or class interests, shortly untruth. He believed, that the antagonistic social forces, which exist side by side in liberal democratic society, are after all in reality held captive, and are essentially determined by the all-dominating social system, under which we live. We shall try to explore and clarify with the help of Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek particularly those issues, - like rationalization and irrationality, integration and disintegration -, in liberal democratic society, which the older critical theorists could not yet be clear about: often simply because they lived in earlier stages of the development of capitalist society: in earlier stages not only of the struggle for self-preservation and survival, but also in the fight for new forms of mutual understanding and recognition. The dialectical religiology takes most seriously the pre-Biblical and Biblical symbols of the Behemoth or Leviathan, and their critical application to liberal, fascist, and socialist societies. In totalitarian fascist Germany, the antagonism between economy and state was very much pronounced. One Wednesday afternoon in early 1943, I told my younger brother Karl, not to go to the Hitler Youth Meeting, but rather to study his Latin for the Lessing Gymnasium in Frankfurt a. M, where we both went at the time, so that he would become something in life: the Hitler Youth would not last very long. My brother ran away anyway and participated in the Hitler Youth Meeting, and told the leaders what I had told him. The leaders denounced me to the Governor of Hessen, because of my unpatriotic behaviour, who then as punishment withdrew my schoolmoney, so that I could no longer attend the humanistic elite school. But during a Power through Joy Trip on the Rhine River of the workers of the formerly Jewish ICA Schneider Shoe Factory, my mother, a typist, went to the Naci Director, whom the fascist state had appointed to take the place of the Jewish owners, who had fled to London, and told him my story: that I had lost my schoolmoney, and that her income was too small to pay for it. The Director simply said: we shall pay for it. The Naci Director and the Naci Governor and the humanistic Gymnasium were supposedly to cooperate with each other harmoneously in the totalitarian fascist state, but obviously did not. Antagonisms, which were manifest in the liberal society, continued nevertheless in the fascist society in a latent form. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C.
**Positivism**

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

**Art, Religion, and Philosophy**

One main goal of our critical theoretical discourse is the exploration of the relationship between the social totality, which according to Horkheimer and Adorno reproduces itself antagonistically, on one hand, and art and religion and philosophy, on the other. With Adorno and Herbert Marcuse we differentiate between affirmative and negative art, religion, and philosophy. Affirmative art and religion and philosophy justify the
antagonistic social totality. They resign themselves to what is the case lukewarmly, or in cold despair. Negative art, and religion and philosophy insist that the antagonism of the social totality ought not to be, and therefore must be overcome. Society needs not only money and power, but also mutual understanding and recognition; the struggle for language-mediated recognition is the very foundation of all ethical and legal norms and values. Who recognizes another person in his or her human dignity and human and civil rights, will not instrumentalize, or exploit him or her, lie to her or him, or kill him or her. Negative art and religion and philosophy resist alternative future I - the totally administered society, and alternative future II - conventional wars and civil wars, NBC wars, and ecological destruction, and promote instead alternative future III - the society, which ought to be, and which is characterized by mutual understanding and recognition, and in which anamnestic, present and proleptic solidarity are realized without loss of personal autonomy. The dialectical religiology deals with art, religion, philosophy and science as the affirmative or negative superstructure of the economic and social base structure of modern systems of human condition and action systems. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.

**Pro-American Left**

In Europe, the Adorno student Habermas has always counted himself among the Pro-American Left. For Habermas, today many Americans do not yet realize the extent and the character of the growing rejection of, if not resentment against, the unilateral policy and lasting effects of the second Bush Administration throughout Europe, including Great Britain, and the great hopes and expectations for the Obama Administration. According to Habermas, the emotional gap may well become deeper than it has ever been since the end of World War II. For Adorno disciples like Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek who always sided with the Pro-American Left, it is important to draw a visible boundary between criticizing the policy of the American Administration, on one hand, and the muddy stream of Anti-American prejudices on the other. As Habermas remembers the Vietnam War, he would consider it to be helpful in this respect, if the opposition in Europe could relate to, and identify with, a similar movement in the USA. Yet compared with 1968, timidity now prevails in the American civil society. Precisely as great Europeans, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek have been and were and could be, - more than Adorno, Horkheimer Marcuse and Fromm had ever been -, bridge builders between Europe and the United States. There is a struggle of recognition raging between Europe and America. Of course, the Obama Administration had already taken the first steps toward a new relationship between the USA and Europe, which critical theorists can only support and help to extend. However, the Trump Administration has rescinded again these first progressive steps. The resistance against America is growing. The dialectical religiology understands itself as bridge-builder not only between the American and the European World, but also between the American and the Near Eastern World, and most of all between the American and the Slavic World, Eurasia. Please, see our Road Map A. B. C. D.
Cosmopolitanism against Liberal Nationalism

In the Adorno disciple Habermas’s view, maybe a kind of systematically distorted communication, understanding and recognition between the United States and Europe is, nevertheless, still in play at this time - 2018. Habermas had not thought of such a possibility until an American friend tried to explain to him, what he perceived as the hawkish worldview of influential politicians in America, like e. g. the former Undersecretary of Defense in the second Bush Administration and then President of the World Bank, Paul Wolfowitz. These influential neo-liberal, conservative-revolutionary, or better still counter-revolutionary American politicians think of themselves, so the explanation went, as the real defenders of universalist ideals. Europeans, always susceptible of anti-Semitism, are perceived as falling back on the cynical realism of their pre-1945 power games, while brave Americans and Britons are rushing to arms for the same goals as in World War II. According to Habermas, from this perspective, only the Anglo-Saxons are committed to defending the universal values of freedom and democracy against an evil, that is now embodied and incarnated not in fascist states, but in new rogue states like Iran, or Syria, or North Korea. If that, so Habermas argues, were in fact more than a caricature, we would need, perhaps, a discussion on the respective faults and merits of what we might contrast as liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism. No doubt, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek remain, - like their teachers Adorno and Horkheimer before -, with their communicative theory of society most deeply committed to universal values and cosmopolitanism: and thus not to a preemptive and preventive clash of civilizations, but rather to discourse and mutual understanding and recognition among them. Without such discourse there can only be war. Who ever wants to have war must only avoid discourse! Our critical sociological discourse is committed to the avoidance of war. While the dialectical religiology is in sympathy with the originally Kantian idea of cosmopolitanism and world government, it also takes seriously the most realistic Hegelian warnings against it, and wishes that in this case Kant would win over Hegel: cosmopolitanism over all forms of nationalism. The problem is, how to neutralize the enormous negativity intrinsic to, - consciously and unconsciously -, the particular nation states due to their particularity, and to establish an international solidarity as has been recently practiced by the European Union toward Greece and Ireland threatened by bankruptcy and will soon soon have to be applied to Spain and Portugal, who are in a similar catastrophic financial situation. If the Trump Administration wants to take nationalistic steps against a World Government, it will find and meet with the strong resistance of the critical theorists of society at home and abroad, including the dialectical religiologists.
B. MAIN DISCOURSE THEMES

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

1. Manifesto: five world model and human potentials
2. Manifesto themes
3. Manifesto correspondances
5. Central notions and problems: mutual understanding and recognition
6. Political ideals
7. Civilizing achievement
8. Competing theories
9. Communicative action and rationality
10. Dialectical and positivistic methods
11. The dialectical notion
12. Liberalism, Socialism, Fascism
13. Military-industrial complex
14. Truth or correctness
15. Social technology
16. Instrumental rationality
17. Productive forces and relations
18. Inhomogeneity of the social sciences
19. Potential for social and cultural change
20. Theory - Praxis Dialectic
21. The State of Israel
22. Resistance against the horrible and terrible in nature, society, and history
23. The aristocratic principle of nature
24. The authoritarian and democratic personality
25. Cultural origins of the critical theory of society
26. Right, Left and Center
27. The sacred and the profane
28. Fundamental conditions of discourse
29. Critical theory and inverse theology
30. Five human potentials
31. Five world model
32. Theodicy
33. Theoretical and practical discourse
34. Social objectivity
35. Alienation
36. Antagonistic reproduction
37. Behemoth or Leviathan
38. Positivism
39. Art, religion and philosophy
40. The Pro-American Left
41. Liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism
42. Historical forms of discourse.
43. Antagonistic totality of society
44. Universal pragmatic
45. Discourse theory of morality and right.
46. Discourse theory of war
47. Discourse theory of the Democratic Constitutional State
48. The struggle for recognition as the moral grammar of social conflicts between master and servant, between the classes
49. The struggle for self-preservation of individuals, nations, races and the species
50. Recognition, crime and criminology
51. Ethical life and socio-ethical totality
52. Recognition and socialization
53. Patterns of intersubjective recognition
54. Personal identity and disrespect
55. Disrespect and resistance
56. Intersubjective conditions for personal integrity
57. The corresponding traditional theories
58. Hegel’s inter-subjectivist innovation
59. Herbert Mead’s naturalistic transformation of Hegel’s Idea
60. Recognition, love, rights and solidarity
61. The violation of the body
62. The denial of rights
63. The denigration of ways of life
64. Recognition in Marx, Engels, Sorel and Sartre
65. A formal conception of ethical life as friendly living together in the life world
66. Competing theories in praxis philosophy, neo-conservatism and deconstructionism
67. Fundamental modern problem: the collective and individual; universal solidarity and personal autonomy
68. Dialectical idealism and materialism
69. Optimism and pessimism
70. Between metaphysics and positivism, or the post-metaphysical age
71. Max Horkheimer's critical theory: recognition
72. Theodor, W. Adorno's critical theory: recognition
73. Walter Benjamin's critical theory: recognition
75. Leo Löwenthal’s critical theory: recognition.
77. Erich Fromm's critical theory: recognition.
78. Jürgen Habermas on the struggle for recognition.
79. Axel Honneth on the struggle for recognition
80. Thomas Mann on the struggle for recognition
81. Bertolt Brecht on the struggle for recognition
82. Franz Kafka’s on the struggle for recognition
83. Habermas and Honneth’s theory of communicative action: alternative futures
C. BACKGROUND READING

The following 3 books constitute the recommended Background Reading of our critical sociological discourse on the critical theory of society of Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek and on Siebert’s Manifesto of the Critical Theory of Religion. You shall find the three required books in the WMU bookstore, or in the library: one book for each month: three books altogether. Throughout the semester we shall discuss together the Manifesto, which is available freely in the WMU Library and in the Siebert Library

Required:
1. Rudolf J. Siebert. From Critical Theory to Critical Political Theology: Personal Autonomy and Universal Solidarity

Recommended:

D. Depth Study

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

I. Adorno.

1. Adorno, Negative Dialectics.
5. Adorno, Philosophy of Modern Music.
7. Adorno, Jargon of Authenticity.
8. Adorno, Notes to Literature.
10. Adorno, Prisms.
11. Adorno, Against Epistemology.
18. Adorno, Studies about the Authoritarian Character
19. Adorno, About Walter Benjamin.
20. Adorno, etc. , The Religion of the Critique of Religion.
22. Adorno, On Kafka
II. Max Horkheimer:
2. Horkheimer, Critique of Instrumental Reason.
3. Horkheimer, Dialectic of Enlightenment.
5. Horkheimer, Eclipse of Reason.
6. Horkheimer, Between Philosophy and Social Science.
7. Horkheimer, The Longing for the totally Other
8. Max Horkheimer, Writings 1931 -1936

III. Walter Benjamin:
1. Benjamin, Reflections.
2. Benjamin, Illuminations.
3. Benjamin, Angelus Novus
5. Benjamin, Understanding Brecht.
6. Benjamin, Moscow Diary.
7. Benjamin, Correspondence.
8. Benjamin, About Children, Youth and Education.

IV. Herbert Marcuse:
4. Marcuse, Eros and Civilization. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud
7. Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man.
12. Marcuse, Counterrevolution and Revolt.
13. Marcuse, From Luther to Popper.

V. Erich Fromm:
3. Fromm, To Have Or To Be
5. Fromm, Psychoanalytic and Religion.
6. Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man.
9. Fromm, Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis
14. Fromm, Beyond the Chains of Illusion.
15. Fromm, On Disobedience.
16. Fromm, Greatness and Limitations of Freud's Thought.
17. Fromm, The Crisis of Psychoanalysis

VI. Alfred Sohn-Rethel:
1. Sohn-Rethel, The Form of Commodity and the Form of Thought
2. Sohn-Rethel, Intellectual and Physical Labour
3. Sohn-Rethel, Economy and Class structure of German Fascism
4. Sohn Rethel, Sociological Theory of Knowledge

VII. Leo Löwenthal:
1. Löwenthal, The Bourgeois Consciousness in the Literature
2. Löwenthal, Literature and Mass culture.
3. Löwenthal, False Prophets. Studies on Authoritarianism
5. Löwenthal, Early Philosophical Writings.

VIII. Jürgen Habermas:
1. Habermas, Theory of Communicative Action, I and II
2. Habermas, Legitimation Crisis
3. Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interest
4. Habermas, Critical Debates
5. Habermas, Autonomy & Solidarity
6. Habermas, Legitimation Crisis
7. Habermas, Theory and Practice
9. Habermas, Post-Metaphysical Thinking
12. Habermas, Toward a Rational Society.
13. Habermas, Philosophical and Political Profiles.
15. Habermas, Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action
18. Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.
19. Habermas, Justification and Application
20. Habermas, Politics, Art and Religion
21. Habermas, The Normality of a Berlin Republic
23. Habermas, The Inclusion of the Other.
24. Habermas, The Past as Future
25. Habermas, Time of Transition
26. Habermas, Small Political Writings
27. Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interests
28. Habermas, From Sensuous Impression to Symbolical Expression
29. Habermas, On the Logic of the Social Sciences
31. Habermas, Toward a Rational Society. Student Protest, Science and Politics
32. Thompson and Held, (eds.) Habermas. Critical Debates
33. Bolte, Uncritical Theory. Against Habermas
34. Habermas, Truth and Justification
35. Habermas, Reconstruction of Historical Materialism
36. Habermas, Texts and Contexts
37. Habermas, Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action.
38. Habermas, Comments on the Discourse Ethics
39. Habermas, The Catching up Revolution
40. Habermas, Theory of Society or Social Technology
41. Habermas, Technology and Science as “Ideology”.
42. Habermas/Friedeburg, Adorno Konferenz
43. Habermas, Change in the Structure of the Public
44. Habermas/Henrich, Two Speeches

IX. Axel Honneth:

1. Honneth, Struggle for Recognition
2. Honneth, The Other of Justice
3. Honneth, The Torn-apart World of the Social
5. Honneth (ed), The Liberation from Majority. Paradoxies of Present Capitalism
6. Honneth, Communitarianism. A Debate about the Moral Foundations of Modern Societies
7. N Fraser, Axel Honneth: Redistribution or Recognition?. A political-philosophical Controversy

X. Slavoj Zizek:

1. S. Zizek/J. Milbank. The Monstrosity of Christ. Paradox or Dialectic?
2. G. Vattimo, R. Girard and S. Zizek, Christ in Postmodern Philosophy
XI. Other Recommended Philosophical and Scientific Books

Books relevant for the Development of the Critical Theory of Society and the Notion of Mutual Recognition:

3. A. Arato and E. Gebhardt, (eds), The Essential Frankfurt School Reader.
5. T. Parsons, The Social System.
6. E. Kogon, The SS. State
7. A. Hitler, My Struggle
10. I. Kant, Critique of Judgment.
11. I. Kant, Religion in the Boundaries of Reason.
13. G. W. F. Hegel, The Science of Logic
14. G. W. F. Hegel, Philosophy of Law.
15. G. W. F. Hegel, Philosophy of History.
17. G. W. F. Hegel, Philosophy of Religion.
22. S. Freud, Civilization and its Discontent.
29. F. Neumann, 'Behemot.' The Structure and Practice of National Socialism.
30. A. Huxley, Brave New World.
31. A. Comte, Course of the Positive Philosophy.
32. G. Orwells, Nineteen Eighty-Four.
34. R. Dahrendorf, Elements of a Theory of Social Conflict.
35. E. Durkheim, The Division of Social Labor.
37. H. D. Lasswell, Propaganda Technique in the World War.
41. R. S. Lynd and H. M. Lynd, Middletown in Transition.
42. Columbia University, Columbia Studies in the Social Sciences.
43. E. Durkheim, Suicide.
44. S. Freud, The Ego and the Id.
50. A. Schopenhauer, Works.
51. F. Nietzsche, Works.
52. L. Feuerbach, Works.
53. S. Kierkegaard, Works.
54. E. Bloch, Works
56. K. Landauer, Theorie der Affekte.
60. Institute for Social Research, Rightwing- Extremism.
61. St. G. Mestrovic, Durkheim and Postmodern Culture.
53. H. Küng, Project World Ethos
65. R. C. Tucker (ed), The Marx-Engels Reader
66. M. Ott, Critical Theory of Religion
68. St. Best and D. Kellner. Postmodern Theory. Critical Interrogations,
69. R. Bachika(ed), Traditional Religion and Culture in a New Era,
70. E. Mendieta (ed), The Frankfurt School on Religion. Key Writings by the Major Thinkers,
72. E. Bloch. , Principle Hope
73 E. Bloch, On Karl Marx.
74. E. Bloch, A Philosophy of the Future
75. E. Bloch, . Man On His Own.
76. Th. McCarthy. The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas
78. J. R. Searle. The Rediscovery of the Spirit
79. W. S. Goldstein(ed). Critical Sociology
80. M. Jay. Marxism and Totality The Adventure of a Concept rom Lukacs to Habermas
82. D. L. Pals, Introducing Religion
83. W. Jensen. 2015. Erich Fromm's contributions to sociological theory
XII. Other Recommended Poetical Books and Music

Books relevant for the Development of the critical Theory of Society and the Theme of the Struggle for Recognition:

1. Homer, Odyssey.
2. Marquis de Sade, Justine.
4. L. van Beethoven, Missa Solemnis
5. L. van Beethoven, Symphonies.
6. A. Mozart, Symphonies.
7. G. Mahler, Symphonies.
8. V. Hugo, Les Miserables.
9. V. Hugo, Ninety-Three.
10. V. Hugo, The Laughing Mask
12. Th. Mann, Doctor Faustus
13. B. Brecht, Prose I - IV.
14. F. Kafka, The Trial
15. F. Kafka, The Castle
16. G. Flaubert, Madame Bovary
17. U. Sinclair, The Jungle
18. B. Brecht, St. John of the Stockyards
19. B. Brecht, Early Pieces
20. B. Brecht, Work journal 1938 - 1942
23. B. Brecht, Man is Man.
25. B. Brecht, Drums in the Night
27. A. Stifter, Stories.
28. S. Beckett, Watt
29. S. Beckett, Waiting for Godot
30. Aeschylus, The Orestean Trilogy
31. Th. Mann, Confessions of Felix Krull
32. Sophocles, King Oedipus.
33. H. Ibsen, Four Great Plays
34. H. Flashar, (Ed.), Greek Readings.
35. L. Tolstoy, Anna Karenina.
36. E. Seckerson, (ed), Mahler, his Life and Times
38. G. Keller, Master stories.
40 B. Brecht, Seven Plays.
41. J. P. Sartre, Troubled Sleep.
42. F. Kafka, The Complete Stories.
44. Homer, The Iliad.
45. A. Hitler, My Struggle.
46. Th. Mann, Disorder and Early Suffering.
47. G. Orwell, 1984.
48. Marquis de Sade, Writings from the Time of Revolution.
49. A. Huxley, Brave New World.
50. L. Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilych.
51. Th. Mann, Tonio Kröger. Mario und der Zauberer.
54. J. P. Sartre, Nausea.
55. J. P. Sartre, The Devil and the Good Lord.
56. M. Proust, Remembrance of Things Past
57. J. Joyce, Ulysses
58. Leo Tolstoi, War and Peace

E. TESTS

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

F. GRADING

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

The final grade will be based on:

1. the participation in our discourse during our 14 weeks of seminar;
2. the monthly 10 minute presentation on a chosen critical theorist;
3. the three take home tests;
4. a voluntary extra-credit paper at the end of our course;
5. our discourses during office hours at WMU, at my House of Shalom, and/or during lunch at Colonial Kitchen
6. grading is based on a 200-point scale in the following order:
7. We shall have a role call after each class session. Attendance will be worth 10 points total. Students who are chronically late or leave early will have their final grades penalized.
8. We shall have as much lecture in each class session as necessary and as much discourse as possible according to the contemporary discourse philosophy. Oral participation in our discourse will be checked after each class and will be worth 50 points.
9. We shall have two major essay tests in the first week of the second and the third month, and a final and comprehensive test in the first week of the fourth month. Background reading, depth study, time diagnosis, audiovisual material, excursion experiences and substantial issues will be tested. The first two tests will be worth 40 points each. The final and comprehensive test will be worth 50 points.
10. We shall have a voluntary extra-credit paper at the end of the course. It will consist of a critical summary of one of the background readings. The extra credit paper will be worth 10 points.
11. Exam make-up policy: in the case of illness, exams can only be made up with a written note from a doctor, or in the case of family emergencies, with a note from the Dean of Students.

12. The grading scale is as follows: A (200 - 185), BA (184-173), B (172 - 159), CB(158-145), C (144 - 131), DC (130-119), D (118-105), E (104 and below).

G. OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE

This listing of the objectives of our critical sociological discourse on Horkheimer’s Adorno’s, Habermas’s, Honneth’s and Zizek’s critical theory of society, and the Manifesto and on their specific attitude toward the language-mediated struggle for recognition between individuals and collectives, master and servant, the classes, the genders, races, and nations, may help you, to evaluate it at its end. It is the purpose of our discourse:

1. To make the student familiar with the general critical sociological discourse: particularly the works of Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek and the Manifesto.

2. To introduce the student into the critical theory of society and the Manifesto, particularly the category of the understanding-mediated struggle for recognition.

3. To make the student familiar with the individual critical theorists, and in what they differ, and in what they are identical, particularly Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth and Zizek, and the Manifesto.

4. To enlighten the student about racism, tribalism, nationalism, Trumpism, corporatism and fascism, which once more have become of great actuality in the East and the West, after the victory of liberal nationalism over socialism and cosmopolitanism in 1989, as well as about the role language and recognition play in the different forms of nationalism and racism.

5. To help the student to understand the contemporary phenomena of racism, tribalism, nationalism, Trumpism, and fascism as well as of the linguistically mediated struggle for recognition taking place in them, and its historical, psychological, sociological, and philosophical roots.

6. To introduce the student into the dialectical method, and its application to the family, civil society, political state, history and culture and to the understanding mediated struggle for recognition.

7. To show the student, to what extent the dialectical theory of society supersedes in it concretely the positive social sciences.

8. To let the student see, how critical theorists - particularly Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, and Zizek - introduce inverted theological concepts into the secular discourse, toward the horizon of the totally Other, as the determinate negation of human injustice, abandonment, and alienation.

9. To teach the student to differentiate between communicative and instrumental rationality, and action, and to cultivate the one as well as the other.

10. To make the student familiar with the essential preconditions of a successful discourse, particularly about the language-mediated struggle for recognition between master and servant, and the classes.

11. To teach the student, how to become a good discourse-partner, and to realize the necessary discourse conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26. To teach the student to differentiate with Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas, Honneth, Zizek and the Manifesto between liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism in the present world-historical situation.

**H. ACADEMIC HONESTY**

Each student is responsible for making himself or herself aware of and understanding the policies and procedures in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs that pertain to Academic Honesty. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse. The policies can be found at http://catalog.wmich.edu under Academic Policies, Student Rights and Responsibilities. If there is reason to believe, that a student has been involved in academic dishonesty, he or she will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. The student will be given the opportunity to review the charge(s). If the student believes that he or she is not responsible he or she will have the opportunity for a hearing. The student should consult with his or her instructor, if he or she is uncertain about an issue of academic honesty prior to the submission of an assignment or test. Students also should open http://osc.wmich.edu and www.wmich.edu/registrar, in order to access the Code of Honor and general academic policies on such issues as diversity, religious observance, student disabilities, etc.
Don’t Worry!!! Be Happy!!!
You Have my
Telephone Number: 269-381-0864
and my website: www.rudolfjsiebert.org/

© 2019 by Rudolf J. Siebert. This document may be reproduced in any non-profit form without permission of the author; however, for-profit reproduction requires written permission.

www.rudolfjsiebert.org