

ENLIGHTENMENT AND TRANSGRESSION BY M. FOUCAULT AND J. HABERMAS: DEBATES BETWEEN THE TWO CAMPUS

Prof. habil. dr. Gintautas Mažeikis

Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas

How are we influenced by normative relationships based on political and cultural freedom with the subjects that are not participants of our social and comprehensive communication? How could be Others recognized and legitimized if they are outside of our daily language and conceptual discourses?

The lecture will be based on the texts of J. Habermas and M. Foucault devoted to the question “Was ist Aufklärung?”, following Kant’s 1784 essay. The question could be one of the debates between two philosophers that didn’t happen in 1984. The possible topics of absent debates inspired multiplicity of reactions and comments. I take two problems from them: what does mean Unmündigkeit (Immaturity) for both of them, and how they interpret radical transgression in the case of un-reason. Both questions I interpret by opposing of J J. Rousseau constitutionalism and Marquis de Sade’s libertines and on the ground of negative dialectics.

The interpretation of the topic will be based on Habermas’ the triples: spheres: linguistic/intersubjective, philosophical/rational and, political/public; forms of rational validity truth (Wahrheit), normative rightness (Richtigkeit) and truthfulness (Wahrhaftigkeit). No one of them doesn’t fully cover Foucault the triple: Reason (Raison), Unreason (Déraison) and Madness (Folie) and his areas: sexual, saint and libertine. The biggest problem for Habermasian approach when it confronts Unreason that acts before appearance of clinical madness. The crucial question for both: is the Unreason the source of a political? And what Enlightenment does with the Unreason and partly with Immaturity? The question covers repressive of hegemonic education and manufacturing of an obedience.

What does classical propaganda strive for? To manufacture consent through education and information in order to dominate. This is a political inversion of Bacon's thesis that knowledge is a power to control nature. Thus, to preserve the state of minority or immaturity is essential for safe freedom, independence, diversity and heterogeneity. However, this decision doesn't enough explain and doesn't enough help to build a modern society and state on the basis of understanding, recognition, rational choice and social contract.

Habermas’ social agreement doesn’t care on the archeology and genealogy of knowledge that presuppose a need of transcending of the present (today). Foucault emphasizes we are not contemporary social-communicative constructs, but historical effects with endless of hidden powers. We hides and lie about who we are. Communicative processes hide and open invisible intentions depending from the condition of exiled, repressed, segregated, undergrounded.

In the critics and development of Habermas I support more M. Bakhtin's conception of a dialogical. A dialogue is not binary communicative action but includes third element that appear in the process of existential debates. The dialogue or agonistic competition, or autonomous game, or the live spectacle/ritual in the theatre, or warfare... has an autonomy of synthesis and are not fully comprehensible, but transgressive. It is something different from negative dialectics of Adorno.

Practical conclusions of the paper speak not about who is right Habermas or Foucault, but about compatibility of their praxes. Habermasian praxis was realized into critics of legitimation of social political processes that happened in EU, especially in the case of unification of two Germanies and the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe. And Foucault praxis is applied to the debating of excluded minorities and critics of biopolitics.

Readings:

1. Michel Foucault. What is Enlightenment? In: Rabinow (P.), ed., *The Foucault Reader*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1984, pp. 32-50.
2. Michel Foucault. *History of Madness*. Routledge, 2006, pp. 83-100 (see index de Sade).
3. Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford University Press, 2002, pp. 1-34.
4. Jurgen Habermas. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1990, pp. 106-130, 238-265.