Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann[1]

Introduction

Jürgen Habermas unquestionably is one of the most famous contemporary social philosophers. He is writer and critic of matters in society and politics. Born in 1929 in Düsseldorf/ Germany he experienced very early profoundly political structures and perceived individuals living in the times of war and post-war. No question that martial crisis, National Socialism, the post-war world order and the political transformation after 1989 have influenced his thinking. Down to the present he plays a full role in world affairs especially if it is about the future of society and the development of Europe. He indeed never has written a special article under the headline "time frames" or "temporality" in almost four decades of working or later as emeritus professor. But nevertheless conceptual thoughts on time frames and temporality are recognizable in his works. His theoretical scripts follow the belief in human individual frame acting in contemporary times. He speaks about the discrepancy, the gap between systemic and life world structures. As we will see time thinking for Habermas is a question of an image of humanity - in the sense of an autonomous human being which is more than political "Stimmvieh" (gullible voters/ ser apenas numerous para o partido). It is personal time frame acting as communicating. With other words: Individuals act on the base of their time frames which they built out and coordinate in communication with other actors. This communication takes at least place between a temporal structured system and an individual time constructed life world (Beck 1994). Assumed we would ask Habermas about his understanding of time. It is suggested his answer would be something like defining time as a matter of an individual horizon. Time is constructed as personal time frames which were embedded in temporal structures of society and systems. So the issue of this article is rather focused on the question what does Habermas contribute to the debates on contemporary time. It is tried always coming back to this question and finding different answers. It will be showed that Habermas never

[1] University of Erfurt. E-mail:jana.hofmann@uni-erfurt.de

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

did write an article under the headline time frame or temporality, but that his work nevertheless is an important contribution to debates on contemporary time theories.

Before going on to certain theories there should be given two examples to illustrate the thinking of Habermas. It will be coming back to these examples on different passages in the text to illustrate the thoughts of Habermas.

As first is taken an article published on May the 24th of 2012. It is an interview with Jürgen Habermas in the Austrian magazine DER STANDARD. It is not long ago and was about time as the future of democracies in the European Union. In relation to the wide financial crisis the interviewer ask Habermas one question about the reasons for the upcoming of so called "Wutbürger". This is the specific name of an enraged citizen. It was the journalist Dirk Kubjuweit who firstly named this term in an article in DER SPIEGEL (Kubjuweit, 2010: 26):

> "A new figure assumes an air of importance: It is the "Wutbürger". He breaks with the bourgeois tradition that to a political centre also belongs an inner middle, calm, countenance. The "Wutbürger" boos, cries, hates. He is conservative, affluent and not younger. In earlier times he was representing the interests of the state. Now he is deeply disappointed in politics. He appears in occasions with Thilo Sarrazin or in demonstrations (…)." (Kubjuweit, 2010: 26).

There were many debates on the term in different disciplines. Often it was remarked that individuals want to have more say in political decisions if it is about the future of society. This makes quite clear how strongly correlated are politics with different timescapes and futurescapes (see therefore chapter 2 and the reflections on Barbara Adam).

Back to the question in the interview (reasons for the "Wutbürger") Habermas' answer was already a typical reflecting on contemporary time frames and temporality which describe the time frame acting of individuals between systemic and life world structures:

> "It (= the enraged citizen) is the healthy reaction on the disappointing realization that the spheres of local and national governmental influences became rather small. Thereby also the chances for a single citizen shrink to have still any significant influence on political processes. I consider our voters rather intelligent." (DER STANDARD Interview with Jürgen Habermas, 24.05.2012)

Habermas classified systemic structures on the political European level. He speaks about less influence and less chance of individuals on political processes. Processes, decisions of future (and futurescapes) are always connected to time and temporality. He speaks about gaps and discrepancies between system and actors. These discrepancies belong probably to different time frames which were built out. Regarding system and actors it can maybe interpreted differences in temporality, in time frames. Asking for the time imaginations and constructions of the single citizen in relation to the system - we principally find in this very short answer the whole theoretical thinking of Habermas reduced on a few sentences: societies have temporal structures and modalities, individuals act in relation to these structures but they have their own spheres of time living - in the sense of being intelligent.

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

It is still taken a second example ten years before. In the result of a survey made in September 2002 ninety one per cent of the Portuguese population did state that they not vote for a Portuguese participation on the Iraq war (Jäger &Viehrig, 2005). In the same month on the 10th of September 2002 the then Prime Minister José Manuel Barroso stayed in America and deals with George W. Bush to the role of Portugal in a war against Iraq. On the 15th of February 2003 millions of citizens demonstrate against the Iraq War, some ten thousands in the streets of Lisbon. On the 31st of May 2003 Habermas and Jacques Derrida published an article in the Franfurter Allgemeine Zeitung "The Renaissance of Europe". Habermas wrote

> "The simultaneous occurrence of these overwhelming demonstrations - the biggest since the Second World War - could retrospectively go down in history books as a signal for the new birth of a European Public." (FAZ Article by Jürgen Habermas 31.5.2003)

This example already shows a very active individual which is engaged in questions of contemporary processes in politics. Habermas speaks of simultaneous acting of people which indicates a social time frame within the participators of the demonstration. He speaks about a European Public, about the citizens which take actively part in public politics. The population does no more play the role of victims, deprived of any initiative power. The citizens act in certain European time frame, with the same timing and the same temporality against the frame and the temporal modality of the future thinking of the systemic structured governments. Individuals in Lisbon, Berlin, Paris and Rom belong to the same time frame; they maybe feel as European, they have to raise their identities on a multicultural level. The civic feeling has expanded on other nations. With other words: On 15th of February a citizen from another nation was regarded in the line of the motto "one of us".

These two examples show very clear the image of humanity of Habermas, and within his way to think different time frames, temporalities and modalities of the system and of the individuals. We will now going on to define what are timescapes and timeframes and after show the differences in thinking time of Habermas in contrary to the system theory of Niklas Luhmann.

TIMESCAPES AND TIMEFRAMES IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

The term "time" used in this article refers to Barbara Adam which defines time as a "complex and multidimensional phenomenon" which is included in a "timescape" (Adam 1998; 2004). In her work she always contributes to a "move beyond the time of clocks and calendars". She wants to make "explicit what constitutes a largely unreflected aspect of contemporary social sciences." Adam makes clear that time is embedded in social interaction, structures, practices and knowledge, in artifacts, in mindfully body and in the environment (Adam, 1995). In this connection Adam has argued that individuals are skilled at living with a variety of time concepts (Adam, 1990, 1995). And she argues that individuals strictly spoken not only live with these

concepts. They work coherent for them. Adam illustrates confirming to Habermas that time is constituted by the interactions of human beings with their environment, particularly their interaction with one another (Adam, 1988, 1995).

But Adam makes quite clear that she reacts against the dichotomy of individual and society (as Habermas also does in his concept of system and life world): "Dualisms are deeply anchored in our thought and they permeate social theory. As synchrony and diachrony, structure and change, individual and society, nature and nurture, quantity and quality, objectivity and subjectivity, order and chaos they haunt our theories and analyses. A focus on time brings these dualisms into high relief and shows them to be untenable" (Adam, 1990: 16).

From a perspective as sociologist of time Adam develops a characterizing of timescapes whose elements are shown in the following picture:

Element	description
Timeframe	bounded, beginning, end, day, year, lifetime, generation, epoch
Tempo	pace, speed, rate of change, velocity, intensity, activity in timeframe
temporality	processes, internal to system, ageing, growing, directionality
Timing	synchronization, co-ordination, right time, wrong time, switching
Duration	extent, temporal distance, no duration = instantaneity
sequence	order, succession, no sequence = simultaneity, at same time
temporal modalities	past, present, future, memory, perception, experience, anticipation

Table 1

To this elements Adam says something very important: "Temporal frames are not given, but chosen, and secondly, the temporal framework we impose determines what we can and do see" (Adam, 2008). So a time frame is an inner choice, it will be chosen. It is a question of standpoint and perspective: "It matters whether you place your subjects and their relations in an objective frame of calendars and clock time which positions them temporally in an externally located, socially constructed frame" (Adam, 2008). These frames are stable and fixed. Thus, in our example, the Iraq war or also the date 9/11 will always stay 9/11 - irrespective of individual's standpoint or perspective.

Furthermore Adam differentiates a personal time frame in the sense of family time, time of illness. These frames are individual, mobile and relative. They move with a new moment, new partnerships and interactions with other individuals, with a new situation or context.

So it can be summed up: Time frames belong to individuals. They are related to personal constructions. Individual time frames are just one element of timescapes. Within these frames individuals act in time (timing), with different tempos and temporalities, their actions have durations and sequences. Individuals can build out futurescapes which are in the same way individual and personal. It is a question of interaction between individuals how timeframes are compatible, can be coordinated, structured and so on. There is no inner reflection of time, but an external construction in interaction with other individuals.

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

Society and its Constitution through Communication

To understand conceptual thinking on timeframes by Habermas it must also returned to some origins and understand society and its constitution through communication. Both Habermas and Luhmann coincided communication as the constitutive element of society. They vary in the perspective from which society is regarded: Time frames and horizons are basically presentable in an actor or system perspective (Rosa, 2005; Beck, 1999). It is about the expression of social changing that is analyzable whether macro-sociological as changing of social structures or micro-sociological from the perspective of a subject-centered social science (Rosa, 2005: 25). And so in the convention that society constitutes on communication there have been divided two different strands regarding "timeframes". One is developed in the tradition of the system theory and Niklas Luhmann, the other follows the "concept of communicative acting" by Jürgen Habermas which will be specified here. But before going deeper to Habermas let us resume the position of system theory. Only who understands the systemic view can recognize the perspective of Habermas.

Niklas Luhmann: System Theory and Temporal Structures

Regrettably neither Jürgen Habermas nor Niklas Luhmann did elaborate a comprehensive time theory. Luhmann repeatedly underlines the importance of temporality to understand social systems. Luhmann is regarding a systemically communication theory under the condition that time is understand as a "temporal structure of a system" (Luhmann 1990: 119, 139). Luhmann illustrates that a reflection on time is possible to construct a theory of society. He is above all interested in the meaning that time takes on the change in temporal horizons, the changing relationships that have been set up in history between past and present and future, and their scarcity in modern times (see also Rosa, 2005). But Luhmann also "conceptualizes time as constituted at every level of existence. He provides a time theory that unifies the social theory perspectives of system and action" (Adam, 1990: 15).

Luhmann votes for the increasing temporal heterogeneity of systems, of technical acceleration and even pointed out that there aren't still any concepts: "Until now the system theory only used very simple chronological terms of time and future. Future only is the status of a system to a subsequent date" (Luhmann, 1990: 137f). Time and time structures for Luhmann are given by the system. And individuals act in this time to confirm time structures. For Luhmann individuals can't act in contrast to the system. In an early article called "time and action - a forgotten theory" Luhmann quotes the French philosopher VAUVENARGUES and speaks through him:

> "On ne peut condamner l'activité sans accuser l'ordre de la nature. Il est faux que ce soit notre inquiétude qui nous dérobe au présent: le présent nous échappe de lui-même, et s'anéantit malgré nous. Toutes nos pensées sont mortelles, nous ne les saurions retenir; et si notre âme n'était secourue par cette activité infatigable qui répare les écoulements perpétuels de notre esprit, nous ne durerions qu'un instant; telles sont les lois de nôtre être. Nous ne pouvons retenir le présent.

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

Il est tellement impossible, à l'homme de subsister sans action que, s'il veut s'empêcher d'agir, ce ne peut être que par un acte encore plus laborieux que celui auquel il s'oppose; mais cette activité que détruit le présent, le rappelle, le reproduit, et charme le maux de la vie" (Luhmann, 1979: 65).

Luhmann speaks in relation to this of "needed and necessary action of individuals in the system". He explains the "structure-depending of individuals on the temporality" and denies individuals the determination and regulation of their actions. He describes the individual as "exposed to temporal structures". In a systemic view the participation on the Iraq war can be defined as a future thinking of a system that is described by the structure of different nation systems. The political systems of Portugal, Spain and Great Britain stand in historical tradition to a partnership to America. Even Habermas speaks of the "special relationships" to the United States of America (Habermas, 2003). But regarding: How does the individual stand in that relation? The system is designed being obligated to support, what about the individual? How were the life worlds of the citizens for example in Portugal or in Spain or Germany? In which way the invasion has been in their reality the future solution?

Incidentally systemic temporal structures also include every technical development which is given to save time, to clock everything and coordinate acting. If you take the thesis of acceleration (Rosa 2005) there will be often make the conclusion from a technical tempo to a social tempo (see the Highspeed Human defined by Karlheinz Geißler, 2000). But it is the same here with systemic and action view: how technical devices, offers and applications are used by communicative actors - is a separate question.

Luhmann basically differentiated an interaction system, an organizational system and a functional system. These three systems are summarized in what he describes as the "world as social system". All these systems (not the actors) consist of, organize and keep itself with communication. And surely all actors communicate with sense. But this sense of communication and further all understanding isn't traceable to the participation of individuals and their psychological intention. It is constituted out of the system by that they are surrounded. Luhmann compares the emergence of biological systems with the social systems: the whole is more than the sum of its parts. So it is the system that communicates but not the "part". The system refers to itself, and all acting of the participating individuals serves to make individual sure of the existing system. In other words: The action fixes communication based on an occasion (an occasion like the Iraq war). Consequently the individual and its perspective of time aren't involved in the autopoietic system that Luhmann constructs; the individual just takes part in a pre-structured way and always in kind of certain occasions. Temporal structures are the "location" for coordination and integration of individual life styles. As Luhmann says with VAUVENARGUES: The temporal structures determine our life: how we live together, how we do in politics and so on. Thus for Luhmann time - constructed by individuals in a sense of "interacted social time" - doesn't really exist. It is always systemic social time, in present and future. Its tact, rhythm, perspective and horizon is given and fixed; and it can't be regulated or

commanded by individuals (cf. Lauer, 2004: 97ff). Luhmann keeps its meaning to the point: "But individuals can't communicate, not even their brains can communicate, not even the awareness can communicate. Only communication can communicate" (Luhmann, 1988: 884).

Based to his thinking is Luhmann's offer to a link to the theory of autopoiesis and systems theory in his contribution Social Systems (1984). The theory of autopoiesis was introduced by the Chilean biologists, Humberto R. Maturana and Francisco J. Varela (1975, 1980). Their thoughts have been discussed, reworked and applied to other disciplines, among them the social sciences. It is then Luhmann who illustrates that autopoiesis for him is not limited in its application to biology. There are adequate tools for a general theoretical review, what he calls the theory of self--referential autopoietic systems (Luhmann, 1984: 19). Communication actions are elements which constitute any social system. These actions would be meaningless in themselves if they were not part of a recursive network that included information, communication and comprehension. The actions are constituted self-referentially. Time and self-reference presuppose each other in that it is not possible to imagine something which is simultaneously object and subject if not by reference to circular time which recursively repurposes alternatives of opposing situations. Only a temporal perspective, in any case, allows a self-reflecting check on action. Luhmann reformulates the basic concepts of sociology in terms of the central role that time plays in self-referential systems. The concept of structure is radically changed and translated into a temporal concept, becoming "the relationship between elements beyond their temporal distance" (Luhmann, 1984: 383; see also Tabboni, 2001: 23f).

Systemic action and event become linked concepts, since they both refer to "the instant which passes immediately". An event can be understood sociologically only if its temporal characteristics are taken into account (Luhmann, 1984: 389). Social systems have to be able to guarantee the link and "the link is possible only in the temporal sphere" (Luhmann, 1984: 390).

Finally, Barbara Adam has faced the question of time and social theory directly in the most original piece of writing in this research process, working around an idea of time that links natural and social sciences in a vast area of interdisciplinary reflections.

Jürgen Habermas: Action Theory and Individual Timeframes

While Luhmann demands on the reducing of social complexity Habermas precisely regards the complex society plus spheres of life. For Habermas communicative acting is located in a symbolic structured sphere of life (Habermas, 1982: 173ff). He does now ask how actions between individuals are possible at all. His answer is rather different from Luhmann. Interaction between individuals works with individual communication. On this basement he develops an acting theory which is "the same like this one by George Herbert Mead focused on communication community" (Habermas, 1981: 9). He considers objective life conditions and their consequences

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

for daily spheres of life. His frame is an understanding diagnostic. From a perspective of the actor he wants to understand acting. Especially for the communicative acting he uses the term "intuition":

> "The intuition is generated in the interpersonal interaction; the aim is the experience of an unscathed intersubjectivity, more fragile than everything offered by communication science. It is a net of intersubjective relationships, which allows a relation between personal liberty and systemic dependence as you can ever imagine in interactive models. There are imaginings of a successfully interaction. Reciprocity and distance, distances and closeness, vulnerability and complementary gentleness - all these pictures of protection, being exposed and compassion, devotedness and resistance are the horizon of experience from which we friendly live together. This friendliness doesn't exclude any conflicts but it means more human forms to overcome and handle conflicts" (cf. Habermas interview in aesthetic and communication 45/46, 1981).

Intuition is the ability to see things from the others perspective. So we could ask: Which perspective had the neighbor on the Iraq war? Which perspective had the colleague which came from Great Britain? Which perspective had my best friend actually working in Italy? And how are these perspectives part of my perspective? More and more questions like these show what Habermas means with the actor view on time frames, on future frames and not least on all time horizons. Habermas regards how individuals embed communicative acting in daily spheres of life and also how they use communication media to organize themselves in time (what Barbara Adam calls Timing), for example for a demonstration, to publish articles in blogs and forums. We can ask: How do individuals try to act in time and in time frames to change future plans of the systems? In case of Iraq war there were many internet based organizations. Even virtual avatars have protested against war. This is the autonomous actor described by Habermas.

Communicative actors, Time frames and Symbolic Interactionism

In his autonomous actor perspective of society Habermas 1981 published the „Theory of communicative Action". Eight years ago a publication of George Herbert Mead appears "Spirit, me and society". It was later transformed to the Theory of the Symbolic Interactionism.

The meaning of time, personal time frames and horizons (and within all the usage of accelerated devices, offers and applications) will be produced in process of changing symbols via communication. That means a feeling for time and a relation to time individuals develop in social interaction, concretely communication. This communication includes significant symbols. Mead speaks about a symbol which is in the same way interpreted in a certain social group. In the meaning of the symbolic interactionism the development of time frames is a question of socialisation.

Already the term "socialisation" makes rather clear that Habermas doesn't see the individual as an isolated subject (cf. Kim, 2004: 41). In contrary he sees an active and behaviouristic subject embedded in social networks. In this relation the Symbolic

Interactionism by George Herbert Mead has built a very important background for Habermas. In the centre stands the social genesis of the individual self. Habermas honours that Mead speaks not more only of subjectivity but of intersubjectivity. This already includes that something like time frames also be negotiated. For Mead the constitution of subjectivity is possible only in relation to other individuals. How should I define my time horizon, my imagination of future, war without the relation to other imaginations or attitudes: "In process of communication the individual is the "other" before it is itself" (cf. Mead, 1983: 217). The relation to oneself Mead defines as "me" and "I". The "I" is spontaneously acting; the "me" develops from the perspective of an alter ego. Within these reflections Mead initiated a paradigm change in the philosophy because the individual does not longer develop its "I" via introspection. Up to this moment in the centre of the subject philosophical tradition was the recognizing individual. In its subjective world the individual is the observatory of it and build its personality via introspection. But for this the "I" has already to exist. It doesn't develop in action, it exists before any acting. Mead calls this in question. So he introduces the eccentric intersubjectivity concept instead continuing the egocentric concept. The process of this individualization is with language: This process passed "through a network of linguistic mediated interaction" (Habermas, 1983: 209).

Fittingly Habermas published his "Theory of communicative Action" because to the time of the publication Habermas already stands in the tradition of the Frankfurt School. With this Habermas submits a proposal for a social theory which integrates the life world concept, the speech act theory and psychoanalytical knowledge. The theory connects a life worldly with a systemic analytical approach in all daily lives. And so it allows considering the effects of objective living conditions in everyday life.

Following Parsons also Habermas asked a sociological basic-question: What makes possible a human together living and, by implication, social timing and interpersonal frames too? He takes the line that the acting individual is product as well as it is the creator of its social ecology. He differentiated between an action which is instrumentally (writing a paper) and which is social (the adjusting of the individuals who write paper to the same theme). Habermas develops at all the following classification of acting:

Types of Acting		
object-referred	subject-referred	
	strategic	communicative

Table 2

And now it is visible: Habermas categorized in reference to Max Weber (1972) two types of acting: one acting refers to an object, for example the car with which one will drive to a demonstration and another acting which is social acting and refers to individual, in this case for example the employee of the rental car or the friend who is the like-minded co-driver. In this subject-referred acting Habermas differentiates between a strategic and communicative acting. The first is profit or

success-oriented, and the individual uses all its chances to reach success, to assert oneself with less regarding the interest of the other. But it has to be mentioned that in the case of renting a car and dealing with the rental car employee there are many rules included (the economic system works in form of converting goods into money). Nevertheless this acting is very different to the communicative acting which is going to reach understanding: For example if it is about the travel route to the demonstration. This acting for Habermas - between the driver and the co-driver - could be a non-hierarchical discourse. Individuals communicate at eye level.

If this approach, if the types of acting will be transformed into a time concept it could be considered that in object-referred acting it is just the acting with time objects (devices, offers, applications). In the subject referred acting there can be discussed different situations. It is taken for example the governmental acting in questions of Iraq war. Has the governmental acting really been a communicative act to reach understanding? Or was it at least the strategic acting to reach success, but of whom? In what kind does a government, a citizen can reach success?

It is however clear that non-social and social acting can be in relation to time theory. Non-social acting includes all acting with temporal objects (devices, offers, applications). Social acting is correlated to other individuals: individuals with a different time frame, belonging to another generation, using other devices (letters instead emails), using devices in different sequences (Smartphone only for telephone but no multidimensional using, many applications parallel). But imagine that there are many grey areas. All these acts hardly can be separated. Especially with the upcoming of digital "media" there are always connections to other individuals via devices, offers and applications. Nevertheless the typing of Habermas offers a structure to regard individual's acting and allows to differentiate between time objected and time subjected acting.

Social Time Frames as Result of Rational Communicative Action

"It is not surprising (…) that our everyday communication is full of references to time" writes Barbara Adam in the Companion Encyclopaedia for Anthropology, Humanity, Culture and Social (Adam, 2011: 544f). Here she already provides an indication that time and time frames were developed by individuals themselves in relation to their all daily life: We get out of bed in the morning, we are late, we start to drive to the demonstration after the breakfast, arranging a meeting on the half tour with another group of participants, then checking emails and find out: the demonstration is shunted to a later time. Already Rosa (2005) comments that in modern societies are many heterogeneous time structures: the daily life consists of time devices, apps and offers in many kinds, and individuals are using them in form of referring to.

And so the society system structures can have temporality marks like the tempo of communicative devices or the rotating velocity of a washing machine. But time frames have social character - in the sense of alter life for a better is related

to human beings. In individual minds are time frames "within which (they) plan and regulate (their) daily lives", so Adam. But surely - individuals act in these frames with devices, offers and applications which have a certain own technical tempo.

Individuals are surrounded by devices, and they use the devices and structural elements just to communicate (in the sense of Habermas). Looking deeper it can be asked: If individuals use devices, offers applications for communicating. How does at least elaborate communication? Habermas comments communication is possible by grounding on arguments. But: What about these arguments? Individual's daily communication is characterized by arguments. In connection to arguments Habermas speaks about the rationality of argumentative acting: On the level of society there were modern temporal structures in science and technique, arts and literature, law and ethics. In these three areas Habermas speaks about the break of the individual with the mystical world view (cf. Habermas, 1981: 228ff). The upcoming of any argumentative structure in the sense of communicative acting belongs to rationality. Individual time frames were built with rational communication acts. It includes for example the beginning and end of a demonstration, the year in which the Iraq invasion should have taken place, maybe we even speak about the "Iraq war generation" one day or the historical epoch of European war affairs in the 21st century. Such time frames aren't given by systems. They are elements of individual time frames.

It will be given an example on individuals level: If there is to coordinate a demonstration, and two people speak about the date to which the demonstration could take place. So the first proposes Friday. The second answers that Saturday is the better day because he had heard Friday it will be raining. So the first responds the he had heard on Friday will be sunshine, even the Saturday brings rain. Both share the interest to arrange a demonstration. The problem is about the truth of the contrasted opinions to the weather. Who has the most rational argumentation? What about the most actual weather record? Is it a serious source? Both raise a claim of truth. Therefore they use arguments. And each of them tries to convince the other.

Although Habermas did not explicit speak of time frames in his theory of communicative action he speaks of the rationality of the arguments in a communicative action. This rationality can also be relevant to time frames. As the example shows a rational reason is a reason which finds social agreement. It would have not worked if the Iraq invasion by the United States were explained in reference to gods will. This is less rational at least in our post conventional society. With rationality is so meant the common sense of communication, intersubjectivity, transparency and relation to real experiences, but not to gods will (in the occidental world). Imagine the rationality of communication in times of crusades. It can be discussed in which way religious motivated wars were (and are still) communicative rational. In the case of the Iraq war Bush justified the invasion with the immense danger of the Iraq which was suggested to have weapons of mass destruction. In this reason the Iraq should have be seen as a danger for the United States and other countries. This danger and the fear should the population let agree to the invasion. It was rather intensively

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

discussed if these reasons were truly substantiated; see therefore an interview with Constanze Stelzenmüller in Deutschlandradio on July the 30th of 2002.

The debates on the Iraq invasion include many chances to regard time frames and temporality. So time frames like this one of a war are the result of social action. And also the consensus of which Habermas speaks is the result of discourses. At least the communicative rationality has three levels: the first is the relation of the individual to occasions in the world (to wars), the second is the relation of the individual to other individuals and their social acting (to the neighbour, friends and family), the third is the relation of the individual to itself (to my opinion, identity, attitudes). Within this trilogy Habermas builds on the theory of George Herbert Mead, mind, self and society.

Time Frames within Communicative Action between System and Life Worlds

The relation of individuals to itself, other individuals and occasions in the world are important on a theory of acting. Without knowing individuals self, knowing other individuals and without knowledge about occasions in the world (which also refer to a time line): Without all these individual's life would be rather senseless. Where is the motivation to communicate without the self-consciousness? Who should be individual's communication with - in the sense of social acting without other individuals and their social characterizing? And to what should communication refer if there were no occasions belonging to individual's world? Furthermore all elements belong to a timeline. Self-consciousness, social acting and occasion implicate temporal movement.

But moreover it is asked in which relations to communicative acting they stand. Parsons ask how it is possible that individuals are acting coordinated instead uncoordinated (Parsons, 2003). This coordination can be basically used in three dimensions - temporal, special and objective - while this contribution is concentrated only on the temporal dimension. Parsons itself tried to constitute an action theory. Based on this action theory he planned to involve a system theory. Both inspired Habermas to create a two step term of society which includes the two different - life world and system.

The fundamental thought of the communicative action is to understand each other. So the theory includes the relation of as many as two individuals who were able to speak and act and were searching for an agreement in an acting situation. They communicate to coordinate their plans and acts in a consensual way. The demonstrations could be such agreements: individual organise themselves via internet, they coordinate their acts, they meet to demonstrate and come together, try to find consensus. On the other hand Bush and Barroso also find their agreement, speak with consensus, one to another. The question is why the governmental system and the public did not reach an agreement. If there time frames play a role or temporality? This would also be worth to discuss.

Habermas indicates that it makes a great difference to regard society from an inner or participating perspective of acting subjects in their life worlds (for example

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

to understand a Portuguese who lives next to Iraqi quarter in Portugal) or to regard society from an outer or observing perspective. In second case the researcher is completely uninvolved; he understands the acting of subjects as a system of acting (if quarters only seen as subsystems, but without any understanding of life worlds). Social acting, so Habermas, is always acting of individuals. And so it is intentional acting which is signed by a subjective sense by its actors. This already Max Weber determines. A purely empirical analysis is less possible because acting is oriented on the sense given by the actors. This sense is not only a subjective sense. It is more an intersubjective sense.

If we summarize the remarks of Jürgen Habermas we realise a connection of time frame, individuality and intersubjectivity in social life worlds. This intersubjectivity is experienced in different ways. Individuals indentify acting (and within time frames) of other individuals. The philosopher Emmanuel Levinas did a study "The time and the other" in which he illustrated that we always have the time frame of the other in our mind. As social individual we needed to regard the other individual to constitute ourselves and our time horizon. Also Georg Picht, Martin Buber and Edmund Husserl indicate the intersubjectivity of time horizons; and Günter Dux at least speaks of a collective time consciousness (Behrmann, 2002: 212f).

It can be at least suggested that there is an intersubjective sense for time frame, a kind of social net, in which individuals are and act. This frame is constitutive. It has the form of world images, inherited and traditional worth, social norms and institutionalized roles and so on. Social acting gets its sense from these time frames which are integral component of a life world. The life world constitutes the horizon, also the temporal horizon. A life world is constituted by fundamental worth and conviction which build this horizon. That's why individual knowledge which is included in this "life world" strictly spoken can't be criticised or falsified by empirical analyses. Communicative actors act in their life worlds. They can't step out of it (Habermas, 1981b: 191ff.). Life worlds of some individuals are transcendental locations in which individuals find together, change communication contents and try to understand each other. The life world for Habermas includes three components: culture, society and individual. This means cultural reproduction, social integration and personal socialisation. Take for instance the example of an Iraqi exchange student which is living in a quarter of Portuguese students. Both have their own cultural reproduction, their own social integration and personal socialisation processes. And even two Portuguese can have completely different understanding of "behaviour toward an Iraqi". In meetings, communicative situations or encounters individuals find three functions of communicative acting which are very useable to manage, to select or to interact in the world:

The first function is that each individual wants mutual understanding: The tradition and renewal of given cultural knowledge is very important to it. Cultural time knowledge could be about punctuality or about using an Email not letters to communicate faster or using a letter to condole, no matter if it is more slowly, but it

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

is adequate to condole not via Email. The second function is that individuals want coordination: Social integration builds solidarity. If some individuals recognize that they have the same opinion about war: This builds solidarity, maybe up to a demonstration. The third function is that individuals want identity: in social processes individual can form a personal identity. Assume one student votes for war. So it is possible in relation to one individuals identity build the own identity - maybe as a pacifist.

These functions aren't separate. They work together. Within these functions individuals regularize their belonging to social groups; it saves solidarity and makes individuals as personality able to speak and act. They are important to build out time frames, imaginations of temporal order and modalities.

The coordination of acting as a question of time

Regarding a connection between Habermas and time theory concepts it can be noted two different: First societies have temporal structures and modalities. Individuals act in relation to social given structures. But they (the individuals) have second their own spheres of time living. Only being surrounded by certain structures does not mean that the individual is unable to reflect. Furthermore although there are society and individuals there is no strictly separated dichotomy of both. The bridge between these two is the concept of system and life worlds by Habermas. Out of a participative perspective Habermas tries to connect the dualism and shows how temporal structures could be integrated in individual's life worlds. He argues that individuals communicate to reach mutual understanding. He differentiates this from the object referred acting. And he uses subjectivity and furthermore intersubjectivity to describe the coordination of individual's acting. On the fundament of being rational individuals try to convince each other.

It can be summed up - Habermas did less care for the limits of the disciplines. Latest since his "Theory of communicative Action" Habermas in a sense is ethnologist, economist, philosopher, linguist, sociologist and rather more. Up to the present he never separates his political from the academically engagement. He is involved in the things the world goes around. That why it is less possible for him to take only the observatory perspective. Attentive readers and listeners will find all aspects of time and future scapes in each of his articles. Most of them are about future in political agendas: Europe, genetic engineering, Democracy, Welfare States and Human Rights; and also in contrary we will find fundamentalism and terror, financial crisis and so on.

Habermas is convinced: Individuals create the sense of their worlds themselves - in interaction with other individuals. There - in the life worlds - are the "rooms for reasons". There will be convictions and attitudes toward time frame, tempo and modalities. There are many different time concepts belonging to life worlds embedded in structures. Studies should be oriented on these life world concepts. They should not simply analyse the structures, the tempo of devices, the multiplicity of time applications but the interrelationships between personalities, identities, social institutions, systemically structures and combine them.

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

References

Adam, B. (1988) "Social versus natural time, a traditional distinction re-examined", in Young, M. & Schuller, T. (eds.) (1988) *The rhythm of society*, edited by Michael Young and Tom Schuller, New York: Routledge, p. 198-226.

Adam, B. (1990) *Time and Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Adam, B. (1995) *Timewatch: The Social Analysis of Time*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Adam, B. (2004) *Time, Polity Key Concepts Series*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Adam, B. & Groves, C. (2007) *Future Matters - Action, Knowledge, Ethics*, Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Beck, K. (1994) *Medien und die soziale Konstruktion von Zeit,* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Behrmann, J. (2002) "Vom Umgang mit der Zeit der Anderen. Die Temporalisierung intersubjektiver, interkultureller und xenologischer Interaktion", in Schmied-Kowarzik, W. (2002) *Verstehen und Verständigung. Ethnologie, Xenologie, interkulturelle Philosophie,* Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen, pp. 212-235.

Geißler, Karlheinz (2000) "Uns droht ein Zeitinfarkt", in *PM 2000*, 6.

Habermas, J. & Luhmann, N. (1971) *Theorie der Gesellschaft oder Sozialtechnologie*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, J. (1981) *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, Band 1 und 2*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1981): "Dialektik der Rationalisierung" (Interview with Axel Honneth, Eberhard Knöler-Bunte and Arno Wildermann, held in Berlin on May 22, 1981 and Starnberg on July 10, 1981), *Ästhetik und Kommunikation*, 45/46: 126-55.

Habermas, J. (1985) *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, J. (1988) *Nachmetaphysisches Denken, Philosophische Aufsätze*, Frankfurt am Main: S. 209ff.

Habermas, J. (2003) "After the war. The renaissance of Europe", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31st of May 2003.

Habermas, J. (2012) "Wollen europäische Bürger Suizid begehen?", in *Der Standard Alexandra Föderl-Schmidt and Ronald Pohl*, 23. Mai 2012.

Jäger, T. & Viehrig, H. (2005) "Gesellschaftliche Bedrohungswahrnehmung und Elitenkonsens. Eine Analyse der europäischen Haltungen zum Irakkrieg 2003", *Arbeitspapiere zur Internationalen Politik und zur Außenpolitik*, 1/2005.

Kubjuweit, D. (2010) "Der Wurtbürger", *Der Spiegel*, 41/ 2010: 26-27.

Lauer, D. & Laakay, A. (2004) *Medientheorien. Eine philosophische Einführung*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verlag, pp. 97-126.

Levinas, E. (2003) *Die Zeit und der Andere*, Hamburg: Meinek-Verlag.

Luhmann, N. (1968[4]) "Die Knappheit der Zeit und die Vordringlichkeit des Befristeten", *Politische Planung. Aufsätze zur Soziologie von Politik und Verwaltung*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 143-164.

Jürgen Habermas - Communicative Acting and Time Frames". A contribution to contemporary time theory and individual time concepts

Jana Hofmann

Luhmann, N. (1978) "Handlungstheorie und Systemtheorie", *KZfSS*, 30(2): 211-227.

Luhmann, N. (1979) "Zeit und Handlung - eine vergessene Theorie", *Zeitschrift für Soziologie (ZfS)*, 8 (1).

Luhmann, N. (1980) "Temporalisierung von Komplexität. Zur Semantik neuzeitlicher Zeitbegriffe", *Gesellschaftsstruktur und Semantik. Studien zur Wissenssoziologie der modernen Gesellschaft*, 1, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 235-313.

Luhmann, N. (1984) *Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie,* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, N. (1990) "Gleichzeitigkeit und Synchronisation", *Soziologische Aufklärung*, 5, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 95-130.

Maturana, H. & Varela, F. (1975) "Autopoietic Systems", *Biological Computer Laboratory, Report 9.4,* Urbana: University of Illinois.

Maturana, H. & Varela, F. (1980) *Autopoiesis and Cognition. The Realization of the Living,* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Mead, G. H. (1983) *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Frankfurt: XY, S. 217ff.

Morris, C. W. (ed.) (1972) *George Herbert Mead - mind, self and society: from a standpoint of a social behaviourist,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, T. (2003[6]) *Das System moderner Gesellschaften*, Weinheim: Juventa-Verlag.

Rosa, H. (2005) *Beschleunigung. Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne,* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp-Verlag.

Stelzenmüller, C. (2002) *Angriffspläne gegen den Irak, Deutschlandradio Interview* 30/07/2002, available on http://www.dradio.de/dlf/sendungen/interview_dlf/154797/.

Tabboni, S. (2001) "The Idea of Social Time in Norbert Elias", *Time & Society*, London: Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi SAGE, 1: 5-27.

Weber, M. (1972[5]) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie,* Studienausgabe: Tübingen.