Scientific Research Publishing

Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2025, 13(5), 179-192
https://www.scirp.org/journal/jss
ISSN Online: 2327-5960
ISSN Print: 2327-5952

A Modernity Rethinking of Democratic Politics

Xinxin Gu

Department of Philosophy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
Email: 202031031021@mail.bnu.edu.cn

How to cite this paper: Gu, X. X. (2025). A Modernity Rethinking of Democratic Politics. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 13,* 179-192.
https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2025.135011

Received: April 7, 2025
Accepted: May 18, 2025
Published: May 21, 2025

Abstract

Since the Enlightenment, human reason has been elevated to an unprecedented level. However, alongside the rise of reason, the public sphere of political life has inevitably faced the dilemmas of modernity. While democratic politics enjoys a celebrated reputation, it must also contend with the crisis posed by liberalism—namely, the threat of nihilism, which directly disrupts the harmony and stability of the human spiritual domain. Thus, a critical reflection on the modernity of democratic politics is essential if humanity is to discover a truly suitable political system and thereby achieve a genuinely fulfilling life. The concept of democracy has long stood at the center of political discourse, celebrated for its association with freedom, equality, and rational governance. Yet beneath its ideals lies a complex history of philosophical tension, particularly within the framework of modernity. As liberal democracy has become a dominant global model, questions have arisen concerning the coherence between its foundational principles—reason and freedom—and the realities of modern political life. This paper explores the philosophical evolution of democratic politics from classical antiquity through the Enlightenment, tracing how shifts in the understanding of reason, freedom, and the human subject have produced both profound achievements and deep contradictions. Drawing on the works of Plato, Kant, Weber, and Lukács, it aims to illuminate the inner dilemmas of democratic modernity and consider whether alternative frameworks are necessary for resolving its crisis.

Keywords

Democratic Politics, Reason, Modernity

1. Introduction

In a world increasingly dominated by liberal democratic norms, the need for critical reflection on their philosophical underpinnings has become more urgent than ever. While democracy is often heralded as the culmination of historical progress,

its theoretical and practical foundations remain fraught with tensions. How can a system premised on individual autonomy coexist with bureaucratic rationalization and global technocracy? What happens when freedom becomes equated solely with consumption, or when reason is reduced to calculability? These are not merely political questions but deeply philosophical ones that demand sustained inquiry.

This paper situates the modern democratic project within a broader intellectual genealogy stretching from classical Greek philosophy through the Enlightenment to the twentieth-century critiques of modernity. By engaging key thinkers such as Plato, Kant, Weber, and Lukács, it examines how transformations in the concept of reason have shaped the modern subject, and how democratic ideals have simultaneously flourished and faltered under the pressures of capitalist modernity (Kant, 1991). The objective is to uncover the internal contradictions within modern liberal democracy and explore the potential for new forms of political thought that transcend its limitations (Lukács, 1999, 2005).

To respond to this challenge, some theorists propose a reinvention of public reason that accounts for digital conditions (Yao, 2010). Others advocate for new models of democratic accountability and data ethics that restore the human subject as a political agent rather than a data point. Without such conceptual and institutional innovations, democracy risks becoming a simulation—a formal structure devoid of substantive freedom.

Moreover, as governments adopt mass surveillance technologies under the guise of security and efficiency, the public sphere becomes increasingly opaque and asymmetric. Citizens lose the epistemic and practical means to participate meaningfully in collective self-rule. This development intensifies the internal contradiction within modern democracy: while freedom is celebrated in principle, it is systematically eroded in practice. The Enlightenment ideal of rational autonomy is thereby hollowed out by the technological infrastructures of power.

In the age of digital capitalism, the traditional Enlightenment notion of freedom—as individual autonomy grounded in reason—faces new threats. While liberal democracy promises that individuals are the authors of their own lives, this ideal is increasingly undermined by invisible yet pervasive mechanisms of digital surveillance and algorithmic governance. As Shoshana Zuboff (2019) argues in *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, personal data has become the raw material for predictive systems that reshape human behavior without consent. In such a system, the individual is not only observed but preemptively steered, reducing freedom to a calculated variable.

2. Politics and Philosophy

Since the birth of political philosophy in ancient Athens, its meaning and essential features remain as evident today as they were in the past. All political actions are aimed either at preservation or reform. When preservation is sought, we hope not to become worse; when reform is desired, we seek to bring about something better.

Therefore, all political actions are guided by some conception of what is better or worse.

In its purest form, politics inevitably entails a philosophical standpoint. Philosophy is concerned with the human condition and aims to help individuals achieve a better life through reflective understanding of their actions. Since political life constitutes one of the most fundamental and irreplaceable aspects of human existence, and given that the natural purpose of politics is to enable people to live well, authentic political practice must include philosophical inquiry and guidance. In short, the nature of a society's politics is determined by the nature of its philosophy.

Beyond Plato, Aristotle provides a more grounded yet equally influential framework for understanding politics as an extension of human nature. In his *Politics*, Aristotle famously claims that 'man is by nature a political animal,' emphasizing the organic relationship between individual flourishing and communal life. For Aristotle, *the polis* exists not merely to ensure survival, but to enable the good life (*eudaimonia*), which is attained through virtuous activity in accordance with reason. This vision implies that political structures must reflect a deeper moral and teleological order. Aristotle also categorizes different forms of government—monarchy, aristocracy, and polity—as well as their corrupt counterparts—tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy—highlighting how deviations from virtue lead to political decay. Such a view presupposes that politics is inseparable from ethics, and that the highest form of governance must aim at justice as defined by the rational and moral capacities of the human soul.

By integrating metaphysics, ethics, and political theory, classical philosophers like Plato and Aristotle laid a foundation for political thinking that prioritized the moral cultivation of citizens and the ethical legitimacy of authority—foundations that would later be radically challenged by modern liberalism's turn toward individual autonomy and value neutrality.

2.1. Classical Philosophy and Politics

Classical philosophy approached the world with a holistic perspective, seeing the human being not merely as an isolated self, but as an integral part of nature. This pursuit of wholeness was most profoundly expressed in ancient Greek metaphysics, particularly in its commitment to concepts such as 'being' and 'idea.' These metaphysical entities were understood as the most complete and absolute essences of reality. As the foundation of human rationality, such completeness was accessible only to those capable of grasping the whole through reason. Those who could best understand the ideal standard of the Good, as defined by perfected reason, were the philosophers.

If politics is to guide people toward the good life, it must first have knowledge of the good. Thus, from the perspective of classical philosophy, the best political order is one governed by those who possess such knowledge—namely, the philosophers. Plato's concept of the 'philosopher-king' is the most iconic representation

of this idea.

In Plato's political philosophy, the essence of the human being lies in the soul, which is superior to the body. The soul itself is composed of three parts: reason, desire, and spirit. The relative composition and hierarchy of these elements determine the moral rank of individuals. The more one's soul is governed by reason, subordinating desire and spirit, the nobler that soul is. Philosophers, as the most rational individuals, are therefore the noblest.

Since reason aims toward the good, philosophers are also the most capable of knowing what is truly good. For this reason, Plato's ideal city-state is not democratic; rather, it is governed by philosopher-kings who, through their superior reason, are best equipped to lead society toward justice and the good life.

2.2. The Enlightenment and the Transformation of Reason

While the Enlightenment appeared to raise the banner of reason, in reality it constituted a fundamental break from classical thought. Although Enlightenment thinkers also spoke of reason, their understanding differed substantially. Enlightenment rationality emphasized the individual as a thinking subject, whose actions were based not on divine authority but on autonomous reasoning. In contrast to the classical pursuit of a metaphysical and universal Good, Enlightenment thought turned inward, asserting the sufficiency of human cognition.

If reason is innate and reliable, and every individual is naturally endowed with it, then political equality among individuals follows as a necessary consequence. Given such equality, democracy seems the inevitable choice for political organization. In contemporary discourse, the values born of Enlightenment reason—freedom, democracy, equality, and fraternity—have become not only widespread but also dominant, regarded as universal truths and the highest form of political correctness. Despite the global prevalence of democratic politics, it is by no means free from internal tensions and contradictions.

Kant and Enlightenment

Moreover, the Enlightenment emphasis on individual freedom and legal equality helped institutionalize key mechanisms of modern governance: separation of powers, universal suffrage, and rule of law. These institutional legacies continue to shape political systems around the globe, albeit now under new pressures from technocratic, populist, and digital forces.

Kant's articulation of rational autonomy and moral law further informed liberal constitutionalism and human rights theory in the 20th century. His conception of dignity and the categorical imperative resonates in the foundational texts of international law, most notably the United Nations' *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (United Nations, 1948). These developments demonstrate that Enlightenment rationality did not remain within the realm of philosophy but catalyzed a transformation of political structures—from monarchical absolutism to constitutional democracy, from divine right to popular legitimacy.

The shift in philosophical thinking during the Enlightenment had profound

consequences not only for abstract political theory but also for the concrete institutional frameworks of modern nation-states. John Locke's emphasis on natural rights, the social contract, and the limitation of governmental power laid the ideological groundwork for the American Revolution and the drafting of the U.S. Constitution. Similarly, Rousseau's vision of popular sovereignty and the general will profoundly influenced the principles of the French Revolution and the emergence of modern republicanism.

Kant's articulation of rational autonomy and moral law further informed liberal constitutionalism and human rights theory in the 20th century. His conception of dignity and the categorical imperative resonates in the foundational texts of international law, most notably the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948). These developments demonstrate that Enlightenment rationality did not remain within the realm of philosophy but catalyzed a transformation of political structures—from monarchical absolutism to constitutional democracy, from divine right to popular legitimacy.

Moreover, the Enlightenment emphasis on individual freedom and legal equality helped institutionalize key mechanisms of modern governance: separation of powers, universal suffrage, and rule of law. These institutional legacies continue to shape political systems around the globe, albeit now under new pressures from technocratic, populist, and digital forces.

3. From Philosophy to Politics: Institutional Consequences of Enlightenment Thought

These examples illustrate how political philosophy continues to shape not only the legitimacy but the concrete architecture of democratic governance around the world.

More recently, Jürgen Habermas's discourse ethics and theory of communicative action have informed European Union legal frameworks on public deliberation and transparency, especially in media governance and freedom of expression policies (Habermas, 1991).

Immanuel Kant's deontological ethics, especially his emphasis on the intrinsic dignity of human beings, profoundly influenced the post-World War II articulation of international legal norms. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948), in particular, reflects Kantian ideals of universal moral law and autonomy (Kant, 1996; Morsink, 1999).

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of popular sovereignty deeply shaped both the 1793 French Constitution and Switzerland's direct democracy mechanisms (Rousseau, 1762). His emphasis on the general will continues to resonate in modern participatory and republican political theory.

For instance, John Locke's theory of natural rights and the social contract served as a direct philosophical foundation for Thomas Jefferson's drafting of the Declaration of Independence (United States, 1776), where the language of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness' echoes Locke's triad of life, liberty, and prop-

erty (Locke, 1980).

The influence of Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment philosophical theories on contemporary political institutions is not merely theoretical, but grounded in historical and legal developments.

4. Philosophical Theories and Their Contemporary Political Applications

In his essay "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?", Immanuel Kant defines Enlightenment as "man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity." He elaborates: "Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without guidance from another… Sapere aude! Dare to know! Have the courage to use your own understanding—this is the motto of enlightenment." From this we see that the Enlightenment presupposes a specific conception of the human being—as a finite but rational creature.

On this basis, all individuals should be considered equal. If everyone is born equal, then each rational being ought to govern their life through their own reason, rather than relying on divine authority or the dictates of others. Consequently, the ideals of freedom and democracy become natural implications of the human condition.

While Kant emphasized the individual's capacity for autonomous reasoning, Jean-Jacques Rousseau highlighted the social and collective dimensions of Enlightenment thought. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau famously declared that 'man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains,' calling attention to the paradoxes of freedom within modern society. For Rousseau, true freedom is not mere individual liberty but participation in the formulation of the general will (*volonté générale*), which represents the collective rational interest of the people. This concept elevated the idea of popular sovereignty and laid crucial groundwork for modern democratic theory. Unlike liberal thinkers who sought to protect individual rights against state power, Rousseau envisioned the state as a moral community where freedom is realized through self-legislation. His notion of public reason foreshadows Kant's emphasis on rational autonomy, yet it embeds reason within a communal framework rather than isolating it within the individual.

By incorporating Rousseau's insights, the Enlightenment legacy appears not only as a liberation of individual reason but also as a rethinking of the political community's ethical foundation. This dual heritage would go on to shape both liberal and republican strands of modern democratic theory.

4.1. Freedom and Democracy

Freedom can be understood as the capacity to be the origin of one's own actions. This conception endows individuals with dignity and consolation, for it affirms that one's destiny lies in one's own hands. Closely associated with this notion is democracy, which gained early sympathy and recognition as a political embodiment of freedom. Liberal democracy, as a way of life, originated in continental

Europe and quickly spread across the globe in various forms.

According to Hegelian dialectics, all developments pass through the triadic structure of thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Liberalism is no exception. What began as a celebration of freedom has gradually encountered its own contradictions, leading to internal crisis.

4.2. The Modern Predicament of Liberal Democracy

While liberalism and democratic politics have brought dignity and liberty to modern individuals, they have also led to a fundamental crisis of modernity. The First World War marked the beginning of a spiritual crisis in Western liberal civilization. The development of science and technology gradually replaced the central role of the human being. This is because Enlightenment rationality is, to a large extent, calculative reason—based on the development of natural science and focused on cognition and instrumental utility.

Given its dependency on technological advancement, calculative rationality inevitably weakens the human position in a society governed by science. Thus, the two pillars of the Enlightenment—reason and freedom—begin to conflict within the development of liberalism. This tension, as a defining characteristic of modernity, proves irreconcilable within liberalism and democracy themselves. Thinkers such as Kant attempted to resolve this conflict while preserving democratic politics, but with every theoretical advance, the negative effects of modernity only deepened. Consequently, both liberalism and democratic politics now face an urgent need for alternative paths.

5. The Internal Dilemma of Democratic Politics

The internal dilemma of democratic politics is closely tied to the pathologies of modern society. If politics is directed toward human happiness, then such happiness must be understood on both material and spiritual levels. Material happiness is relatively straightforward and can be pursued through various means. Despite persistent poverty and inequality in certain areas, technological progress and widespread education have enabled more people to secure a basic standard of living. However, in contrast to material abundance, the spiritual domain remains bleak.

Once religion became a matter of private choice and was separated from political life, modern individuals began to face a profound spiritual crisis. Most religious belief systems rest on the negation of worldly life, subordinating human dignity to divine authority. Following the Renaissance, Enlightenment, and Industrial Revolution, people began to affirm their own rational capacities and strove to break the chains of religion in order to build a better life in the secular world. In essence, modernity represents the gradual secularization of society and the growing affirmation of secular life.

This secularization process involves several aspects: the rationalization of judgment, where reason, not the church, becomes the measure of legitimacy; the with-

drawal of religion from public domains, allowing economics and politics to develop independently; and the overall transformation of both social structure and consciousness toward secular modes of thought.

5.1. Reason and Modernity: From Kant to Weber

In his three critiques—Critique of Pure Reason, Critique of Practical Reason, and Critique of Judgment—Kant carried out a comprehensive investigation into the nature and function of reason. This firmly linked modernity to the concept of reason. On one hand, reason was the banner under which Enlightenment flourished; it helped human beings escape from ignorance and enabled the rejection of religious domination, thus opening the way for modernity. On the other hand, reason served as the source of knowledge and value, grounding the very foundation of modern social consciousness.

In contrast, Max Weber regarded rationalism not as a universal human faculty but as a unique cultural development in the West (Weber, 1987). He saw it as a central problem of modernity, aiming to trace its origins and explain the specificity of Western capitalist modernity. Despite denying the innateness of reason, Weber's philosophical work could not avoid engaging with rationality due to Germany's deep metaphysical traditions (Zhang & Hu, 2003).

Weber distinguished between 'reason' and 'rationalization.' From a utilitarian standpoint, what he called 'reason' primarily referred to instrumental rationality—that is, the means-end calculation embedded in capitalist production. Rationalization, meanwhile, referred to the increasing quantification and bureaucratization of all areas of social life. Economic life became regulated by calculations of investment and profit; political power passed to professional elites and bureaucratic systems, and culture became secularized and functionally disenchanted. Though externally orderly, such rationalization led to a form of instrumental reason that reduced all actions to means toward ends, ignoring their intrinsic value or meaning.

This logic results in a paradox: if humans were machines, this would cause no problem—everything would be efficient and precise. But humans are not machines. The mechanization of behavior cannot fully extinguish the living soul or the innate desire to seek value. Thus, individuals experience a contradiction: while modern life provides convenience, it suppresses spiritual vitality. People begin to long for meaning, justice, and moral purpose, but these cannot be satisfied by mere utility. This reveals the inner fracture of modernity—between form and content, reason and unreason—highlighting the irrational consequences of excessive rationalization.

Weber's analysis culminates in his famous metaphor of the 'iron cage' (*stahlhartes Gehäuse*), a condition in which individuals are trapped within the structures of rationalization that they themselves have created. What began as a means of liberation through reason and organization ultimately becomes a source of alienation and disenchantment. In the rationalized world of modern bureaucracy,

individuals are no longer guided by moral convictions or spiritual ideals but by procedures, protocols, and calculations.

This contrasts sharply with pre-modern societies where religion provided a coherent worldview and ethical guidance. Weber's comparative sociology highlighted how Protestantism—particularly Calvinism—contributed to the emergence of capitalist rationality by promoting work ethic, asceticism, and the internalization of discipline. However, as modernity progressed, these religious motivations were hollowed out, leaving behind a mechanized shell of routine behavior. This process of secularization and value-neutrality posed a profound challenge to human freedom: not the lack of choice, but the loss of meaning in choice itself.

Thus, Weber's legacy lies not merely in describing the rise of instrumental rationality, but in warning against its psychological and cultural consequences. His vision is one of tragic realism: modern man may be technically equipped and materially secure, but spiritually homeless and existentially disoriented.

5.2. Lukács and the Critique of Reification

Although Lukács's theory of reification begins with the phenomenon itself, its deeper theoretical aim is to critique the modernity of capitalist society. Following classical Marxist theory, all reification ultimately traces back to the economic realm, especially to the domain of production. Unlike Marx, who distinguished between alienation and reification, Lukács focused on the value implications of reification—primarily from a negative, critical perspective.

In *History and Class Consciousness*, Lukács sought to awaken proletarian consciousness by exposing the pervasive reification embedded in capitalist society. He argued that only through such critical exposure could the proletariat attain revolutionary self-awareness. His goal was to apply Marx's dialectics of totality in a manner that would reveal the systemic distortions of capitalist life. Because Lukács approached modernity from a Hegelian logical standpoint, his analysis was less historical but more precise in dissecting the internal logic of reification (Marx, 2000).

For Lukács, the most widespread form of reification was commodity fetishism: once labor products are produced as commodities, they acquire a fetishistic character. This condition is inherent in any society dominated by commodity production. Initially, in primitive societies, commodity exchange existed merely to meet basic needs and was not fundamentally different from hunting or gathering. But as material life grew more complex, commodities began to derive their value more from their exchangeability than from their utility. With the separation of capital and labor, this process intensified, and reification became a lived reality—one that shaped not only life practices but also modes of thought.

Lukács's analysis therefore reveals the depth of modernity's alienation. The modern human subject is both a producer and a product of reified structures. While Marx grounded his critique in the economic base (Marx, 2014), Lukács emphasized the cultural and ideological superstructures. His value-centered critique

remains a powerful challenge to the instrumental rationality of modern life and continues to offer insight into the contradictions of liberal democracy and capitalist modernity (Liu & Shi, 2006).

Lukács's legacy in critical theory was later extended and revised by Jürgen Habermas, who sought to move beyond the pessimism of reification by introducing the concept of communicative rationality. While Lukács diagnosed the pervasiveness of objectified consciousness under capitalism, Habermas emphasized the emancipatory potential of rational discourse grounded in intersubjective communication. In his theory, rationality is not limited to technical control or economic calculation but includes the capacity for mutual understanding and norm formation through dialogue.

Communicative rationality provides a normative foundation for democratic legitimacy: it imagines a public sphere in which individuals participate as equals in reasoned deliberation. This vision seeks to rehabilitate the Enlightenment project by defending reason not as domination, but as a medium of solidarity and ethical life. Habermas thus addresses one of the central concerns left unresolved in Lukács—the possibility of resisting reification not merely through revolutionary class consciousness, but through institutionalized practices of critical engagement and democratic discourse.

In doing so, he charts a possible path toward reconciling reason and freedom in modernity, not by reverting to classical metaphysics, but by reimagining the conditions under which human beings can communicate, reflect, and act together.

6. Classical Thought and Contemporary Challenges

Reengaging with classical thought thus encourages us to reevaluate the moral purposes of democratic institutions and to resist reducing politics to procedural efficiency. In times of ideological fragmentation and moral disorientation, the classical tradition can help revive a normative discourse centered on justice, virtue, and the common good.

Similarly, Plato's notion of the 'philosopher-king' underscores the importance of knowledge and rationality in governance. While his vision may not align with democratic ideals, it critiques the tendency of mass politics to be driven by appetite and passion rather than reason. His tripartite theory of the soul serves as a metaphor for balancing reason, desire, and spirit in both individuals and institutions (Plato, 1992).

Aristotle's view that the purpose of *the polis* is not merely to enable life but to promote a flourishing life (*eudaimonia*) highlights the ethical orientation of politics. His categorization of political regimes and their corrupt forms—monarchy versus tyranny, aristocracy versus oligarchy, polity versus democracy—offers valuable insights into contemporary democratic pathologies such as populism, technocracy, and political apathy (Aristotle, 1996).

The enduring significance of classical political philosophy, particularly the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, lies in its capacity to offer ethical foundations for ad-

dressing contemporary political challenges. In modern liberal democracies where proceduralism and value-neutrality often dominate, the classical emphasis on virtue, justice, and the good life provides a much-needed corrective lens.

6.1. Digital Surveillance and the Crisis of Democratic Freedom

In the age of digital capitalism, the traditional Enlightenment notion of freedom—as individual autonomy grounded in reason—faces new threats. While liberal democracy promises that individuals are the authors of their own lives, this ideal is increasingly undermined by invisible yet pervasive mechanisms of digital surveillance and algorithmic governance. As Shoshana Zuboff (2019) argues in The Age of Surveillance Capitalism, personal data has become the raw material for predictive systems that reshape human behavior without consent. In such a system, the individual is not only observed but preemptively steered, reducing freedom to a calculated variable.

Moreover, as governments adopt mass surveillance technologies under the guise of security and efficiency, the public sphere becomes increasingly opaque and asymmetric. Citizens lose the epistemic and practical means to participate meaningfully in collective self-rule. This development intensifies the internal contradiction within modern democracy: while freedom is celebrated in principle, it is systematically eroded in practice. The Enlightenment ideal of rational autonomy is thereby hollowed out by the technological infrastructures of power.

To respond to this challenge, some theorists propose a reinvention of public reason that accounts for digital conditions. Others advocate for new models of democratic accountability and data ethics that restore the human subject as a political agent rather than a data point. Without such conceptual and institutional innovations, democracy risks becoming a simulation—a formal structure devoid of substantive freedom.

6.2. Contemporary Theoretical Responses to the Crisis of Liberal Democracy

These contemporary perspectives, while diverse, converge in seeking to overcome the normative insufficiencies of liberal democracy by reintegrating ethical, cultural, and deliberative dimensions into its framework.

Moreover, some contemporary theorists suggest that liberal democracy must evolve into a more ethically substantive form—a 'post-liberal' democracy that embeds individual autonomy within a matrix of social solidarity, moral commitments, and institutional accountability. This approach resonates with the communitarian critiques advanced by Michael Sandel and Charles Taylor, who argue for a civic republicanism that reinvigorates the role of public virtue and shared meaning in democratic life (Sandel, 1996; Taylor, 1991).

In response to the challenges of the digital era, such as algorithmic decision-making and surveillance capitalism, thinkers like Shoshana Zuboff have called for a new form of public reason that addresses data ethics and information asym-

metry. The concept of the individual as a rational agent is at risk when predictive technologies undermine autonomy and consent. Calls for democratic accountability, algorithmic transparency, and participatory data governance aim to reclaim freedom within digital societies (Zuboff, 2019).

One of the most influential responses is offered by Jürgen Habermas, whose theory of communicative rationality and the public sphere reorients the basis of democratic legitimacy. In contrast to the technocratic or market-driven models of governance, Habermas envisions a deliberative democracy grounded in intersubjective communication. Here, legitimacy arises not from outcomes or efficiency, but from inclusive and reasoned public deliberation among free and equal citizens (Habermas, 1991).

In light of the multiple internal crises identified within liberal democracy—ranging from the dominance of instrumental rationality and spiritual disaffection to the erosion of freedom under digital surveillance—a number of modern thinkers have proposed theoretical frameworks to reconstruct democratic legitimacy and practice (Yi, 1997).

7. Conclusion

Modern democratic politics, rooted in the Enlightenment ideals of freedom and reason, has achieved remarkable progress in securing individual dignity and rights. However, this very foundation contains unresolved contradictions. As instrumental rationality overshadows moral reasoning and reification permeates both political and cultural life, democracy risks losing its emancipatory potential.

Through engagement with classical and modern thinkers, it becomes clear that neither a return to metaphysical absolutes nor a naive faith in liberal rationalism can resolve the crisis. Rather, what is required is a renewed philosophical inquiry—one that reconsiders the human condition, ethical life, and the purpose of politics beyond mere efficiency. Only through such reflection can we envision a form of democracy that truly honors both the rational and spiritual dimensions of human life.

Modern democratic politics, while historically framed as the culmination of freedom and reason, now reveals its vulnerability to internal decay. The contradiction between instrumental rationality and human emancipation, between formal equality and substantive alienation, cannot be resolved through technocratic governance alone. As Weber warned with his image of the 'iron cage', the rationalization of society has not led to greater moral clarity but to a loss of meaning and the erosion of ethical life.

At the same time, the critiques of Lukács and Habermas show that a critical engagement with modernity remains both necessary and possible. Rather than abandoning the Enlightenment project altogether, these thinkers urge a reconfiguration of its foundational ideals—reason, freedom, and public life. What is needed today is not a nostalgic return to classical metaphysics, nor an uncritical faith in liberal institutions, but the courage to reimagine political community in the face

of persistent fragmentation.

This reimagination may take the form of a 'post-liberal' turn, in which individual autonomy is not sacrificed but re-embedded within networks of solidarity, shared meaning, and democratic accountability. Such a vision calls for new institutional forms, normative commitments, and philosophical orientations—ones that can sustain both the dignity of the individual and the cohesion of the social body. Only through this kind of integrative renewal can democratic politics move beyond its modern impasse and recover its promise as a project of human flourishing.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Aristotle (1996). *The Politics* (T. A. Sinclair, Trans., T. J. Saunders, Ed.). Penguin Classics.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press.

Kant, I. (1991). *Political Writings* (H. B. Nisbet, Trans., H. Reiss, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809620

Kant, I. (1996). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Liu, Q., & Shi, W. (2006). On the Critical Value of Lukács' Theory of Reification. *Academic Exchange, 12,* 1-5.

Locke, J. (1980). *Second Treatise of Government* (C. B. Macpherson, Ed.). Hackett Publishing Company.

Lukács, G. (1999). *The Destruction of Reason*. The Commercial Press.

Lukács, G. (2005). *History and Class Consciousness*. Jiangsu Education Press.

Marx, K. (2000). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. People's Publishing House.

Marx, K. (2014). *Capital, Volume I*. People's Publishing House.

Morsink, J. (1999). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Origins, Drafting, and Intent*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Plato. (1992). *Republic* (G. M. A. Grube, Trans., C. D. C. Reeve, Rev. Ed.). Hackett Publishing Company.

Rousseau, J. J. (1762). *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings* (Gourevitch, V. Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sandel, M. J. (1996). *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy.* Harvard University Press.

Taylor, C. (1991). *The Malaise of Modernity.* House of Anansi.

United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*

United States (1776). *The Declaration of Independence.*

Weber, M. (1987). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Sanlian Press.

Yao, S. (2010). *A History of Marxist Philosophy: From Its Origins to the Second International.* Beijing Normal University Press.

Yi, J. (1997). Alienation Theory, Reification Theory, and the Critique of Technical Rationality. *Philosophical Research, No. 8,* 10-16.

Zhang, Y., & Hu, D. (2003). *The Historical Logic of Western Marxist Philosophy.* Nanjing University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* PublicAffairs.