神学，批判社会理论和公共领域

Theology, Critical Social Theory, and the Public Realm

〔美〕大卫·特雷西　著　美国芝加哥大学

David Tracy, University of Chicago, U.S.A.

汪海　康心　译

[**Abstract**] In this essay, Tracy examines two concepts essential to the public realm——"reason" and "modernity"——which have been questioned and defended albeit unsuccessfully by various modern philosophical and theological schools of thought. Then Tracy observes how Habermas used his critical social theory of communicative action to stage a philosophical defense of communicative rationality and present a sociological analysis of social systems and social actions. Together they formed his basic defense of modernity and critique of the selective rationality of modern society and the colonization of the life-world. By so doing, Tracy believes that Habermas has made significant contribution to the public realm. Tracy then proceeds to raise critical questions from six different aspects of public theology regarding Habermas's theory, and argues that by insisting that there are only three autonomous validity claims, Habermas has ignored the claims of religion and reduced the claims of art to individual expressions of integrity. As a result, utilitarian rationality will increasingly colonize our life-world to the detriment of the

public dialogue.

导言:公共领域——理性与现代性

公共领域,根据定义,有赖于对理性这一概念达成共识。而对理性本质的争论却遍及多个学科,这可能会影响人们所寄托的全部希望:寻求一种真正的公共领域。公共领域就是被共享的理性的空间,在这里,所有参与者不管彼此有什么特殊差异,都可以坐下来商讨任一宣称——只要这一宣称按照理性是可被维护的。任何严格意义上的,对于理性本质的相对主义的解读,都不可能使公共领域具有公共性这一本质特征。其实,甚至一个像理查德·罗蒂(Richard Rorty)那样严格的语境主义者(contextualist),逻辑上也肯定会坚持这样的看法:想要从哲学角度为公共领域寻找得以成立的理由是不可能的,只能从历史角度来为它辩护,即公共领域(作为某种具有启发性的想象)对于任何一个现代民主社会来说都是不可或缺的。

虽然罗蒂从杜威(Dewey)那里寻求理论资源,但是他对公共领域必需的理性概念所做出的解释恰与杜威的看法对立。对杜威来说,理性——正确理解的话,逻辑上必然要求所有对话参与者都是平等和自由的,也就意味着对民主政治的需要。对罗蒂来说,民主——正确理解的话,顺理成章的需要全体公民的平等和自由,从而意味着需要某种获得共识的理性观念。找不到任何站得住脚的严格的哲学根据,但从历史和文化的立场出发,这种获得共识的理性观念是必需的。实用主义传统的领军人物杜威认为,民主能从理性那里得到支持、维护。罗蒂则相信,为公共领域所必需的共享理性(the shared rationality),即便可以,也只能是站在历史的立场上为