一、下列一段文字描述了十五年前英美學界內自由派個人主義者與社群主義者興起的論戰，請問你個人的看法為何？試舉國內或國外具體的例子支持你的論點。（占總分百分之五十）

社群主義者從兩個方向提出對自由派個人主義者的攻擊：一是方法論的批評；其次是在規範層次(normative)的質疑。從方法論的角度來看，社群主義者認為自由派理論家所建構的個體自我形象是錯誤的。個體並不像自由派人士所認為的，是自立自主的主體，不受非自願義務的規束，能夠在個人偏好的基礎上，面對現有的可能性自由地做出選擇。相反地，那些所謂的偏好卻是由個體存在的社會連繫網絡(network of social attachment)所形成的，而且並不是所有的連繫關係都能夠自由的選擇。如果個體的建構從實際的社會情境中被抽離了，那麼個體就會變成了錯誤的抽象觀念，因爲只有實際的社會情境才提供了塑造個體意志的溫床與道德資源。

從規範的觀點來看，社群主義者也提出了對自由派理論家的挑戰，認為他們藉由將個體建構為一個不受任何社會連繫關係約束的存在，取消了所有具有真正道德內涵的政治義務觀念。如果一個人與他出生社群之間的聯繫並不具有真實的道德價值的話，自由派的個人主義者要如何解釋人們隨時準備為他們的家族、親族、族裔團體或國家犧牲的現象？更廣泛的說，社群主義者認爲個體需要社群來賦予生命的道德意義；甚至個人也是在社群之中，而非在社群外，才能夠更成功地表現自身的自主性。最重要的，社群主義者並不準備接受自由派理論的前提，以維護個人自由就預設了權利的考量必須要高於公同利益(the common good)的思考。社群主義者所堅持的正是共同利益才是現代參與性政治(participatory politics)的核心精神，而自由派人士試圖抑制並將共同利益變為危險的，並具有潜在分裂傾向的做法，只會造成公民彼此之間普遍的冷漠，並使得西方大多數的自由民主政體成為以利益為中心的操縱性政治(manipulative politics)。

自由派個人主義者對社群主義者批評其方法論的回應是：社群主義者認為自我的形象是由社群裡的生命經驗所建構的說法或許是真切的，但是這只是一種特殊的理論位置，目的是為了突顯共同利益的重要性。其實，在共同利益的討論裡還有好幾個互相競爭的立場，而他們之間的差異之深，使得他們彼此之間在這些問題上並不存在任何的共識。自由派的論點則認為，唯有所有程序做法都中立的社會空間，才是一個可以讓所有不同觀點都能夠平等而公平地呈現自己的情境，而這正是自由派個人主義者方法論的基礎。

在道德層面上，自由派個人主義者並不完全反對社群之於個體生活的重要性，有些人同意社群的存在是基於一種需要(need)：其他的人則認為社群的目標就算在自由社會裡也是可以被實現的。他們主要的辯論是：在貶低自由派的權利體系及其在共同利益問題上的政策中立之後，社群主義者反而打開了多數暴力(majoritarian intolerance)之門，不但穩固了保守的信念和實踐，更可能引爆順應既有規則(conformism)的暴政潛能。
The problem of critique as reinforcement of the system has been sketched with admirable economy and polemical force by Theodor Adorno in “Cultural Criticism and Society.” His complex essay traces the breakdown of traditional forms of cultural critique in the face of contemporary culture’s abandonment of ideological pretence. Neither the anti-exclusionary assault on high culture as the (bourgeois) part standing in for the whole, nor the assault on mass culture as “bread and circuses” that mask the true nature of expropriation will do. In this context, the critique of culture as an ideology becomes obsolete, since there is no outside to cultural ideology. Culture no longer hides anything; there is nothing behind culture for ideology critique to find, although “the materialistic transparency of culture has not made it more honest, only more vulgar.” This means that the analysis of culture can no longer assume a stable ground. To use Adorno’s words, “Today, ideology means society as appearance. Although mediated by the totality behind which stands the rule of partiality, ideology is not simply reducible to a partial interest. It is, as it were, equally near the center in all its pieces.”

As Adorno recognizes, the cultural critic either assumes a transcendent position that criticizes culture as false or unnatural (without realizing that the notion of the “nature” is itself generated by the culture under critique), or takes up an immanent position that offers culture a self-consciousness it already possesses, that increases its vulgarity rather than its honesty. “There are no more ideologies in the authentic sense of false consciousness, only advertisements for the world through its duplication and the provocative lie which does not seek belief but commands silence.” The critique of culture depends on the assumption that culture is organized in terms of truth and falsehood rather than in terms of successful or unsuccessful performance. What is more, critique depends on the idea that there is a quasi-religious belief in the icons of culture, and it loses its force once the system is prepared to make any cultural icon the site of economic profit. So the excuse for popular submission, while on MTV Beavis and Butthead can perform semiotic analyses of gender roles in video clips for the amusement of those viewers whom cultural critique presumes are the blind dupes of these same video clips.

Hence the problem of Cultural Studies: its analyses of culture do have an effect, but as sites for further investment by a system that is no longer cultural in the
traditional sense. Rather than posing a threat, the analyses performed by Cultural Studies risk providing new marketing opportunities for the system. Practices such as punk music and dress styles are offered their self-consciousness in academic essays, but the dignity they acquire is not that of authenticity but of marketability, be it in the cinema, on MTV, or as a site of tourist interest for visitors to London.

(Excerpt from Bill Readings, The University in Ruins)