

ASSIMILAZIONISMO ETICO IN JÜRGEN HABERMAS: RIFLESSIONI PER UNA GIUSTIZIA INTERCULTURALE

Umberto Imbriano*

Abstract. Assumed that to prevent the violence of the cultural and identitarian questions it's not enough the strength of armies quartered in barracks in defense of the legal precepts, we will investigate the problematic aspects of the pluralism in their pre-juridical and moral dimension.

For this purpose I will attempt a methodological reorganization of Habermasian moral understanding by subjecting it counterfactual and pluralistic torsion, in order to open it to the acceptance of applications at once universal and vernacular.

The ethical problems of today cannot be guessed at without taking into account the nature of post-metaphysical and pluralistic modern societies.

Therefore, a universal ethic of communication has to deal with disruptive cultural complexity of modern democratic societies. So, it is required an awareness of linguistic and cultural hybridization that covers the worlds of life, driven by more and more obstinate processes of globalization, moving of people, goods, globalization of markets and economies.

Retracing some of the key points of Habermasian thought, the following pages try to reorganize the claimed universality of the Discourse Ethics, assuring by the insidious Eurocentric suspicion and saving it from a colonialist or assimilating demand.

In fact, the topic of the denial of the possibility of opting for a long-term output from the contexts of action oriented toward understanding reifies Habermas' thought, an awareness of qualitatively 'transcendental' even if quantitatively weak, which excludes the mere 'counterfactual' qualification of the categories of the understanding, in favour of an aprioristic and vertical metaphysical dependence.

Here the Habermasian transcendentalism describes rationalistic autonomy that the communicative subjects perform in reproductive processes of worlds of life.

The gravitational force that moves the communicative action, in fact, is based on the model of universal Pragmatic of neo-Enlightenment and rationalist matrix which, as Kantian speech, prescribes patterns of

* Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II.

general practical discourse disarticulated from human inclinations. At this point, it promises an claimed Eurocentric control of the communicative processes in order to overcome the individual discourse community, and that's because the invoked or described discursive metric, ends up proposing nothing more than an apology for the Euro-Rationalist thought.

By contrast, if the moral point of view would cultivate its own ambition to universality, should reject formulations of contents or even procedural, validated or validatable only in relation to a specific geographical cultural tradition, and open up to the normative register of different worlds and other symbolic horizons.

You have to think an ethic by which keep in constant even if variable equilibrium instances of universalist moral and ethic claims, profiles of rationality and vernacular instances, in order to decree the true acceptance of the many claims of individual and collective recognition which forward to claim parts of respect and social esteem.

Summarize the cultural and biographical peculiarities in the context of Discourse Ethics, eliding the arrogant rationalist Eurocentric autonomy, means to reconcile the universalism of the regulating principles and contextualism of historical and cultural worlds, to tribute to the general practical discourse a kind of universality at all alien to the cognitive dimension of the speakers.

It would be an unforgivable mistake to think to pluralism in terms of a drastic deletion of differences and of the individual or collective peculiarities, since because of reductionist claims will emerge the ethnocentric parable and the disdain for the differences.

Therefore, the multicultural communicative ethics on one hand intends the unique historical and cultural authenticity as a insoluble condition within which one builds the individual biographies, but on the other hand must tend to the pursuit a moral universality inscribed in communicative reflexivity of the concrete social subjects.

Dialogic mediation between actors belonging to different worlds of life or even in the same ethically complex social worlds, generates a comprehensive normativity non-homologous to the Kantian and Enlightenment thought. I refer to the possibility of 'cultural landscape' as the final and indefinite outcome of communicative competence of speakers, able to captivate cultural and symbolic placement and legal-universalist positions, clearing the field of transcendental claims and emancipatory affirmation of speakers within the socio cultural contests they live in.

This is not a way to exclude ex ante that there are emancipatory instances increasingly convincing and well-established which animate moral learning processes (especially within the walls of modern Western societies). However, it means to account for the symbolic complexity of the many doctrines including crowding planetary space, in many cases divorced from the dynamics of rationalization of the Western type.

It can be assumed that the same distinction between matters of good life and justice issues, or the discernment of ethical discourse and moral discourse, has not met the same fate at every latitude. Therefore, it would be impossible to translate the attempt to reflect on geometric models of Justice, divorced from the deepest vernacular reasons .

In respect of those visions of the images of the world not yet differentiated into them, you would advance, therefore, a claim merely assimilatory if it would be confined within narrow and neutral space of Enlightenment rationality, the unique conditions which allows moral development.