



# 日常生活中的公共性

THE PUBLICNESS OF EVERYDAY LIFE

公共艺术协同创新中心  
公共艺术理论系列讲座和工作坊

姜俊 / 主编

上海书画出版社

# 日常生活中的公共性

The Publicness of Everyday Life

公共艺术协同创新中心

公共艺术理论系列讲座和工作坊

姜俊 / 主编



---

#### 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

日常生活中的公共性 / 姜俊主编. — 上海 : 上海书画出版社, 2018.6

ISBN 978-7-5479-1773-2

I. ①日… II. ①姜… III. ①艺术评论—世界—文集

IV. ①J051-53

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2018)第120149号

---

## 日常生活中的公共性

姜俊 主编

---

责任编辑 吴蔚

责任校对 倪凡

技术编辑 钱勤毅

---

出版发行  上海书画出版社

地址 上海市延安西路593号 200050

网址 [www.ewen.co](http://www.ewen.co)

[www.shshuhua.com](http://www.shshuhua.com)

E-mail [shcph@163.com](mailto:shcph@163.com)

印刷 上海文艺大一印刷有限公司

经销 各地新华书店

开本 890×1240 1/32

印张 7 插页 1 字数 150千字

版次 2018年8月第1版 2018年8月第1次印刷

---

书号 ISBN 978-7-5479-1773-2

定价 38.00元

若有印刷、装订质量问题,请与承印厂联系

## 序言

姜俊

page.1

## 主题阐释

公共领域：阿伦特与哈贝马斯

谢永康

page.17

“生活世界”的现象学意涵及其效应

王俊

page.27

## 历史性理论

情感与规范性：早期现代进程中公共生活美学之维开启的一条发生学线索

余玥

page.39

杜尚之后的艺术

——论创意经济和仕绅化

许煜

page.51

现代国家建设与中国的“公共”领域

王东杰

page.75

从意识形态角度看纽约画派的公共性

毛秋月

page.87

从全景敞视到流动监控

——介入公共领域的艺术策略

姜宇辉

page.93

图绘现代城市生活：

拉兹诺·莫霍利·纳吉和大都市

提尔·尤利安·胡斯

(Till Julian Huss)

page.99

## 公共空间中的艺术实践

社会服务中的艺术表达：

社会工作的视角

王瑞鸿

page.131

体验经济下的公共性

——当代艺术中的体验性

姜俊

page.137

艺术馆空间的公共性

施瀚涛

page.145

从艺术教育走向娱乐消遣的

德国“明斯特雕塑项目”展

托斯肯·施耐德

(Thorsten Schneider)

page.177

## 作者简介

page.219

## 序言 | 姜俊

自 19 世纪以来，艺术在西方的语境下获得了某种自治，这往往被放到“现代性诞生”的框架中去认知。18 世纪末康德所著的三大批判《纯粹理性批判》《实践理性批判》和《判断力批判》似乎标示出了在现代性下可以分离的三块领域，即：认知、道德、审美。认知所针对的是人和世界主客体关系，道德则涉及个人和共同体的行动原则问题，审美则是在感性上沟通了人对世界的科学认识以及人对自身的道德认识。

自此，人类周遭世界中的神圣光晕轰然倒塌，万物不再是上帝庞大规划下各就各位的万物，不再散发着神秘的光芒，它们成为了可以被作为新主体的人类所感知的客体物。它们要么是可以被理性认知的客体，要么可以被纳入到伦理法则之下，或者完全成为人们纯粹审美欣赏和赞叹的对象。

一件客体物到底该被如何认知，取决于它被放到哪一个框架下观看和诠释。而这三种框架便发展成了科学（认知）、政法（伦理）、艺术（审美）三种体制。这种分割在西方被三种体制所保障，它们作为理想的模型被反复宣称，但在真实的日常生活中却永远无法如此干净和清晰。其中，围绕艺术展开的便是我们所熟知的美术馆、画廊、艺术空间、美术学院、艺术品拍卖行、艺术评论……这类被总称为艺术体制的东西。艺术只有在这样的“特殊场所”中才被加持为“艺术

作品”，获得超出于一般物品的价值，即成为圣物。每个造型和图像只有在既定的画框中或者基座上才映射出它那深邃的“世界”，而人们正是在这样的框定下才得以反身地观看到自己和世界的关系，除此之外它只是一个平凡的日用品。

于是问题由此产生，什么可以被纳入艺术机制中观看？什么只能成为日常生活中众多平凡的物象？它们可能无法被艺术机制接纳，它们却被赋予另外的某种目的，被作为某种政治或商业的宣传，或者实施某种伦理教化，即所谓物象的工具化。

在今天这个物象泛滥和加速运转、复制、重组的时代，没有任何的物象可以被规定在某一特定意义之下，成为永恒不变的存在。它们永远在不同的背景中获得新的意义并被重新识别，因此在运动中从工具性的图像和造型到纯粹欣赏的图像和造型之间存在着各种不同的区间。某一事物是否被定义为艺术其实取决于它到底在什么机制和背景中被识别和运作，即在什么样的诠释学框架下被理解。

今天在日常生活中许许多多的实践，既可以被识别为商业操作、政治宣传、伦理教化，也可以被理解为社会活动，同时又可以被包装成为艺术项目。本书中我们聚焦事物的感性层面，并欲从中探讨的正是这一复杂，但多维度的现实——在作为媒介的感性之下，人和世界、人和人之间千丝万缕、各式各样的关联。

针对以上的诉求，自2016年6月至12月，由上海公共艺术协同创新中心(Public Art Cooperation Center, 简称PACC)，上海美术学院推出了“日常生活中的公共性”系列讲座。“日常生活”和“公共性”成为本次系列讲座的关键词。

日常生活(alltägliches Leben)或生活世界(Lebenswelt)这一概念最早出现在德国现象学家埃德蒙德·胡塞尔的研究中。生活世界是相对于客观的科学世界和抽象的逻辑理念世界而言的主观世界和直

观世界,它是为了针对20世纪上半叶大行其道的工具理性而被提出的。它相对于单向度和效率目的优先的工具理性有着丰富而多元的维度。经历了“一战”的欧洲有必要反思其貌似光彩夺目的现代性背后那沉重的阴影,人类不只是把周遭的世界给工具化了,甚至使得他人和自己也成为工具,被宰制了。

“公共性”概念出自于1962年德国哲学家尤尔根·哈贝马斯对于纳粹专制的反思,以及对于西德民主进程的原理性研究。它最早得益于汉娜·阿伦特对于复数的人之行动(Handlung)的思考。对于阿伦特而言政治并非是一种单一化的操作,而是复数人的商谈,它应该开启一种运动中的公共领域。在哈贝马斯关于民主化的讨论中,公共性同样也是一种人和人之间的平等而公开的对话关系。中期的哈贝马斯在公共性的基础上再次激活了“生活世界”这一概念,它被与系统(System)对立起来。如果系统是人对于世界的工具理性化,那么生活世界对于他来说就应该是主体和主体之间的关系,那是一种对于他前期“公共性”概念的发展和推进。

哈贝马斯对现代性危机有着独特而深刻的理解,他认为现代性危机的症结在于“系统对生活世界的殖民化”——人和人之间的关系正不断地被工具理性所侵蚀,特别是在普遍的资本主义下,任何原来不可能贩卖的事物都在新的商业模式下骤然间成为可以贩卖的商品。一切多元维度的感性连接都成为了单一的“手段-目的”关系。

总而言之,“日常生活”和“公共性”都指涉人和人之间的关系,即主体之间的问题。它们是在工具理性不断扩张中被发明出来的反思性概念。当人和人之间的关系被异化为工具关系之后,我们将何以立足?如康德所认为的,感性和审美如果被理解为综合人和世界、人和人之间关系的桥梁,那么它必定拥有多元和复杂的维度和可能。相对于单一的工具理性化,感性物象无论将以艺术的方式被展现,还是以

其他的方式融入到日常生活之中，我们都有必要对其予以关注，从而挖掘出它通向多种可能性未来的潜力。

以“日常生活中的公共性”为题展开为期半年的公共理论讲座和工作坊实践活动正是试图从几种不同的视角切入，从而多维度地打开这一系列问题。我们邀请了各个领域的专家学者，就日常生活和公共性为主题从历史学、哲学、社会学、建筑史、艺术史、政治学、艺术实践、社会实践等方面跨学科地展开言说和讨论。

首先，为了深入打开“公共性”一词，我们邀请了南开大学的哲学教授谢永康从汉娜·阿伦特和尤尔根·哈贝马斯这两条线切入。德国纳粹和第三帝国的极权统治是他们两位在战后思考如何进入共同生活的重要背景。避免单一化强迫，形成多元互动成为了“公共领域”这一概念最为核心的问题焦点。他们的思考一方面是针对极权统治的理性反思，另一方面也是对于“二战”后德国重建民主生活的重要探索。浙江大学的王俊教授，则从现象学的角度为我们打开了对于“日常生活”或“生活世界”的思考。“生活世界”一词虽然源自现象学，却被哈贝马斯借用，并从他早期的“公共领域”概念中发展出了一种交往理性所引导的主体关系。在他那里“生活世界”是那种不可被简化、被工具化和商品化的人和人之间的日常。四川大学的哲学研究员余玥，从公民情感生活的起源到美学教育的社会效用探讨了革命和社会规范性重构的问题。从对于席勒的研究开始，他获得了这样的一种理论认知，任何美好的理念都必须附着在某种感性游戏之中，慢慢在不断地操练中渗透到社会意识的深层，从而再造失序后的规范。正如同哈贝马斯所讨论的——平等开放的公共领域起源于对于艺术和文学的欣赏和讨论，席勒也认为，社会的规范性之建立正应该求助于艺术和自由的感性游戏。在游戏中，理想的生活方式包裹着抽象的人类愿景被落实在每一位操练的个体身上，从而逐渐在主体互动间形成一套新的



社会规范。

为了理解中国，我们还特别邀请了四川大学历史学系的王东杰教授。他从本土的脉络上（从清末到民国，直至今天）讨论了在中国现代化过程中公共领域形态发展的变迁史。中国的公共领域绝对不同于西方的公共性，它以另一种组织方式实施着类似的社会中介作用，沟通和调节上下层关系。华东师范大学的姜宇辉教授，则从福柯《规训与惩罚》的角度再去涉及今天的公共性问题，特别是在数码时代的社会监控系统下。

在艺术史领域，我们还邀请了艺术史学者，如毛秋月博士从大众意识形态的角度展现了美国“二战”后抽象表现主义艺术的崛起和成功。冷战话语构成了公共领域的集体意识形态结构，先锋艺术也正是在这一整套语境下找到了自己的历史位置和合法性逻辑。德国洪堡大学的Till Julian Huss博士则从20世纪30年代新感性的形成来讨论欧洲城市化（柏林）和公共感知结构的变迁，这一特征无疑同时也发生在30年代的大都市上海。高速和错综复杂的城市化造就了一种新的感知结构——同时性的感知代替了历时性的线性感知；碎片化、高速运转的日常生活代替了整体性、田园式的叙述；工业化的美学代替了农业化的感知系统。同济大学建筑学系的卢永毅教授，从建筑史的角度相应地讲述了30年代上海四大百货公司的发展，与Julian Huss的柏林互为对照。

明斯特美术学院的Gerd Blum教授和Thorsten Schneider博士，为我们带来了关于明斯特雕塑项目展的讲座，讨论了在城市公共空间中艺术职能的转变——从1977年开幕兴起的市民启蒙到今天城市名片的推广、生活的经济美学化。施瀚涛先生，作为一位资深的美术馆人几乎陪伴和见证着上海本土艺术馆的诞生，发展和繁荣。他为我们带来了一场关于上海城市和本地美术馆发展历程的讲座。最后，

华东理工大学社会工作系的王瑞鸿教授，从社会服务和美学的角度上讨论了公共生活的再造问题，特别是在灾后重建的语境之下。公共艺术和社会工作，以及社会活动互为交织。在今天它们之间的界线已经变得极其模糊，在何种框架下展开论述成为了更为重要的问题；也决定了它们在具体讨论中以何种面貌出场。此外，德国吕纳堡大学的许煜教授虽然出于各种客观原因无法参与，但为我们的讲座年鉴提供了一篇关于“城市公共空间和士绅化运动”的精彩文章。

这里我们由衷地感谢每一位接受邀请的嘉宾学者。同时也感谢每一位参与讲座讨论的观众们，他们不仅给我们打开了多种观看问题的视角，还带来了有益的启发。当然还要感谢为我们讲座付出辛勤劳动的工作人员，他们的名字就列在我们的版权页面，这里恕我不再一一详述。

最后，我们希望这本 2016 年讲座年鉴可以为公共艺术的实践者们带来更多的思考维度，为各个领域对于“艺术和公共性”这一话题有兴趣的工作者提供一个讨论的平台。2016 年的“公共性和日常生活”系列讲座只是一个开始，每一年我们都会设置一个新的概念，配合“公共性”的讨论，我们试图能在一系列的问题中与大家保持对话：今天在中国的语境下，我们应该如何去看待所谓的现代性，以及一个多世纪以来急速发展的现代化进程？我们应该如何在日常生活的语境下理解公共性和公共空间中的感性物象？中国是否拥有西方所谓的“公共性”？什么是中国特色的公共性？百年前欧洲面对现代化过程中的阵痛和思考是否也值得今天的我们研究和借鉴？在整个社会巨变中艺术和美学又扮演着何种角色，是否有弥合和消融这一现代性危机的作用？

姜俊

2017 年于杭州之江九里

## Foreword: First Season of The Publicness of Everyday Life

From the 19th century onward, art has acquired a certain degree of autonomy within the Western context. This is generally understood within the framework of "the birth of modernity". In the late 18th century, Kant's Three Critiques entitled Critique of Pure Reason, Critique of Practical Reason and Critique of Judgment seemed to indicate three separate fields of modernity: cognition, morality and aesthetics. Cognition was aimed at the subject-object relation between man and the world, whereas morality had to do with issues concerning behavioral principles of the individual and the collective. Aesthetics, in turn, linked up the scientific understanding of the world with a moral understanding of the self.

Since the toppling of our world's erstwhile sacred haloes, things in the universe no longer keep to their quarters as originally set out in god's all-encompassing design. Things no longer emanate mysterious light. They've become objects of perception by mankind, who in turn can be regarded as a new subject. As objects, they can either be rationally perceived, incorporated into an ethical code, or altogether become the object of man's pure aesthetic appreciation and adoration.

How exactly objects are supposed to be perceived, depends on the framework in which we observe and interpret them. The three aforementioned frameworks have developed into three systems, i.e. science (empirical understanding), politics and law (ethics) and art (aesthetics). In the West, this division is ensured by three organizational structures. They are oft-professed as ideal patterns, yet in the reality of everyday life their distinctions never as neat and

clear-cut. Within this supposed trifecta, the development of art is encompassed by our ever so familiar museums, galleries, art spaces, art institutes, art auctions, art criticism etc. These are generically designated as art's institutional strongholds. Only within the boundaries of such "specific sites" is art granted the titular blessing of "artwork", along with value exceeding that of ordinary goods, all of which turn it into a sacred relic. Shapes and images only exude their profound "realm" if placed within a pre-ordained frame or mounted atop a pedestal. Only within these framed restrictions do people turn their heads to observe the connections between themselves and the world. Beyond that, they're merely ordinary daily commodities.

Hence the question: which things can be incorporated for closer scrutiny into this system of art, and which end up rejoining the myriad object-images of everyday life? Perhaps they cannot be admitted to the system of art, yet they're endowed with an alternative purpose, or made into a kind of political propaganda or commercial publicity, or used to implement some or other ethical indoctrination, i.e. the so-called 'instrumentalization' of the object-image.

In this era of proliferation, accelerated circulation, reproduction and reconfiguration of object-images, object-images cannot be formulated as having a sole, specified meaning, nor can they take on a timeless existence. They constantly assume new meanings and are re-labeled against different contextual backdrops. As a result, the spectrum of this [echoing] motion ranges from instrumentalized images and shapes all the way to images and shapes for appreciation's sake. Whether or not objects are defined as art, depends on the precise system and contextual setting in which they gain recognition and operate, that is to say the hermeneutical framework in which they're interpreted.

Today, the multifarious praxis of everyday life can be identified as commercial undertakings, political propaganda and ethical indoctrination. They can just as well be understood as social activities, or packaged as artistic projects. In this book, we focus on the perceptual layer of objects, which will hopefully allow us

to probe into this complex, multi-dimensional reality: on the level of sensibility - which serves as intermediary - a wide array of ties connects people to the world and to one another.

In reference to the above mentioned premise, the Public Art Coordination Center (hereon referred to as PACC) and Shanghai Academy of Fine Arts joined hands from June to December, 2016 to organize a series of talks on 'The Publicness of Everyday Life.' 'Everyday Life' and 'Publicness' were deemed keywords of this series of talks.

The concept of 'everyday life' (alltägliches Leben) and 'the world in which we lead our lives' (i.e. life-world or Lebenswelt) first appeared in the research of phenomenologist Edmund Husserl. The Lebenswelt, compared to the objective world of science and the world of abstract, logical notions, is a subjective world of direct, sensorial perception. It was proposed in response to instrumental reason, which prevailed in the first half of the twentieth century. Compared with the one-dimensional and efficiency-oriented instrumental reason, it has rich and multitudinous dimensions. Post-WWI Europe was forced to reflect on the eerie gloom left behind by the dazzling era of modernity. Mankind's instrumentalization of his surroundings had gone so far as to make it and others into instruments, eventually subjecting itself to tyranny.

The idea of 'publicness' originated in philosopher Jürgen Habermas' 1962 examination of Nazi despotism and the principles that proved crucial in West-German democracy. [His research] greatly benefited from Hannah Arendt's ruminations on the behavior (Handlung) of the masses. For Arendt, politics was by no means a one-sided operation, but a negotiation between the masses, with the intent of unlocking a shifting public domain. In Habermas' discussions on the topic of democratization, publicness is similarly an equal-footed, open-ended dialogical relationship between people. Toward the middle [of his career], Habermas invoked the concept of Lebenswelt yet again, backed by the idea of publicness. He pegged it as being contrary to the 'system', and believed that if the system was man's instrumental rationalization, then Lebenswelt must be the interrelation between subjects. This meant a further development

and advancement of his prior concept of 'publicness'.

Habermas had a distinct and profound understanding of the crisis of modernity. He believed that the crux of modernity's crisis lay in 'the colonization of the Lebenswelt by the system: relationships among people were constantly eroded by instrumental reason, especially under the ever-watchful eye of capitalism, in which a formerly unsellable object could unexpectedly become a marketable commodity. All multi-dimensional, perceptual connections had been reduced to a mere relation of "means & ends".'

In brief, "everyday life" and "publicness" both refer to a relation between people, i.e. the issues that occur between subjects. Both of them are introspective concepts devised amid the constant expansion of instrumental reason. How are we to gain a steady foothold if the relationships between people are distorted and made into instrumental relationships? The way Kant saw it, if we interpret the perceptual and the aesthetic as bridges synthesizing the relation between people and the world and people amongst one another, then they're bound to have multiple, complex dimensions and possibilities. Compared with the singular phenomenon of instrumental rationalization, we have to pay close attention to perceptual object-images, whether displayed by means of artistic methods, or integrated into daily life via other approaches. By bestowing attention on them, we can expose their potential to create a future rife with possibilities.

In this half-year series of publicly held, theoretic talks and workshops & hands-on activities on the subject of The Publicness of Everyday Life we attempted to tackle the topic from different angles, hoping to address this cluster of issues from a wide range of facets. We invited expert researchers from different fields to engage in interdisciplinary talks and discussions on the topic of everyday life and publicness, from the vantage point involving history studies, sociology, architectural studies, art studies, political science, art practice and social practice.

First and foremost, to thoroughly delve into the term 'publicness', we invited Nankai University philosophy professor Xie Yongkang to

address the topic via the two above-mentioned strands of Hannah Arendt and Jürgen Habermas. Both of them treated the totalitarian rule of the Nazis and the Third Reich as a crucial backdrop for their musings on public life. The focus that lay at the core of the idea of a "public sphere" was how to avoid the menacing force of homogenization and achieve a pluralistic interaction. Their musings were rational reflections on totalitarian rule, as well as vital investigations into the rebuilding of democratic life in the aftermath of WWII. Professor Wang Jun from Zhejiang University in turn shed his light on the topics of 'everyday life' and 'Lebenswelt' from the angle of phenomenology. Although originating in phenomenology, the term *Lebenswelt* was borrowed by Habermas. This then further evolved from his early concept of "the public sphere" into an intersubjective relation guided by communicative reason. For him, the term '*Lebenswelt*' meant the interpersonal, quotidian goings-on that could not be reduced, instrumentalized or commodified. Through his reflections on the birth of citizens' emotional life and the social effectiveness of aesthetic education, philosophy researcher Yu Yue (Sichuan University) explored issues relating to revolution and the resetting of social normativity. Taking his research on Friedrich von Schiller as a starting point, he arrived at the following theoretical understanding: any wonderful concept must adhere to a certain perceptual game. Slowly, through continuous practice, it then permeates into the depths of social consciousness, thereby giving norms a new lease on life after they've fallen into disarray. Just as discussed by Habermas, an equal-footed, open-ended public sphere originates in the appreciation and discussion of art and literature. Schiller also opined that for the construction of social normativity, recourse should be taken to art and free, perceptual games. In such games, the ideal way involves mankind's abstract visions being carried out at the level of every practicing individual. Gradually, a set of brand-new social regulations takes shape among the interacting subjects.

In order to better fathom the case of China, we invited professor Wang Dongjie from the Department of History at Sichuan university. He adopted the contextual vein of the mainland (from Qing dynasty, via the Republican era, upto the present) to discuss the developmental history of the public sphere over the course of

China's modernization. China's public sphere absolutely differs from Western publicness. It uses another kind of organizational approach to implement a similar social intermediary function, linking up and adjusting hierarchical relations. Professor Jiang Yuhui of Huadong Normal University addressed present-day issues of publicness from the angle of Foucault's Discipline and Punish, particularly within the social monitoring systems of our digital age.

In the field of art history, we also invited such art historians as Dr. Mao Qiuyueto shed light on the rise and success of America's post-WWII abstract expressionist art from the angle of mass ideology. Cold war rhetoric helped construct collective ideological structures of the public sphere. Avant-garde similarly asserted its own historical position and valid logic within a full-fledged set of contextual parameters. Taking as his angle the formation of neo-sensibilities in the 1930s, Dr. Julian Huss of Humboldt University(Germany) talked about European urbanization (the case of Berlin) and [the resulting] changes in public perception structures. Without a doubt, this characteristic simultaneously occurred in metropolitan Shanghai in the 1930s. Rapid and complex urbanization forged a new perceptual structure: synchronous perception substituted diachronic, linear perception. Daily life, with its fragmented, rapid revolutions, substituted the holistic, pastoral narrative. Industrial aesthetics took the place of agricultural systems of perception. Representing the Architectural Studies Department of Tongji University, Professor Lu Yongyi described the development of the "big four department stores" in 1930s Shanghai from the angle of architectural studies, drawing parallels with Berlin as presented by Julian Huss.

Drs. Gerd Blum and Thorsten Schneider from the University of Fine Arts Münster delivered a lecture detailing the Skulptur Projekte Münster exhibition, in which they spoke about the transformations of the functions of art in the urban, public space: from civilian enlightenment emerging at the 1977 opening, up to today's promotion of the city's name cards and life's economic aestheticization. Mr. Shi Hantao, a veteran in museum circles who practically lived through and witnessed the birth, development and flourishing of Shanghai's contemporary art. He presented us with a lecture on the developmental history of Shanghai's urban



and local art museums. Finally, professor Wang Ruihong of the Department of Social Work at East China University of Science and Technology (ECUST) discussed the reconstruction of public life from the perspective of community service and aesthetics, particularly in the context of rebuilding after a disaster. Public art and social work, along with social activities, are mutually intertwined. Nowadays, their boundaries have become largely obscured, so the more critical issue is now in which frame of reference to discuss them, as this will also decide how they appear in the arena of discussion. Furthermore, despite his absence due to various objective reasons, professor Yuk Hui of the University of Lüneburg (Germany) has nonetheless contributed a splendid article on “urban public spaces and gentrification movements” to our yearly periodical.

We hereby express our most sincere gratitude to all distinguished scholars who accepted our invitation. Meanwhile, we wish to thank all audience members who attended the lectures and discussions. They not only helped us access various perspectives from which to look at the issues at hand, but also provided helpful insights. It goes without saying we're also indebted to our staff, who worked painstakingly throughout. Their names are listed on our credits page, so I'll refrain from specifying them one by one.

In conclusion, we hope this 2016 lecture journal can provide new dimensions of thought for practitioners of public art, as well as serve as a discussion platform for workers from all fields with an interest in “art and publicness”. The 2016 talk series “Publicness and Everyday Life / Lebenswelt” is but a beginning. We'll come up with a new, concept each year in keeping with our “public” discussions. This is our attempt to engage in a long-lasting dialogue pertaining to a series of questions: how are we - within the Chinese context - to deal with so-called modernity, as well as the century-old process of modernization? How are we - within the context of daily life - to comprehend publicness and perceptual object-images that crop up in the public space? Does China have a “publicness” as coined by the West, and if so, what is publicness with Chinese characteristics? Is it worth for us to research and draw conclusions from the century-old throes of European modernization? Could it be that, amid the