

Prof. Vojislav STANOVČIĆ

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts

*Ethics, Politics and Science**

Abstract

The article is related to what's the role of ethics, politics and science in regard to values in the past and today. It touches several important groups of **problems, controversies and contradictions** related to three subjects (notions) in the title, which are (inter)connected through the long history and existing today as important for the character and status of values in contemporary societies. One group of controversies is connected with two opposed conceptions: one treats the **moral as basis of polis and politics** (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Augustine, Aquinas), assuming that „**common good**” and **justice** are the highest values; and the opposite conception puts the accent on the **interest of the state** (to achieve power, territorial expansion and success) **disregarding moral and religious values**, and obliges citizens to do so when the interest of the state requires (Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Botero, Bodin with some reserves, Hobbes). On both sides there were some philosophers who favored rigid authoritarian control which could be basis of **totalitarian** government. Many philosophers dedicated their efforts, talents and common sense to acquire knowledge by systematic research appropriate to base ethics and politics on science and wisdom.

Another group of problems, existing permanently, and criticized already by ancient Greek and Roman philosophers, was the **relationship of power** (i. e. politics, government, state, political rulers, statesmen, naked power, force) **and laws**. Laws were treated as expression of political power, but also as the means of limiting and moderating the power – social and political). To fulfill their role it was not sufficient for laws to

* The paper is printed as submitted.

have the political force behind, but also to contain distinct qualities and to be enacted in a proper procedure to poses all quality to deserve to be treated as laws.

The paper touches also contradictions – between **logic and ethics** in regard to science. These are the most relevant for the modern age (after Bacon, Descartes, Erasmo and then in the 20th century again) when results of science and technology can threaten the very existence of mankind, and the ethnics of responsibility should replace all ethics of absolute values and of final ends.

I Ethics and Politics

The first group of problems and contradictions we are going to touch are related to opposed conceptions of the role and place of moral and immoral in politics. Having in mind the role of moral rules as foundations of civilizations from the oldest times, we put the accent at teachings of great ancient pioneer-thinkers (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero) who thought that ethics and politics ought to be connected. Since Socrates, ethics became philosophical discipline. Plato and Aristotle followed and developed very systematic approach to ethics and values (making distinction between right and wrong), treating them as grounds of polis and social life, assuming that „common good”, justice and human virtues are the highest values. In Plato’s dialogues (see *The Republic*),¹ opposite sides are arguing. Plato puts his ideas into the mouth of Socrates, and he persistently defended moral values and virtues treating them as a founding principles of good polis. Opposing to Socrates’ ideas, Thrasymachus defined the justice as „the interest of the stronger” (which he clarified to mean superior and better, but not in moral sense) and said that selfishness determines international relations, adding that injustice is the natural right of a strong man, while conventions are made by inferior who advocate equality (similar ideas expressed Callicles in Plato’s dialogue – *Gorgia*). Plato had in mind an aim to establish justice and to extinguish conflicts (which, he thought, were motivated by greed, party strives, ambitions and selfishness). On the ground of studies and experience he stressed that all wars are waged for the purpose of acquiring wealth (he used the word for money). Theologians and philosophers, Augustine and Aquinas, supported and continued these ancient teachings.

¹ Plato, *The Republic*, Oxford University Press, 1945, translated by Francis MacDonald Cornford; in Serbian edition *Država* (the State), Belgrade, Kultura, 1957.

At the period of Humanism and Renaissance that movement revived many ancient humanistic values including *human dignity*²). But „political situation” in Italy in the 15th century was contrary to aims of humanistic movement, because bloody political struggles, dirty politics, growing authoritarian and severe monarchical absolutism, and some perceptions of evil human nature, caused the big change in conceptions of politics and ethics. So called „new political moral”, later named „Machiavellianism”, was condensed in the theory of the „Reason of the State” (*raison d’État*, *Staatsräson* etc.).³ Though this term as such was not used by Machiavelli, it was in the spirit of works of his contemporary (Guicciardini) and a couple of decades later a book was dedicated to that topic by Giovanni Botero (the book in Italian „Ragione di Stato”, 1589). Anyhow, ideas of Machiavelli corresponded to this concept and term (otherwise Machiavelli was the first to use the concept and term „the state” and it was accepted and used after him). New doctrine was that a ruler of the state (monarchical or republican) does not need to obey moral norms, but to act in the interest of the state to increase its power and territories. Politics was treated as an art which is not concerned neither with moral nor religious values and criteria. Such trends were opposed by many distinguished scholars and moralists (Pico della Mirandola, Thomas Moore, Erasmus of Rotterdam and others) who had different conceptions.

Machiavellian and similar new theories are treated today as the beginning of „realistic” political science, which rejects religious and moral values in studying politics. Machiavelli was describing and suggesting to princes new „art of rule” and „art of war” which uses all means if they can give wishful results. During religious wars in France between Catholics and Huguenots (French *Calvinists*) in the second part of the 16th century Bodin introduced the theory of state sovereignty, but however, his theory limited the power of the French king, but tried to make the state omnipotent which implied that state has to be over all churches to extinguish the wars between them. And Hobbes, during the bloody Puritan revolution, wrote *Leviathan*⁴ constructing in theory an

² See: Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, *Oratio de hominis dignitate* (*Oration On the Dignity Of Man*), in Latin and Serbian published in Belgrade, Filip Višnjić, 1994.

³ Niccolò Machiavelli, *Il Principe* (*De Principatibus*, manuscript written in 1513; first time published in Roma, 1532) and *Discorsi sopra la prima Deca di Tito Livio* (1513-1519; published in Roma, 1531); in *Tutte le opere di N. Machiavelli* (edizione da M. Martelli), Firenze, 1972.

⁴ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan or the Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*, edited by Michael Oakeshott, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1955; from this

artificial being – the state – in which sovereign is the absolutist ruler, because citizens among themselves concluded an agreement under which they transferred all their rights at the sovereign in exchange for peace and safety. These mentioned contributed to modern „real-politics” in political science. Their approach is very much present in today’s international politics. And despite of all sets of democratic values, many „modern” „democracies” can not provide peace nor safety to their citizens.

Further history proved that both opposite teachings (one Plato’s, the other Machiavelli’s and Hobbes’) could be the doctrinaire basis for totalitarian government. Plato and Machiavelli were accused in the 20th century: Plato’s doctrine because it would give to government the control and power to impose moral virtues was proclaimed as totalitarian. Karl Popper among enemies of the open society included Plato, Hegel and Marx, but he did not mention Machiavelli, Hobbes, Fichte, though Machiavelli rejected any moral value and norm if it would be contrary to interests of a state, Hobbes offered authoritarian grounds for a totalitarian state in *Leviathan*, and Fichte in his *Addresses to German Nation* and in *Closed Commercial State* initiated the idea of „national-socialism”. Before both groups of theoreticians, the historian Thucydides, did not approve, but in his *Peloponnesian War* described many war crimes against civilian population, and concluded that powerful states impose their interests disregarding any legal norm, international treaty or moral principles. Taking the logic of events he assumed that the state which behaves in the mentioned way, i. e. which blindly pursues its interests, sooner or later would end in destruction (that happened to powerful Athens, defeated in the war in which committed many crimes).

Though Plato favored ethics to be obeyed in politics, he permitted a deception, false invention, fiction which could be useful for the state, and some scholars translated Plato’s idea as „the noble lie”⁵ The use of lie was recommended publicly by Machiavelli and was especially widely used in the 20th century by

edition the Serbian one was published (*Levijatan*, Beograd, Kultura, 1961) with the „Foreword” by Mihailo Đurić.

⁵ Plato, *The Republic*, 414-415; Cornford quotes that this is frequently translated as „noble lie”, but he uses the words „invention” and „fiction” and uses the modern word propaganda to express the meaning; in Serbian edition it is also translate as invention („izmišljotina”, *Država*, Belgrade, Kultura, 1957, p. 110).

fascist and similar force-using actors⁶ in politics, but that practice continues. Following Plato and exceeding him, Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* gave the plan of his conception and the aim of a book dedicated to politics (the result was his *Politics*. He also had a plan to study politics empirically and studied and by help of his students collected – 158 constitutions with descriptions of social, economic and institutional aspects (only *Athenian Constitution* is preserved). The study of constitutions had an aim to reach conclusions about conditions for good laws and forms of government, and to establish the „philosophy of human matters” (called also practical philosophy). This kind of philosophy was teaching how to achieve values like common good, eunomia (ancient Greeks had goddess Eunomia whose name meant legality and justice), virtues, happiness, free choice, some forms of participating citizens in government of the polis). The role of Cicero and medieval Christian philosophers and theologians (Augustine, Aquinas⁷ and others) was very important because their ideas served as roots and foundations of European Civilization – including the religion (faith) and rule of law (some philosophers explained the character of four kinds of laws – from natural to human).

Human life in humanistic theories was one of corner-stones in many of value-systems, ancient and contemporary, starting with Hellenistic humanistic ideals, then the Christian set of values, and of most humanistic orientations in the modern time movements and schools of thought – including Christian and non-Christian existentialism, but also several ideological conceptions disguised in nice though usually empty words.

In the 19th and 20th centuries it was widely regarded that after the Renaissance at the beginning of the Modern Age (of discoveries, explorations, colonization) modern political science was founded, and among the founders were included Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Botero, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Austin). Teachings of those who contributed to concepts of the Reason of the State and of absolute sovereignty considerably influenced present-day

⁶ See: Hannah Arendt, *Lying in Politics* with other Essays, New York, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972; and Hana Arent, *Laž u politici*, Beograd, Filip Višnjić, 1994.

⁷ Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, London, Penguin Books, 1977; edited by David Knowles who wrote Introduction; and Aurelije Augustin, *Država božja*, Podgorica, CID, Biblioteka „Sinteze” (edited by Dragan K. Vukčević), 2004; from Latin translated by Marko Višić, who wrote the „Introductory Study” and comments; and. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae et De regimine principum*; see parts in: Aquinas, *Selected Political Writings*, ed. with an Introduction by A. P. D’Entrèves, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1959; Latin and English texts.

theoreticians and followers of the „real-politics”. We assume that positivism in the 19th and scientism and „value-neutral” science in the 20th century were influenced also by new trends in epistemology and methodology of empirical research (see below).

II Political Will Vs. Law

Another group of important issues (problems) is related to different conceptions about the character and role of laws (legal rules) and values which laws protect. Two perceptions and conceptions of laws are connected with the role of political power and acts of political will (in some situations of militaristic will). One conception is on the side of political will, voluntarism and authoritarianism. The other insists on the role of justice (as ethical category) and quality of laws, legal equality in front of laws, and on *ratio* (or spirit) of laws. This conception also questions the character and role of laws – whether they are based on political will and force alone, or comprise appropriate „qualities of law” – justice, isonomia (legal equality). We start with a distant history, but these problems and contradictions exist today in many cases in many countries. The notion of legality in legal philosophy comes close to great problem of legitimacy.⁸

In principle, relationship between politics and law contains a deep structural and essential contradiction: the law is an expression of political will (power, government) which secures the implementation of laws (that was the case since Hammurabi’s predecessors, and continued through the history all the time to similar conceptions supported by teachings of Hobbes, Austin, Max Weber, Hans Kelsen and others like Soviet positivists).

From the other side, law has the role to limit political will and power, moderate it in order to act reasonably, and gives frames in which government is obliged to subdue to legal provisions (the rule of law) and procedures (the due process of law) – to pace the way to constitutionalism.

Founders of so called „great world religions” (Moses, Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, Mahomet) developed ethic norms and rules of behavior which became foundations of respective civilizations and played a role of meta-legal grounds for legal systems. Values favored by mentioned religious teachings are very

⁸ Vojislav Stanovčić, *Macht und Legitimität*, St. Gallen/Lachen, Dike Verlag, 2003.

similar, but churches interpret them in different ways, putting forward their interests and behave like political parties and (mis)use religious teachings as political ideologies. Moses initiated the idea of God's will turned into laws and religion (Moses was influenced by the Codex of Hammurabi and by experience in Egypt), and with different means (words and force) made his people to accepted both (laws and religion, which helped them to survive as a group without state and territory). Moses' teaching implied the covenant between the God and his people (which became the ground for social contracts theories in Western Europe in the 16th century during religious wars in France, and except Hobbes, other social contract theoreticians (Althusius, Locke, Rousseau, Fichte and others) included participation and democracy as a form of government. Moses' conceptions also implied the rule of laws because even the God expressed his will in the form of laws. So laws have to regulate relations in society instead by the will of politicians. Such approach to ethics and politics was further stipulated in Europe by theologians and among results achieved by priests and political elite (in case e. g. of Magna Charta Libertatum) and by lawyers at high positions (like Henry de Bracton two decades after the Charta).

The problem of the character (good or bad), quality and rationality of laws was raised the first time in a discussion of Pericles and Alcibiades recorded in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. That was a discourse over a long term contradictions and conflicts between **political will** (based on power and force), and **ratio of laws** based on justice and rationality regardless of whether laws are enacted by one (in monarchy), several (in aristocratic republic or oligarchy) or by all (i. e. of majority in democracy). Since then for theoreticians it was clear that neither one, nor several nor majority who enact laws could be over laws, but subjected to them. In cases of many countries politicians are still beyond the laws of the country they rule. There follows that there are unjust and irrational „laws” which morally and politically can not be accepted even if there is a legal obligation to subjugate to them. After the dialogue of Alcibiades and Pericles, in the next generation, first philosophers who developed systematic teaching and conceptions which favored the unity of ethics and politics (Plato, Aristotle and Cicero) developed the concept of the rule of law in frames of their general philosophy and of philosophy of law (containing justice as basic element). Justice, which is one of basically ethic, one could say specifically as a part of their philosophy of law and values, was also treated as a base for legal systems. Taking into account all facts known about laws and law-making and changing his philosophical ideas expounded in *the Republic*, Plato expressed

new ideas which made him the philosophical founder of the **rule of law** theory (in his unfinished work *the Laws*⁹), and Aristotle followed and further developed teacher's idea in his *Politics*.¹⁰ These theoreticians implied that rule of law presumes qualities which were discussed and analyzed to suggest them to law-makers to take into account. In mentioned works the basic ideas included or implied the best moral, political and social values that laws should regulate and protect. Plato and Aristotle we treat in this paper as the founders of the rule of law theory as the best political form of government, because their great contribution in this respect is enormous and usually neglected. Cicero's role was less neglected because his ideas influenced very early the British Constitutionalism, particularly his idea (*Non sub homo sed sub lege*) which influenced Henry de Bracton and others to make it the permanent principle of constitutionalism. Cicero was educated in Athens and followed Plato's ideas.¹¹ In general, the basic dispute and political struggle concerning interpretation of the law among Greek philosophers and Roman jurists and rulers were over the essence of law – whether it was rationality and justice (*ius quod iustus est*) or in commands (orders) behind which stays political will, power and force (*ius quod iussum est*). A survey of conceptions from *Thucydides*, Trasimachus and Calicles to today's Machiavellians of real-politics, and from ancient humanistic ideals to Rawls and his predecessors, demonstrate that what is the „justice” it is determined by those who are the most powerful. They neglect morals and ethics, but pretend to pursue and defend ethical values. If theories of Plato and Aristotle influenced Cicero, who combined Greek philosophical foundation and practical expertise of Roman lawyers, so also his basic idea influenced Henry de Bracton, who twenty years after the *Magna Carta* introduced the idea of the rule of law in England („*Non sed homo, sed sub Deus et lege*), and that was the beginning which influenced many theoreticians of law and lawyers in government to develop the idea of the rule of law (the quoted Latin sentence is in large letters deeply inscribed into concrete wall all along the building of Harvard Law School). That sentence expressing **the rule of law principle** became basic corner-stone of Western Civilization. And it was included

⁹ Plato, *The Laws*, see: *The Dialogues of Plato*, translated and edited by Benjamin Jowett, Oxford University Press, and many editions; see also Platon, *Zakoni*, Zagreb, Kultura, 1957.

¹⁰ Aristotle, see: *The Politics of Aristotle* translated and Introduction by Ernest Barker, Oxford, 1946.

¹¹ Cicero, *De Re Publica et De Legibus* vol. XVI of his Works (in 28 volumes), in Latin and English, Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.) and William Heinemann, London, 1977.

in the Preamble as the basic principles of the European Union Constitution Draft and its set of values and it became part of the Treaty of Lisbon (signed in 2007, and in force 2009). We do not need to follow a long history, but have to mention the contribution of John Locke. He was the founder of modern democracy, of limited government based of the consent of governed, liberalism, etc, and he analyzed and described what should be appropriate laws. He also determined the scope of freedom as „freedom under the law” (meaning just and rational laws) which, as he said, „are promulgated and established Laws, not to be varied in particular Cases, but to have one Rule for Rich and Poor, for the Favourites at Court and the Country Man at Plough”).¹² And he gave grounds for human rights and liberties which were taken by George Mason and Thomas Jefferson to be included in „Virginia Declaration of Rights” and „The Declaration of Independence” (1776). These documents significantly influenced the French „*Declaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen*”, 1789, and that was a part of the most modern tradition to install human values in legal and political systems.

The importance of ideas inspired by Locke, Bentham, Kant, Mill and others that we quote, stress the importance of values like justice, principle of „the greatest happiness of the greatest number”, knowledge-enlightenment (*sapere aude!*), human rights and liberties, moral autonomy as ethic foundations of social life and rationality in creating and implementing the law. The contract (agreement) as legal and trust and honor as moral categories make ground for successful entrepreneurialism and economic progress (cf. M. Weber, *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*), and human dignity (cf. E. Bloch) and mutual respect and honor – as moral, social and psychological precondition to enjoy rights and freedoms, because an ethic without dignity was rightly exposed to criticism by Dostoyevsky, Weber, John Rawls’ and some others.

We must keep in mind the importance of the most basic conceptions on the character of laws and the role of justice is short reviewed evolution from the dialogue of Alcibiades and Pericles to the legal philosophy of Gustav Radbruch¹³ and other theoreticians of law from the 18th – 20th century, as well as

¹² John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, II, 142 and previous. Of many editions we used „A critical edition based on recently discovered manuscript that is believed to be Locke’s final and perfected version of his work with Introduction and notes by Peter Laslett, New York – London, 1963.

¹³ Gustav Radbruch, *Rechtsphilosophie*, Stuttgart, K. F. Köhler Verlag, Achte Auflage, 1973; see: Gustav Radbruch, *Filozofija prava*, Beograd, Nolit, 1980.

the Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman heritage which were the roots of European Civilization up to values enumerated in the Preamble of the proposal of the EU Constitution and in Treaty of Lisbon in which some basic civilization achievements.

In the proposal of the EU Constitution, it was stated that the member states declare that their mutual values are **liberty, democracy, respect for human rights, the rule of law, human dignity, equality, and minority rights**; society within the EU is built on **pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity, and equality of the sexes**. (These provisions are obviously not new, but some are codified for the first time.)” There are also many instrumental values related to organization of the EU and voluntarily conferred competences on it by its member states according to the so-called **principle of conferral, principle of subsidiarity, but in decision-making the principle of proportionality and qualified majority voting**, and rotating persons at important functions. Also: mutual cooperation, agreed objectives, to serve the interests of the EU’s three elements: citizens, member states, and Union. And the Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union etc. confirmed that „drawing inspiration from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed the universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law;”

However, permanent tensions and contradictions between „the spirit” or *ratio* of rules (religious, moral and legal) laws, and from the other side, the political will taking decisions from the point of its power and force (most frequently naked) is a permanent feature if relations between legal system and politics are not harmonized on the ground of the rule of law and rational laws.

III Conflict of Logic and Ethics

In Vocations of Politician and Scientist

The third group of problems refers to specific epistemological and methodological principles of research and procedures in regard to different nature of phenomena which are studied, but also which a politician faces. This article stresses the problem of „the philosophy of human matters” approach. Socrates’ concern was the human virtue (Greek *arête, ἀρετή*) and character which for him was the basis for happiness (*eudemonia, εὐδαιμονία*), and his ideas were spread by his students. Plato was Socrates student and for him, one of

two grounds of the polis was moral (the other was division of labor as the economic and social ground). Aristotle treated Ethics and Politics as studies of subjects (matters) where human will plays a big role and so, he argued, that the wisdom (*fronezis, φρόνησις*), reasonableness, understanding, tolerance, moderation and moral concerns have to play the role, and to be implemented, while in studying natural phenomena human will can not change natural laws and so exact sciences (*episteme, ἐπιστήμη*) can discover the character of natural phenomena and adequate natural laws. After more than a millennium of domination of theology over science (which was suppressed), Francis Bacon, the lawyer, gave a new impetus to empirical research and processes which resulted with the scientific and technological revolutions, initiated by Bacons' principles expounded in the *Novum Organum*, in which he criticized obstacles to development of science, offered new episteme-methodological approach, and surpassed the theory of Aristotle's *Organon*. So, Bacon developed new logic, but as the public functionary, he was morally corrupted person. However, from his empirical and theoretical beginning several industrial revolutions took place later. And French philosophers after a century and a half after him appreciated his great contribution to science, and dedicated *Encyclopedia* to Bacon regardless of his political immoralism that he demonstrated as lawyer. The advance of knowledge and methods continued by Descartes' treaties and meditations, discoveries of Copernicus, Newton, Locke's development of empiricism and up to Kant's critics, and many others continuing with further great successes in natural sciences. Trends of speedy advance in natural sciences started with significant new epistemological and methodological approaches which opened the epoch of revolutionary discoveries and inventions which were implemented and they changed human conditions of living. It seemed as improvement only, but already the first industrial revolution caused many social problems, and the third and next ones resulted with the possibility that the man can destroy the life on the earth if not the earth itself.

As a reaction to deformation of social studies and presentations of social facts by ideological, religious and moral attitudes, the attempts were made in the 19th and the 20th centuries to reorient social studies to methodology of natural sciences in order to achieve similar results in social sciences like in natural ones. (Auguste Comte, mostly known as a founder of sociology, John Stuart Mill, and in 20th century Émile Durkheim and Max Weber). Mill with his studies and essays gave contributions to logic, economy, representative government, liberty and to him is attributed the so called modernized liberalism changing conceptions of classical liberalism from „laissez-fair” to social

orientation and actions of government with an aim to improve the situation of poor and unable and to manage distribution of wealth which inspired and influenced the 20th century ideas about „welfare state”.

After the 19th century orientation in research, the positivism and later scientism took ground achieving splendid results in natural sciences and industries, and freeing social sciences of religious and ideological influences, but the idea of „value-neutral” social science neglected the different nature of social and natural phenomena. Many scholars in social and political sciences were oriented to positivism and value neutral approach in scientific studies which as positivism and scientism were dominating in the 20th century.

Max Weber who contributed a lot to the idea of value-neutral social science, after the end of World War I gave two famous lectures – on science and politics as vocation – stating that value orientations are different and so in permanent conflicts which makes senseless the scientific approach to this issue. Then, he argues that the ethics of Jesus’ Sermon at the Mount deprives of personal dignity everyone who behaves in accordance to it. Further, he makes an important distinction between the ethics of final ends or final aims (which religions and ideologies preach) which can take individuals to follow such ethics and to commit crimes pursuing their ideas. As the opposite of the mentioned, Weber favors the ethnics of responsibility which requires to think about consequences of one’s beliefs. In the lecture on politics Weber stressed that politics is involved in violence and that absolute ethics of pure will leads to evil outcomes. Weber concludes that one who wants to be involved into politics will be intermingled with diabolic forces which threaten by acts of violence.¹⁴

Those considered approaches and methods did not give results in social sciences like those in natural ones. The most it could be reached in social studies could not be explanation of phenomena in sociology, but „verstehen” (understanding) – used by Max Weber, and by other scholar.¹⁵ In studies of most large scale social phenomena changes and events could not be predicted

¹⁴ Max Weber, „*Science as a Vocation*” (*Wissenschaft als Beruf*), delivered at the University, Munich, 1918; and „*Politics as a Vocation*” (*Politik als Beruf*) a lecture given by Max Weber to the Free Students Society/Movement of the Munich University, in January, 1919. See also his main work in sociology, political science, economy and law: *Wirtschaft und Geseschaft*, Köln – Berlin, Kiepenheuer – Witsch; in Serbian *Privreda i društvo*, I-II, Beograd, Prosveta, 1976, Introduction written by Radomir D. Lukić.

¹⁵ See: G. H. von Wright, *Explanation and Understanding*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1971.

like those in natural sciences. For example, like those in astronomy which tell us that the next sun eclipse similar to one which happened recently will be repeated in the year 3045. But already Christopher Columbus saved the life predicting exactly eclipse of the sun in front of Indians who wanted to execute him when they captured him and his sailors at the American soil. Many important social and political processes and changes took place in the 20th century which were not and could not be predicted. For example, at the beginning of the year 1989, nobody and no social or political studies institute could predict collapse of communism at the end of that year, regardless of the fact that many critically oriented scholars wrote about weak and wrong foundations of communist ideology and systems based on such premises. Or the recent big economic depression could not be predicted despite of hundreds of institutes studying economic processes.

IV Quests of Philosophy of „Human Matters”

As all mentioned contradictions and conflicts exist today, some kind of a summary considers **moral relativism** as not only inter-conflict among fields of ethics, politics and science, and logics, but also due to the fact that all epochs and various regions in frames of opposed religions and governments proclaimed quite different values, which were expounded, promoted and accepted or rejected as norms of behavior and customs. Despite theories of value-neutral sciences and specially social sciences, the wonderful results of natural sciences which can help and determine, but also can threaten the destiny of mankind – should be limited and even encroached by ethical responsibility. The example of Robert Openheimer, called „the father of American atom bomb”, tells us a lot by his behavior when on the ground of ethics and conscientiousness he rejected to develop hydrogen bomb giving an example to other scientists. But, there were always those from the social top and political heights who denied or breached the rules and customs as well as those oppressed from the bottom who used different forms of resistance, sometimes peaceful, but more frequently violent means of actions. Another group of problems the article dealt with was the relationship between scientific truth (and truths as values), but also have to be seen in frames of ethical values. After the climax of positivism and scientism in the 20th Century, an influential trend of **renaissance (rival) of the „philosophy of human matters”** takes ground in studying humanistic and social sciences with a stress on the importance of values. Values are treated as essential (principles of achieving/preserving life, body, family, safety, peace, basic needs, reciprocity, freedom, equality, justice, entrepreneurialship

and others) and instrumental (property, wealth, association, authority, government, law, order, etc.), but these classifications are also relative, depending on basic needs and the quality of human life. Many values are only declared or generally agreed, but not respected.

Mentioned processes and corresponding values or counter-values were influenced by religions, ideologies and imposed laws. So, there were many different „values” which opposed to each other. Even in modern times when fashionable values were declared and introduced and frequently influenced by religions and ideologies in Western Europe, and became clear after some time (or immediately) that in every set of values some of them contradicted to each other. This was happening all the time since the distant past to the present time. For example, some modern principles of scientific logic contradicted to religious beliefs (and corresponding value orientations and practices) and the science was victorious. Also, in the field of ideologies, each one wishing a good for some social groups, contradictions were obvious. For example, liberalism (as the first and very influential modern ideology) stressed the liberty, freedom of human beings in frames of rational and reasonable laws, and, on the other side, socialistic ideology, put the stress on equality (primarily economic equality), and when those different values are put together, conflicts are difficult to avoid. The motto of the French Revolution 1789 („*Liberté, égalité, fraternité*”) combined different values, which is understandable, and similar it is in the proposal of the EU Constitution and accepted in the Treaty of Lisbon as the set of very distinguished values (which we quoted above). But, when we published our book on *Power and Liberty* (2003) we put the slogan of the French Revolution across the front page. But our mind was pre-occupied with the vision of Francesco Goya’s painting (in Museo del Prado, Madrid) called „1808”, though its name is „The Shootings of May 1808”. But that painting shows French revolutionary soldiers executing innocent unarmed civilians collected in streets of Madrid and executed as hostages at the time when Spanish people resisted French „liberation”. The painting reminds one on how revolutionary forces and innocent civilians in those short moments before the death experience international liberty, equality and fraternity.

Many scholars in the field of social sciences reached conclusion that social sciences can contribute to „understanding” social phenomena, but not to that kind of knowledge which look for and achieve natural sciences (explanation and discovery of relatively permanent laws of natural phenomena). In the name of ethics, the master of physics and the father of atomic bomb, R.

Oppenheimer, rejected to work on the project of hydrogen bomb. A distinguished group of philosophers, sociologists, lawyers, those who are in the field of political theory – work in favor of the renaissance of the „the philosophy of human matters” (Perelman, Henis, Kantorovič¹⁶, Djurić, Basta and others.). Great number of scholars in the field of political theory and methodology turn our attention to many facts which demonstrate that human values can not be avoided nor should be neglected in determining the aims of scientific research but have to be taken into account in studying social phenomena, and even more so in taking responsibility in political decisions, as well as in participating in social actions. However, in research scholars have to follow very rigorous methodology, appreciating facts found and trying to place the results in wider frames and in frames of wisdom. Unfortunately, moral values are frequently used as means for immoral purposes disguised like moral and accompanied with naked force, and such acts lead to militarism and can turn into aggression.

Many social and political movements and social changes could not be predicted and hardly controlled. But, scientists as well as politicians have to follow the ethics of responsibility and rely on humanistic values which include human life and moral virtues. Otherwise, they can push us to the Hell.

REFERENCES

- Alhaj A. D. Ajjola, *The Islamic Concept of Social Justice*, Lahore, Islamic Publications, 1977.
- Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes in Five Nations*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963 (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1965).
- Danilo Basta, „Hans Kelsens fragwürdige Destruktion der Gerechtigkeit”, in: *Sprache-Literatur-Kultur. Studien zur slavischen Philologie und Geistesgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bern-Bruxelles-New York-Oxford-Wien, 2005; and „Schwächen der Demokratie”, in: *Dimensionen der Politik: Aufklärung-Utopie-Demokratie*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 2006.
- Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution, The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (1983), Cambridge (Mass.) – London, Harvard University Press, 1999 (third edition).
- Alexander P. D' Entrèves, „Legality and Legitimacy”, *The Review of Methaphysics*, 1963.
- Mihailo Djurić, *Mythos, Wissenschaft, Ideologie*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1979; *Nietzsche und die Metaphysik*, Berlin-New York, 1985; *The Idea of Natural Law among the Greek Sophists*, Belgrade, 1954; *Sociology of Max Weber*, Zagreb, 1964; *On the Need of Philosophy*

¹⁶ Hermann Kantorowicz, *Der Kampf um die Rechtswissenschaft* (1906) und *Zur Lehre vom richtigen Recht* (1909). Both short and important studies reaffirming Natural Law values in an approach to Science of Law.

- Today: Philosophy between East and West*, Novi Sad, Prometej, 1999; and Belgrade, 2002 (second edition); „The Fragile Human Good. Contemporary Importance of Aristotle ‘s Practical Philosophy”, Belgrade, 2002.
- Ronald Dworkin, *A Matter of Principle*, Harvard University Press, 1985; and Ronald Dworkin, *Taking Rights Seriously*, Harvard University Press, 1977; published as *Suština individualnih prava*, Beograd – Podgorica, Službeni list SRJ – CID, 2001; preveo Đurica Krstić.
- Richard E. Flathman, *Political Obligation*, London, Croom Helm, 1973.
- Th. Franck, *The Power of Legitimacy Among Nations*, Oxford University Press, 1990
- Carl J. Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Law in Historical Perspective*, Chicago, 1958;
- Lon Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964; and *The Anatomy of Law*, New York, The New American Library, 1969.
- H. L. A. Hart, *The Concept of Law*, Oxford, Clarendon Law Series, 1961 (tenth edition 1979); now Hart, *Pojam prava*, Podgorica – Cetinje, CID, 1994, with the Forward „Hart’s Ideas on Systemic Quality of Law” written by Kosta Čavoški.
- Friedrich A. von Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, Chicago University Press, 1960; in Serbian *Poredak slobode*, Novi Sad, Global Book, 1998; translated and written „Pogovor” (Epilogue) by Ilija Vujačić; and *Law, Legislation and Liberty*, 3 vols. (I: Rules and Order, 1973; II: The Mirage of Social Justice, 1976; III: The political Order of a Free People, 1979).
- Wilhelm Hennis, *Politik und praktische Philosophie*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1977; and „Legitimität: Zu einer Kategorie der bürgerliche Gesellschaft”, in: Peter Graf Kielmansegg (Hrsg.), *Legitimationsprobleme politischer Systeme*, Duisburg, Herbst, 1975.
- Jeanne Hersch, *Das Recht ein Mensch zu sein*, Basel, Helbing und Lichtenbahn, 1990 (French original: *Le droit d’être un homme*, UNESCO, 1968). For the motto of the book she choose: „Jeder Despot kann Sklaven zwingen,/ Hymnen der Freiheit zu singen” (Mariano Moreno, 8. Dezember 1810); *Die Ideologien und die Wirklichkeit*, Zürich, Buchclub Ex Libris, 1976 (first in *Idéologies et Réalité*, Paris, Plon, 1956); *Die Hoffnung, Mensch zu sein!*, Köln, Benziger, 1976 (fifth edition: Zürich, Benziger Verlag, 1990).
- Hans Kelsen, *General Theory of Law and the State*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945; What is Justice?, Berkeley, 1957; „The Natural Law Doctrine Before the Tribunal of Science”, in *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 2, 1949.
- A. Leftwich, (ed.), *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study*, Oxford and New York, Blackwell, 1984.
- Otto Kirchheimer, „Legalität und legitimität”, *Die Gesellschaft*, juli 1932, a ima i iz 1933.
- Alexandre Kojève, *Esquisse d’une Phénoménologie du Droit*, Paris, Gallimard, 1981.
- Emil Lask, *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, Tübingen, 1923; works on Philosophy of Law. *L’Idée de Legitimité*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1967.
- Niklas Luhmann, *Legitimation durch Verfahren*, Neuwied, 1969; for Croatian Edition Eugen Pusic wrote Forward „The Theory of Systems and Systematized Experience of the Law”.
- J. G. Merquior, *Rousseau and Weber, Two Studies in the Theory of Legitimacy*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Franz Neumann, *The Democratic and the Authoritarian State: Essays in Political and Legal Theory*, Free Press, 1957, and *The Rule of Law: Political Theory and the Legal System in Modern Society*, Berg Publishing, 1986.
- J. Newman, *Foundations of Religious Tolerance*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Carol Pateman, *The Problem of Political Obligation*, New York, Wiley, 1979.
- J. Roland Penncock and John W. Chapman (eds.), *Compromise in Ethics, Law and Politics*, Nomos XXI, New York, New York University Press, 1979; and vol. XII: *Political and*

- Legal Obligation*, New York, Atherton, 1970 (new edition, 2007); vol. XV: *The Limits of Law*; and vol. XX: *Constitutionalism; Human Rights*, New York, New York University Press, 1980.
- Chaim Perelman, *Droit, morale et philosophie* (1968), Paris, *Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence*, 1976. In Serbian edition *Pravo, moral i filozofija*, Beograd, Nolit, 1983; the Forward „Renaissance of Practical Philosophy in Perelman’s Rhetoric” written by Dusan Boskovic.
- Slobodan Perović, *Le Droit naturel et le juge*, Belgrade, 1997; and *Human Rights as a Heritage of Natural Law*, Belgrade, 1998.
- Leo Pfeffer, *Church, State, and Freedom*, Boston, Beacon, 1967.
- Raymond Plant, Harry Lesser, and Peter Taylor-Gooby, *Political Philosophy and Social Welfare*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Paul Ricoeur (ed.), *Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights*, Paris, UNESCO, 1986
- R. Rogowski, *Rational Legitimacy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1973.
- B. Rosenberg and D. M. White (eds.), *Mass Culture*, Princeton, Van Nostrand, 1961
- Eugen V. Rostow (ed.), *Is Law Dead ?*, Simon & Schuster, 1971.
- Edwin M. Schur, *Law and Society*, New York, Random House, 1968.
- James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Resistance*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985.
- G. Sharp, *The Politics of Non-Violent Action*, Boston, 1974.
- Judith N. Shklar, *Legalism*, Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, 1964.
- A. John Simmons, *Moral Principles and Political Obligations*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Leo Strauss, *The City of Man*, Chicago, 1964.
- P. Thornberry, *International Law and the Rights of Minorities*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Theodor Viehweg, *Topik und Jurisprudenz*, Ein Beitrag zur rechtswissenschaftlichen Grundlagenforschung, München, Verlag C. H. Beck, Fünfte Auflage, 1974.
- J. Tussman, *Obligation and the Body Politic*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Ilija Vujačić, „Common Good, the Rule of Law and Neutral State”, in: *Civic Society in the Countries in Transition-Comparative Analysis and Practice*, Subotica, Open university, 1997.
- Michael Walzer, *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War and Citizenship*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1970; and *Spheres of Justice*, Basic Books, 1983.

