

ETHICS IN POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

Faton Murseli¹, Behar Mjekiqi²

^{1*}*Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy*

^{*}*Corresponding authors e-mail: faton.murseli@unite.edu.mk , behar.mjekiqi@unite.edu.mk*

Abstract

The paper of dealing with the relationship between politics and ethics has been a subject of study for many thinkers. Philosophers, sociologists, political scientists and other fields activists, throughout different periods of social development, have dedicated themselves to this issue. This issue is becoming more and more relevant today, especially in societies in transition, in which politics seems to have strangled ethical values as part of the human behavior and its survival. The political philosopher, the Enlightener Montesquieu (1689-1755), has written: The political ethics of responsibility (duty, function) is fundamental to a good Republic, far ahead of good laws, rather than the virtues of the citizens. As it can be seen, this precious French philosopher has valued political ethics, even as a value above laws and beyond human virtues. This phenomenon has also been addressed in various scientific forms by many other thinkers at certain times. Some of them treat Ethics as a philosophical discipline but not as an independent science, others consider that ethics has its object of study and as such it is the science of morality and human values. Moreover, numerous studies have been steered on the connection and differences that exist between political science and Ethics. In this scientific paper, through the chronology of the development of ethical consciousness in political sociology, we have highlighted the importance of ethics in this science. The connection between ethics and politics from the philosophical period of the Renaissance to that of the New Age is presented chronologically.

Keywords: Ethics, politics, philosophy, sociology

1. Introduction

When it comes to the relationship between politics and ethics, it must be firstly clarified the category of politics or ethics we are talking about and afterwards these two concepts require to be precisely defined. It is possible to discuss different aspects of the relationship between these two terms. The purpose of our examination may be the influence of ethical consciousness and ethical acts in today's political practice, respectively the stimulus which they should have. On the other hand, our political decisions also influence certain orientations of ethical practice. The question of what today's impact is and how it should be can be the subject of serious analysis. In all these analyzes, the practical aspects of politics and ethical reality will be debated. We can also trace the relationship between ethics as a scientific

discipline and politics as a science. The doctrinal analysis of this testimony will result in answering the most fundamental and important questions about possible types of policy and ethics interconnectedness. The influence of some factors may be obvious, which does not mean that the influence of hidden factors is less important. Therefore, when judging on the relationship between political practice and ethics, respectively the meaning of politics and ethics, we must be oriented towards doctrinal principles, precisely on the ontological, anthropological and epistemological foundations, which clearly define the discovery of answers to these questions. The various stages of knowledge, of course, will provide more adequate doctrinal principles in resolving the above-mentioned issues.

This means that rejoinders to the relationship between politics and ethics must be analyzed based on their conjunctural resources and fundamental principles. Our analysis would not be right and comprehensive, if we do not take into account the philosophical implications and specific visions of the world and the knowledge gained in educational institutions that discourse about politics and ethics. However, the traditional vision of the world and the knowledge that is published are distinguished by the means of many modern schools define the world of existence and the possibilities of human knowledge.

Hence it is peculiar to expect traditional and modern schools to express identical opinions or similar attitudes on the mutual influences of politics and ethics. Today, the traditional definition of politics and ethics is hardly supported by anyone, and this issue has been publicly set apart and rejected. However, this definition has been dominant in all earlier eras of the history of human thought.

The dominant influence of the traditional definition of politics and ethics has been reversed after the Renaissance passé, during the period when the modern definitively conflicted with the traditional. In the contemporary times, the exclusive dominance has been taken by the new treatment of the world and the knowledge about it. The levels of modern knowledge today have encompassed all the scientific institutions of the contemporary world and unhinderedly offer us a new direction in defining the relationship between politics and ethics.

3. The philosophical framework of the relationship between politics and ethics

In Aristotelian philosophy an important focus was placed on ethics and thus we have three great works on Aristotle's Ethics: "Nicomachean Ethics" in ten textbooks, "The Great Ethics" in two textbooks and "Eudeme Ethics" in seven textbooks. While the latter deals more with particular virtues, in the first two there are mainly general inquiries of the principles (Hegel 2003: 141). Utilitarianism and its ethical-sociological conception are important for the study of economic and political developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially in England. This conception connects us with the theory of liberalization which constitutes the most important and widespread social and political theory of the Bourgeoisie. Liberalism, as the most widespread theoretical and practical manifestation of the position, interests and aspirations of the Bourgeoisie, not only in England but throughout developed Europe, appeared in various forms and variations, such as economic doctrine, as a philosophical-sociological, political or ethical conception, as an aim and political activity (Agani 2002: 99).

Ethics and morality in public policy has been of great importance since the 18th and 19th centuries and up to the present time. A large part of the field of political sociology owes to ethical norms for practical policy applicants to successfully achieve their goals. Fehmi Agani defines political sociology, its subject and objective as a social science that seeks its focus. This slightly abstract and ironic definition actually expresses a more precise definition in line with the dynamics of today's development and the great expansion of knowledge, new fields, new phenomena and aspects of vision, which require sciences to be defined and redefined, therefore, constantly require the definition of the subject of study and their scope (Agani 2002: 143).

Different conjunctural levels provide unequal approaches to defining the relationship between politics and ethics. Therefore, it will not be useful to examine the essence and implication of this report, if we do not conclude in advance which scientific level we support, respectively within which scientific level the debate takes place. Of fundamental importance in this regard is to address the issues of whether ethics is a scientific discipline and whether political science includes evaluative judgments. These two different issues will guide the general direction of our study. However, in ancient times, these issues have sparked widespread debate. During the Renaissance passé but also after the dominance of empiricism, the answers to these questions were not even approximate. However, in various texts of the science of political philosophy, we can declaim completely contradictory answers to these two tremendously important questions. Based on one set of conjunctive and epistemological principles, valid ethical judgments are scientific judgments, meaning that ethics has a scientific identity. Representatives of the same conjunctural principles agree that political science also speaks about the values of judgments. Hence the relationship between politics and ethics, on this conjunctive level, would be the relationship between the two sciences.

This means that we value the mutual services of politics and ethics as logical services of two scientific disciplines, which, of course, necessarily follow the universal logical norms of activity.

Today, there are even dominant conjunctural principles based on which valid ethical judgments have no scientific identity. At these levels of knowledge, on the other hand, political science cannot contribute to the evaluation of valuable data. According to this the relationship between politics and ethics will not be of a scientific nature.

Distinguished Muslim philosophers of politics such as Farabija (died 950 AC), Avicenna (died 1037 AC) and Hadzha, Nasirudina, Tusija (died 1274 AC) who were the most influential philosophers, Tangible Doctrines political and ethical have placed them in the context of the multidisciplinary science discourse. Considering the demonstrative relationship of their traditional philosophical theories, they have not doubted that ethics and politics have a scientific identity. However, the most important philosophical instrument of these great peripatetic in the process of defining the relationship between politics and ethics was the vision of their in the undisputed role of theoretical and practical thinking on this issue. Deprived of the logical impact of these two conjunctural sources, it would be impossible to base the conclusion that valid ethical and political judgments belong to scientific verdicts.

Islamic philosophers in their writings have made detailed explanations on how theoretical thinking helps the scientific disciplines that have been formed in the context of judging practical activities. They have proved that theoretical thinking creates numerous metaphysical and ontological principles which utilize these sciences. Then when the purpose of our analysis and review can warn a series of examples that illustrate the impact of theoretical judgment in supporting scientific ethical and political reports. Theoretical thinking before prepares many potential proposals for expanding and deepening these scientific relationships. The political science of Islam as a science of "governing states" (Tadbir Al-Mudun) has for centuries exploited the rich intellectual potentials of practical thinking that have been systematically supported by theoretical thinking. The relationship between such science on "governance with states" and ethics has been a scientific-logical relationship, while science at this conjunctive level has not been able to be understood as defined by the positive contemporary trends.

Ethics and politics have a logical connection even after the Renaissance period, during the time of rationalist philosophy. This can be clearly seen in the works of the modern rationalists such as Descartes and Spinoza. Kant even treats politics and ethics in the context of practical thinking, despite the fact that he couriers his well-known doubts about theoretical thinking. Due to the special importance given to practical thinking, he increasingly tends to find theoretical ethical and political principles in practical judgment. Thus, Kant on the greatness of the soul and human desire, on freedom and rights speaks in the path of practical thought and consideration, because he considers that these concepts do not belong within the framework of theoretical thinking and reasoning. The other great rationalist philosopher Hegel, in modern times, also often speaks of the obligatory logical relationship between ethics and politics, considering that the role of the state is to elevate man into a moral being. He underlines "The state is the reality of the moral idea" (Hegel 1964: 204).

The emergence of empiricism has brought about great changes in terms of the relationship between politics and ethics. Those changes were reflected in the first phase of the domination of empiricism, so it was not necessary for even empiricism to take a positivist interpretation. It was immediately concluded that it is necessary to separate ethics from science. Subsequently, all valid political judgments have emerged from the political sciences and it has finally been made recognized that ethics has nothing in common with the science of politics. Thus, empiricism has formulated the new scientific definition, which is not encountered in any other earlier era throughout the history of human thought. From those times, scientific decrees are only those controllable judgments. Respectively those that can be related to the power of our senses. According to the new definition, all metaphysical and conjunctural judgments are declared unscientific judgements, which science would be never able to analyze. The separation of science from ethics, according to this, represents a clear result of the well-known process of separating knowledge from values within the conjunctive empirical stages. On these fundamental conjunctural changes, Hume describes explicitly for the first time. However, this well-known empirical philosopher with his defining philosophical approach, could not support the naive optimism of the early empiricists, but

clearly discovered the inalienable path of empiricism towards hopeless and irreversible skepticism.

Separating political science from political practice is widely found in the works of Max Weber. Despite his innovative approach to understanding the humanities, Weber has not been able to go beyond the basic positivist directions of defining science. Therefore, in his work "The Vocation Lectures" which includes two original papers on the profession of scientists and the profession of politicians. Weber unequivocally defends the judgment on the removal of conjunctural political and practical political judgments from political science. But the emphasis on the separation of ethics and politics belongs exclusively to the theoretical period. This means that political ethics and practice, namely conjunctural political judgments, have never been separated. Based on this, the theoretical framework of this process of division has only managed to eliminate the scientific connection between ethics and political science. Put it differently, all representatives of the epic conjunctive horizon, even Weber himself, have been aware of the influence of the ethical values present in the margins of scientific knowledge and political science. They have explicitly clarified that according to their vision, these values do not penetrate the core of political science nor its internal structure, but unequivocally regulate the directions and approach of scientists in relation to the 7 different topics and the aim of their research.

Such an abrupt theoretical division of political science, respectively all the knowledge of ethical and conjunctural judgments, very quickly became the subject of serious criticism during the mutual debates of philosophers. The empirical aspect on this subject has not survived long, and even in the right relation between ethics and political science, again many philosophers have begun to think, who at that time had essential remarks on the existence of modern science. In other words, the science of politics has not even managed to be completely reorganized as a provable scientific discipline, and has had to witness the erasure of imaginary boundaries that have been created between ethics and well-known scientific circles. Newer traces of intellectual change, the close link between ethics and political science, has recently been addressed and accepted.

But special care must be taken here in the philosophical nature of the relationship between ethics and political science during the period when the definition of science as verified knowledge was radically rejected. This is the newest period of postmodernist thought streams. Thus, the relationship between ethics and political science even then is not of a scientific and logical nature, since postmodernist thinkers do not think at all about ethics as a science that will be related to political science within the activities of theoretical and practical judgment. Here, politics is not the "reality of the moral idea," as Hegel pointed out. On the contrary, here ethics becomes the object of the domination of political power. In today's postmodernist era politics has prevailed over ethics. Today political power creates ethical values and moral ideas, instead of a genuine moral idea. In reality, power and desire are the criteria of all realities and this will have the same importance as the well-known expression of the magicians of the pharaohs transmitted by the holy text in the Qur'an:

He who kneels down today will surely prosper one day” (Qur’an XX: 64). The postmodernist attitude that many thinkers have treated as an insurmountable crisis of modern science. Philosophers have proved that modern empirical science has not been able to fully define these issues. In other words, the basic principles of modern science have not been enough for a given judgment to be undefined. In that instance, the question was posed as to whether some reality in general exists?! Whether reality is the criterion of human choice and desire, or is human will is the criterion of reality. If the latter is right, then man with his power and will will create reality. In our case this means that political power creates ethical values. The final conclusion illustrates the familiar framework of the newest links that have been established between ethics and science, including the science of politics. However, in the history of political thought, Machiavelli has presented the first theoretical foundations on the dominance of political science over ethics. These bases were later reinforced by Nietzsche in his writings, such as his famous and highly contradictory work “Desire for Power: An Attempt to Re-evaluate All Values” (2012)

4. Ethics and public relations

Ethics, this diminutive word but with such a broad concept. There are more definitions for this word, but as a common element of those definitions can be distinguished the difference between good and evil for the natural arrangement of what should represent value. For a person to perform his obligations in the ethical and moral aspect in his profession, he must know his ethical foundations. Therefore, today every profession has its own code of ethics - in the set of norms (guidelines) that are defined through ethical principles which should be followed or prohibit certain activities.

In the US, the first ever public relations practitioners’ focus was exclusively on hyperbole and sensationalism, so such reporting lacks truth and objectivity. Edward Bernays (the father of public relations) addressed this issue from 1850-1905 in "the public be informed era". The treatment of ethics gained momentum during the development of contemporary practice in 1906, with the introduction of the code of ethics of public relations. - Statement of Principles. The statement was compiled by Ivy Lee, who is also considered the contemporary founder of public relations. He has presented in his statements his philosophy which emphasizes that public relations practitioners have public responsibility which implies obligations to the client. It is also important to mention John Wiley Hill co-founder of the company Hill and Knowlton (1933), which has managed to become one of the world's largest public relations companies. Hill has based his public relations philosophy on four elements: strategic work planning sensitive to obstacles and circumstances for public policy, high standard of corporate responsibility, monitoring and communication issues.

4.1. Contemporary ethics in public relations

Public relations experts are taking an increasingly favorable position in today’s world in professional terms. Various companies, institutions and organizations are increasingly aware of the fact that good public relations is crucial in creating a respectable image and controlling obscene statements. More creators estimate that it is impossible for public relations to be

ethical and for ethics to be valued as its oxymoron, because the practice itself is like a sister to manipulations and propaganda. The current condition of ethics in public relations practice largely depends on the code of ethics compiled by professional organizations. Examples include the International Public Relations Association (IPRA) code of ethics. Membership joins voluntarily and those codes do not differ much from one country to another. Some plugs of the codex try to provide guidance of a practical professional nature, while others engage in defining general moral principles of ethical conduct, such as focusing on dignity and respect for human rights and honest communication. The International Association of Communication Affairs (IACA) has conducted researches on the topic of ethical communication. During these researches very important results have been achieved as 50% of respondents continuously advised their colleagues when making ethical decisions, about 65% have no education on ethics in the workplace, and even 70% of respondents have never learnt ethics.

4.2. How to progress ethically?

In the efforts of public relations experts, they have often encountered situations where the interest of the company or customers rely on concealing certain facts but here there is a risk of discovering the truth when the most valued ability comes to the fore.

PR experts escape from predicament situations and control levels when there are damages created. Although protecting the interests of the client and the company represents quite important sincerity, while it is the most common and best choice because it is determined to establish relationships with others. The key to the ethical advancement of public relations professionals is the recognition of internal and external public values and their utilization in the analysis of ethical dilemmas. Communication experts need to be careful about ethics before applying it in practice. The care and dedication of ethical analysis facilitates the creation of trust and in addition the creation of stable relationships that ultimately is in the function of public relations.

5. Political Ethics

Political ethics (sometimes referred to as political morality or public ethics), is the practice of making morality in general for political actions, and the study of the same practices. As a research problem, it is divided into two parts, each of which consists of multidimensional problems and from different study literature. The first direction is ethics as a process (or differently office ethics) which is focused on official public problems and the methods used for them. The rest is about ethics in politics (ethics and public policy), which is concentrated in policy studies and lawmaking. Both directions are developed in the field of principles and political philosophy, democratic theories and politics as a science. But political ethics consists in the freedom of research in the context of truth. Many scholars in this field do not apply fundamental theories of morality, but they are based on middle-level concepts and practices that are closest to political agencies and that imply political decision-making.

6. Conclusion

The main issue is the extent to which ethical principles govern in political offices and what is the difference of the governance and life morality in general (1978; 1987). In which direction are politicians obliged to take actions which would not be wrong? This is an important question of political ethics, especially for political leaders, to be fair and just, but it also obliges them to sacrifice their personal lives for the good of a nation. A president, for example, is morally obliged to undertake or order military action even though he knows that civilians may also suffer during it. (The dilemma of immorality becomes whether the war itself should be conducted only by respecting the theories of war?).

Similar problems also arise in the role of the individual in the corporation or his/her profession, who are forced to be more extreme or more open in political life. The scope and structure of modern politics means the multiplicity of cases from which different situations arise or are produced.

Ethical problems in public policy develop from two general public issues — that is, representation and organizational political character. Public political figures act for us, and act with others. Since action for us, denote the rights and obligations, which a citizen does not have, or does not possess them in a concrete case. Meanwhile, in dealing with others, we mean even actions when we are forced to use force, keep secrets, and perhaps break promises in the direction that would be wrong in private life. These issues that would be harmful to private life, especially in the principles of morality, create what in science is called the "problem of dirty hands." This problem has its origins in the world by principalities and kingdoms, who do so in order not to violate the traditional morality of the states that they represent during their rule. Machiavelli offers us a classic formulation. The problem carried in our time would be very dramatic, it would raise dilemmas of confrontations, just as Jean Paul Sartre realized the problem of the modern times. It is extremely important that some policy theorists suggest that the leaders of stable democracies may have hands that are not slightly polluted. In a rather influential formulation Michael Walzer (1973) argues that "the particular action of government can be exactly right, to develop in utilitarian terms, and then to produce the man who would feel morally guilty." In this view, the problem raises a paradox: that a politician must make a mistake in order to improve. The realm of morality in politics is the simultaneous combination of elements of consequentialism and deontology. It is not surprising that these two unstable mixtures are criticized by all scientific directions. Consequentialism means that after a justified action, the politician is not guilty of anything (even if he would feel guilty in himself). Deontology means the question of whether an action is proven wrong, a politician simply should not do it.

Democratic theories underline the issue that Walzer, in his critical philosophy points out that problems are distinguished in today's policies of the democratic systems (1987). Thus, Vallzer and other researchers suggest the key topics how to punish or bring to justice those with dirty hands. But leaders who have their hands dirty do so on behalf of the citizens, even with their approval (even if their decisions are undemocratic, the problem lies in the abuse of power and this is not a moral dilemma). In the context of democracy, the question is not what

citizens should do for leaders, but what citizens and the state should do to compensate victims of decisions or how citizens can hold accountable leaders who have made decisions even in a way secret. A generalized form of the problem of soiled hands lies in politics rather than in the dilemma of what is considered paradoxical or in how agents irregularize the leader as individuals in a democratic state. In general, the problem stems from the question of what actions are taken to justify meanings and decisions in politics. A very productive literature focuses on particular thoughts such as violence and segregation which are also moral issues but which can also be justified depending on the situation. Many issues always remain unjustified and torture is a typical example of this. But some theorists are focused on following Machiavelli in his extreme formulation that "when the end is good ... it always justifies the thought" (Machiavelli 1977).

Another similar point of view is that although the goal may be justifiable, it also depends on other factors, including recent expectations. For example, in public regardless of whether political determinations are justified, we must consider the importance of the ultimate goal;

- Having the alternative to achieve the goal;
- The identity of the victims of that decision;
- Responsibility from the decision
- Control of decisions taken (if the decision affects other official actions).

In a democratic arrangement, hidden habits (meaning manipulation and deception) require special attention, they protect citizens from collective judgments about mistakes in governance, including vices and violence (Mendus 2009).

The representative character of political morality, highlights a problem, which has a similar logical structure during the thinking/conclusion of the trial and is treated in a special way. Should representatives follow consistency or dictation? To gain and preserve morality (in a democracy a desired outcome), representatives must sometimes act regardless of judgment as to what is right or what is the general interest (a moral issue). The problem is more complex than that, because from this simple issue we come to the conclusion that the answer does not have only a single desire, therefore the representative persons have different approaches, ie subjective. As long as the problems of judgments or expected outcomes are actions defined in public policy but not in private life, problems of high moral standards refer to actions that are strictly defined in public life and then in private life (Mendus 2009).

Ethical principles, for example, the attempt to disclose information about oneself that may affect privacy, if they have been ordinary citizens. Public persons may be prohibited from exercising the post for personal gain in order to be unacceptable to the crowd. They may be responsible for the consequences, for which they have had little or no control, and for which they should apologize if it comes to privacy. A very sensitive issue of high moral standard are the rules of public governance, which refer to the ethics of governance (Spinoza 2001). Axis theme in this aspect is the regulation of conflicts of interest, watering, nepotism, external influences. Much of the work towards strict rules, based on logical or profoundly technical rules, are specific parts of governance ethics. Also, there are many theoretical problems that

begin at the conclusion of an action, such as the difference between Individual and Institutional corruption (Spinoza 2001). The paradigm of bribery in terms of corrupt individual motives today is seen as a moral punishment, which is the way to understand more complex forms of corruption that take place in campaign finance practices. Overall, the interrelationships between democratic theory and political ethics are very important in governance ethics. For example, the denial of extreme transparency affects the recognition and implementation of democratic norms in public policy, not only when it comes to public interests alone, but also when studying the fluidity of a political action. The nature of organizing a morality towards the public constitutes the second general part of the problem of ethics as a process, respectively it is about public responsibility. Here the difficulty or complication is not in the principles to be used, but which agencies to use. Like any kind of morality, political ethics means that every person you lead should be held accountable for the actions you take. But in morality towards the public these issues are seen differently. This is because different personalities in an organization contribute in different ways to achieve the goals and therefore it is difficult to identify the personalities who are responsible for an outcome. This is called the "multi-hand mixing problem". There are two different approaches to this issue. The collectivist approach (which was about an organized action) is treated more in the science of philosophy. This approach has two advantages: If we target only one organization, we will be able to identify the reasons for responsibility without examining the individual issue, and the reason which have the best capacity to prove they carry reforms. But, even if collectivity is ranked as an agent of morality as a person, that person is still a representative of individuality in an organization and consistent in being individually responsible. Consequently, in this way we cannot separate this part from individual responsibility.

Other scientists agree that with some modifications to the standard liability criteria, individual liability (including individual liability for collective action) can be preserved.

References

- [1]. Agani, Fehmi. 2002. Për shoqërinë civile. Biblioteka Kombëtare dhe Universitare e Kosovës, Prishtinë.
- [2]. Agani, Fehmi. 2002. Në rrjedha të mendimit sociologjik. Biblioteka Kombëtare dhe Universitare e Kosovës, Prishtinë.
- [3]. Hegel, Georg Vilhelm Fridrih. 2003. Aristoteli. Botimet Dritan, Tiranë.
- [4]. Hegel, Georg Vilhelm Fridrih. 1964, Osnove Crte Filozofije Prava. Sarajevo, Veselin Maslesha,
- [5]. Hume, David. 1930. An Equiry Concernin the Principles of morals. Chicago, The Open Court Publichin, Co.
- [6]. Kant, Imanuel. 1979. Kritika Praktičnog Uma. Beograg, Bigz.
- [7]. Machiavelli, Niccolo. 1977. Sundimtari. Prishtinë, Rilindja.
- [8]. Mendus, Susan. 2009. Politics and morality. Kembrich: UK: Policy.
- [9]. Spinoza, Baruch. 2001. Theological-Political Treatise. Indianapolis/Cambridge, Hacket Publishing Com.
- [10]. Weber, Max. 2004. The vocation Lectures. Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Co.