



FRIEDRICH NAUMANN
FOUNDATION For Freedom.

Western Balkans

Kriza izazvana korona virusom
kao kriza liberalizma?

Is the Coronavirus Crisis
a Crisis of Liberalism?



Prof. dr Klaus Dirksmajer / Prof. Dr. Claus Dierksmeier

Impresum / Imprint

Autor / Author

Porf. dr Klaus Dirksmajer / Prof. Dr. Claus Dierksmeier

Urednici / Editorial Team

Edita Barać-Savić
Mihael Roik / Michael Roick

Priprema za štampu / Layout

Dina dizajn

Štampa / Print

Grafipro

Tiraž / Number of copies

200

Izdavač / Publisher

Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom
Western Balkans
Bulevar Kneza Aleksandra Karadjordjevica 13/A8, 11040 Belgrade, Serbia
00 381 11 3066824
westbalkan@fnst.org
<http://westbalkan.fnst.org>

Facebook @FNFWesternBalkans

Twitter @FNFWestbalkans

YT /FreedomTVEurope

Autorsko pravo / Copyright © 2020

by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom

All rights reserved.

Ovaj članak odražava mišljenje autora i ne predstavlja nužno stav fondacije Friedrich Naumann za slobodu.

This article reflects the opinion of the author and does not necessarily represent the position of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom.

Klaus Dirksmajer

Kriza izazvana korona virusom
kao kriza liberalizma?

Claus Dierksmeier

Is the Coronavirus Crisis
a Crisis of Liberalism?

Predgovor

Klaus Dirksmajer (Claus Dierksmeier), profesor globalizacije i ekonomske etike na Univerzitetu u Tübingenu i bivši direktor Instituta globalne etike (2012-18), godinama je branio svoju ideju slobode kao vodeće vrednosti globalnosti.

Prema tome, individualna sloboda uvek uključuje odgovornost za njeno društveno i ekološki održivo korišćenje. Mora se izvagati kojim i čijim slobodama treba dati prioritet. Prema Dirksmajeru, prva stvar koja se računa je kvalitet—a ne količina—naših sloboda. Jer sloboda ne znači maksimiziranje mogućnosti nekolicine, već optimizovanje mogućnosti svih građana sveta.

U 2016. predstavio je „Kvalitativna sloboda—samoopredeljenje u kosmopolitskoj odgovornosti“, brilijantno osnovno delo za savremeni liberalizam, koje je od 2019. dostupno i na engleskom jeziku.¹

U ovom članku Dirksmajer jasno pokazuje praktičnu pogodnost svog kvalitativnog pristupa na primeru korona krize.

U sintezi slobode i odgovornosti koju on izvodi, privremena i dobro utemeljena ograničenja pojedinačnih sloboda ne treba shvatiti samo kao „neophodno zlo“ ili „nealternativno“ ograničenje, već kao veze svojstvene samoj ideji slobode.

Kako to? Da li je Dierksmajer slep za opasnosti od prevrata slobodnog poretka u autoritarizam, za razne napore i mere da se ova pandemija iskoristi kao izgovor za duboka ograničenja osnovnih prava? Nikako! Ovde je, prema Dirksmajeru, važno biti na oprezu.

Istovremeno, proporcionalni karantin sigurno može pogodovati slobodi: ako se umanji sloboda kupovine u buticima i hranjenja u restoranima, ali s druge strane jača sloboda da se ne razboliš ili čak izgubiš svoj život, onda ide klasa pre mase.

U slučaju slobode, kvalitativno vrednovanje mora prethoditi kvantitativnim merenjima. Centralno pitanje je koje su slobode i čije slobode uključene:

¹ Klaus Dirksmajer, „Kvalitativna sloboda – autonomija u kosmopolitskoj odgovornosti“; Springer, Hajdelberg / Njujork 2019

Foreword

For years, Claus Dierksmeier, Professor for Globalization Ethics at the University of Tübingen and former director of the Global Ethic Institute (2012-18), has defended his idea of freedom as the guiding value of globality.

Individual freedom always includes responsibility for its socially and ecologically sustainable use. In each case, he has said, which and whose freedoms should be given priority must be weighed up. According to Dierksmeier, it is the quality - and not the quantity - of our freedoms that matters most. After all, freedom does not mean maximising the options of the few, but optimising the opportunities of all global citizens.

In 2016, he published “Qualitative Freiheit - Selbstbestimmung in weltbürgerlicher Verantwortung,” a brilliant foundational work for contemporary liberalism, which has been available in English translation since 2019.¹

In this article, Dierksmeier vividly demonstrates the practicality of his qualitative approach, using the Corona crisis as an example.

In the synthesis of freedom and responsibility, he posits, temporary and well-justified restrictions on individual freedoms are not to be understood simply as ‘unavoidable’ or an ‘alternativeness’ constraint, but as bonds inherent in the very idea of freedom.

How so? Is Dierksmeier blind to the dangers of the overturning of free orders into authoritarianism, to the manifold efforts and the measures using this pandemic as a pretext for the far-reaching restriction of fundamental rights? Not at all! According to Dierksmeier, we must be on our guard here.

Nonetheless, a proportionate quarantine can certainly be conducive to freedom: if the freedom to shop in boutiques and eat in restaurants is curtailed, while on the other hand the freedom not to fall ill, or even lose one's own life, is strengthened, then class takes precedence over mass.

In the case of freedom, he says, qualitative evaluation must precede quantitative measurements. The central question is which freedoms and whose freedoms are at stake:

¹ Claus Dierksmeier, “Qualitative Freedom—Autonomy in Cosmopolitan Responsibility”; Springer, Heidelberg / New York 2019

„Jer, ako nam pravo na slobodu pripada kao osobi, onda pripada svim osobama. Dakle, tamo gde ograničavamo slobodu pojedinca na njenu kompatibilnost sa slobodom svih, univerzalna ideja slobode nije smanjena, već ostvarena. Ukratko: privremeno odustajanje od opcija koje ugrožavaju slobodu drugih da prežive mogu biti nezgodne. To nije napad na naš poredak slobode“.



Mihael Roik
Direktor kancelarije za Zapadni Balkan

“For if we are entitled to freedom simply as persons, then all persons are. Thus, where we limit individual freedom to its compatibility with the freedom of all, the universal idea of freedom is not reduced but realised. In short, temporarily giving up options that threaten the freedom of others to survive may be uncomfortable; but it is not an attack on our liberal order.”



Michael Roick
Head of Western Balkans Office

Klaus Dirksmajer

Kriza izazvana korona virusom kao kriza liberalizma?

Tokom krize izazvane virusom COVID-19 države su slobode svojih građana očito ograničavale na različite načine, na primer propisima u oblasti zdravstvene zaštite, odlukama o trijaži ili u odnosu na primenu digitalne tehnologije. Neke zemlje su usvojile autoritarne politike, dok su u drugim propisi koji su inače prihvaćeni bez pogovora izazvali populističke kontra-reakcije. Obe krajnosti predstavljaju izazov za „otvorena društva“.

U prvom – autoritarnom – slučaju, njihova sloboda je napadnuta direktno, u drugom – liberalnom – scenariju, napad je posredan: podrivanjem odgovornosti koja je neophodna za svako održivo očuvanje slobode. Oba zahtevaju kritiku ideje slobode na kojoj se zasnivaju otvorena društva.

Svako ko iz pandemije korona virusa želi da nauči kako se nositi sa budućim vanrednim stanjima bez narušavanja demokratskih institucija i pluralističkih kultura liberalnih društava, bi, prema mojoj tezi, krizu izazvanu korona virusom trebalo da analizira i kao izazov „otvorenog društva“ i temelja njegove legitimnosti.

Šta je na kocki?

Izuzetne i vanredne situacije predstavljaju velike izazove za sva društva. Međutim, dok se države organizovane po principu „komande i kontrole“ u kriznim trenucima lako oslanjaju na diktatorsko donošenje odluka i regulatorne procese, prelazak na „jasne naredbe odozgo“ teži je u otvorenim društvima. Ono što se u nedemokratskim društvima čini samo proširenjem već dominantne prakse vladanja, u pluralističkim demokratijama predstavlja skok u nepoznate oblike upravljanja. Dok se „tamo“ reč vlasti oduvek legitimisala (navodnim) boljim znanjem i umećem onih koji su na vlasti, takve strategije legitimisanja retko uspeavaju „ovde“, gde građani otvorenih društava sebe ne vide kao podanike ili maloletnike. To pokazuju i različite reakcije na

Claus Dierksmeier

Is the Coronavirus Crisis a Crisis of Liberalism?

During the COVID-19 crisis, states have restricted the freedoms of their citizens in strikingly different ways, such as through health policy regulations, triage decisions or the use of digital technology. Some countries have adopted authoritarian policies, while in others, largely uncomplainingly accepted regulatory requirements have provoked populist counter-reactions. Both extremes challenge 'open societies'.

In the first – authoritarian – case, freedom is directly attacked; in the second – libertarian – scenario, the attack is indirect: it undermines the responsibility that is indispensable to any sustainable preservation of freedom. Both require a critique of the idea of freedom on which open societies are based.

Anyone who wants to learn from the coronavirus pandemic how to cope with future states of emergency without damaging the democratic institutions and pluralistic cultures of free societies should, according to my thesis, also analyse the coronavirus crisis as a challenge to 'open society' and its foundations of legitimacy.

What is at stake?

Exceptional circumstances and emergency situations pose major challenges for all societies. However, while states organised according to the principle of 'command and control' easily rely on dictatorial decision-making and regulatory procedures in moments of crisis, the transition to 'directives from above' is more difficult in open societies. What appears to be merely an extension of already dominant governance practices in non-democratic societies, represents a leap into unfamiliar forms of governance in pluralistic democracies. While 'over there' the dictum of power has always been legitimised by the (supposedly) better knowledge and skills of those in power, such legitimisation strategies rarely work out 'over here', where citizens of open

način kojim država upravlja krizom u demokratskim društvima, koje, grubo pojednostavljeno, mogu da se podele u tri grupe.

Kao prvo, postoje zemlje poput Poljske i Mađarske, u kojima su vlade iskoristile krizu kako bi ubrzale već postojeće tendencije ka sve autoritarnijim stilovima upravljanja. Argument za opravdanje takvog razvoja bio je da se u interesu opšteg dobra ionako moramo odvojiti od prenatrženosti lične slobode. Kriza je to samo dodatno dokazala i pojačala potrebu za delovanjem.

Kao drugo, pogled na SAD pokazuje suprotnu sliku: društvo koje u ime slobode (suviše često shvaćene previše liberatarijanski) sve više pruža otpor merama nametnutim od strane vlasti, koji je usmeren kako protiv ograničenja individualne slobode kretanja, tako i protiv zahteva za većom ličnom odgovornošću građana jednih za druge.

Oba fenomena se međusobno podupiru. Tamo gde sloboda može da se prikaže kao neodgovorna sloboda kretanja, poziv za njenim autoritarnim ograničenjem uslediće u stopu. Obrnuto, tamo gde jačaju autoritarni sistemi, dolazi do pojačane reakcije društva protiv bilo kakvog ograničenja građanskih sloboda. I jedno i drugo ugrožava socijalnu ravnotežu između individualne slobode i društvene odgovornosti, koja je neizostavna ne samo za upravljanje tekućom krizom.

Kao treće, obe tendencije zastupljene su i u javnom mnjenju nekoliko zemalja koje su, svaka na svoj način, pronašle izlaz iz krize mimo diktature i haosa. I u Saveznoj Republici Nemačkoj su, na primer, neki tvrdili da je kriza dokaz dugo iščekivanog kraja (neo)liberalne ere, dok su drugi, nasuprot tome, glasno digli glas u prilog ideji slobode kako bi se suprotstavili ograničavanju svojih svakodnevnih aktivnosti proisteklom iz „fizičkog distanciranja“.

Iako su mnoge države Centralne Evrope uspele da – u praksi – postignu ravnotežu između lične slobode i društvene odgovornosti, ovu ravnotežu su – u teoriji – osporili disidenti, bilo negirajući (u autoritarnoj verziji) da je takva ravnoteža uopšte moguća, ili (u libertarijanskoj verziji) da je neophodna.

Takve rasprave pokazuju koliko je fragilan konsenzus na kome se zasnivaju otvorena društva. Činjenica da su one snage koje koketiraju sa političkim ekstremima ovde u Zapadnoj Evropi izražene manje nego drugde pruža samo slabu utehu. Jer, „otvoreno društvo“ može dugoročno da se sačuva samo tamo, gde se njegove ponekad neprijatne odluke u velikoj meri prihvataju dobrovoljno, tj. gde se za njih ne sumnja da podrivaju liberalni princip društvenog poretka ili deluju samo kao lažni kompromisi.

Stoga nije dovoljno da „establišment“ ostrakizuje autoritarne i liberalne krajnosti. Zapravo, ravnoteža između individualne slobode i društvene odgovornosti koja se dinamično prilagođava datoj situaciji može da

societies do not see themselves as subordinates or minors. This is also shown by the different relations to state crisis management in democratic societies, which, in broad terms, can be divided into three groups.

First, there are countries like Poland and Hungary, where governments used the crisis to accelerate already ongoing movements towards increasingly authoritarian styles of governance. The argument used to justify those developments was that, in the interest of the common good, one had to move away from an overemphasis on personal freedom anyway. The crisis only serves to prove this further and increases the pressure to act.

Second, a look at the USA shows the opposite picture: a society where, in the name of (an all too often narrowly libertarian conception of) freedom, many have put up quite some resistance to public health mandates, opposing both against restrictions on individual freedom of movement and against the demand for more personal responsibility of citizens for each other.

Both phenomena reinforce each other. Where the idea of liberty has been reduced to but an irresponsible freedom of movement, the call for its authoritarian restriction follows hot on its heels. Conversely, where authoritarian systems are on the rise, civil opposition against any and all restrictions on civil liberties grows. Either threatens the social balance of individual freedom and social responsibilities, which is essential for the management of society not only during the present crisis.

Third, both tendencies may be reflected in public opinion even in several countries that, each in its own way, found a viable way – beyond dictatorship and chaos – out of the crisis. In the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, some argued that the crisis was evidence of the overdue end of the (neo-)liberal era, while others, on the other hand, invoked the idea of freedom so as to oppose the reduction of their everyday options through ‘physical distancing’.

Although many countries in Central Europe succeeded – in practice – in achieving a balance between personal freedom and social responsibility, this balance was disputed – in theory – by dissidents, either (in the authoritarian version) by denying that such a balance was possible at all or (in the libertarian version) by denying it was necessary.

Such disputes show how fragile the background consensus of open societies is. The fact that those forces flirting with political extremes are weaker here in Western Europe than elsewhere is of little consolation. For an ‘open society’ can only be preserved in the long term where its at times unpleasant decisions are largely accepted voluntarily, i.e. where they are not suspected of undermining the liberal principle of social order or where they appear merely as faux compromises.

se ostvari samo snažnijom argumentacijom. Jer, samo ukoliko liberalna politika ume da bude i popularna, ne mora da se plaši populizma. Međutim, ona može biti popularna samo ako limitiranje individualne slobode kretanja ne predstavi prosto kao „nužno zlo“ ili „neizbežno ograničenje“ bez alternative, već kada je u stanju da ga definiše kao obavezu imanentnu samoj ideji slobode.

Zašto je potrebno filozofsko razmatranje

Bez teorijske sinteze između slobode i odgovornosti, oni teško da će moći da se povežu u praksi. I obrnuto: ako teorija slobode može da definiše jasne kriterijume za legitimno korišćenje slobode, to može da olakša njeno ostvarivanje u svakodnevnom životu i da ojača njeno prihvatanje od strane javnosti.

Svedoci smo da je kriza izazvana korona virusom dovela do suprotstavljanja različitih sloboda (npr. ekonomska sloboda malih i srednjih preduzeća ili sloboda kretanja i okupljanja širokog dela stanovništva, nasuprot pravu na zdravlje i preživljavanje posebno osetljivih građana, lekara i medicinskog osoblja). To pokazuje da opšta posvećenost slobodi kao principu otvorenih društava nikako nije dovoljna za donošenje konkretnih odluka tamo gde su slobode jednih suprotstavljene slobodama drugih. Kako bismo se bolje snašli u takvim slučajevima, trebalo bi prvo da se razjasni **koje** slobode i **čije** slobode se, u zavisnosti od primenjenog modela, jačaju ili slabe i prema kojim normativnim aspektima bi to trebalo da se proceni od slučaja do slučaja. Jer, kao što je poznato, u epidemijama i vanrednim situacijama teret krize retko pogađa sve građane podjednako, na primer bogate i siromašne, obrazovane i neobrazovane. To u slučaju KOVID-a 19 nije ništa drugačije.

Ovaj zaključak predstavlja problem kako za praksu, tako i za teoriju. Naime, tamo gde način na koji država upravlja krizom produbljuje postojeće nejednakosti, nezadovoljstvo stanovništva se brzo sa situacione kritike vlade proširuje na načelnu kritiku vrednosti i normi koje ista zagovara. Tako se kriza u otvorenim društvima brzo pretvara u krizu samog otvorenog društva, koja se hrani utiskom da sloboda toliko hvaljena od strane „elita“ u krajnjoj liniji služi samo njihovom interesu za očuvanje svojih stečenih dobara, ali ne i interesu „malog čoveka“. Kriza izazvana korona virusom može postati, odnosno doprineti krizi liberalizma.

Šta bi trebalo filozofski učiniti kako bi se rešio ovaj problem? Pre svega, teorija ne bi trebalo da stvara prepreke praksi sugerišući neizbežan antagonizam između slobode i odgovornosti. Umesto toga, trebalo bi da pokaže da postoji treći način koji objedinjuje oba cilja. Zatim bi o onome što mi ljudi dugujemo jedni

It is therefore not enough for the 'establishment' to ostracize authoritarian and libertarian extremes. Rather, the path of a dynamically and situationally adapting balance between individual freedom and social responsibility requires itself an argumentative buttressing. For only if liberalism knows how to be popular does it not need to fear populism. It can only be popular, however, if it does not simply present restrictions on individual freedom of movement as a 'necessary evil' or as a 'inevitable constraint' without alternative, but when it can identify them as bounds inhering the very idea of freedom.

Why philosophical reflection is needed

Without a theoretical synthesis between freedom and responsibility, their practical becomes precarious. And vice versa: if a theory of freedom can define clear criteria for the legitimate use of freedom, this can both facilitate its implementation in everyday life and strengthen its public acceptance.

The coronavirus crisis has brought different freedoms patently into competition (e.g. the economic freedom of small and medium-sized enterprises or the freedom of movement and association of broad sections of the population as opposed to the rights to health and survival of particularly vulnerable citizens, doctors and nurses). This shows that the general commitment to freedom as a principle of open societies is by no means sufficient to make concrete decisions where the freedoms of some conflict with the freedoms of others. In order to provide orientation in such cases, it would first be necessary to clarify **which** freedoms and **whose** freedoms are strengthened or weakened in each case – and according to which normative aspects this should be assessed respectively. For, as is well known, in epidemics and emergencies, the burden of crises rarely affects rich and poor, educated and uneducated citizens alike. This is no different with COVID 19.

This finding is a problem for both practice and theory alike. Where state crisis management reinforces existing inequalities, the population's discontent quickly spreads beyond situational criticism of the government to more general criticism of the values and norms it claims to uphold. A crisis in an open society quickly turns into a crisis of the open society itself, which feeds on the impression that the freedom much vaunted by the 'elites' ultimately only serves their vested interest, but does not cater to the 'little man'. Thus the coronavirus crisis can accentuate the crisis of liberalism.

drugima trebalo raspraviti u diskursu u kom se prinuda od strane države legitimiše i građanska odgovornost zahteva na način da se slobode svakog usklade sa slobodom i životnim šansama svih. Jer, tamo gde sloboda svih predstavlja normativno merilo javnih odluka, one verovatno bar u onoj meri nailaze na veće prihvatanje, u kojoj ne mogu da se odbace kao neliberalne, bar ne u dobroj veri.

Zašto nam je potrebna nova filozofija slobode...

Ako je, dakle, zadatak ponuditi teoriju koja neophodno ograničavanje individualnih sloboda u interesu opšte slobode čini verodostojnijim, dugo prevladavajuće teorije slobode „negativne“ naspram „pozitivne“ konotacije nisu od velike pomoći, jer se odlike „negativno“ i „pozitivno“ pri pblížem razmatranju baš i ne mogu najbolje spojiti sa interesima koje zagovaraju njihove pristalice.

Negativna sloboda naime uvek želi da zaštiti nešto **pozitivno** – neki lični prostor. Negirajući element je samo od sekundarne važnosti, usmeren protiv napada na slobode koje treba shvatiti primarno – i samim tim definisati pre svega pozitivno. Stoga je negativna sloboda definisana preko pozitivnog dobra koje štiti – iako možda nesvesno. Ona, osim toga, zavisi od pozitivnih sloboda. Na primer, već za kreiranje individualnog životnog plana, čije ostvarenje može da potpadne pod zaštitu „negativne“ slobode, potrebni su određeni preduslovi (poput doslednog formiranja mišljenja, discipline u sprovođenju, itd.). Njihovo postojanje takođe zavisi od „pozitivnih“ sloboda (na primer pristupa obrazovanju). Ono osim toga u širem smislu podrazumeva i dostupnost određenih osnovnih dobara (hrana, zdravstvena zaštita, itd.); a pouzdan i na krize otporan pristup tome pruža samo pozitivna sloboda.

Sloboda takođe mora da se odnosi i na stvari u svetu. Kako bi se one u tom procesu (negativno) zaštitile, moraju da se stvore odgovarajuće institucije, na primer za zaštitu imovine. Te pravne institucije, međutim, moraju biti legitimisane na takav način da i oni koji se takvim propisima stavljaju u nepovoljan položaj prihvate njihovu valjanost. To se često ostvaruje, na primer, kroz ravnopravnu participaciju koja se pak opet legitimiše teorijama pozitivne slobode.

Ukratko: Bez pozitivne slobode nema pravedne raspodele; bez toga nema održive zaštite individualne svojine i samorealizacije; a samim tim bez pozitivne slobode nema ni negativne slobode.

Stvari ne stoje ništa bolje sa teorijama pozitivne slobode. One, naime, prevazilaze konceptualni okvir negativne slobode na toliko načina da često ostaje nejasno šta im je od centralne važnosti. Teorije pozitivne

What would need to be done philosophically to address this problem? First of all, theory should not throw a cog into the wheel of practice by suggesting an inevitable antagonism between either freedom or responsibility. Rather, we need to show that there is a third way reaching both goals. Then, what we humans owe each other should be elaborated in a discourse in which state coercion is legitimised and civil responsibility is demanded in such a way that the freedoms of each are reconciled with the freedom and life chances of all. For where the freedom of all forms the normative yardstick for public decisions, these for their part should meet with increased acceptance insofar as they cannot be rejected as illiberal, at least not in good faith.

Why we need a new philosophy of freedom...

If this is the task – to offer a theory that makes the necessary restrictions of individual freedom in the interest of universal freedom more plausible – then the long-prevailing theories of freedom, 'negative' versus 'positive' versions, prove to be of little help, because the labels 'negative' and 'positive', on closer examination, hardly advance the interests of their proclaimers.

Negative freedom always wants to protect something **positive** – a personal space. The negating element is only of secondary importance, namely against attacks on a circle of freedom which is to be understood as **primary** – and thus first of all to be defined positively. Thus, negative freedom is defined by its positive object of protection – although perhaps unwittingly. Moreover, it depends on positive freedoms. Certain preconditions (such as consistent decision-making, discipline in execution, etc.) are imperative for the creation of an individual life plan, for example, the execution of which can then fall under the protection of 'negative' freedom. Their viability also depends on 'positive' freedoms (such as access to education), or, by extension, also implies the availability of certain basic goods (food, health, etc.); and only positive freedom grants crisis-proof, reliable access to the latter.

Freedom must also relate to objects in the world. In order to protect them (negatively) in this process, suitable institutions must be created, for the protection of property, for example. These legal institutions, however, must be legitimised in such a way that those disadvantaged by such regulations can accept their validity. This is often done by linking them to, for example, acts of distributive justice, which in turn are usually legitimised by theories of positive freedom.

slobode tako obično nude nekoliko sledećih dopuna negativne slobode: vezivanje volje za racionalnost, njenu orijentisanost prema moralnim zakonima i vrednostima, kolektivnu orijentisanost ka određenim kulturnim kontekstima i tradicijama, negovanje participativnih republikanskih modela upravljanja, omogućavanje pedagoških preduslova za autonomno odlučivanje, kao i kontrafaktičko stvaranje ekonomskih uslova privatne autonomije za sve i još mnogo toga. Međutim: oni koji odbacuju neke od ovih aspekata ne moraju odbiti sve; i obrnuto, oni koji zagovaraju neke od ovih dimenzija, ne moraju da se zalažu za sve njih. Otvoreno rečeno: pojam negativne slobode je jasan, ali sterilan; ideja pozitivne slobode je plodna, ali nejasna. Oboje su nezadovoljavajući.

Da li se usuditi i razviti novu teoriju?

Umesto neprikladnog obrasca negativne naspram pozitivne slobode, potrebna nam je razumljiva dijalektika između različitih dimenzija ideje slobode, koja je u stanju da na razumljiv način integriše njihove različite elemente. Iznad svega, mora biti moguće udovoljiti kako interesu za proširenje individualnog opsega delovanja (koji obično zagovaraju pristalice negativne slobode), tako i želji za odgovornim, na primer socijalno i ekološki održivim kreiranjem ličnih životnih šansi, kao i omogućavanju svima da žive u dostojanstvenoj autonomiji (dakle interesu zagovornika pozitivne slobode).

Za ovaj zadatak se kao teorijsko polazište nameće razlika između **kvantitativnog** shvatanja slobode koje je fokusirano na masu naših mogućnosti delovanja, i kvalitativnog shvatanja koje je bazirano na klasi naših životnih šansi. Kroz ovu razliku (ne: **dva** navodno samostalna koncepta slobode, već aspekata koje treba sačuvati u okviru **jedne** ideje slobode), prema mojoj tezi, mogu da se redefinišu globalne diskusije o posledicama kako pandemije KOVID-a 19 tako i drugih kriza na ličnu slobodu.

Ukratko, obrazloženje ovog pristupa je sledeće: u središtu koncepta slobode je tenzija koja neprestano mora da se rešava i koja može da se razreši integriranjem dveju tendencija koje izolovano ne dovode do željenog rezultata. Ta tenzija postoji između, **s jedne strane**, kvalitativnog razmatranja sloboda koje političke i ekonomske modele analizira sa aspekta mere u kojoj maksimiziraju mogućnosti individualnog izbora i minimiziraju socijalna ograničenja, i, **s druge strane**, kvalitativne obaveze favorizovanja određenih vrsta sloboda (npr. održivih, odgovornih oblika) nad drugim.

In short: without positive freedom there is no distributive justice; without this there is no sustainable protection of individual property and self-realization; and thus without positive freedom there is no negative freedom.

Theories of positive freedom are not much better. They go beyond the conceptual framework of negative freedom in so many ways that it often remains unclear what is of central importance to them. Positive freedom theories usually offer several of the following additions to negative freedom: the binding of the will to rationality, its orientation towards moral laws and values, the collective orientation towards certain cultural contexts and traditions, the maintaining of participatory republican models of government, the granting of the pedagogical prerequisites for autonomous decision-making, creating economic opportunities for all, and much more. However, those who reject some of these aspects do not have to reject all of them; and conversely, those who advocate some of these dimensions do not have to argue for all of them. To put it bluntly: the concept of negative freedom is clear but sterile; the idea of positive freedom is fruitful but unclear. Both are unsatisfactory.

Dare to make a theoretical new start?

Instead of the unsuitable scheme of negative versus positive freedom, we need a comprehensible dialectic between the different dimensions of the idea of freedom, which is able to plausibly integrate its diverging elements. Above all, it must be possible to do justice to both the interest in expanding the individual scope of options (typically advocated by friends of negative freedom) and the desire for responsibility, for example: the socially and ecologically sustainable shaping of personal life chances as well as the empowerment of all to live in dignified autonomy (i.e. the concerns of supporters of positive freedom).

The theoretical lens for this task is the distinction between a **quantitative** understanding of freedom that focuses on the mass of our options for action and a **qualitative** understanding of freedom that focuses on the class of our life chances. Through this distinction (not of two supposedly independent concepts of freedom, but of the aspects to be preserved within one idea of freedom) global debates on the effects of both the COVID-19 pandemic and other crises of personal freedom can be redefined, I hold.

The rationale for this approach, in brief, is as follows: at the centre of the concept of freedom is a tension which must be constantly negotiated anew, and which can only be resolved by integrating two

U svetlu ovog terminološkog reformatiranja brzo postaje jasno da kvantitativna perspektiva (u odnosu na opcije koje pojedinci uvek moraju da zadrže, čak i u kriznim vremenima) ne može da se smatra jedinim odlučujućim faktorom, već mora da se posreduje pomoću kvalitativnih procena (u odnosu na prirodu i kvalitet tih opcija). Čist kvantitet ne može da se poima; on je uvek kvantitet nečega što je opet kvalitativno određeno. Utoliko kvalitativni momenat konceptualno stoji na prvom mestu. Obrnuto, međutim, kvalitet se ne može u potpunosti razumeti bez definisanja gde se nešto određeno završava razgraničavanjem od drugog: kvantitet je suštinski deo kvalitativnog. Rezultat: kvalitativno **odmeravanje** dolazi pre kvantitativnog **vaganja** – ali ne može bez njega.

Ako se ove kategoričke odredbe primene na koncept slobode, to omogućava nijansiranu formulaciju odnosa između individualne slobode i društvene odgovornosti. Ukoliko se oba aspekta podvedu pod okrilje kvalitativnog, može da se razreši inače apstraktna suprotnost između *ili* manje slobode *ili* manje odgovornosti.

Prema tome, o odnosu između javnog zdravlja i slobode (kao u vreme pandemije korona virusa), kolektivne sigurnosti i slobode (kao u slučaju terorizma) i nacionalne kulture i kosmopolitske slobode (na primer u odnosu na migracije) i na kraju ekološke održivosti i ekonomske slobode (u raspravama o globalnom zagrevanju) ne bi trebalo da razmišljamo čisto kvantitativno i da se pretvaramo da svi ti ciljevi i vrednosti mogu da se ostvare samo smanjenjem slobode ili, obrnuto, da je sloboda dostižna samo umanjem tih ciljeva i vrednosti. Umesto toga, naše pitanje mora da glasi kako ideja slobode može interno da se kvalifikuje na način da se prioritizuju, odnosno prvenstveno stvaraju određeni oblici slobode koji su u skladu sa navedenim ciljevima.

Međutim, kako se pri tome autonomna srž ideje slobode ne bi prokockala heteronomnim definicijama, ove konkretizacije moraju da proisteknu iz same slobode i preko nje. I to takođe, ali nikako isključivo, u proceduralnom smislu: participativne procedure ideji slobode treba da daju konkretne obrise. Ali to nije dovoljno. Njima je sa svoje strane, na primer za ustavno-pravnu koordinaciju i praktičnu koherentnost, potrebna normativna tačka konvergencije. A ona proističe iz prava pojedinca na slobodu. Ukratko: sloboda treba da bude razlog, granica i merilo sopstvenih ograničenja. Kako se to može postići?

Prema klasično-liberalnom tumačenju, sloboda se pojedincima ne daje na osnovu njihove klasne, polne, religijske, etničke ili druge pripadnosti, već prosto **kao** osobama. Ali, ako se zahtev za slobodom pravda upravo na ovaj način, onda to mora da važi za **sve** osobe; za one koje su od nas prostorno, vremenski ili civilizacijski udaljene, kao i one sa kojima smo već u bliskim odnosima. Tačnije rečeno: ljudi pravo na

tendencies which founder in isolation. This tension runs between, **on the one hand**, a quantitative consideration of freedoms, which analyses political and economic models in terms of the extent to which they maximise individual choices and minimise social constraints, and, **on the other hand**, a qualitative obligation to favour certain types of freedoms (e.g. sustainable, responsible forms) over others.

In the light of this terminological reformatting, it quickly becomes clear that the quantitative perspective (with regard to the options that individuals must always retain, even in times of crisis) cannot be seen as the sole deciding factor, but must be conveyed with qualitative considerations (with regard to the nature and quality of those options). Pure quantity cannot be thought; it is always the quantity of something that is itself qualitatively determined. Insofar the qualitative moments come first conceptually. Conversely, however, quality cannot be fully conscribed without showing where a certain something ends by distinguishing it from others: Quantity belongs to the essence of the qualitative. As a result, qualitative **evaluation** precedes but never precludes quantitative **weighing**.

If these categorical provisions are applied to the concept of freedom, this allows a nuanced formulation of the relationship between individual freedom and social responsibility. Insofar as both aspects are brought to bear under the aegis of the qualitative, the otherwise abstract opposition between **either** a reduction of freedom or a reduction of responsibility can be resolved.

So we should not think in purely quantitative terms of the relationship between public health and freedom (as in the times of the coronavirus pandemic), collective security and freedom (as in the case of terrorism) and national culture and cosmopolitan freedom (as in the case of migration, for example), and finally environmental sustainability and economic freedom (in debates on global warming), and pretend that all these goals and values are only achievable by a reduction of freedom or, conversely, that freedom is achievable only by a rescinding these goals and values. Rather, our question must be how the idea of freedom can be qualified internally so that certain forms of freedom are prioritised or primarily created in harmony with the stated goals.

However, in order not to gamble away the autonomous core of the idea of freedom through heteronomous definitions, these concretisations must be made from and through freedom itself. This is meant also, but by no means only, procedurally: participatory procedures are to give the idea of freedom its concrete contours. But that is not enough: for their part, they need a normative lodestar, for instance, for their practical coherence and constitutional coordination, which in turn is indebted to the individuals' right to freedom. In

slobodu za sebe mogu *individualno* da zahtevaju upravo kada dozvole da ona bude *univerzalno* validna. Iz ove imanentne kvalifikacije lične kroz univerzalnu slobodu sledi (vremenski) njena *međugeneracijska*, kao i (prostorno) njena *kosmopolitska* odgovornost. Ova – kvalitativna – obaveza mora da se ispuni pre nego što bi se krenulo u – kvantitativno – proširenje dotičnih opcija.

Rezultat dosadašnjih razmatranja: stvaranje, jačanje i zaštita životnih šansi za sve sada više ne deluje kao loša prepreka, već kao ciljno orijentisana deonica na putu ka doslednoj realizaciji ideje slobode. Drugim rečima: sloboda obavezuje; odgovornost oslobađa.

Kvalitativna percepcija koncepta slobode zahteva da se pojedinačne slobode osmisle na način da se pri tome poštuju slobode svih uključenih, kako u pogledu procedure, tako i u pogledu sadržaja. Oni koji su pasivno pogođeni odlukama imaju pravo i treba im dati sredstva za aktivno bavljenje tim odlukama; bar zato da neophodni propisi ne budu odbačeni kao spoljne barijere, već priznati kao samonametnute obaveze.

Tako bi se u pluralističkim društvima jedinstvo ideje slobode moglo sačuvati zajedno s različitim oblicima njenom ostvarivanja, koji se razlikuju od mesta do mesta i od vremena do vremena. U skladu sa principom supsidijarnosti, ovo nije samo korisno u normativnom smislu, već i efikasno. Ono podstiče i ohrabruje da se za rešavanje socijalnih problema primene decentralizovane, eksperimentalne strategije kod kojih država ne nastupa kao jedina koja rešava probleme, već se sve više oslanja na civilno društvo i ekonomiju. Konačno, postaje sve jasnije da lokalno utemeljeno i kontekstualizovano znanje može poboljšati donošenje odluka u društvu i na koji način je to moguće. Takvi ko-kreativni pristupi upravljanja su, međutim, izuzetno retki u tradicionalnim, a posebno u „negativnim“ teorijama slobode. A to se mora promeniti, ako sloboda želi biti – i ostati – ideal ne samo **za** građane otvorenih društava, već i **od** njih.

Koje probleme treba rešavati?

Moć teorije kvalitativno-*i*-kvantitativne slobode koja je ovde predstavljena ne može se detaljno dokazivati u okviru ovog kratkog teksta, ali svakako se može pokazati u odnosu na pandemiju korona virusa. Sa teorijom kvalitativne slobode u fokus konstruktivne javne rasprave o politikama suzbijanja korona virusa dospevaju posebno sledeće tačke:

short: freedom must be the reason, boundary and measure of their own limitations. How can this be achieved?

According to a classical liberalism, freedom is not owed to individuals on the basis of their class, gender, religion ethnicity, etc., but simply as persons. But if the claim to freedom is justified in exactly this way, then this must apply to **all** persons; to those who are distant from us in terms of space, time or civilisation, as well as to those with whom we are already in close relation. To put it more succinctly: people can legitimately claim their *individual* freedoms precisely when they pursue it in **universally** valid forms. From this immanent qualification of personal by universal freedom follows (temporally) their *intergenerational*, as well as (spatially) their *cosmopolitan* responsibility. This – qualitative – obligation must be enforced before one starts – quantitatively – to expand the options in question.

The result of the considerations so far: the creation, strengthening and protection of life chances for all no longer appears to be deviating from but directing us on the way to a consistent realisation of the idea of freedom. In other words: freedom obliges; responsibility liberates.

The qualitative perception of the concept of freedom requires that individual freedoms be designed in such a way that the freedoms of all those involved are respected, both in terms of procedure and content. Those who are passively affected by decisions have the right and should be given the means to actively effect these decisions; if only so that necessary regulations are not rejected as external barriers but are recognised as self-imposed commitments.

In pluralistic societies, the unity of the idea of freedom could thus be preserved together with the diversity of its forms of application, which vary from place to place and from time to time. In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, this is not only normatively adequate but also efficient. It empowers and encourages the use of decentralised, experimental strategies to tackle social problems, where the state does not act as the sole problem solver but increasingly relies on civil society and the economy. Finally, it is becoming increasingly clear both that locally embedded and contextualised knowledge can improve social decision-making and how that functions. Such co-creative approaches to governance, however, are extremely rare in traditional, and especially 'negative', theories of freedom. And that must change if freedom is to be – and remain – an ideal not only for citizens of open societies, but also of them.

- **Digitalizacija:** Predstoje rasprave o kompatibilnosti digitalnog rada i obrazovanja sa socijalnošću i vnmrežnim susretima. Uvek bi trebalo da se zapitamo: koje se slobode time proširuju ili smanjuju? Koji su socijalni i ekološki uticaji povećane digitalizacije izazvane krizom i čije će slobode kao rezultat biti podsticane ili ograničene?
- **Korisnost nasuprot autonomiji:** Ko ima pravo da okonča ljudski život i zašto, kada sloboda jednih da prežive i sloboda drugih da žive dobro dođu u međusobni sukob u uslovima oskudne medicinske nege? Kada socijalna korisnost mora da zauzme mesto iza dostojanstva i autonomije pojedinca? Ovo pitanje ne može da se reši bez pribegavanja konceptu slobode koji kvalitativno uzima u obzir prava i odgovornosti svih uključenih i ne samo, u čisto kvantitativnom smislu, maksimizira interese određenih krugova.
- **Kauzalnost i kontrafaktičnost:** Protivnici „zatvaranja“ (*lockdown*) tvrdili su da su preduzete mere donele više štete nego koristi. Da li je to tačno? Kako se korist ili šteta odabranog puta uopšte može uporediti i odmeriti sa koristima puta kojim se nije išlo? Pri tome se odluke uvek donose uz nesigurnost koja postoji u odnosu na puteve kauzalnosti, čiji se tok obično procenjuje misaonim eksperimentima punim kontrafaktičkih hipoteza i statistikama baziranim na njima. Ko ima pravo ili slobodu da daje takve procene? To u jednom otvorenom društvu ne sme da se radi na tehnokratski način, već se mora sprovesti demokratski – a normativni princip za to je autonomija svih.
- **Smanjenje rasta, de-globalizacija, usporavanje:** Da li bi trebalo da usporimo naše društvene procese (na primer, radi slobode da usvojimo kontemplativniji ili društveniji način života), da pređemo na manji rast (da bismo životnoj sredini dali prostor za disanje i podržali autohtone oblike proizvodnje) ili da de-globalizujemo (da bi afirmisali lokalne kulture i ekonomsku samodovoljnost, posebno u pogledu zdravstvene zaštite ili strateških dobara)? Procena ovih alternativa mora uzeti u obzir da li i kako utiču na slobode svih, ne samo onih privilegovanih da uživaju u blagodatima takvih promena (bez većih troškova ili odricanja sa njihove strane).

Sve gore pomenute problemske oblasti zahtevaju dublju analizu sloboda na koje se pozivaju kako branitelji *statusa kvo*, tako i njegovi kritičari. Pri odlučivanju bi legitimitet relevantnih (kvantitativnih) ograničenja građanskih sloboda trebalo da proizlazi iz samog koncepta slobode, povlačenjem (kvalitativnih) kontura individualne slobode u svetlu ideje univerzalne slobode. Uostalom, nije stvar samo u garantovanju postojećih sloboda nekolicini, već u slobodi i autonomiji svih ljudi, uključujući buduće generacije.

Which problems need to be addressed?

The power of the theory of qualitative-*cum*-quantitative freedom presented here cannot be demonstrated in all details in the context of this short text, but it can be showcased with regard to the coronavirus pandemic. With the theory of qualitative freedom, the following points in particular are put on the agenda of a constructive public discussion on coronavirus policy.

- **Digitisation:** Discussions on the compatibility of digital work and education with sociality and offline encounters are imminent. We should always ask: which freedoms are thus extended or reduced in each case? What are the social and environmental impacts of the increased digitisation caused by the crisis, and whose freedoms will be promoted or hindered as a result?
- **Utility versus autonomy:** Who has the right to end human life, and why, when the freedom of some to survive and the freedom of others to live well come into conflict with each other in the face of scarce medical care? When must social utility take second place to the dignity and autonomy of individuals? This question cannot be resolved without recourse to a concept of freedom that qualitatively takes into account the rights and responsibilities of all those involved and does not merely, in purely quantitative terms, maximise the interests of certain circles.
- **Causality and counterfactuals:** Opponents of the lockdown claimed that the measures taken caused more harm than good. Is this true? How can the benefits and harms of the path taken be compared and weighed against those of the path not taken? Such decisions must always be made under uncertainty about causality paths, the course of which is usually estimated by thought experiments replete with counterfactual hypotheses and statistics based on them. Who has the right or freedom to make such assessments? In an open society, this must not be done in a technocratic way, but has to be carried out democratically – and the normative principle for this process is the autonomy of all.
- **De-growth, de-globalisation, slowing down:** Should we slow down our social processes (for example, for the sake of the freedom to adopt a more contemplative or sociable lifestyle), switch to less growth (to give the environment a respite and support indigenous forms of production), or de-globalise (to affirm local cultures and economic self-sufficiency, especially in terms of health care or strategic goods)? The assessment of these alternatives must take into account whether and how they affect the freedoms of

Odlučujuća strateška i komunikativna prednost ovog novousmerenog shvatanja slobode leži u odbacivanju stava da se moralna, socijalna i ekološka održivost, građanska odgovornost, sigurnost i zdravlje mogu steći samo po cenu slobode. Čini se da je u tom pogrešnom misaonom okviru podržanom od strane kako libertarijanaca tako i autoritaraca, građanska sloboda u neizbežnom sukobu sa svim ostalim što je ljudima vredno.

Zbog toga moramo da pokažemo da je sloboda u osnovi pogrešno shvaćena sve dok one koji su pogođeni njenim regulisanjem ne pretvorimo u učesnike u njenom oblikovanju – u skladu s jednakim pravom na slobodu svih građana sveta da se razlikuju lokalno, nacionalno i regionalno. Tamo gde se lokalno ostvarivanje slobode u svetlu njenih globalnih efekata uređuje i za nju odgovara kosmopolitski, iz toga rezultirajuće zabrane i ograničenja individualne slobode kretanja niti mogu da se ozloglase kao nelegitimna, niti da se – posebno u pogledu planetarne dimenzije suzbijanja pandemije – odbace kao neadekvatne problemu.

Stoga teorija slobode fokusirana na globalnu odgovornost, koja slobodu na lokalnom nivou prvo kvalitativno oblikuje sa aspekta prava svih građana sveta, pre nego što nas podstakne i ohrabri da njen lokalni radijus kvantitativno optimiziramo u zavisnosti od konteksta, i libertarijance i autoritarce podjednako postavlja na svoja mesta.

Kratak rezime

Izneo sam argument da kriza izazvana korona virusom ne može pravilno da se razume i savlada bez razmatranja dugogodišnje krize ideala slobode u otvorenim društvima. Međutim, tradicionalni obrazac razlikovanja „negativne“ naspram „pozitivne“ slobode u ovom kontekstu nije od velike pomoći, jer je semantički neprecizan i činjenično obmanjujući time što stvara pogrešan utisak da negativna sloboda može postojati bez pozitivne slobode.

U dosadašnjoj diskusiji o slobodi preovlađujuća nastojanja (numerička maksimizacija i sadržinska optimizacija) mogu se mnogo bolje obuhvatiti kategorijama kvantiteta i kvaliteta. Međutim, jasno je da je teorija koja se fokusira samo na masu, a ne i na klasu naših opcija neizvodljiva. Umesto toga, moramo početi sa odmeravanjem kvaliteta šansi za liberalan život koje želimo da obezbedimo jedni za druge, kako bi zatim – demokratski, a ne tehnokratski – odredili kako kvantitativno možemo da definišemo, proširimo i održivo oblikujemo prostor tih željenih šansi.

all, not only those privileged enough to enjoy the benefits of such changes (without major costs or sacrifices on their part).

All of the above-mentioned problem areas require a deeper analysis of the freedoms cited by both the defenders and the challengers of the *status quo*. For the decision-making process, the legitimation of the relevant (quantitative) restrictions of civil liberties should result from the concept of freedom itself, by drawing the (qualitative) contours of individual freedom in the light of the idea of universal freedom. After all, it is not just a matter of guaranteeing extant freedoms to a few, but of the freedom and autonomy of all people, including future generations.

The decisive strategic and communicative advantage of this reorientation of the understanding of freedom lies in the rejection of the view that moral, social and ecological sustainability, civil responsibility, security and health can all only be acquired at the price of freedom. In that misguided mental framework, maintained by libertarians and authoritarians alike, civil freedom seems to be in inevitable conflict with everything else that people hold dear.

That is why we must show that freedom is fundamentally misunderstood as long as we fail to include those affected by its regulation as participants in their making – according to the equal right to freedom of all world citizens to differentiate themselves locally, nationally and regionally. Where the local use of freedom is globally oriented and answered for in the light of its cosmopolitan effects, the resulting ties and restrictions on individual freedom of movement can neither be repudiated as illegitimate nor – especially with regard to the planetary dimension of pandemic control – dismissed as inadequate to the problem.

Liberals and authoritarians alike are thus equally constrained by a theory of freedom geared to their global responsibility, which first qualitatively conscribes freedom in terms of the rights of all world citizens, before empowering and encouraging us to quantitatively optimise, varying according to context, its local radius.

Brief summary.

I have argued that the coronavirus crisis cannot be properly understood and managed without addressing the long-standing crisis of the ideal of freedom in open societies. However, the traditional template of

Na ovaj način se može pokazati da određena ograničenja individualne slobode kretanja i nekoliko društvenih ograničenja lične autonomije nisu negacija slobode ako su sprovedena u svetlu prava svih građana sveta da žive u slobodi. Tamo gde politika slobode građana konkretizuje u kosmopolitskoj odgovornosti, može da se ostvari teška ravnoteža između očuvanja pluralizma otvorenih društava i istovremenog omogućavanja dovoljne unutrašnje kohezije i spoljne saradnje kako bi se trenutna pandemija i buduće krize savladale u odgovornoj slobodi.

distinguishing between 'negative' and 'positive' freedom is not very helpful in this context, because it is semantically imprecise and substantially misleading, giving the mistaken impression that negative freedom can exist without positive freedom.

The efforts that have been prioritised in the discussion of freedom so far (numerical maximisation and optimisation of content) can be captured far better by the categories of quantity and quality. However, it is clear that a theory that focuses only on the number and not also on the nature of our options is unworkable. Instead, we must begin by weighing up the quality of liberal life chances that we want to secure for each other, and then – democratically, not technocratically – determine how we can quantitatively define, expand and sustainably shape the space of these desired chances.

In this way, it can be shown that certain restrictions on individual freedom of movement and several social bonds of personal autonomy are not a negation of freedom if they are made in the light of the right of all world citizens to live in freedom. Where politics concretises citizens' liberties in cosmopolitan responsibility, the difficult balance of preserving the pluralism of open societies and at the same time enabling sufficient internal cohesion and external cooperation to deal with the current pandemic and future crises in responsible freedom can be achieved.

Napomene

1. Uporedi Karl Raimund Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Princeton, New Jersey 2013 (prvo izdanje: 1945).
2. Uporedi Ivan Krastev and Stephen Holmes, *The Light That Failed: Why the West Is Losing the Fight for Democracy*, New York 2019.
3. Uporedi Pankaj Mishra, *Age of Anger*, London / New York 2017.
4. O aktuelnom stanju diskusije, vidi Ian Carter, Matthew H. Kramer and Hillel Steiner, *Freedom: A Philosophical Anthology, Malden, Massachusetts* 2007, str. 4-5.
5. Uporedi Joseph Raz, *The Morality of Freedom*, Oxford 1986, str. 408.
6. Uporedi Stanley Isaac Benn, *A Theory of Freedom*, Cambridge; New York 1988; Raz, *Morality*, str. 407.
7. Uporedi Philippe van Parijs, *Real Freedom for All: What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism?*, Oxford; New York 1995, str. 22.
8. Uporedi Gerald Allan Cohen, *Self-Ownership, Freedom, and Equality*, Cambridge; Paris; New York 1995.
9. Detaljnije: Claus Dierksmeier: *Qualitative Freiheit – Selbstbestimmung in weltbürgerlicher Verantwortung*, Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2016.
10. Uporedi Neera Chandhoke, "Putting Civil Society in Its Place", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44 / 2009: 12-16
11. Uporedi Amartya Sen, *Rationality and Freedom*, Boston MA 2002.
12. Uporedi Comor, E., "The Role of Communication in Global Civil Society': Forces, Processes, Prospects", *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 / 2001: 389-408
13. Slični argumenti u: Thomas Pogge, *Freedom From Poverty as a Human Right: Who Owes What to the Very Poor?*, New York (UNESCO) 2007; Philip Pettit, *Just Freedom. A Moral Compass for a Complex World*, New York 2014.

Comments

1. cf. Karl Raimund Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Princeton, New Jersey 2013 (First edition: 1945).
2. cf. Ivan Krăstev und Stephen Holmes, *The Light That Failed: Why the West Is Losing the Fight for Democracy*, New York 2019.
3. cf. Pankaj Mishra, *Age of Anger*, London / New York 2017.
4. On the current state of discussion see Ian Carter, Matthew H. Kramer und Hillel Steiner, *Freedom: A Philosophical Anthology, Malden, Massachusetts* 2007, p. 4-5.
5. cf. Joseph Raz, *The Morality of Freedom*, Oxford 1986, p. 408.
6. cf. Stanley Isaac Benn, *A Theory of Freedom*, Cambridge; New York 1988; Raz, *Morality*, p. 407.
7. cf. Philippe van Parijs, *Real Freedom for All: What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism?*, Oxford; New York 1995, p. 22.
8. cf. Gerald Allan Cohen, *Self-Ownership, Freedom, and Equality*, Cambridge; Paris; New York 1995.
9. In detail: Claus Dierksmeier: *Qualitative Freiheit – Selbstbestimmung in weltbürgerlicher Verantwortung*, Bielefeld: Publishing House Transcript, 2016.
10. cf. Neera Chandhoke, "Putting Civil Society in Its Place", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44 / 2009: 12-16
11. cf. Amartya Sen, *Rationality and Freedom*, Boston MA 2002.
12. cf. Comor, E., " 'The Role of Communication in Global Civil Society': Forces, Processes, Prospects", *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 / 2001: 389-408
13. Similar arguments in: Thomas Pogge, *Freedom from Poverty as a Human Right: Who Owes What to the Very Poor?*, New York (UNESCO) 2007; Philip Pettit, *Just Freedom. A Moral Compass for a Complex World*, New York 2014.

Biografija

Prof. dr Klaus Dirksmajer je profesor globalizacije i ekonomske etike na **Univerzitetu u Tübingenu**, u Nemačkoj. Njegova područja stručnosti i akademskog rada uključuju političku, ekonomsku i religijsku filozofiju sa posebnim fokusom na teorije slobode i odgovornosti u doba globalnosti. Od 2012. do 2018. bio je i direktor Globalnog etičkog instituta u Tübingenu. Od 2002-2012. predavao je kao profesor na Stonehill koledžu u Istonu / Boston, Massachusetts (Stonehill College, Easton/ Boston, Massachusetts), a od 2011. kao redovni profesor ("Uvaženi profesor za etiku globalizacije"). Između ostalog, član je istraživačke grupe „Etika na delu za održivi i integralni razvoj“, koju su sazvale Vatikanska akademija nauka i Mreža rešenja za održivi razvoj Ujedinjenih nacija / UN-SDSN, član je i naučnog savetodavnog odbora GVO (Ekonomija za opšte dobro). Iz njegovog obimnog naučnog rada posebno se ističu dve monografije: „Kvalitativna sloboda - autonomija u kosmopolitskoj odgovornosti“; Springer, Heidelberg / Njujork 2019. i „Preoblikovanje ekonomske etike - filozofske osnove humanističkog upravljanja“. London / Njujork: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, 2016. (London / New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, 2016).



Više o radu profesora Dirksmajera možete pronaći na sledećim linkovima:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Claus_Dierksmeier

<https://uni-tuebingen.academia.edu/ClausDierksmeier>

Biography

Prof. Dr. Claus Dierksmeier is Professor for Globalization Ethics at the **University of Tübingen** in Germany. His areas of expertise and academic work include political, economic, and religious philosophy with a particular focus on the theories of freedom and responsibility in the age of globality. From 2012 to 2018 he was also Director of the Global Ethic Institute in Tübingen. From 2002-2012 he taught at Stonehill College in Easton/Boston, Massachusetts. He is, among other things, a member of the research group "Ethics in Action for Sustainable and Integral Development", convened by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network/UN-SDSN, as well as a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of the HMN (Humanistic Management Network). From his extensive scientific work, two monographs are particularly noteworthy: "Qualitative Freedom - Autonomy in Cosmopolitan Responsibility"; Springer, Heidelberg / New York 2019 and "Reframing Economic Ethics - The Philosophical Foundations of Humanistic Management". London / New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers, 2016.

Dierksmeier's works can be accessed online via the two following links:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Claus_Dierksmeier

<https://uni-tuebingen.academia.edu/ClausDierksmeier>

