

**UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE**

PhD THESIS

SUMMARY

SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR

Prof. Univ. PhD. LIVIU-PETRU ZĂPĂRȚAN

Drd.Fărcaș I.E. Ioan

CLUJ-NAPOCA

2012

**UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE**

**THE APPEARANCE OF PLURALISM THESIS IN THE
MODERN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
SUMMARY**

SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR

Prof. Univ. PhD. LIVIU-PETRU ZĂPĂRȚAN

Drd. FĂRCAȘ I.E. IOAN

CLUJ-NAPOCA

2012

CONTENT

Content.....	p. 3
Chapter. I. References to the political pluralism.....	p. 4
1. Roots of pluralism.....	p. 5
2. The democratization of the society.....	p. 27
Chapter. II. European model of pluralism.....	p. 61
1. The appearance of the pluralist flow.....	p. 61
2. Pluralism at Isaiah Berlin.....	p. 82
Chapter. III. Political pluralism in U.S.A.....	p. 119
1. The theory of the American pluralism.....	p. 119
2. Rethinking of pluralism.....	p. 146
3. Pluralist democracy and sovereignty.....	p. 154
Chapter. IV. Tolerance.....	p. 166
1. Introduction.....	p. 166
2. The problem of tolerance at the great thinkers.....	p. 171
3. Tolerance – pluralism – human rights.....	p. 183
Conclusions.....	p. 188
Bibliography.....	p. 207

Keywords: *pluralism, democratization, personalism, pluralist democracy, sovereignty, tolerance, human rights.*

SUMMARY

The appearance of pluralist thesis in modern political philosophy

The theme of the present paper is represented by `the appearance of pluralist thesis in the modern political philosophy`. The term pluralism has a richness of determinations, but in essence it expresses a vision or a conception about reality which is explained by more principles or entities. This is why, there is a philosophical, political, social, moral, cultural, religious, value, methodological pluralism, etc.

From a metaphysical point of view, the term pluralism designates the philosophical doctrines in which substances and principles blend, in opposition to monism as a doctrine of a unique principle, but also to dualism which often differs of pluralism (Pythagorean, Platonic, Cartesian or Kantian pluralism), because it was conceived as a response to monism

In the political thinking, pluralism has affirmed only in the second half of the XIXth century and then, in the next one, but especially in relation to the experience of the two forms of totalitarianism, the fascist and the Stalinist one. As N. Bobbio writes, political pluralism does not mistake with an anti statalism, even though it contests the omnipotence of the state and neither with an atomism.

The historical premises which are at the bases of the development of the pluralist political theory from the XIXth century have been the ideas elaborated by Hobbes who blamed parties which acted as a `state within a state`; by Spinoza who made reference to the state harmony in his work *Ethics* (1677); by Rousseau who is a point of reference in the democrat thinking and who considered that `partial associations` were dangerous for the general will – *Social contract* (1762). The problem of recognizing the party as a basic element of the pluralist theory has appeared in the ideas expressed by Hume and by Madison. Pluralism has developed on two different plans. On the one hand, there were the theories of the American political thinking which developed. On the other hand, there were the theories of the European experience of pluralism which sketched.

American pluralism was initiated by Alexis de Tocqueville, its bases were established by Arthur Bentley – the first theorist of the American pluralism, who wrote that the government does not have an abstract existence, but has its bases on the concrete action of the social groups. Starting from the theoretical bases exposed by A. Bentley, Truman thought that the political category of the `group` was necessary in order to create, in a genuine manner, the relation between the individual and the state; and MacIver considered that the real protagonists of the political process were not the individuals, but the groups and the community. Later, Robert A. Dahl dealt, in his work, with the consolidation of the theory of the American pluralism. To him belongs the notion of `polyarchy` which is the modern definition of the democracy. In spite of the fact that he put the theoretical bases of the pluralist democracy, Dahl also showed its dangers. Along with Robert A. Dahl, we also must make reference to J. Rawls who thought that if it is true that plurality is not a fortunate aspect of the human condition, than it is the result of the free exercise of the individual's freedom of thought.

One of the roots of the European pluralism is represented by the theory of Montesquieu about `intermediate bodies`, but in Europe, the real protagonist of the pluralism is the state, as the expression of the political unity. According to Otto von Guericke and William Maitland, the theory of intermediate bodies has finally found a space of legitimacy. Starting from the opinions expressed by these two authors, two models of pluralism have developed: the Christian-social pluralism and the socialist one. Christian-social pluralism has its roots in the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, but its bases were established by E. Mounier and his `personalist revolution`, by the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, by Maritain, Tillich and Buber. The socialist pluralism was represented by Proudhon who sustained the necessity of multiplication of the centers of power; by Georges Gurvitch who made reference to the affirmation of a `social law`; by G. D. Cole and S. G. Hobson who have established the bases of the movement called `guild socialism`; by Adriano Olivetti who has established the bases of the `movement of the community` at the end of the Second World War. After the Second World War, the European pluralist theory was sustained by Pietro Rescigno, Alessandro Pizzorno, J. H. Kaiser, Rainer Eisfeld and others.

The first chapter of the present paper, called `References to political pluralism` is structured in two parts: the first part refers to the roots of pluralism, and the second one to the contributions of pluralism to the democratization process of the society. Pluralism has its

philosophical origins in the liberal visions which oppose to the leadership exercised by a single person (as in the absolute or dictatorial monarchies), by a single idea of dominant religion. Pluralism has developed on the bases of the liberal ideas and militates for a constitutional government based on: the rights of the individual, on the institutional balance and on decentralized or federal systems of government. At the middle of the XIXth century, the liberal position was very well articulated, but gradually pluralism has searched its own way, so that, at the end of the XIXth century the pluralist position could be completely separated from liberalism.

Classical pluralism insisted on the importance of the individual development as a reason of the human life which justifies individual rights in the prejudice of the state. Pluralists have also insisted on the groups and voluntary associations and on their effort to transcend the state in comparison with the individual or on the absolutism in comparison with liberalism. A different aspect is offered by U.S.A. where the continuous arrival of a great number of immigrants and the extensive expansion of the industrial towns has aroused the fear among the liberals, who thought that the established democratic culture was endangered. In reality, there was nothing disturbing in those events, because the new comers have conserved their own cultural roots and have adapted to the American conditions, assimilating the U.S. policy and economy.

In the Europe of the beginning of the XXth century the pluralist thinking has developed in relation with the old organizations as the Churches and the charity associations. Conservative pluralists have underlined the importance of the intermediary organizations as bridges between the business class and the working one, the accountability of the business environment in its interaction with the working class. In a few European countries from Scandinavia and England, pluralism stood beside the social democratic ideas about a state of the welfare as they were developing in the XXth century. By contrast, European pluralism means a more organized system and asks itself how could a welfare of the state's institutions attenuate the conflicts between the business environment and the working force. In U.S.A, pluralism was more wide in its social inclusion, considering that any group is capable to influence politics. Both American pluralism and the European one have seen the solving of the political problems in the choice of a representative government.

The different accents of the pluralist philosophy have joined and have reached a cultural resonance that was more clear in U.S.A and in England around the Second World War. The explication of this phenomenon was given by Hannah Arendt (1951) who has seen the danger of the totalitarianism as a social automation, in which each intermediary association (family, religion, business club, universities or media) is destroyed or taken by the state. In the same sense, Karl Popper also saw the conflict between totalitarianism and pluralism as an expression of the fight between the opened society and its enemies. The main message was that any argument for the `enlightened despotism inevitably leads to state monism` so that totalitarianism is `one of the most powerful and dangerous arguments from the entire history of the human thinking`. According to K. R. Popper, in an opened society there should be planned, contemplated and accepted only the `peace social mechanisms`, because more radical solutions for straightening of the social diseases will always be doomed to fail. Confronting to failure, their instigators would be tempted to cross the slippery slope of the coercion in order to determine the functioning of their plans.

In 1950 the British sociologist T.H. Marshall wrote about the evolution of pluralism, underlining his attachment to a inevitable modernization process, in which the rights of the citizens in the liberal democracies have developed in the social democracies, in three phases. First of all, we can talk about *the phase of the civil and legal rights* – which is represented by the right to property and inheritance, the right to found companies and enterprises and legal protection against the arbitrary intervention of the state; then about *the phase of the political rights* as the freedom of speech and the appearance of the liberal democracy; and finally about the phase of the economic and social rights expressed by the safeguards taken against poverty caused by the lack of jobs, by the care for the older people, for a decent living and for the health insurances.

Regarding U.S.A policy, the 50s and the 60s were the top years of the pluralist influence in the political science. Despite the supposed objective character, at the middle of the XXth century, many American analysts presented and put into practice together the explanatory and normative models. In this context, Robert Dahl introduces the concept of `polyarchy` in order to describe a political system which offers control in the politics of the many, but also in order to characterize the imperfect extensions through which the liberal democrat ideas have been realized in America, in European and in other states with a representative governance. The

author has explicitly recognized that besides the vote, with a few exceptions, the resources that have influenced the politicians and the political process have been unequally distributed. `If each political position would be examined, I believe that all the time we would discover that only a small proportion of the electorate actively brings its contribution to the influence of a politician`.

The `pluralization` process was described by three theories. The first theory refers to the `power of the elite` and was issued by Floyd Hunter and interpreted by R. Dahl and N.W. Polsby. In this context, we must recall the significance given by different authors to the term `elite`, in the modern thinking. L. P. Zăpârțan retains the rich significances of this term. In a wide sense, it designates the ones who obtain remarkable performances in a certain area of activities, persons who have special aptitudes or who make an `exceptional effort`. In another sense, which has racist connotations, the term `elite` designates the ones who have overpassed the highest standards from the perspective of the process of cultivation of the human features. These senses of the term `elite` have also been used in the political theory, and the concrete sense of the term identifies itself, in the author's opinion, in `direct dependence with the ideological references that stand at its base`.

Social equality is a condition of the absolute justice. In a pluralist democracy it is not sufficient that the appurtenance to a group to bring the differentiation and neither that the elites to become more responsible. True responsibility means the reduction of the inequalities between the different segments of the society. When people are equal it is very unlikely that they accept an absolute bureaucratic rule. So, true equality is the final form of equity. Pluralism covers the liberal theory of the political market. The notion of individual competition is replaced by a network of the competition, influence, responsibility and organizational information, within which groups can organise and, by the exercise of their rights, they can realise their interests by influencing the purposes of politics. The ones who have a smaller power try to convert their interests into values, and the ones who have a greater power try to transform values into interests. The stability of the pluralist system is based on: the maintainance of the consensual rules; the conversion of the values into interests through the organizational competition; the guidance of the society towards equality; and on the anticipation of the conversion of interests into values by the ones who do not have the entire power.

Taking into consideration both the tendencies of fragmentation, but also the ones of cohesion, the theory of associative pluralism rises certain question marks concerning the

conditions which prevent its the formation and the sustenance. One of the most interesting theories referring to these conditions was advanced by E. Nordlinger. The author establishes a theory of the conditions which must be examined in order to represent the theoretical association.

Starting from the terms `people` and `power`, the democracy was defined as the `power of the people`. Because the senses of the term `power` differ according to the historical situation to which we refer, it has been considered that the exercise of the power is an attribute of the elites' activity. From this point of view we can see that `in no political regime the mass of citizens cannot really govern itself, in real forms, but it is or it can be requested to this activity, in more ample or more restraint forms`. L.P. Zăpârțan saw that along with the accumulation of the democratic experiences the basic characteristics of any democratic political regime can reveal, this way creating `a model of democratic political life` to which the different political practices to relate to.

Democracy is a set of conditions which can be approximated in the real life. According to R.A. Dahl, a key characteristic of the democracy is `the continuous liability of the government to the requests of the citizens – considered equals from a political point of view`. Dahl shows that the possibility that a regime to be polyarchic increases along with the growth of its social economical level. The research referring to polyarchy show that it cannot function within a political regime characterized by inequalities and extreme cleavages.

The research literature considers that the most elaborates attempts to transpose the pluralist theories into informational systems were done by K. W. Deutsch and D. Easton, but also by B. Barry who resorting to a philosophical interpretation of some terms as equity, interest, welfare and public interest has shown the way in which the hierarchy can accomplish the purposes of a certain culture. Pluralism is not the only theory or idea which defines the relation between equality, participation, accountability, cleavages, consensus, stability and growth. These factors can be combined under different forms, because they represent the basic ingredients of the modern theories on democracy. In the second part of the first chapter we have made references to the cybernetic model of pluralism, to the importance of the political parties for the creation of a democracy, so that at the end of the first chapter to concentrate on the crisis and on the changes in the pluralist thinking, on the neo-pluralism and on the critics addressed to pluralism.

The second chapter, named `The model of the European pluralism` is devoted to the approaching of the appearance of the pluralist current in Europe and to the great thinkers that have established the bases of the pluralist theory and of the democrat state in Europe, as Machiavelli, Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Mounier, Maritain, Tilich, Pye, Buber, Berlin and Zăpârțan. Modern political thinking, with Machiavellian origins, has structured around the category of the authority, making it its main concern and accepting as a model the excessive disjunction between politics and moral. The research literature has noted that Machiavelli's political thinking opens a new evolution line, detaching from the previous political thinking due to the new perspective from which it has proposed to research the political phenomenon. The place of man is taken by the `civil society`, the discourse about the political phenomenon targeting the state and the civil society. Modern thinking has assumed the consequences of the disappearance of man from the space of the political thinking, and so, have appeared certain `extensions` of this disappearance, which resulted in theories about the civil society, about civil law, about the social contract, about the natural law, about human rights, etc. Th. Hobbes, H. Grotius, B. Spinoza, J. Locke, J. J. Rousseau, B. Constant, A. de Tocqueville are some of the ones who will work at the imposing of the new object of the political thinking: state and civil society.

Modern political thinking establishes the role of the free individual, equal to his peers and rational in the construction of his relations with them. The modern liberal model established by Locke is enriched by Montesquieu in whose work there are two concepts which structure his discourse about the political phenomenon: the law and the social group. Jean-Jacques Rousseau is considered by some historians of the political thinking as the founder of the traditions of the theories about the democracy in the modern era. Pierre Manent wrote about the relation with the political thinking of Rousseau: `With Rousseau, modern political thinking reaches to its expression and ultimate perplexity. It does not turn against liberalism unless for the fact that it has taken until the end the impulse and the initial logic: to build a unitary political body, starting from the individuals who are assumed to be radically independent`. According to J. J. Rousseau, political thinking enters a new phase. Two facts are significant for the history of the political thinking: the creation of the political doctrines and the distribution of the system of the political thinking in two series of facts: the political doctrines (liberalism, conservatism, socialism,

communism, etc.) and the political paradigm – which ensure the continuity of the history of the political thinking, even though they do not extend the old political thinking.

While for the economic and social modernization there are a certain set of criteria concerning the level and the structure of the forces of production, the organization and the leadership, the value and the structure of the social product, for the political life the senses of the political modernization are put into other terms, and consequently the doctrines constituted in relation with this fact situate on extremely different positions. This way, as L.-P. Zăpârțan says, if in the economic thinking the strategy of modernization has only ultimately a ideological significance, in the political thinking the sense of the terms is dependent on the content of the social and political forces, of the classes of a society, of the peoples and nations. The main criteria of the degree of political development enunciated by Lucian Pye are: the structural differentiation of the political within a society; the capacity of the political system; the tendency towards the promoting equality. Political structure has an universal character.

Starting from 1930, against individualism and totalitarianism we can notice the appearance of the personalist current sustained by writers as E. Mounier, J. Maritain and Tilich, who have been animated by the desire to fold politics towards the respect of the human person.

E. Mounier has militated in favor of the Church's values, of the freedom and of the human dignity. Among the elements which have been defining for the personalist and community revolution we recall: the care expressed for syntethizing the project of the social Catholicism and of Proudhon's federalism; the defense of the pluralist democracy, the decentralization to the person; and the liberation of the society of all oppression from the state. In turn, J. Maritain dealt with the establishment of a new Christian order built on the idea of integral humanism. It was not about the promotion of the religion's values over the ones of the civilization, nor of the power of the Church over the civil one. Maritain sustained the necessity of establishing a democracy in which to find the evangelical message of equality and freedom of God's sons. So, we can see that both Maritain and Mounier are Catholic thinkers who have influenced not only the Christian democratic doctrine, but also the pluralist thinking.

A significant part of the second chapter is dedicated to the ideas of Isaiah Berlin who is the foremost representative of the radical pluralism. His philosophical conception is centered of the concept of freedom, with almost two hundred senses identified by the historians of ideas. He examines only the two ones which have played a decisive role in the history of humanity and, he

believes, that they will continue to do so for a long time. The first of those senses, which (according to many thinkers) he describes `negatively`, is incorporated in the answer to the question: `Which is the field within which a subject – individual or collective – must or should be capable to make or to be, without the intervention of somebody else?` The second sense, named `positive`, is incorporated in the answer to the question: `On what does authority which can oblige someone to make or to be in a certain way or another establish?` These two problems are evidently different although the answers to them can partly overlap`.

Berlin does not seem to adhere to the individualist, contractual and liberal values to which he demonstrates the serious errors of appreciation that lead them, especially concerning nationalism which, according to him, is falsely considered `the ephemeral product of a unsatisfied desire of self-determination`, a product which is destined to disappear `along with its clauses, eliminated in turn by the irresistible progress of the Lights`.

Berlin affirms that the principles are not less sacred just because we cannot guarantee them the perennality, showing, and at the same time quoting Schumpeter, that `to recognize the relative validity of self convictions and so, to protect them is what distinguishes civilized man from a barbarian. Strauss will reproach him that this idea places Mafia among civilized people, and Plato and Kant among barbarians. Adding the common logical argument: to consider as being the greatest good from the position according to which there cannot be a greater good means to have a self destructive speech. Similarly, radical pluralism of the incommensurable values makes more types of regimes be justifiable from a moral point of view, according to John Gray. Berlin's pluralism does not prevent him, but more, it obliges him to consider that certain truths are not contingent but necessary being, from this point of view, superior principles. Real knowledge and understanding represent a value because the understanding of other forms of self-achievement by the exercise of imaginative empathy enlarges the horizon of the our self values and also the possibilities of self-comprehension.

For Berlin, the main justification of the negative liberty and of the liberal conscience stands in the fact that it allows the building of an individual and collective life around the acknowledgement that the incommensurable values are not errors, deadlocks or imperfections, but the holders of a real and understandable human significance. From this perspective, no singular value is once and for all a priority, transformed into an idol. This thesis reveals the profound significance of Berlin's pluralism and of his affinities for the liberalism; the

philosopher not only that he denies in all cases that the same value must prevail over the others, but he equally refuses, and for the same reasons, the anti-rationalism and the skepticism of abstract pluralists for whom nothing is comparable, and for whom there are as many reasons in order to radically reject negative freedom, but also accept it, being in the end a `business of tastes`. In this sense, Berlin's liberalism is not real, but is `honest`, guided by a real desire of comprehending the concrete people through their own representations.

Maybe this pluralism which means the refusal of the tyranny of a single value, of a single system or concept (for example, the concept of `rights` or the one of `obligation`), meaning the refusal of the tyranny of pluralism itself became a system and an unique value with a negotiable content is not but a trivial appeal at the virtues of the inter-knowledge, of the moderation and of the restraint, itself explicable through the life of a young immigrant who `has succeeded`, who has found in England the best state in the world, the less corrupted, the less cruel, and the less inclined towards enormities.

In a paper devoted to I. Berlin, C. Aarsbergen-Ligtvoet shows that the historical and philosophical perspectives that Isaiah Berlin has granted both to his readers, and to the academic environment are many. No doubt that the greatest of his contributions was the deliverance of a new philosophical approach, which is *valuable pluralism*.

Berlin is considered, in the present, the founding father of this perspective, which is an important current in the contemporary political and moral philosophy, which has influenced in different ways a series of contemporary thinkers.

Pluralist thinkers share the idea that there is a diversity of values and finalities in our moral world and that conflicts between these values cannot exist. The values and finalities that we follow in our lives and which we consider to be important according to our moral standards, cannot always be combined in a harmonious whole. Even among the people who think and action in a reasonable manner having the best intentions, will always exist disagreements concerning the values that are the best and that should have priority.

Valuable pluralism is a term that Berlin himself barely used, simply naming it `pluralism`. The term was developed later by authors who have been inspired by the new perspectives provided by Berlin, wishing to distinguish their own points of view from other types of pluralism, less conscious of the possibility of the conflicts in the idea of good itself.

In his famous essay 'Two concepts of liberty' (1958), Berlin describes his philosophical position in these words: 'If, as I believe, the purposes of men are multiple, and not all of them are in principle compatible with each of the others, then the possibility of the conflict and of a tragedy, cannot ever be entirely eliminated from the human life, be it personal or social'.

Berlin's place in the European and British political theory is established through the fact that he avoided the institutional accent of the American school after the war and he focused on pluralism's epistemological foundation. Even though he did not recognize a specific duty to the previous pluralist thinkers, the principles of the valuable pluralism and the incommensurability have been central in the search of the relation between liberalism and pluralism. Even though I. Berlin is the best known for his writings on the theme of liberty, he established the necessity of this attention and the attitude against monist vision.

The third chapter of the present paper refers to political pluralism in U.S.A. Diversity goes hand in hand with pluralism. It is very easy to mistake European pluralism with American individualism, but the two are different. 'The American dream' is the one of the individuals who are fighting for their individual success by affirming their individual talents. The European ideal is the one of the groups which are leaving together in harmony, which negotiate their differences and take care of the members of the groups. It is clear that both the 'dream' and the ideal are often despised in practice, but this aspect does not muffle their aura in the public culture. They help to the explanation of the subtle differences between the neoliberal American style and the collectivist economic one associated to the continental Europe. At first sight, Great Britain seems more close to United States than to the rest of the European Union, but 'the English Channel is, in reality, better navigable than the Atlantic'.

During nearly 40 years, Connolly has helped to rebuilding entirely the theory of pluralism. Pluralism had more a political connotation in the American political science in the 60s. In his work from 1965 'A Preface to Democratic Theory', Robert Dahl has put the bases of the pluralist literature, offering a particular vision of the American tradition which had both political and social implications. From a political point of view, pluralism has offered an explanation of the electoral absenteeism, by describing the ones who do not vote as being satisfied by the system. Connolly has interfered in the attempt to create a discipline of the political science, by redefining pluralism, from a conservative theory of the order based on a

status quo, in a radical theory of the democratic contestation based on a progressive political vision.

Samuel A. Chambers and Terrell Carver also make reference to works which start by criticizing what was known in 1969 as being pluralism, but also to the transformation of theory of pluralism by Connolly, in 2005. The authors show how Connolly has rejected the model of the interest groups competition, passing from the Rawls' assumption of the 'reasonable pluralism'. For many thinkers pluralism has become a static concept which shows 'the way in which a society presents itself' or suggest a theory of the group formation and interaction. In Connolly's vision, the ethos of pluralization not only does it bring into discussion the theories about the formation of groups and societies, but it also expands the impact area of pluralism, of pluralization.

In the work 'The Irony of Democracy', Thomas R. Dye and Harmon Ziegler debate the theme of elitism in United States, but they also refer to the multitude of groups which detain the power in U.S.A., to the competition between them, to the abuse of power, to the influences that the individual citizen can have over the course of the national events in the voting process, to the support of the political parties, but also to joining the interests of the group – aspects which are included in the pluralist theory. In their approach, Thomas R. Dye and Harmon Ziegler resort to the definition of pluralism, but also to the presentation of the differences between elitism and pluralism. In defining pluralism, they make reference to the actual situation from the American policy, in which they see the limits in the achievement of all the purposes of the democracy: the nonparticipation of all citizens to the decision making process which outlines their life, the prevalence of the majority's preferences, but also the fact that not always the system protects the rights of the minorities, values as life, liberty and property, and the chance to influence public policy is not always ensured. In the light of these limits, pluralism represents the faith that democratic values can be kept in a system in which many elites who are in competition determine public policy by negotiation and compromise, the voters make significant choices in elections, and the new elites can win access to power. In this framework, 'pluralism looks to affirm that the American society is a democratic one'.

Pluralism has ensures for a long period of time the dominant description and the ideal of the American policy. As a description, pluralism showed the system as a balance of power between economic, religious, ethnic and geographical groups. Each of those 'groups' has

something to say in the sketch of the social decisional construction, each of them constrains and is constrained within the processes of group adopting and all majority groups share a certain system of faiths and values which encourage the conflict state within the group and which allow the dissolution of the initial misunderstandings by finding some compromise solutions. As an ideal, the system is celebrated not because it accomplishes perfectly a single function, but because it promotes much more efficiently than any other known alternative, many public and private objectives.

In the content of this chapter a special place is occupied by the thinkers who have put the bases of the American pluralist theory and who we have already reminded at the beginning of this presentation (Tocqueville, Dahl, Berle, Mills, N.H. Smith, Mill, Rorty, G. Alperovitz, Douglas Pratt, John Gray and others). Also, within the American system G. Alperovitz, Douglas Pratt, John Gray have each wrote about certain forms of pluralism, as the economic or the ethic one.

Rethinking pluralism and pluralist democracy are analyzed in relation with the political pluralization which is easy to understand because its effects can be seen all over, every day, in spite of the fact that, by itself, the concept of political pluralization is an abstract one, as are the state, the sovereignty, the civil society, the city, the polis, the metropolis, and others. This is the reason why, Connolly presents in his work the entire story of the political pluralization, its disadvantages, possible defense strategies against them, making reference in this last sense to the environmental policy of the international level.

In his work, H. Koyama analyzes pluralism in the context of globalization, in terms of plurality of the political agents and of the participants, but also the problem of the governance within this vision, making reference to Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri and Carl Schmitt. The first two authors refer to the actual global order with the term `Empire`, in the work with the same title. According to them, the `empire` is `a new form of sovereignty which regulates the cultural and economic exchanges on the globe`, but which unlike the empires from the past centuries have a stretching which overpasses the already established frontiers of the states, and within which there can be found many identities. `Decentralization and deterritorialization` exist `everywhere and nowhere`, engaging in a `bio-political production` the production of the social life itself through different new methods. H. Koyama makes reference to those two authors because to them he finds the pluralist vision of the `world political construction` or, in other

words, `the notion of joint constitution`. Starting from this last idea of Polibius, of `joint constitution`, the authors define the empire as being `the multitude of political forces which use different virtues, including monarchical, aristocratic and democratic ones`. Contemporary global order, in their opinion, similar with the description of the Roman Empire, as a form of government. Today, when we analyze the configuration of the global power within its many bodies and organizations, we can recognize `the pyramidal structure composed of three parts, each of them with different levels`. The three parts identified by Hardt and Negri are: the superpowers; the transnational capitalist networks which have expanded within the global market; and the groups which represent `global peoples` and which action in their interests.

In turn, Carl Schmitt refers to the contradiction between parliamentary and democracy. The possibility of the existence of pluralism in a globalized world can be understood through the help of some political principles. In explaining this relation references are made to Schmitt's political thinking which is often associated with the concept of `state` as a supreme political entity. Attacking the pluralist understanding of the state as it was characterized by the Anglo-American philosophers, Schmitt thinks that in politics, pluralism can be conceived only at international level as an inter-state pluralism. This way, the frontiers of pluralism must be political unities as are the states: `The plurality of the states ... is ... the expression of a well understood pluralism`. National state is characterized by unity or by its feature of preventing groups which are in opposition from transforming into extreme enemies.

The theme approaches in the content of the last chapter is `tolerance`. Starting from the presentation of its significance we have passed on to its analyze from the perspective of some great thinkers, for in the final part of the chapter to also insist on the relation between tolerance, pluralism and human rights. Some philosophers think that the moral virtue of tolerance is impossible because it requires that an agent to believe that it has decisive reasons in order to actively oppose to what is wrong from a moral point of view, but which does not act for other reasons. The paradox of tolerance intimidates the objective framework which accompanies cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism shows us that the different social, political or cultural conceptions about good can be as legitimate and that each of them must be respected, while the commitment to its moral objective implies the recognition of the fact that the moral judgments are not properly treated by indifference, apathy or inaction. So, the paradox suggests that pluralism must be denied, and moral relativism must be embraced. In terms of the moral

dimension of pluralism, the analyze of tolerance implies, among others, the fact that it is of a pluralist nature. The concept or the idea of pluralism is ambiguous from many points of view. So, when references are being made to pluralism, to the possibility that pluralism or its implications, they must be very clear concerning the type of pluralism about which they discuss because the risk of misunderstanding is huge. When we discuss about tolerance, at least one of its dimensions is a pluralist one. So, pluralism is found among the conceptions of good – which are the most common conceptions of pluralism, according to which different individuals, cultures and subcultures which have different conceptions about what having a good life means, about what is necessary for the individual development, and about how the society should be organized in order to facilitate the `flowering` of its members. This type of pluralism makes that the virtue of tolerance be intangible. Ronald Sandler and Cynthia Townley are asking themselves how should this type of pluralism be answered.

In their analytical approach on the nature and limits of tolerance, the authors have noted the existence of a theoretical pluralism in relation to the different types of virtues. An explanation of the susceptibility of the theory of the virtue from the paradox of tolerance, is represented by the tendency to search for a single theoretical model which to take place for all virtues, meaning the models which conceive virtue as an individual intellectual excellence.

Ronald Sandler and Cynthia Townley think that we do not live in a pluralist world, but in a world of pluralism. This means recognizing the fact that is unlikely that a single principle or a certain set of rules to ensure the way to follow in all situations and in which all the relations in which individuals are or in which they engage. Their conclusion is that we must be prepared to action for justice and for good, but at the same time, the sensibility to ambiguity that characterized many of the ethical experiences must be cultivated, because nobody is ideal from a moral point of view, and an ideal world does not exist.

Tolerance means accepting people and their practices even when we do not agree with them and with their concerns. Tolerance implies an intermediary attitude between acceptance and in-acceptance. This intermediary status transforms tolerance in a puzzle. There are certain things, as murder, which should not be tolerated. Also, there are certain limits within which we should action in order to prevent the generation of intolerable things, but for this we must give up tolerance in the name of some general values. In other situations, when we should be intolerant we must try to get out of this state, for example, in the case of some rasial or ethnic attitudes.

Tolerance, as an attitude which requests the restraint of disapproval feelings, is also a way of dealing with some attitudes which even though are not good, cannot be removed.

The components of the tolerance must be watched both from a legal perspective, and from a legal one. Tolerance means the recognition of the political and legal rights of men: the right to vote, to have a job, to enjoy public goods that are destined to all, as education, public security, the protection of the legal system, health, etc. In addition, it is necessary that the state to not have a preferentially attitude towards a certain group when it decides privileges and benefits. Scanlon thinks that each religious group is entitled to the protection and the benefits that are given by the state. Certain forms of support are prohibited for any religion, and others are allowed as long as they are awarded to all the religions from a certain community. This combination seems to be a political compromise, and not a solution imposed by the idea of religious tolerance.

Determining the value of tolerance is a problem which has its justification in the relation between the citizens that rely on tolerance. A tolerant person and an intolerant one have a different attitude towards the ones they disapprove. The attitude of the tolerant persons is in the sense that `even though they disagree, they are equally members of the society and so, are as entitled to the law protection and to live their life as they like. In addition, none of their ways of life are not the unique ways offered by the society`. Intolerant individuals do not recognize these aspects. In exchange, they desire an important place for their own values and for their way of life. The ones who do not share their vision are not `members with full rights of the society`, and so, they consider action must be taken in the name of `protecting the society and its values`, either by the power of the criminal law, or by the refusal pf any forms of public aids of such groups.

The first references to tolerance have been made by Emeric Crucé in his work *Le Nouveau Cynée* (1632), by Locke in *The Chart on Tolerance*, by Montesquieu in *Cartas persas*, by Voltaire in *The Treaty on Tolerance*, by Turgot in *The Charts on Tolerance*. Thomas Paine, Kant, Pascal, Bayle, Spinoza, Hobbes, Berlin and others have also made reference to tolerance.

Universal structure of the value which depends on the reconciliation of faith in the universality, with a correct understanding of the real diversity of values, can offer the best hope of creating a link for the humanity. Only this way human values that we share can be realized. In addition, by the awareness on the realities of pluralism takes place the protection of the moral

and political purpose of the values. By recognizing the multitude of life styles the pluralist consciousness can be better expressed. The conflicts between values cannot be eradicated, but the pluralism of values will accomplish its positive role by its bringing to light by the ones who promote the interests and values of all. This way, the pluralism of values represents the best theoretical understanding of the moral conflict.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aarsbergen-Ligtvoet, Connie, *Isaiah Berlin, A Value Pluralist and Humanist View of Human Nature and the Meaning of Life*, Rodopi, Amsterdam/New-York, 2006.
2. Ali's, Tariq, *The Clash of Fundamentalisms*, Verso, London, 2002.
3. Ali's, Tariq, „The Fundamentals of Fundamentalism”, in *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 20 June 2003, <http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/>.
4. Almond, Gabriel A., Verba, Sidney, *The Civic Culture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963.
5. Almand, G., Coleman, James S., *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1960.
6. Alperovitz, Gar, *America beyond capitalism, The Pluralist Commonwealth*, in vol. Robert Garnett, Erik K. Olsen, Martha Starr (edit.), *Economic pluralism*, Routledge, New York, 2010.
7. Apter, D.E., *Choice and the Politics of Allocation*, Yale University Press, 1971.
8. Apter, D., *Introduction to Political Analysis*, Winthrop Publishers, Inc., Cambridge,
9. Apter, D.E., *The Political Kingdom in Uganda*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961.
10. Arendt, Hannah, *On Revolution*, Penguin Books, New York, 1963.
11. Babolin, A., Kajon, I., Despre M. Buber, in vol. *Enciclopedia Filosofica*, vol. secondo, Bompiani, Milano, 2006.
12. Bachrach, Peter, *The Theory of Democratic Elitism*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1967.
13. Badie, B., *Le Développement politique*, Ed. Economica, 2e édition, Paris, 1980.
14. Barber, Benjamin R., *The Death of Communal Liberty*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1974.
15. Barry, Brian, *Political Argument*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1965.
16. Bentley, Arthur F., *The Process of Government*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1908.

17. Berelson, Bernard, Democratic Theory and Public Opinion, în *Public Opinion Quarterly*, nr. 16, 1952.
18. Berg, Axel van den, Janoski, Thomas, Conflict Theories in Political Sociology, în Thomas Janoski, Robert R. Alford, Alexander M. Hicks, Mildred A. Schwartz (edit.), *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
19. Bergson, Henri, *Creative Evolution*, trans. Arthur Mitchell, Dover, New York, 1998.
20. Berle, Adolf, *Power Without Property*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1959.
21. Berlin, Isaiah, *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age: Their Rise and Influence on Modern Thought*, Pimlico, London, 2007.
22. Berlin, Isaiah, *L'Eloge de la liberté*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1988.
23. Berlin, Isaiah, *Four Essays on Liberty*, editor Henry Hardy, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
24. Berlin, Isaiah, Excerpts from "My Intellectual Path", în *Four Essays on Liberty*, editor Henry Hardy, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
25. Berlin, Isaiah, "Does political theory still exist?", în H. Hardy, *Concepts and Categories: Philosophical Essays*, Hogarth Press, London, 1979.
26. Berlin, Isaiah, "The Birth of Greek Individualism", în *Four Essays on Liberty*, editor Henry Hardy, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
27. Berlin, Isaiah, *A contre-courant: essais sur l'histoire des idées*, Albin Michel, Paris, 1988.
28. Berlin, Isaiah, "The Three Strands in My Life", în *Jewish Quarterly* 27 [2-3], Summer /Autumn 1979.
29. Berlin, Isaiah, Williams, Bernard, „Pluralism and Liberalism: a Reply”, în *Political Studies*, XLII, 1994.
30. Berlin, Isaiah, *Liberty*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
31. Berlin, Isaiah, *The Power of Ideas*, Chatto & Windus, 2000,.
32. Berlin, Isaiah, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, John Murray, London, 1990.
33. Berlin, Isaiah, *Crooked Timber of Humanity*, Fontana, London, 1991.
34. Berki, R. N., *The History of Political Thought: A Short Introduction*, Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, New Jersey, 1977.

35. Bobbio, N., Pluralismo, în *Dizionario di politica*, diretto da N. Bobbio, N. Matteucci, G. Pasquino, Milano, 1992.
36. Bodin, *Colloque entre sept savants qui sont de différents sentiments*, Droz, Ginebra, 1984.
37. Bouchilloux, Hélène, „Tolérance et vérité: le critère philosophique de la compréhension chez Pascal”, în vol. J. C. Zarka, Franck Lessay, John Rogers (edit.), *Les fondements philosophiques de la tolérance*, Presses Univ. de France, Paris, „Fondements de la politique”, 2002, vol. 1.
38. Braithwaite, John, Drahos, Peter, *Global Business Regulation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
39. Branco, Manuel, *Underdevelopment as Cultural Resistance or Culture as Resistance to Underdevelopment*, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
40. Braud, Ph., Budeau, Fr., *Histoire des idée politiques depuis la Révolution*, Montchrestein, Paris, 1992.
41. Brownlie, Ian, *Principles of Public International Law*, Fifth Edition, 1998.
42. Buchanan, James M., Tullock, Gordon, *The Calculus of Consent*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1965.
43. Bunce, Valerie, “Comparative Democratization: Big and Bounded Generalizations”, *Comparative Political Studies*, nr. 33, 2000.
44. Butler, David, Stokes, Donald, *Political Change in Britain, Forces Shaping Electoral Choice*, Macmillan, London, 1969.
45. Byrne, Peter, *Prolegomena to Religious Pluralism: Reference and Realism in Religion*, Macmillan, London, 1995.
46. Canovan, Margaret, *Arendt’s theory of totalitarianism: a reassessment*, în vol. Dana Richard Villa (edit.), *The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt*, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2000.
47. Caramella, S., Gomasca, P., *Despre pluralismul filosofic*, în vol. *Enciclopedia Filosofica*, Vol. Nono, Bompiani, Milano, 2006.
48. Castells, Manuel, *The Information Age, Vol. I: The Rise of the Network Society*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1996.

49. Catlin, George E.G., *The Science and Method of Politics*, Appleton, New York, 1927, în vol. Robert Adcock, Mark Bevir, Shannon C. Stimson (edit.), *Modern Political Science: Anglo-American Exchanges Since 1880*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2007.
50. Cernica, Viorel, *Cetatea sub blocada ideii, Schița fenomenologică a istoriei gândirii politice*, Institutul european, Iași, 2005.
51. Chambers, Samuel A., Carver, Terrell, *Introduction: Politics, theory, and innovation: the writings of William E. Connolly*, în Samuel A. Chambers, Terrell Carver (edit.), *William E. Connolly, Democracy, Pluralism and Political Theory*, Routledge, London, New York, 2008.
52. Charles, Sébastien, *Tolerancia Activa y Pasiva Según Voltaire*, în vol. John C. Laursen, José Villaverde (edit.), *Forjadores de la Tolerancia*, Ed. Tecnos, Madrid, 2011.
53. Châtelet, François, Duhamel, Olivier, Pisier, Evelyne, *Dictionnaire des oeuvres politiques*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1986.
54. Cherbury, Herbert de, *Le salut du laïc*, Vrin, Paris, 2002.
55. Chong, Dennis, *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1991.
56. Conciliul Ecumenic Vatican II, *L'Eglise*, Ed. Du Centurion, Paris, 1965.
57. Cornford, Francis Macdonald, *Before and After Socrates*, Cambridge, 1932.
58. Cox, Kevin R., „Geography, Social Contexts, and Voting Behavior in Wales, 1861-1951”, Allardt, Rokkan (edit.), pp. 117-159
59. Crowder, George, *Liberalism and Value Pluralism*, Continuum, London, 2001.
60. Cutright, Philipps, *National political Development, Its Measurement and Social Correlates*, în vol. *Politics and Social life*, (ed.) N. Polsby, R. Dentler, P. Smith, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1963.
61. Dahl, Robert A., *Polyarchy*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1971.
62. Dahl, Robert A., *After the Revolution?*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1970.
63. Dahl, Robert A., *Pluralist Democracy in the United States*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1967.
64. Dahl, Robert A., *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961.
65. Dahl, Robert A., *Who Guverns?*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961.

66. Dahl, Robert A., *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956.
67. Dahl, Robert, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, Anchor Books, New York, 1960.
68. Dahl, Robert A., Lindblom, Charles E., *Politics, Economics and Welfare*, Harper & Brothers, second edition, New York, (1953, 1963) 1976.
69. Dahl, Robert A., Lindblom, Charles E., *Politics and Economic Welfare*, 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976.
70. Dahl, Robert A., Lindblom, C.E., *Politics, Economics and Welfare*, Harper&Row, New York, 1953.
71. Dahrendorf, Ralf, *Class and Class Conflict in an Industrial Society*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957.
72. Derrida, Jacques, „Declarations of Independence”, în *New Political Science*, nr. 15, 1986.
73. Derrida, Jacques, *Acts of Religion*, Routledge, New York, 2002.
74. Deutsch, Karl W., *The Nerves of Government*, The Free Press, New York, 1963.
75. Dewey, John, “Democracy and Educational Administration”, *School and Society* , April 1937.
76. DiPalma, Giuseppe, *Apathy and Participation*, The Free Press, New York, 1970.
77. Domhoff, William, *Who Rules America?*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1967.
78. Downs, Anthony, „Why the Government Budget in a Democracy is too Small”, în *World Politics*, XII, nr. 4, Iulie 1960.
79. Driver, Julia, *Uneasy Virtue*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
80. Dryzek, John S., Dunleavy, Patrick, *Theories of the Democratic State*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009.
81. Dryzek, John S., Downes, David, Hunold, Christian, Schlosberg, David, Hernes, Hans Kristian, *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
82. Dunleavy, Patrick, *Perspectives on Urban Studies*, în A. Blowers, C. Brooks, P. Dunleavy, L. McDowell (edit.), *Urban Change and Conflict: An Inter-Disciplinary Reader*, Harper & Raw, London, 1982.

83. Dunleavy, Patrick, *Urban Political Analysis*, Macmillan, London, 1980.
84. Duverger, Maurice, *Political Parties*, Methuen, Londra, 1954.
85. Dye, Thomas R., Ziegler, Harmon, *The Irony of Democracy, An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*, fourteenth edition, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Boston, 2009.
86. Easton, David, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, Wiley, New York, 1964.
87. Easton, David, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, Wiley, New York, 1965.
88. Eck, Diana L., *Encountering God. A Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Banares*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1993.
89. Eckstein, Harry, *Division and Cohesion in Democracy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966.
90. Eisenstadt, S.N., *Social Differentiation and Stratification*, Scott Foresman, Glenview, 1971.
91. Emerson, Rupert, *From Empire to Nation*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1960.
92. *Encountering Tragedy: Rousseau and the Project of Democratic Order*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1999.
93. Eulau, Heinz, Prewitt, Kenneth, *Labyrinths of Democracy: Adaptations, Linkages, Representations, and Policies in Urban Politics*, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1973.
94. Evans, Gareth, Mohamed Sahnoun, „The Responsibility to Protect”, în *Foreign Affairs* vol. 81, nr. 6, Nov/Dec 2002.
95. Fenno, Richard, *The Power of the Purse: Appropriations Politics in Congress*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1966.
96. Flathman, Richard, *Pluralism and Liberal Democracy*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2005.
97. Flathman, Richard, *The Public Interest*, Wiley, New York, 1966.
98. Frantzius, Ina von, *World Summit on Sustainable Development Johannesburg 2002: A Critical Assessment of the Outcomes*, în *Environmental Politics*, nr. 13, 2004.
99. Fraser, Nancy, “From Discipline to Flexibilization? Rereading Foucault in the Shadow of Globalization”, în *Constellation*, nr. 10, 2003.
100. Freeman, John R., *Democracy and Markets: The Politics of Mixed Economies*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1989.

101. Frynas, J. George, Global Monitor: Royal Dutch/Shell, în New Political Economy, nr. 8, 2003.
102. Furnivall, J.S., Netherlands India, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1939.
103. Gadamer, Hans Georg, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, ed. and trans David E. Linge, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1976.
104. Galbraith, John Kenneth, *American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1952.
105. Galbraith, John Kenneth, *The New Industrial State*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1967.
106. Galston, William, *Liberal Pluralism*, Cambridge University Press, London, 2002.
107. Gasset, José Ortega y, *The Revolt of the Masses*, Norton, New York, 1932.
108. Geddes, Barbara, "What do we know about Democratization after Twenty Years?", Annual Review of Political Science, nr. 2, 1999.
109. Geertz, Clifford (edit.), „The Integrative Revolution”, în Old Societies and New States, The Free Press, New York, 1963.
110. Gerth, H.H., Mills, C. Wright (edit.), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, Oxford University Press, New York, 1946.
111. Gherardini, B., Despre P. Tilich, în vol. Enciclopedia Filosofica, vol. Dedicesimo, Bompiani, Milano, 2006.
112. Giddens, Anthony, Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 2000.
113. Gierke, Otto, Natural Law and the Theory of Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1950.
114. Gomasasca, P., Despre pluralismul politic, în vol. Enciclopedia Filosofica, Vol. Nono, Bompiani, Milano, 2006.
115. Gow, James, „A Revolution in International Affairs?”, în *Security Dialogue*, vol. 31, nr. 3, 2000.
116. Graham, Allison T., Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Little, Brown, Boston, 1972.
117. Graham, Gordon, Tolerance, Pluralism, and Relativism, în David Heyd (edit.), *Toleration: an Elusive Virtue*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996.

118. Gray, John, *Cele două fețe ale liberalismului*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2002.
119. Gray, J., *Liberalism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1986.
120. Gray, John, „Where Pluralists and Liberals Part Company”, în *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, vol. 6, nr. 1, 1998.
121. Gray, John, *Two Faces of Liberalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2001.
122. Griffin, Keith, *Stratégies de développement*, C.D.O.G.D.E., Economica, Paris, 1989.
123. Grotius, Hugo, *Despre dreptul războiului și al păcii*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1968.
124. Grotius, Hugo, *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis Libri Tres*, Vol II., în J.B. Scott, *The Classics of International Law*, trad. de Francis W. Kelsey, Oceana Publications Inc, New York, 1964.
125. Guttmann, Amy, Rockefeller, Steven, Walzer, Michael, Wolf, Susan, *Multiculturalism and “The Politics of Recognition”*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993.
126. Habermas, Jürgen, *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1996.
127. Habermas, Jürgen, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1990.
128. Habermas, Jürgen, *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001.
129. Hampshire, Stuart, *Justice as Conflict*, Duckworth, London, 1999.
130. Hardt, Michael, Negri, Antonio, *Empire*, Harvard UP, Cambridge, 2000.
131. Hartz, Louis (edit.), „A Theory of the Development of the New Societies”, în *The Founding of New Societies*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1964.
132. Hermann, Margaret, Kegley, Charles, „The Use of U.S. Military Interventions to Promote Democracy: Evaluating the Record”, în *International Interactions*, vol. 24, nr. 2, 1998.
133. Hirst, Paul, *Associative Democracy: New Forms of Economic and Social Governance*, Polity, Cambridge, 1994.

134. Hix, Simon, Towards a Partisan Theory of EU Politics, în *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 15, nr. 8, 2008.
135. Hobbes, Léviathan, Sirey, Paris, 1971.
136. Honig, Bonnie, *Democracy and the Foreigner*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2001.
137. Horowitz, I. L. (edit.), *Power, Politics, and People: The Collected Papers of C. W. Mills*, Ballantine Books, New York, 1961.
138. Horton, John, „Toleration as a Virtue”, în David Heyd (edit.), *Toleration: An Elusive Virtue*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996.
139. Hunter, Floyd, *Community Power Structure*, Doubleday Anchor Books, New York, 1963.
140. Isaiah Berlin en toutes libertes: entretiens avec Ramin Jahanbegloo, Ed. du Félin, Paris, 1990.
141. James, William, *A Pluralistic Universe*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1996.
142. Jänicke, Martin, Democracy as a Condition for Environmental Policy Success: The Importance of Non-Institutional Factors, în William M. Lafferty, James Meadowcroft (edit.), *Democracy and the Environment: Problems and Prospects*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 1996.
143. Janowitz, Morris, *Political Conflict*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1970.
144. Kalyvas, Andreas, “Feet of Clay? Reflections on Hardt’s and Negri’s Empire,” în *Constellation*, nr. 10, 2003.
145. Katzenstin, Peter J., *Small States in World Markets*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1985.
146. Kaufman, Arnold, *The Radical Liberal: New Man in American Politics*, Atherton Press, New York, 1968.
147. Konrad, G., „Chance Wandering”, în *Dissent*, 1990.
148. Koyama, Hanako, Political Philosophy and Pluralism in a Globalised World, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.

149. Laclau, Ernesto, Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, Verso, London, 1985.
150. Larmore, Charles E., *Patterns of Moral Complexity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.
151. Larmore, Charles, *The Morals of Modernity*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1996.
152. Laursen, John C., Villaverde, José, Introducción, în vol. John C. Laursen, José Villaverde (edit.), *Forjadores de la Tolerancia*, Ed. Tecnos, Madrid, 2011.
153. Lecler, Joseph, *Histoire de la tolérance au siècle de la réforme*, Albin Michel, Paris, 1994.
154. Lehmbruch, Gerhard, Concertation and the Structure of Corporatist Networks, în John H. Goldthorpe (edit.), *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1984.
155. Lenski, Gerhard, *Power and Privilege*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1966.
156. Lessing, Nathan le sage, Gallimard, Paris, 2006.
157. Leu, Corneliu, Reintroduce în personalism - eseuri, Editura Realitatea, 2000.
158. Levine, Andrew, *The general will. Rousseau, Marx, communism*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.
159. Lijphart, Arend, *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*, ediția a II-a, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1975.
160. Lijphart, Arend, „Consociational Democracy”, în Kenneth McRae (edit.), *Consociational Democracy, Political Accommodation in Segmented Societies*, McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1974.
161. Lindblom, Charles E., *Politics and Markets: The World's Political-Economic Systems*, Basic Books, New York, 1977.
162. Linz, Juan, „An Authoritarian Regime: Spain”, în Stein Rokkan, Erik Allardt (edit.), *Mass politics: Studies in Political Sociology*, The Free Press, New York, 1970.
163. Lipset, Seymour Martin, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1960.
164. Locke, J., *Scrisoare despre toleranță*, în *Tratat despre cărmuire*, Ed. Nemira, București, 1999.

165. Lorwin, Val R., „Segmental Pluralism”, *Comparative Politics*, vol. 3, 1971.
166. Lukes, Steven, *Power*, Macmillan, London, 1974.
167. Lynd, Robert S., Lynd, Helen Merrell, *Middletown in Transition*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1937.
168. Lyotard, Jean-François, „Notes on Legitimation”, în *Oxford Literary Review*, nr. 9, 1987.
169. MacIntyre, Alistair, „Incommensurability, Truth, and the Conversation Between Confucians and Aristotelians about the Virtues” în *Culture and Modernity East-West Philosophical Perspectives*, Eliot Deutsch (edit.), University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, 1980.
170. Madsen, Richard, Strong, Tracy B., Introduction: Three Forms of Ethical Pluralism, în vol. Richard Madsen, Tracy B. Strong (edit.), *The Many and the One, Religious and Secular Perspectives on Ethical Pluralism in the Modern World*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2003.
171. Manent, Pierre, *Istoria intelectuală a liberalismului*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1992.
172. Mann, Michael, „The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracy”, în *American Sociological Review*, vol. 35, nr. 3, Iunie 1970.
173. Marcuse, Herbert, *One Dimensional Man*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964.
174. Maritain, J., *Humanisme integral. Problèmes temporels et spirituels d’une nouvelle chrétienté*, Ed. Aubier, Paris, 1936.
175. Maritain, J., *Humanisme integral: problemes temporels et spirituels d’une nouvelle chrétienté*, Fernand Aubier, 1936 (Trad. - *Integral Humanism: Temporal and Spiritual Problems of a New Chrestendom*, Tr. Joseph W. Evens, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1968.
176. Maritain, J., *The Range of Reason*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1952.
177. Maritain, J., *Man and the State*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951.
178. Maritain, J., *La loi naturelle et la loi non écrite: text inedit stabilit de Deorges Brazzola*, Fribourg, Suisse, Editions universitaires, 1986.
179. Maritain, J., *Les droits de l’homme et la loi naturelle*, Editions de la Maison française, New York, 1942.

180. Maritain, J., *Les droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle*, Editions de la Maison française, New York, 1942.
181. Marshall, T. H., *Citizenship and Social Class, and Other Essays*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1950.
182. Marshall, T.H., *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*, Doubleday, New York, 1964.
183. Marquand, David, *The End of the West. The Once and Future Europe*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2011.
184. Mayhew, David R., *Congress, the Electoral Connection*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1974.
185. McClure, K., "On the subject of rights: pluralism, plurality, and political identity", în C. Mouffe *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*, Verso, London, 1992.
186. McConnell, Grant, *Private Property and American Democracy*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1966.
187. McFarland, Andrew S., *Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, 1969.
188. Meernick, James, „United States Military Interventions and the Promotion of Democracy”, în *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 33, nr. 4, 1996.
189. Meidinger, Errol E., *Forest Certification as a Global Civil Society Regulatory Institution*, în Errol E. Meidinger, Chris Elliott, Gerhard Oesten (edit.), *Social and Political Dimensions of Forest Certification*, Forstbuch Verlag, Remagen-Oberwinter, 2003.
190. Michels, Robert, *Political Parties*, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1958.
191. Mill, John Stuart, *On Liberty*, 1859, <http://www.utilitarianism.com/ol/one.html>.
192. Mills, C. W., *The Power Elite*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, (1956) 1959.
193. Mills, C. Wright, *White Collar*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1951.
194. Mogami, Toshiki, *International Organizations*, University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1996.
195. Montesquieu, *Despre spiritul legilor*, vol. II, Cartea a XXV-a, Ed. Științifică, București, 1964-1970.
196. Mouffe, Chantal, *The Democratic Paradox*, Verso, New York, 2000.

197. Mounier, E., Oeuvres, Tome I, Manifeste au service du personnalisme, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1936.
198. Newey, Glen, „Value Pluralism in Contemporary Liberalism”, în *Dialogue*, Nr. 77, 1998.
199. Newmann, Sigmund (edit.), Modern Political Parties, University of Chicago Press, Chicago; Kay Lawson, The Comparative Study of Political Parties, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1976.
200. Nordlinger, Eric A., Conflict regulation in Divided Societies, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1972.
201. Offe, Claus, Contradictions of the Welfare State, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1984.
202. Offe, Claus, New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics, în *Social Research*, nr. 52, 1985.
203. O'Hagan, Timothy, Rousseau, Routledge, London, 1999 (2005).
204. Olson jr., Mancur, The Logic of Collective Action, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1965.
205. Parekh, Bhiku, „Theorizing Political Theor”, în *Political Theory in Transition*, Noel O'Sullivan (edit.), Routedledge, London, 2000.
206. Pateman, Carole, Participation and Democratic Theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.
207. Peceny, Mark, „Forcing Them to Be Free”, în *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 52, nr. 3, September 1999.
208. Pekkarinen, Jukka, Pohjola, Matti, Rowthorn, Bob, Social Corporatism: A Superior Economic System?, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.
209. Pierre, Jon, Peters, B. Guy, Governance and the State, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2000.
210. Pirie, Madsen, 101 Great Philosophers, Continuum, London, 2009.
211. Plaw, Avery, Pluralist Imperialism: The Emergent Paradigm of U.S. Foreign Policy, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
212. Polsby, Nelson W., Community Power and Political Theory, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1963.

213. Popper, Karl R., *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1966.
214. Pratt, Douglas, *Religious Plurality, Referential Realism and Paradigms of Pluralism*, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
215. Pratt, Douglas, „Pluralism and Interreligious Engagement: The Contexts of Dialogue”, în *A Faithful Presence, essays for Kenneth Cragg*, David Thomas, Clare Amos (edit.), Melisende Press, London, 2003.
216. Presthus, Robert, *The Organizational Society*, Vintage Books, New York, 1962.
217. Pye, Lucian W., *Politics, Personality and Nation Building*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1962.
218. Pye, L., *Aspects of Political Development*, Little Brown, Ed. Boston, 1967.
219. Rawls, „Justice as Fairness: Political, Not Metaphysical”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1985.
220. Rawls, John, *A Theory of Justice*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1971.
221. Rawls, J., *After Politics: The Rejection of Politics in Contemporary Liberal Political Philosophy*, Palgrave, New York, 2001.
222. Raz, Joseph, *The Morality of Freedom*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986.
223. Reiss Jr., Albert J. et al., *Occupations and Social Status*, The Free Press, New York, 1961.
224. Rhodes, R.A.W., *Understanding Governance*, Open University Press, Buckingham, 1997.
225. Rhodes, R.A.W., *Policy Network Analysis*, în Michael Moran, Martin Rein, Robert Goodin (edit.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
226. Ricci, David (edit), *Community Power and Democratic Theory*, Random House, New York, 1971.
227. Riker, William H., Ordeshook, Peter C., „A Theory of the Calculus of Voting”, în *American Political Science Review*, vol. 62, Martie 1962.

228. Rorty, Richard, "Cultural Politics and the Question of the Existence of God," in Nancy Frankenberry (edit.) *Radical Interpretation in Religion*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
229. Rorty, Richard, *Philosophy and Social Hope*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1999.
230. Rorty, Richard, Pragmatism as Romantic Polytheism, in Morris Dickstein (edit.), *The Revival of Pragmatism*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1998.
231. Rorty, Richard, *Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth Century America*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
232. Rousseau, *On the Social Contract: With Geneva Manuscript and Political Economy*, trans. Judith Masters, St Martin's, New York, 1978), vol. 1.
233. Rosenau, Pauline V. (edit.), *Public-Private Policy Partnership*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2000.
234. Rostovtzeff, M., *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1941.
235. Sabatier, Paul A., An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein, *Policy Sciences*, nr. 21, 1988.
236. Sabatier, Paul A., Policy Change Over a Decade or More, in Paul A. Sabatier, Hank Jenkins-Smith (edit.), *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Westview, Boulder, 1993.
237. Sabine, Georges H., *A History of Political Thought*, 4th ed., Forth Worth, 1973.
238. Sandler, Ronald, Townley, Cynthia, A Defense of Tolerance as a Moral Virtue, in vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
239. Sartori, Giovanni, *Parties and Party Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976.
240. Scanlon, T. M., *The Difficulty of Tolerance. Essays in Political Philosophy*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003.
241. Schattschneider, E. E., *The Semi-Sovereign People*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1960.

242. Schlosberg, David, "The Pluralist Imagination", în John S. Dryzek, Bonnie Honig and Anne Phillips, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
243. Schmitt, Carl, "Ethic of State and Pluralistic State," în Chantal Mouffe (edit.), *The Challenge of Carl Schmitt*, Verso, London, 1999.
244. Schmitt, Carl, *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1985.
245. Schumpeter, Joseph Alois, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Routledge, London, (1943) 2003.
246. Schwartzemberg, R. G., *Sociologie politique*, Ed. Montchrestien, Paris, 1971.
247. Scruggs, Lyle A., *Institutions and Environmental Performance in Seventeen Western Democracies*, în *British Journal of Political Science*, nr. 29, 1999.
248. Sivarajah, Mark, *Value-pluralism and Human Rights*, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
249. Sjöblom, Gunnar, *Party Strategies in a Multiparty System*, Studentlitterature, Lund, Sweden, 1970.
250. Slaughter, Anne-Marie, *The Real New World Order*, în *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, nr. 5, 1997.
251. Smith, Nicholas H., *Is Monotheism Compatible with Pluralism? Reflections on Richard Rorty's Critique of Religion*, în vol. Avery Plaw (Edit.), *Frontiers of Diversity. Explorations in Contemporary Pluralism*, Rodopi, New York, 2005.
252. Soltan, Karol, *A Marriage of Gandhi and Madison*, *Newsletter of the Committee on the Political Economy of the Good Society*, vol. 2, nr. 1, 1992.
253. Sørensen, Eva, Torfing, Jacob, *Introduction*, în Eva Sørensen, Jacob Torfing (edit.), *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2007.
254. Swenson, James, *Rousseau, the Revolution and the Republic*, în vol. Holger Ross Lauritsen, Mikkel Thorup (edit.), *Rousseau and Revolution*, Continuum, London, New York, 2011.

255. Tesh, Sylvia N., *New Social Movements and New Ideas*, 1993, în John S. Dryzek, Patrick Dunleavy, *Theories of the Democratic State*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009.
256. Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, în vol. Richard D. Heffner (edit.), Mentor Books, New York, 1956.
257. Trăsnea, Ovidiu, *Probleme de sociologie politică*, Ed. Politică, București, 1975.
258. Truman, David B., *The Governmental Process*, Knopf, New York, 1951.
259. Verba, Sidney, Nie, Norman H., *Participation in America*, Harper&Row, New York, 1972.
260. Walzer, Michael, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*, Basic Books, New York, 1983.
261. Warner, W. Lloyd et al., *Social Glass in America*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1960.
262. Weber, Max, *The theory of social and economic organization*, William Hodge, London, 1947.
263. Wennan, Mark, William E. Connolly: *Pluralism without Transcendence*, în *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, nr. 10, 2008.
264. Wissenburg, Marcel, *Political Pluralism and the State. Beyond sovereignty*, Routledge, London, 2009.
265. Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Contribuții la critica teoriilor elitare*, Ed. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1979.
266. Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Doctrină Politică*, Editura Fundației Chemarea, Iași, 1994.
267. Zăpârțan, L. P., *Repere în știința politicii*, Editura Fundației Chemarea, Iași, 1992.

