

SUMMARIES

J. V. Snellman and today's political science

By Heikki Paloheimo

J. V. Snellman was the best known political philosopher in Finland during the last century. His ideas concerning the essence of state were rather much similar to those of G. W. F. Hegel. So Snellman too divided his philosophy of right into three different parts: natural law, morality and science of politics or ethical life.

According to Snellman's theory of ethical life social justice can't be based on abstract ideas of natural law or subjective feelings of morality only. It must be based on accepted habits of the people or the spirit of nationalism. The positive laws of a state are always based on the needs and accepted habits of the people, and if they are not they could not be positive, effective laws at all. The ethical task of a people living in *civil society* is to try to understand the reason and justice that is included in the positive laws. In civil society people are fulfilling their own particular interests, and their life is ethical when they spontaneously understand the reason and justice of positive laws. According to Snellman people are free if their will is reasonable, identical with the spirit of nationalism.

In the *state*, on the other hand, the spontaneous observation of the legal forms is not a sufficient condition for ethical life. When acting in the state people must also make rules, not just follow them. Action in the state should be based on the interests of the whole, not on particular interests as in civil society.

According to the *positivistic jurisprudence* social order is based on the system of positive laws. Positive laws may always be fulfilled independent of the subjective feelings of the actor. So law and freedom of action are in a way contradictory concepts. The more you have legal norms the smaller is the sphere of free action. Snellman, on the other hand, maintains that positive laws and freedom of action may coincide: Outside the sphere of positive law you don't have freedom but arbitrariness and coercion. Justice is reasonable freedom of mind.

Brian Barry divides social scientists into two groups: economists and sociologists. *Economists* think that social order is based on an action system where actors are motivated by particular interests. *Sociologists* on the other hand see a common value system as the basis of social order. Neither economics nor sociology alone can explain social action entirely. Their views are complementary. An interesting question is in which respect social action can be explained with a utilitarian and with a sociological calculus. Maybe a still more interesting question is the relations between these two views: what

is the effect of utilitarian action systems to the common value system and the other way round. Snellman's science of politics implies one answer to this question.

There are some analogies between Hegelian and Marxian social theories. Both of these schools try to find a solution to the problem of how the particular interests of individual actors may at the same time coincide with the interest of the whole society.

Some differences between Hegel's and Snellman's social and political views

By Juha Manninen

The most important works of J. W. Snellman (1806—1881) were *Versuch einer speculativen Entwicklung der Idee der Persönlichkeit* (published in 1841 in Tübingen) and *Läran om staten* (published in 1842 in Stockholm). In the present paper it is emphasized that these two works cannot be understood properly except in close connexion with each other. The speculative foundations of the latter are developed in the first.

Snellman was the foremost representative of Finnish Hegelianism, but in many respects his view were different from those of Hegel. For instance, in his characterization of the relationship between civil society and the state Snellman did not accept Hegel's analysis of the civil society as a sphere of subjectivity. Snellman's philosophy as a whole was strongly antisubjectivistic. More over, Snellman's philosophy had a more 'positivistic' bent than that of Hegel, separating him from the master's dialectic and coming close to the vicinity of the Historical School. This difference was not without consequence, since it was one of the intellectual presuppositions of Snellman's nationalism as against Hegel's doctrine of non-nationatistic patriotism.

J. V. Snellman and the problem of small nations

By Esko Antola

J. V. Snellman, a Finnish philosopher and politician (1806—1881) was one of the most prominent figures in the scientific and political life of the mid 19th century in Finland. In his writings on politics and state, he largely reflected the Hegelian tradition. According to many of his followers in the academic life of Finland, Snellman, however, in many respects was forced to give up the Hegelian tradion in the streigt sence. By and large his philosophical thoughts were combinations of the Hegelian tradition and of the experiences of the everyday politics in the Finnish society.

In his major contribution to the political theory, *Läran om staten* (Science of Politics, 1842) Snellman defines his principles of the international system. Snellman strongly supports the principle of full sovereignty of every nation. He also stresses that the national independence and sovereignty are necessary conditions for the fulfillment of nationhood and of the spirit of nationalism, a mystified concept of Snellman indicating the capability of a nation to survive. As to the problem of small nations, Snellman strongly stresses the right for self-determination of every nation regardless of the size of the nation.

The most important precondition for the national survival is the spirit of nationalism in the Snellmanian sense. The spirit of nationalism consists of the understanding of the history of a nation, of the habits and national peculiarities of a nation and of the moral and political strength of the nation. The international system is in Snellman's works seen as a balance of power system reflecting the principles of the Congress of Vienna. His basic ideas come close indeed to those of the realistic school of the post Second World War period.

In the international system of the balance of power, small nations can survive only through the politics of realism. Political realism is the key concept in the works of Snellman when he touches the problems of small nations in world politics. His realism has had an important impact on the development of the Finnish foreign policy of neutralism, first of all through J. K. Paasikivi, president of Finland in 1945—1956.

G. W. F. Hegel on the nature of the philosophical treatise

Notes for the study of the Introduction to the Encyclopedia of Heidelberg

By Lauri Mehtonen

The author tries to explicate Hegel's understanding of the philosophical research. The raw material of the explication is taken from his introduction to the Heidelbergian edition of the Encyclopedia.

The paper shows that the difference between philosophy and the special sciences is a basic constituent in Hegel's idea of the philosophical research as a logical exposition of the Reason and its self-development. If this fundamental difference is forgotten, a number of Hegel's own descriptions of the nature of the philosophical study will not be understood.