



INTRODUCTION

Alexandra Abranches*
alexandra@ilch.uminho.pt

The Centre for Ethics, Politics and Society (CEPS) at the University of Minho held the third edition of the Braga Colloquia in the History of Moral and Political Philosophy on the 1st and 2nd February 2018. This annual conference has been conceived as an encounter among researchers fostering an amicable discussion among peers which would attract prestigious scholars and provide young researchers with an opportunity to present their work and promote the study of the tradition of political and moral philosophy and its legacy in shaping our institutions, culture and beliefs. But the goal of this series of conferences is also to focus on how this tradition can contribute to tackling the challenges our societies are facing today. Every year the conference will have a specific theme, which will be chosen by taking into consideration the current global political situation. So, in line with the spirit behind this new series of conferences, the third edition of the Braga Colloquium in the History of Moral and Political Philosophy explored the ideas of “radicalism” and “compromise”. The Centre for Ethics, Politics and Society (CEPS) at the University of Minho held the third edition of the Braga Colloquia in the History of Moral and Political Philosophy on the 1st and 2nd February 2018. This annual conference has been conceived as an encounter fostering an amicable discussion among peers which would both attract prestigious scholars and provide young researchers with an opportunity to present their work and promote the study of the tradition of political and moral philosophy and its legacy in shaping our institutions, culture

* Integrated Researcher at CEPS (Center for Ethics, Politics and Society), University of Minho.

and beliefs. But the goal of this series of conferences is also to focus on how this tradition can contribute to tackling the challenges our societies are facing today. Every year the conference has a specific theme, which will be chosen by taking into consideration the current global political situation. So, in line with the spirit behind this new series of conferences, the third edition of the Braga Colloquium in the History of Moral and Political Philosophy explored the ideas of “radicalism” and “compromise”. Politics has frequently been defined as the art of the possible or the art of compromise. More dramatically, it has been depicted as the realm of Faustian deals and tragic choices. Max Weber famously wrote that the political call demands endurance in the face of disappointment. It is the realm of frustration and sacrifices, of fragile equilibriums between *fiat justitia* and *raison d'état*.

Sometimes the existence of political structures of accountability relaxes the dependence on character, reputation, and honor among conflicting parties. Reasonable civic duties suffice to deflate social conflicts and to compensate offended actors. Lacking these institutions, integrity becomes non-negotiable for social trust.

On occasion, however, a social order of tolerance would not emerge without sacrificing the moral integrity of former heroes that we now consider dogmatic integrists. Conversely, this institutional order of tolerance also allows the political space for the reconstruction of identity claims for recognition that derive their radical strength from their intrinsic aversion to political settlement.

From a historical point of view, our political languages and attitudes towards compromise, negotiation, bargaining, and agreement have changed in a myriad of contexts and traditions. As so did our conceptions of what seemed once worth sacrificing or defending**.

The format of the conference includes a keynote speaker, a prestigious scholar in the field either of Ethics or Political Philosophy, or both, who is generally recognized for their contributions to the discussion of the conference's topic. Professor Avishai Margalit, Professor Emeritus at the Hebrew University

** My special thanks to Professor David Alvarez, from the University of Vigo – and a very much missed former integrated member of CEPS - for drafting this year's call for papers.

of Jerusalem, who, sadly, wasn't able to travel due to health problems, would have been our guest this year. But we were fortunate enough to have as keynote speaker Prof. Simon Cabulea May, from Florida State University, who not only generously accepted our late invitation, but also participated actively in the many discussions arising in the various sessions of the conference. As organizer of this edition of the conference and as a member of CEPS, I wish to express here my deep gratitude to Professor Simon Cabulea May for his critical role in making this a successful event, attracting participants from all corners the world.

Another feature of this series of conferences is that the authors of those presentations deemed most relevant are invited to submit an article based on their presentations for publication in a special dossier in the *Ethics, Politics and Society* journal. This year, six articles which impressed by their quality, have been collected and are now herein presented.

In "A Politics without Compromise: The Young Hegelians and Politics" Vivien Garcia explains how compromise is rejected by the Young Hegelians since it is incompatible with their Hegelian stance on reality as a dialectical process. Julio. A. Andrade, in "Enacting Levinas's infinite responsibility as an ethico-political compromise", argues for a particular reading of Levinas on the relationship of ethics and politics as compromise which permits the possibility of there being continuity, rather than a gap, between the two, and discusses the implications of this interpretation for business ethics. Paolo Vanini, "A reactionary fascination: Emil Cioran and Joseph De Maistre" explores Cioran's reading of De Maistre's thought as an instrument with which to investigate the ideological debate on reaction and revolution that took place in the twentieth century. In "What Does Being An "Aristotelian" Really Mean" Sinan Kadir Çelik addresses the ambiguity with which terms like "(neo-)Aristotelian" or "Aristotelianism" are used in current literature on ethics and political philosophy, and proposes a definition or characterization of an "Aristotelian" way of inquiry in these fields. In "Compromise and/or Integrity? Some Normative Remarks.", Beatrice Magni offers a conception of compromise which distances itself from negotiation and preserves the demanding requirements of moral fairness. Finally, Yuval Eilon discusses the cost of compromise in terms of political virtue and proposes that being uncompromising is sometimes the best course of action.