


Pergunta 1

Por responder

Nota: 2,00

 Marcar pergunta

Analyse the following sentence of Hespanha:

In fact, most lawyers, as well as non lawyers, will assume that law is irreducibly linked to modernism, so deep is the oblivion of older conceptions about societal order and so inevitable seems to be the current identification between law and State. I intend to prove that this not so. However, I am also aware that, even if the proof succeeds, almost everything in legal theory has to be rebuilt to restore lost capacities: I. to render visible the plans of emergence of order; II. to activate bridges between different societal orders; III. to control the validity of normative transactions between them; IV. to dress conjunctural hierarchies amidst normative constellations. António Manuel Hespanha, "Jurists as Gamekeepers, *Acta Histriae*, 16(4), 2008, 477-502.

OR


Analyse the following sentence of Guibentif:

"Law and the legal professions, once experienced, at least by certain social categories, as helpful for insightful dealings with the rules of the community, are increasingly conditioned by concepts and rules shaped transnationally. And states – or most of them – as well as the law, ceased to form the centre of the global world". Pierre Guibentif, "Law in the Semi-Periphery

Pergunta 2

Por responder

Nota: 2,00

 Marcar pergunta


Analyse the following sentence:

"To a large extent such conflicts rather are the inevitable consequence of the incompatibility that exists between the intrinsic necessities of logically consistent formal legal thinking and the fact that the legally relevant agreements and activities of private parties are aimed at economic results and oriented towards economically determined expectations". Max **Weber**, *Economy and Society*.

Pergunta 3

Por responder

Nota: 2,00


 Marcar pergunta

Analyse the following sentence of Etienne Balibar:
"the contradiction between democratic ideas that are declared as their founding principles by most of our contemporary societies and the heavy reality of discriminations, inequalities, and exclusions that characterize our liberal "bourgeois" societies is not really mysterious, because it is quite simply a *fact* [...]. The question, however, is not only to describe facts, identify causes, or choose between acceptance and revolt, it is to understand *why*, in modern societies as opposed to most "traditional" social orders that were hierarchic by definition, the distance between principles and facts appears as a contradiction, which consequently can be seen as unbearable, or as a pragmatic necessity". Etienne Balibar, "Ontological difference, anthropological difference, and equal liberty", Eur J Philos. 2020;1–12.

Pergunta 4

Por responder

Nota: 2,00

 Marcar pergunta

Analyse the following sentence:

"The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so that the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations, the dominant material relations grasped as ideas; hence of the relations which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance". Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology*.