

Ana S. Vuković¹
Institute of Social Sciences
Belgrade (Serbia)

Marinko V. Lolić²
Institute of Social Sciences
Belgrade (Serbia)

PHILOSOPHICAL AND LEGAL VIEWS ON PACIFISM OF THE SERBIAN INTELLECTUAL ELITE IN THE 20th CENTURY: EXAMPLE OF KSENIJA ATANASIJEVIĆ AND ĐORĐE TASIĆ³

The state of war (is) in itself an injustice of the highest degree. Peace is “the ultimate purpose of legal learning” and “the greatest political good”.

Immanuel Kant

ABSTRACT: The paper critically discusses the theoretical foundations and key values of pacifism in the philosophical and socio-legal discourse of Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić. Furthermore, in the context of political events in Europe and the world in the 1930s, the interest in pacifist ideas and non-violent forms of resistance to extreme forms of violence among the Serbian intellectual elite is analyzed, pointing out the fate of pacifism and advocacy of pacifist ideas, as well as the significance of these ideas for our contemporary political culture. In the second part of the paper, from a broader perspective of our time in a context dominated by various forms of extreme violence resulting from wars, migration, epidemics and the struggle for political, economic and military dominance, the authors

¹ annvukovic@yahoo.com

² marinko.lolic@gmail.com

³ This paper was written as part of the 2023 Research Program of the Institute of Social Sciences with the support of the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia.

intend to indicate the relevance and key values of the idea of pacifism and the practical pacifist engagement of Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić.

KEYWORDS: Ksenija Atanasijević, Đorđe Tasić, philosophy, sociology, law, pacifism, violence.

INTRODUCTION

Well-known researchers of contemporary Serbian philosophical and legal culture (Basta, 1991; Marjanović, 1993) emphasize that philosopher Ksenija Atanasijević and philosopher of law and sociologist Đorđe Tasić are the most famous advocates and theoreticians of pacifism in the Serbian academic elite of the first half of the 20th century. Regardless of these flattering evaluations, their pacifist ideas, which have exceptional theoretical and practical relevance, have not been sufficiently explored and adequately evaluated in our contemporary philosophy, law and sociological theory.

In the 1930s, although the consequences of the First World War were still felt, eminent scientists and researchers in European countries, including Serbia, and in the world, sensed that the battle between good and evil was on the horizon again, and realized that social changes, such as the coming to power of dictators with eugenic-racist ideological rhetoric, the forcing of the military-industrial complex and the armament of countries, required their philosophical, legal and sociological reflection. Among the scientists and researchers of humanism and society as a whole, who through the questions raised and analyzed in their texts, directly and indirectly, indicated the possibility of a new world conflict, were philosopher Ksenija Atanasijević and jurist and sociologist Đorđe Tasić.

Although the legal sociological and philosophical perspectives of Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić differ, their kinship is reflected in emphasizing the importance of solidarity as a key value in the period of crisis in Europe and the emergence of totalitarian regimes. Ksenija Atanasijević points to the emergence of Nazism, and Đorđe Tasić draws attention to fascism in his texts, while they both believe that it is necessary to make efforts to maintain a just peace. Both authors criticized the League of Nations, that is, the corruption of the society and its inability to peacefully resolve the growing antagonisms between nations. In the Đorđe Tasić thought, the legal and sociological aspect is more prevalent, because he often speaks about the state as an institution that should protect the individual, while in the thought of Ksenija Atanasijević, the moral-philosophical aspect is also included, because she writes about reverence for the human person, that is, about the necessity of protecting human dignity.

In this paper, we try to illuminate only the most important aspects of their, at first glance, very diverse conceptions of pacifism and to point out the relevance of their peace projects for understanding the key problems of our time.

THE ROADS OF PACIFISM OF KSENIJA ATANASIJEVIĆ

In her philosophical understanding of the idea of pacifism, Ksenija Atanasijević was deeply convinced that there were two paths leading to this very atypical political point of view, not only in ours, but also in European and the wider global political culture. She called the first path transcendental, and, in her opinion, it “refers to one who has completely lost interest in world events (...) who is completely turned to some higher religious or metaphysical principle” (Atanasijević, 2011: 41). According to her, “people with such healed souls” are “pacifist-minded ... they do not pick a fight with anyone and do not accept reasons for reckoning from anyone, because they do not even need any of the vain earthly achievements” (Atanasijević, 2011: 41-42). Ksenija calls such persons “sublimated peace-caring... people who forever defeated the world of multitude and deception” (*Ibid*: 42). Although some of her critics and interpreters attributed precisely this understanding of pacifism to her, Ksenija rejected it, considering it too radical and, it seems, ineffective in the real world.

The second path, which leads to a pacifist point of view, in the opinion of our author, is less radical than the previous one, because it strives to achieve peace in our earthly life and is achieved “again by entering into religious⁴ or philosophical truths” (*Ibid*: 42), but with the difference that this type of “altruism is related to activity within the framework of participation in the laws and events of this world” (*Ibid*: 42). With Gandhi’s⁵ belief in the power of truthfulness, she asserts that “people who have deeply imbued themselves with the truth” and consider that “their first duty is to ensure a peaceful existence for themselves and their neighbours, will consciously raise the foundation of the soul ethic, whose first principle will be the inviolability of every human being, without exception” (Atanasijević, 2011: 42). Ksenija believed that morality based on truthfulness resulted in “a political doctrine that will declare that every country, large as well as small⁶, has the same right to an independent and free life and to unimpeded development” (*Ibid*: 42).

As a philosopher of refined moral sensibility (Jeremić, 1997: 129), Ksenija pointed out numerous shortcomings of contemporary civilization. Like Immanuel Kant, she believed that “only when culture acquires an ethical character will the danger of using technical inventions to destroy and exterminate people disappear” (*Ibid*: 42). She was deeply convinced that “only enlightened consciousness was able to curb the egoistic and predatory instincts of man and people, and to unite them in joint work for the common good” (*Ibid*: 42).

⁴ Cf. Halkin, 1994.

⁵ In his autobiography entitled *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, Mahatma Gandhi expressed his belief in the power of truth in the statement: “God is truth - truth is God” (according to Čičovački, 2022: 98).

⁶ Đorđe Tasić advocated that the principle of equality of states applied to the League of Nations regardless of the size of the states (Tasić, 1922: 121).

On the basis of the valuable philosophical insights into human nature, provided in Ksenija Atanasijević's philosophical work, it can be said quite reliably that the highly emphasized pessimism⁷ permeating her philosophical thought, in a significant sense also determined her final attitude towards pacifism. Bearing in mind the indomitability of human nature, Ksenija believed that most we could expect in the future in this regard was the achievement of "relative peace (underlined by A.V. and M.L.) which (...) will never be unyieldingly respected, because man's nature (...) will continue to snatch under the control of conscience and compassion" (Atanasijević, 2011: 42-43).

Ksenija Atanasijević did not initially advocate the idea of the possibility of achieving ideal peace on earth, as preached by Christ (Atanasijević, 2011: 97-105), or certain modern thinkers, such as Kant. Some researchers of her philosophical thought believe that our philosopher, only in her later writings, begins to believe in the possibility of realization of the "pacifist utopia" (Vuletić, 2012: 237). However, it seems that in those forecasts, her expectations were much more realistic, considering that she believed that significant success would be achieved if "in the future at least the repetition of bloody and devastating wars is avoided" (Atanasijević, 2011: 43).

However, in order to achieve even this substantially modest goal, in the opinion of our philosopher, fundamental changes are necessary, not only in our ethical norms, but also in ontological principles. According to her, the resolution of conflicts between people is not possible without "investing in ontological cosmological essentials and using high moral orientations for practical actions derived from them" (*Ibid*: 43). Since she was convinced that this high moral requirement of "enlightenment can be fulfilled only by philosophers and prophets", it is quite logical for her to point out that "far less harm would have been done to people and nations, if the states had listened to the advice of exalted prophets and of the wise" (*Ibid*: 43).

Ksenija Atanasijević is one of the pioneers in the history of the development of the philosophy of feminism in the territory of Yugoslavia. Her texts, which reflect on the social position and altruistic role of women, represent studious reflections on women and feminism based on experience and knowledge of the mentality, culture and social relations of our midst. According to Ksenija Atanasijević, women significantly contributed to the realization of individual freedom, the protection of women and children, and the introduction of the idea of pacifism instead of political conflicts (Vuković, 2019).

In her discussions on pacifism, Ksenija Atanasijević did not remain only in the sphere of high speculative philosophical theory and theological thought, but also tried to practically realize her peace ideas, as evidenced by her involvement in the Women's Movement,

⁷ Ksenija Atanasijević belonged to the generation of students of Branislav Petronijević, who, after returning from Germany, gave his first lecture on Schopenhauer, and was one of the first philosophers in Serbian philosophical culture who wrote about the greatest philosopher of European pessimism. The words of Ksenija Atanasijević testify to how strong the influence of the author of the work *The World as Will and Performance* was in our intellectual and academic public: "We all swore by Schopenhauer then" (Atanasijević, 2006)!

where she enjoyed a reputation of one of the leaders of Yugoslav feminism and pacifism, as seen from her lecture and her report from the World Conference of Women for Peace and Disarmament, held in Belgrade from May 17 to 19, 1931. Also, her thought and actions later inspired women's organizations in our country (Vuković, 2015). This kind of political and feminist engagement of Ksenija Atanasijević can be seen as a forerunner of research into the role of women's identity – whether women have an identity and what its components are, as well as practical political participation through the analysis of collective women's identity in which the social position of women and the influence it has on the formation of female identity in society is discussed (Vuković, 2013: 249-250).

The topic of Ksenija's presentation was the pacifist influence of women on public opinion during peacetime. From a philosophical perspective, the author pointed out the kinship between feminism and pacifism, and underlined that, in the pursuit of achieving women's rights, the women's movement "is based on an ontological and moral foundation" (Atanasijević 2008: 75). She believed that "feminists spread an atmosphere of harmony and peace around them" (Atanasijević 2008: 79), and given that they stand up for "respect for every person, their political concept will be that one must feel reverence for the freedom of all people, because every stranger is a neighbour" (*Ibid*: 79). In the philosophical views of our philosopher, in which deep empathy towards the foreigner is emphasized, her opposition to any xenophobia that had already deeply affected the "European world of life" is clearly shown.

Evaluating, in the current political context, the importance of the conference on peace, Ksenija did not fail to emphasize that the Belgrade debate came at the time when terrible threats of war emerged among the countries all over the world. She was convinced that the peaceful messages heard at the Belgrade conference strongly "wavered the consciousness and conscience of those who attended and (...) influenced the creation of an atmosphere suitable for achieving moral disarmament" (Atanasijević, 2008: 77). The author states that, at this gathering, the representatives of different countries advocated that women should be given full justice, and that humanity should be provided with permanent and improved peace, which will have a beneficial effect on the strengthening of pacifism in our country and in the world. In the final words of her report, the previous position that affirms Belgrade on the world map as the capital of world pacifism and feminism is summarized:

"Close contact with European and American pioneers of a more ethical and fairer future of humanity, and listening to their lively, honest and temperamental words, left a beneficial mark in our midst. That is why the effort of the long journey to our Belgrade, which they, in their kindness, compared to the most beautiful cities in the world, paid off for these great idealists" (Atanasijević, 2008: 77).

Undoubtedly one of the eminent Serbian researchers and sincere supporters of pacifism, Ksenija Atanasijević made a great contribution to the understanding and popularization of the most important philosophical works in our community, which

significantly strengthened the theoretical reflection of members of the pacifist movement. In her review of the first Yugoslav integral edition of Kant's writings on Perpetual Peace (Atanasijević, 1936: 627-630), she points out that the thinker from Königsberg, within the framework of philosophical research of transcendental idealism, "developed more deeply his review of perpetual peace between peoples, as one of the points whose realization falls under the necessary requirements of the practical mind" (Atanasijević, 1936: 627). Pointing to the eternal relevance of Kant's idea of perpetual peace, she points out that the "greatest German pacifist" not only "exceeds all understanding of man's attitude towards man of his time", but also "surpasses even our age, which is (...) savagely inhuman and blindly merciless" (*Ibid*: 628).

The key principles of Kant's transcendental philosophy of peace; categorical imperative and the concept of legal duty are considered insufficient by Ksenija, "so that evil in man, rooted in the primeval, could weaken to some extent" (Babić, 1985; Hare, 1985; Höffe, 1995; Kindić, 2016; Lolić, 2018; Slapšak, 2020). Nevertheless, our philosopher pointed out that the creator of transcendental idealism, "in addition to striking distance from reality, also has (...) moments of shrewd, undeniable pessimism" (Atanasijević, 1936: 629), which she saw in the ironic remark of Königsberg thinker "that the world will not perish if there are fewer evil people in it" (*Ibid*: 629). Therefore, she rightly points out that the provision of Kant's concept of perpetual peace that is "grossly desecrated" is precisely that provision of Kant's concept of perpetual peace in which the writer of *The Critique of Pure Reason* demands that "every government has to treat human rights as sacred" (*Ibid*: 629).

Ksenija Atanasijević rightly believed that in the middle of the 20th century the idea of pacifism reached its deepest crisis and turned into a "monstrous caricature" (Atanasijević, 1936: 630). Therefore, she welcomed Schneider's translation of Kant's writing on Perpetual Peace into the Serbian language, seeing in it not only an attempt to oppose further degradation of pacifist thought in our environment, but also an opportunity to point out that the thinker from Königsberg, in his peace writing, expressed not only a political demand, but also a spiritual need of the modern age.

ĐORĐE TASIĆ: PACIFISM FROM A LEGAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL STANDPOINT

The first writing of Đorđe Tasić in which he deals with the problem of peace, contains three fragments. It is about his short treatise *Several thoughts about the lost peace* (Tasić, 1928: 46-48), a review of the first years after the Great War, pervaded by the melancholic spirit of the members of the "lost generation" (Žeželj Kocić, 2018: 100-105). The author writes not only about the fact that his generation "lost the peace of our fathers" but also resignedly notes that "we are not trying to regain it" (Tasić, 1928: 46). Tasić's pessimistic words accurately describe the spirit of the new era, whose main features are "the race for money, power, fame, and pleasure, as if we do not care at all about saving our souls" (*Ibid*: 46).

Tasić's reflections on peace and the causes of deep human anxiety in the first decades of the 20th century refer to the social, political, and existential problems of the modern individual. As an important feature of the contemporary era, the author points out the crisis of the individual itself and its search for existential peace. Tasić believes that an individual will gain his own peace when he accomplishes his existential task and designs his existence. Therefore, he points out in his writing that "life is human, and life is also a task" (*Ibid*: 46).

In an effort to emphasize the need to revitalize the fundamental values of European contemporary culture – humanity, solidarity, and justice, the philosopher, jurist, and sociologist Đorđe Tasić began his search for the concept of peace. He would deal intensively with this problem until the beginning of the 1940s when the life of this exceptional professor, scientist, and great humanist ended tragically and prematurely. At the same time, Ksenija Atanasijević, the most famous Serbian female philosopher of the 20th century, also started researching the problems of pacifism and the struggle against militarism. She, like Đorđe Tasić, begins her engagement with the problem of peace from a broader philosophical, anthropological (see: Slapšak, 2020: 317–325), and existential (see: Atanasijević, 1929: 91–93) perspective.

In a short note in *A Fragment on Peace*, with which the author announced the publication of the first volume of her *Philosophical Fragments*, she equates "human existence and chaoticity as identical terms" (Atanasijević, 1929: 91). Observing human life from a pessimistic perspective, our author, like Schopenhauer, believes that "there is no harmony, transparency, or goodness anywhere in earthly life; order and logos are excluded from it" (*Ibid*: 91). In Ksenija's opinion, "everything happens either by chance or by some dark and silent necessity" (*Ibid*: 91). Therefore, our philosopher believes that in our lives it would be "completely wrong to predict and calculate" (*Ibid*: 91). She suggests that we should strive for "all misery and all entanglements" in our lives to "turn into the calmness of the lake" (*Ibid*: 91). Because the author sees our every action and activism as an absurd Sisyphean effort, "filling a bottomless barrel" (Atanasijević, 1929: 91).

Three years later, Đorđe Tasić will not only write several treatises on the problem of peace, demonstrating exceptional awareness and thorough knowledge of the literature on various aspects of peace, but he will also become a participant in key European debates on this issue and, with his works, he will be the first among us to highlight the most important European sociological, legal, and philosophical research on the causes of war and the problems of peacekeeping.

The first discussion, in which Tasić indirectly writes about the problems of peace, is dedicated to considering the legal equality of states in the League of Nations (Tasić, 1922: 193–202). In that debate, Tasić discusses the ideas of the leading European jurists on the problem of the democratic organisation of the League of Nations, in which small states should also decide on world politics alongside the Great World Powers. Tasić insisted on respecting the principle of equality regardless of the size, economic strength, and cultural importance of individual states, because he believed that in this way the

democratic principles of international law are protected. However, Tasić points out that his position is not shared by German jurists, whose ideas carry a democratic and, at the same time, a solidaristic spirit based on an idealistic view of the essence of the law. Famous German jurist Gierke “during the war advocated the idea that the equality of states is usually an empty form without any content” (Tasić, 1922: 121). Gierke believed that “the equality of all can be received in law only as equality according to the values of the culture that a country has” (Tasić, 1922: 121).

In the views of the German jurist, Tasić sees an expression of the unfavourable circumstances caused by the disaster of the First World War, “when the greatest spirits descended into the dust, carried away by political noisemakers or by letting themselves be carried away by elemental urges” (*Ibid*: 122). Among the intellectually stumbling greats were such great philosophical figures as Wundt, who claimed that “modern philosophy has only the German spirit to thank for its basic thoughts”, and Bergson, who proved that the French people represented life and the German mechanism (forgetting that, according to his philosophy, one nation can only be life)” (*Ibid*: 122). Similar to Wundt, Eltzbacher also wrote that new international law emerged in wartime conditions. Tasić raises the question of the value and sustainability of rights that arise as a justification for violating legal norms in wartime conditions (*Ibid*: 122). Tasić disagrees with Eltzbacher, who attempts to demonstrate that history prepared the ground for such a development of legal culture, because he believes that the views of German jurists “are far from a proper understanding of general human interests” (*Ibid*: 122) and that he “ultimately recognizes force as right” (*Ibid*: 122). In addition, Tasić is certain that a single further step is required “to define even common barbarism and banditry as a right” (Tasić, 1922: 123).

Tasić’s second discussion on the problem of peace is his report on the work of the International Institute of Sociology from its last congress, which was devoted to the causes of war and the conditions for lasting peace⁸, and at which the most renowned representatives of European sociological thought, such as Gaston Richard, delivered their lectures (Leopold von Wiese et al.). In his concise report, Gaston Richard indicated the state of sociological research on war and the problems of maintaining global peace. While earlier sociologists were divided into two groups, those who believed that with the industrial society and the victory of scientific positive thinking (Comte, Spencer), peace would prevail in the world, and those who believed that life’s competition (Gumplowitz, Ratzenhofer) prevents society from demilitarising (Tasić, 1931: 235), Tasić notes that modern sociologists avoid these extremes, reject fatalism, and strive to “help the pacifist”. In his report, Tasić points out that the majority of participants in this congress

⁸ In the same year, Tasić published a more concise version of the report from the international congress on war and peace in Geneva in the Serbian Literary Herald, in which he notes that, in addition to Italian scholars, the Hungarian scholars (More) justified the war. Tasić explains the Hungarian scientists’ apology for the war with Hungary’s defeat in the First World War. Tasić particularly emphasizes the thesis of the Hungarian jurist Móra, who argued that pacifism is contradictory. Tasić published an article about More’s treatise in which he pointed out the weaknesses of the author’s thesis (Tasić, 1931a, cf. Avakumović, 1935: 191-196).

optimistically believed that “the causes that cause war can be overcome by the conscious will of the people” (*Ibid*: 235). There is an interesting remark by Tasić that only Italian delegates, Rugarli and Namias in particular, vigorously defended the opposing position on this topic. They were challenged by the Kantian, Hegelian, and Spencerian tradition, which was represented at this convention by the French sociologist Émile Lasbax. The disagreement between Lasbax and Italian sociologists involved the historical rhythms of war and peace (*Ibid*: 235). While Namias argued that the rhythm of peace and war could not be controlled by human reason and will, French sociologist Richard, citing Lasbax, attempted to demonstrate the exact opposite: that war is a condition that arose later and that its various forms depend on the social structure of a society (Tasić, 1931: 236).

Based on the published announcements and discussions, Tasić stresses that the main message of the participants of this congress is that, from the point of view of sociology, it cannot be concluded that there will be no more war. However, he believes that the mere possibility of war does not imply its necessity. According to Tasić, “the will for peace is just as possible as the will for war” (Tasić, 1931: 236). As a result, he believes that “pacifist and pacifying institutions with the goal of performing an educational role on public opinion” (*Ibid*: 236) should not be underestimated.

However, Đorđe Tasić, who was not just a reporter from the peace congress in Geneva, but also participated as a lecturer, pointed out in his report entitled “War or Peace: Contemporary Sociological Views” that modern humanity was facing an epochal challenge. Tasić tries to answer this complex dilemma not only as a philosopher of law but also by relying on the latest sociological research and the insights of well-known sociologists. Referring to the opinion of Pitirim Sorokin, the American sociologist of Russian origin, he points out that this “issue has not yet received its definitive solution” (Tasić, 1931: 366).

Regarding the understanding of the relationship between war and peace, Tasić also cites the opinion of representatives of evolutionist-oriented sociologists, who “take the struggle for survival as a fundamental social law and therefore believe” that “the forms of struggle change and soften (...) so that war can, quite naturally, disappear in the course of evolution” (Tasić, 1931: 366). The main thesis that Tasić wants to investigate in his work is whether war becomes crueller throughout history or whether the so-called “humanization” of war causes conflicts. Tasić believed that, based on sociological research, “it is difficult to determine an accurate account of how good or harmful war is” (*Ibid*: 366). He notes that naturalistic authors such as Novikov believe that “the struggle for survival leads to better adaptation by removing the incompetent and acquiring more and more mild forms over time” (*Ibid*: 336). The Russian sociologist claimed that instead of “physical”, more and more “intellectual” struggles were emerging between people (*Ibid*: 366). Novikov overestimated the future of war, believing that “there will only be an economic and political, scientific and artistic struggle, without blood and extermination of people” (*Ibid*: 366). Moreover, Novikov is convinced that the need for any form of struggle is necessary because, without struggle, “society would, indeed, fall into a state of dangerous lethargy” (*Ibid*: 366).

Nonetheless, Tasić believed that the presented evidence, when examined by a sociological expert who values facts, would lead to overly broad and bold generalizations. To the contrary, Tasić agrees with Sorokin that Montaigne's scepticism is justified, stating that war is "a specific feature of the human race, as well as the ironic epigram of Shaftesbury, that Hobbes's famous saying *homo homini lupus*, an insult to a wolf, because they are less bloodthirsty and cruel to each other than man to man" (Tasić, 1931: 367).

In considering the dilemma of war or peace, as a key argument against war, the most frequently used statistics is that "the best of a nation, the flower of the nation, perished in the war" (*Ibid*: 367). This is confirmed by many historians who believe that "the cause of the downfall of Greece and Rome was the extermination of the best blood" (*Ibid*: 367). However, those who advocate the opposite thesis claim that in war "the brave, skilled, and hardy are likely to stay alive and that (...) they leave behind the best offspring" (*Ibid*: 367). Attempting to assess the positive and negative effects of war, Tasić asserts that in addition to the pain of people, war also introduces a huge number of diverse mass diseases and creates numerous disabilities in children born during warfare. Based on statistical data and benchmarks, it can be concluded that war, on the one hand, represents "the devastation of economic goods and, on the other hand, it necessarily requires finding new methods of production and leads to a change in the distribution of wealth among societies (nations)" (*Ibid*: 368).

Tasić asserts that some authors believe that "perpetual peace (...) would put to sleep (...) if war concentrated all national forces" (*Ibid*: 368). It has not been scientifically confirmed that the criminality of soldiers and civilians increases during war. On the contrary, it was established that in times of war, individuals were ready to make sacrifices, that customs were observed, and that corruption decreased. Not ignoring the terrible consequences of the war, nevertheless, examples of courage and heroism and the willingness to sacrifice in the circumstances of war were, according to Tasić, even for Pitirim Sorokin, enough to express doubt that "perpetual peace is something healthy" (Tasić 1931: 368).

Following the genesis of Tasić's legal and philosophical thought about law and the state, it can be observed that his theories of the state and law increasingly take on the meaning of relative pacifism and solve the problem of "order (peace) on the one hand and justice on the other, as well as the relations between states" (Simić, 1995: 83). Because the problem of the connection between these values is addressed too metaphysically, Tasić dismisses as utterly inadmissible those interpretations that only give primacy to order (peace) or justice. In his comments, Tasić argues that the problem of peace should be understood from the perspective of tangible historical reality and that, in such framework, it is possible to find solutions to reconcile these two principles, without which peace cannot be recognized. According to Tasić, "humanity progresses along the route between justice and order (peace)" and he considers the primary function of law to be "maintaining order (peace) and facilitating the growth of society" (Simić, 1995: 83).

The concept of relative pacifism was developed by Tasić primarily in polemical conflict with his role models, Giorgio Del Vecchio (War as a concept and peace as an

idea) and Julius More (Is pacifism contradictory? - Discussion with Julius More), as well as other well-known European authors (Del Vecchio, 1999; Tasić, 1931; Tasić 1936; Tasić, 1937), about whom he wrote more in domestic and foreign magazines and anthologies (Tasić, 2011).

CONCLUSION

In their philosophical, legal, and sociological considerations of the causes of modern war, Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić showed that the issue must be approached in a multidisciplinary way from multiple perspectives because it is a complex problem. The key ideas on which Tasić's understanding of pacifism and his criticism of war are based are the ideas of solidarity and justice; the critical reception of Del Vecchio's analysis of war and peace, which shows that war can only be justified if it is of a defensive nature; and the author's demand that war as a way of solving social problems should be declared a crime. Tasić developed his theory of pacifism during the 1930s, at the time of the deepest political crisis in Europe, in an atmosphere where the Nazi idea of "krigideologie" dominated the political scene.

His criticism of that ideology is principled and solidly sociologically, legally, and ethically founded. As a public intellectual, he remained consistent with his pacifist ideas, beliefs, and hopes even in the most difficult wartime situations. He intensively followed and participated in domestic and the most important European debates on the problems of pacifism. In his legal and philosophical debates, Tasić leads discussions and engages in polemics with the leading philosophers and jurists of that time; Giorgio del Vecchio, Julius More, Karl Schmidt, and Oswald Spengler. Tasić strives not only to follow but also to participate equally in the most important European debates on the problems of peace and to inaugurate sociological research on the problem of pacifism in the social sciences and other humanistic disciplines. Together with the legal discussions on pacifism of his colleagues Slobodan Jovanović and Živojin Perić, Tasić referred to the philosophical debates on pacifism of Ksenija Atanasijević who, like him, was very involved in the feminist movement and Nazism criticism in her legal and sociological research on peace in the 1920s and 1930s. She, like Tasić, approached the problem of pacifism from a historical perspective, searching for the roots and principles of pacifism deep in the past of European philosophy, Christian religion, and Eastern thought. Ksenija's condemnation of war and understanding of pacifism have points of contact with Tasić's legal and sociological⁹ understanding of this problem. Their closeness in understanding

⁹ Although she does not explicitly mention sociological works on pacifism by Đorđe Tasić, our philosopher was no stranger to the sociological perspective when considering the problem of pacifism. In several of her works, she mentions the importance of sociological insights for understanding pacifism. For example, in her review of the book by Hlapec-Đorđević, PhD, Ksenija writes: "For example, philosophers and sociologists are invited to get to the heart of the pacifist problem" (Atanasijević, 2008: 200, cf. Atanasijević, 2011: 45, 47).

pacifist thought, regardless of all the theoretical idiosyncrasies of their pacifist discourse, is reflected in their concept and belief that social reality is only possible to achieve relative peace (Atanasijević) and in the advocacy of the doctrine of relative pacifism (Tasić), which our authors came to from different and completely independent theoretical paths.

As prominent Serbian intellectuals, both Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić strongly condemned the war and advocated peace and solidarity among people, not only in their theoretical writings but also in their public intellectual engagement. Both of them wrote critically about the war and pointed out not only the importance of peace but in their theoretical works they also advocated for justice, equality, and human dignity, legal and moral principles that must be respected as regulative ideas of human struggle. Just peace is the fundamental value of pacifism. The struggle for the ideals of freedom, justice, and human dignity, led by Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić, has inestimable importance for our culture because they, as representatives of the elite of a small nation, were deeply aware that even in extreme war conditions, one must not trade with the truth, justice, or freedom, and advocated that political disputes should not be resolved by war but “in an amicable and consensual way”. Being critical of war apologists, Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić were not blind to the flaws of our intellectual elite either. Therefore, their critical theoretical insights about our intellectual elite, expressed almost a century ago, can also serve as valuable landmarks for us today in our further search for a way out of the impasse we have been led into by the contemporary Serbian clientelist elite. At this sad time of ours, it is worth recalling the main message, or rather the promise Ksenija Atanasijević and Đorđe Tasić left us with: their high philosophical (Lolić, 2005) and scientific achievements, as well as their dignified demeanour in the most difficult moments for their people.

At the beginning of the last century, when Europe was going through one of its worst crises, they thought that one of our tasks was:

“... to develop a taste for thinking, namely theorizing and philosophizing, because our nation needs a deepening of knowledge and the construction of a single point of view on the world and a clear stance on social issues, and because we do not yet have a developed tradition of thought.” (Tasić, 1938: 153-154).

REFERENCES:

- Atanasijević, K. (1929). A Fragment on Peace. *Život i rad*, February issue, 91-93. [In Serbian]
- Atanasijević, K. (1936) Translation of Kant's *Perpetual Peace* into our language, *Srpski književni glasnik*, vol. 48, May-August, 629. [In Serbian]
- Atanasijević, K. (2006). *Serbian Thinkers*. Beograd: Plato. [In Serbian]
- Atanasijević, K. (2008). *Ethics of Feminism*, edited by Lj. Vuletić. Beograd: Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava Srbije. [In Serbian]

- Atanasijević, K. (2011). *Ethics of Courage*, edited by Lj. Vuletić. Beograd: Žene u crnom: Rekonstrukcija Ženski fond: Centar za ženske studije. [In Serbian]
- Avakumović, M. (1935). 33rd World Peace Congress. *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, No. 1-2, 191-196. [In Serbian]
- Babić, J. (1985). The Ethical Problem of War. *Gledišta*, No. 9-10, 186-204. [In Serbian]
- Basta, D. N. (ed.) (1991). *Transformations of the Idea of Law. A Century of Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law 1841-1941*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet u Beogradu.
- Čičovački, P. (2022). *In Gandhi's Footsteps*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Del Vecchio, Giorgio (1999). *Law, Ethics and the State*, translated by M. T. Ristić and Đ. Tasić. Beograd: Pravni fakultet, Centar za izdavačku delatnost. [In Serbian]
- Halkin, Léon-E. (1994). *Erasmus: A Critical Biography*. Novi Sad – Sremski Karlovci: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića. [In Serbian]
- Hare, R. M. (1985). Peace. *Gledišta*, No. 9-10, 224-238. [In Serbian]
- Höffe, O. (1995). Einleitung: Der Friede – ein vernachlässigtes Ideal. In: O. Höffe, *Immanuel Kant, zum ewigen Frieden*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, S. 5-29
- Kindić, Z. (2016). Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace, *Srpska politička misao*, No. 2, 61-92. [In Serbian]
- Lolić, M. (2005). Perpetual Peace and World's Civic Order. *Filozofija i društvo*, XXV, 27-41. [In Serbian]
- Lolić, M. (2018). Aspects of Pacifism in the Works of Ksenija Atanasijević, *Srpska politička misao*, vol. 59 No.1, 293-320. [In Serbian]
- Marjanović, M. (1993). Tasić's Understanding of Pacifism. *Pravo, teorija i praksa*, No. 1-2, 43-49. [In Serbian]
- Simić, M. (1995). Relative Pacifism in the Oeuvre of Đorđe Tasić. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Prištini*, 83- 91. [In Serbian]
- Slapšak, S (2020). Ksenija Atanasijević and Anthropology. In: Z. Mršević and M. Jovanović (eds.). *Ksenija Atanasijević: My Works Will Speak of Me*. Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 317-325. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1928). Several Thoughts on Lost Peace. *Novi vidici*, No. 1, 46-48. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1931). International Institute of Sociology and Its Last Congress Dedicated to War. *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, No. 3, 235- 236. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1931). Pacifism in Legal Philosophy – One of the So-called Legal Theories. *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, book XXIII, No. 4, 241-249. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1931). Sociological Congress in Geneva on War and Peace in 1930. *Srpski književni glasnik*, book 24, No. 7, 543-544. [In Serbian]

- Tasić, Đ. (1931a). War or Peace? – Modern Sociological Views. *Srpski književni glasnik*, book 33, No. 5, 365-376. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1938). Intelligentsia and People. *Letopis Matice srpske*, book. 349, vol. 3, 153-155. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1939). Thoughts on Small Nations and on Us at the Moment. *Letopis Matice srpske*, book 351, vol. 5-6, 321-323. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1939a). On National Sentiment. *Politika*, year XXXVI, No. 11085, 8-11, April, p. 18. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1984). *Selected Debates and Articles from the Theory of Law* (edited by academician R. Lukić). Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1991). Justice, General Interest and Social Peace. In: D. Basta (ed.) *Transformations of the Idea of Law. A Century of Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law 1841-1941*, 247-255. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1991a). The Problem of Peace in Philosophy of Law. In: D. Basta (ed.) *Transformations of the Idea of Law. A Century of Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law 1841-1941*, 239-246. [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (2011). *Debates from Philosophy and Theory of Law* (translated from foreign languages by D. Guteša, B. S. Marković, D. N. Basta and D. Popović), Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Trkulja, J. (ed.) (1999). *In Honour of Đorđe Tasić*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet u Beogradu; Vranje: Skupština opštine Vranje. [In Serbian]
- Vuković, A. (2013). The Question of Women's Political Identity in Serbia and the USA – a Comparison, *Sociološki pregled* 47(2), 249-270. DOI: 10.5937/socpreg1302249V [In Serbian]
- Vuković, A. (2015). Civil society and women's NGOs in Serbia, *Zbornik radova Filozofskog Fakulteta u Prištini*, no. 45 (2), 335-358. DOI: 10.5937/zrffp45-7131 [In Serbian]
- Vuković, A. (2019). *Social Features of the Modern Feminist Movement in Serbia* (defended doctoral dissertation). Beograd: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu [In Serbian]
- Vuletić, Lj. (2005). *Life and Thought of Ksenija Atanasijević*. Beograd: Lj. Vuletić. [In Serbian]
- Žeželj Kocić, A. (2018). *Hemingway and Gender: The Writher in the Network of Theory*. Beograd: Partenon. [In Serbian]