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“...one of these demands is for renewal of politics, for a new politics.” (Tony Blair)
Abstract. In order to understand new politics one has to reflect industrial and mechanical background of the old politics, which is supposed to be based on the paradigm of the French Revolution that has developed classical political doctrines. Few political revolutions in the 20th century have had an open mind for new technologies which have been changing rapidly and forms of thinking and doing, that is also in the sphere of political. In accordance with the situation the third way should be understood as a new reflection of a new situation, a new mediation of individual’s life and therefore new politics. It is my opinion that the third way is not simply a mechanical sum of socialism and liberalism or some other parts of classic doctrines and political movements, but an original new way of making politics in the world context. As such the third way has also won some sympathy in Slovenia among political parties, especially United List of Social Democrats (member of Socialist International) and Liberal Democrats of Slovenia (member of Liberal International). For the ULSD this new way is important politically mostly because the party wants to get rid of the Communist past, for the LDS it is because they want to create more socially-polite image in the public.

“At the moment, every mode of system description which we possess in physics, biology, human sciences, technology, or anywhere else, is at heart the same as the one which Newton propounded in the seventeenth century.”
(Rosen, 1994:324)

“The mechanistic view has created a rather crude and gross meaning which has created a crude and gross and confused society.” (Bohm, 1994a:450)

“The process of coming to know oneself, confronting one’s contingency ... is identical with the process of inventing a new language - that is, of thinking up some new metaphors.” (Nietzsche, Ansel-Pearson, 1994:167)

τα πολιτικα persist a long period of time. The question arises whether the concept of politics is the nucleus which at all times bears the same contents or it is only glass which holds one or another volume. The common sense declares that from the beginning
politics has been the same thing and will remain until its end. In political science consensus prevails that it is possible to distinguish at least two types of politics: ancient and modern one. We will try to develop some elements of the third type of politics, i.e. third way politics based on its own political philosophy.

We agree with Agnes Heller who states that “there are two alternative theoretical routes towards grounding a philosophical concept of the political. First, ‘the political’ can be seen as a certain ‘thing’ (a quality, a factor) that may be shared (or not) by other ‘things’. Secondly, ‘the political’ can be conceived of as a domain, for example a sphere or a system, which endows whatever enters it, whenever it enters with political nature; whatever leaves this domain ceases to be political, whenever it makes its exit.” (Heller, 1991:330) These two roots, that are valid only in dominant conceptualizations, could be reduced to only one, geometric-mechanical.

When we try to answer the question what is politics, modern politics, we have to begin with the question what modern reality is. Birth cramps are inscribed in its body, although it appears as it has been here forever in front of us clear and grown up, palpable and limited.

Modern age constitutes itself by the replacing of the idea of God with the idea of nature. Instead of thinking itself through God, modern age think itself through nature. The sacredness, which was eminent in previous legitimization with God, now persists in science. Only science, that is natural science, has the right relationship with the nature. Delegitimization of God has happened simultaneously with legitimization of nature through science. Natural sciences are therefore the reflection of the modern period. Through natural sciences modern civilization becomes aware of itself.

It was through mechanical law that Western civilization had stolen the God a great part of competencies and left him only with initial creation. That process has been going on and still is primarily through physics. It is for that reason that physics is the first science and the form of awareness of the modern age. The physics is an ideology of modern: on the level of physics Western society gets a basic consciousness about itself, its conflicts, creates its identity, and solves the conflicts. The physics has a privilege to define what is the real, and with that what is nature, which first of all as a materia
“defines itself with mechanics of their own forces”. (Kant, 1989:12) The other sciences on that basis create or discover partial and derived realities. Although for Kant the prime science is mathematics, it lacks direct touch with reality and nature, something mathematics can only grasp through physics.

The main question for every modern science has always been: what is nature, what is the real. Only after that question comes the question about specific object of specific science. It is the question physics answers before political science, or to put more precisely, political science answers on that question through physics and physics through political science\(^1\). Physics lies at the core of dominant consciousness. By defining what is real, it also defines limits of the political. Every political revolution is jump out of the physics. Captivity in the reality of physics was the best illustrated in the student protest movement in 1968 with slogan: Let’s be real, let’s demand impossible. Where political sciences assumes is its essence, where political science presents itself in its purest form, there it is the most captured in physics. And *vice versa*: where physics is the most by itself, there it is captured in political philosophy. Both sciences are reflection of the same social and political relations, both speak to the same society, about the same society and from the same society, both speak what they can see, feel and according to the criteria of their own praxis, make out of it, although they serve as they would be absolutely separated. \(^2\)

Jammer (1957:242) holds that the “history of physics shows clearly that the introduction of the concept of force led to a methodological unification of the conceptual scheme of science.” Cartesian world of prevailing causal relationships is reduced to the action by contact, that is push. All physical change must be explicable in terms of clockwork\(^3\) mechanisms in which the various moving parts push one another

---

\(^1\) It seems as modern social sciences has grown up as an transfer of mechanic. That appearance arises from the fact, that modern sociology and modern political science (in dominant perception) constituted themselves at the end of 19th century, that is after physic has taken the position of the (first) science.

\(^2\) Jammer (1957:124) reports, that “force, for the Newton was a concept given a priori, intuitively, and ultimately in analogy to human muscular force.” Like others contemporary scientists he started with the concept of the “natural individual”.

\(^3\) Globus (1994: 372) reports: “Technology shapes thought. Pottery, for example, was a ‘defining technology’ for the Greek philosophers. The potter holds an ideal image of the pot to be produced - the
along. "Push is the principle of mechanical explanation. There can be no action at a distance." (Popper, 1995:166) We shall conclude that physics-mechanics has produced elementary concepts that are applied in all sciences: body without inside structure and independent from anima and consciousness, movement, force (power), time, space, velocity, speed, work, energy, etc. But in fact, these concepts are social and political products and only because of a particular kind of source, i.e. physics, they are immanent to every kind of modern science, and modern perception of reality, that is also political.

We may observe how modern political thought started with the question of reality. Not only Hobbes and Leibniz, but also others departed from the same mental framework.

Hobbes (1966:19) wrote at the very beginning of the introduction to the Leviathan:

“Nature, the art whereby God hath made and governs the world, is by art of man, as in many other things, so in this also imitated, that it can make an artificial animal. For seeing life is but a motion of limbs, the beginning whereof is in some principal part within; why may we not say, that all automata (engines that move themselves by springs and wheels as doth a watch) have an artificial life? For what is the heart, but spring? and the nerves but so many strings; and the joints, but so many wheels, giving motion to the whole body."

Diplomat Leibniz, Popper (1995:168) finds out, developed “a political theory of matter: bodies, like states, have borders or limits which must be defended by repulsive forces; and physical vacuum, like political power vacuum, cannot exist because it would at once be occupied by the surrounding bodies (or states).”

We can find legacy of mechanicism in all political doctrines, but at the top and by far the most contaminated is liberalism⁴ as a dominant perception of the world politics. It

⁴Robinson Crusoe goes with its society on the voyage. Natural force, storm, destroys his sociality, individualizes him and after he is individualised on his way, he as a so-called natural individual is
appears as though that the relations it has produced are based on Newton’s system of physics. Main properties of such concepts, according to Barber (1984:33), are: atomism, indivisibility, commensurability, mutual exclusivity and sensationalism. Atomism posits that human beings are reduced to physical beings or atoms\(^5\) that are separated, integral, self-contained and unitary particles. In this sense the world is a world of physical Ones. \(^6\)

Indivisibility means that human beings are unfragmented unitary wholes. Human beings are commensurable, that means that anyone is governed by the same laws of behaviour and therefore interchangeable with any other. Mutual exclusivity means that human beings cannot occupy the same place at the same time even in political, cultural or psychological sense. Sensationalism means that humans fell, think, and imagine only in response to physical causes. Barber (1984:34) concludes that “liberal inertial frame is physicality of its language and imagery”. He speaks on “thingness” of the human world: property is understand as an extension of physical self, boundaries as the crucial metaphor in conflicts of rights and autonomies, sanctions as an extension of physical penalties, freedom as the absence of external impediments to motion, power as physical coercion.

Parekh (1993: 158) describes liberal individual as “distinct and easily distinguishable from others”, unassimilable and with separate existence. Constant concern of individuals is “to preserve their separateness, to construct all kinds of high protective walls around themselves, and to ensure that nothing enters, let alone settles, in their being without their knowledge and scrutiny.” The idea of selfenclosure, of bounded self accessible and available to others only to a severely limited degree, is according to Parekh an integral part of the liberal view.

\(^5\)It should be stressed that atom is used here in the meaning which is dominant for the perception before 20th century.

\(^6\) Also by Rosenberg we can find similar formulation that “theoretical atomism entailed by their analytical priority as completed orders dictates a mechanical conception of structure.” (Rosenberg,1994:31)
Lukšič: The Third Way - New Thinking of the Political

Liberal individual sees itself as a physical being. He is therefore not in a position to reflect his sociability as he is his nonphysical existence. He lives between his physical individuality and sociality as a person who is “suspicious of, and feels nervous in the presence of, feelings and emotions especially those that are deep and powerful and not fully comprehensible to reason or easily brought under its control.” (Parekh, 1993:158)

Thoughts, feelings, opinions, rights are all perceived as things that are outside individual’s properties (characteristics), which are by their nature removable.

As an atom individual links itself with other individuals without changing identity and his/hers inner structure. In all alliances it stays the same, unchangeable and solid. When one alliance doesn’t fit him any more, he chooses another one, with clear awareness that his natural and therefore only proper position is absolute loneliness. Only loneliness brings him autonomy and independence. Contacts with others limit him, and furthermore, they annihilate him. Natural position is stability, this is tranquillity, non-mobility. Therefore every shift of that atom around the space, is perceived as dangerous intervention in individuality. Moving is created by push and push is intervention of others from outside of an individual, intervention in natural individual.

Individuals are more real than political entities which are just hypothetical constructs. It is for that reason that talking about public interest makes no sense. The only interests which exist are the actual interests of real people. “Any political value that appeals to the social whole is therefore either at best nonsensical, or at worst totalitarian threat to the interests of the individual.” (Ramsay 1997, 9)

French revolution legalised new reality and new concept of reality, that it brought it on power. Nature became with the help of political means real, true reality, and natural science state ideology. Modern political science began with political emancipation, with the act of recognition of individuals as citizens (citoyen), that is as points, which

7 The legitimisation of this position is included in the statement: when they are born, what is a difference between the king and the peasant?

8 “The path of a particle in space-time is called ‘natural’ if no forces exerted on the particle.” (Jammer, 1957:260) In a non-Euclidean space time gravitation becomes property of space-time and loses the character of a force.
form the state. Bourgeois as a member of civil society, is real alive individual, which is recognised not as a such but as an atom; that means as a smallest particle of matter, as an element of society, which understands itself through nature and natural science.

A lot of political philosophers and scientists stated that politics understands itself through categories of mechanics and consequently named that kind of reasoning mechanicism: transmission of the concepts from the field of mechanics to the politics. It is no surprise, that most of them are non- or even anti-liberals. The most important authors that are changing (still!) the mechanicistic paradigm in the political science are Hegel, Marx, Gramsci, and Foucault.

It is impossible not to begin with Hegel. No matter how we label him, it is impossible to say that he was a mechanicist. His *Phenomenology of Spirit* leads us to the world of things that are not facta bruta. All things are mediated through media, tools, and media, the process of recognition, constructs the thing. “Talk of the unity of subject and object, of the finite and infinite, of being and thinking, etc., is misleading because object and subject, etc., signify that which they are outside their unity, and in the unity they are not meant in the sense suggested by such an expression. Just so, the false is no longer something false as a moment of truth.” (Hegel, 1966:60)

To describe reproduction of common sense, based on mechanicism, Hegel (1966:48) wrote:

*What is familiar is not known simply because it is familiar. It is the most common self-deception and deception of others to presuppose something as familiar when it comes to knowledge, and to accept this; but with all its talking back and forth such knowledge, without knowing what is happening to it, never gets anywhere. The subject and object, etc. God, nature, the understanding, the sensibility, etc., are presupposed as familiar and valid foundations without having been scrutinized, and they are accepted as fixed points of both departure and return.*

For development of our argument is here important his view on individualism. “The subject is accepted as a fixed point to which the predicates are affixed as to their
support-by a movement which belongs to those who know of the subject and which is not supposed to belong to the fixed point—though only this (recognition) could represent the content as a subject. In the way in which the movement is here constituted, it could not belong to the point; but after this point has been presupposed it really cannot be constituted differently and is bound to be merely external. This anticipation that the absolute is subject is therefore not only not actuality of this concept but even makes this actuality impossible; for it posits a point at rest, while the actuality is self-movement.” (Hegel, 1966:36)

For him it was less important “to purify the individual from the manner of immediacy and the senses while making it into a thinking and thought substance, than to attempt the opposite: the sublimate fixed, determinate thoughts and thus to actualise the general and infuse it with spirit. But it is far more difficult to make fixed thoughts fluid than sense existence.” (Hegel, 1966:50)

State in his view is not government reducible to the building or some bodies of their members. “The state exists immediately in custom, mediate in individual self-consciousness, knowledge, and activity, while self-consciousness in virtue of its sentiment towards the state finds the state, as its essence and the end and product of its activity, its substantive freedom.” (Hegel, 1952:80, p. 257) Individual is not as a body member of the state as a thing. Individual exists through the state in the state through individuals. The same is with monarch. (S)He as single individual is decisive moment of the whole, in him (her) the will of the state is concentrated. “The state knows what it wills and knows it in universality, i.e. as something thought.” (Hegel, 1952:84, p. 270)

Thinking and acting standpoint for Marx is not this reality, civil society; “the standpoint of the new is human society, or social humanism”. (Marx, 1977:423) According to him the chief defect of hitherto existing materialism is that “thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object or of contemplation, but not as sensuous human activity, practice, not subjectively.” (Marx, 1977:421) Therefore any changing of circumstances is possible only with self-changing through human activity.

Marx realised that the most important creator of social mechanics lies in the process of commodification of all things, political and social relations. “It is nothing but the
definite social relation between men themselves which assume here, for them, the fantastic form of a relation between things.” (Marx, q.a. Rosenberg, 1994:173) Reification of human relations should be analysed and overcome in the process of human emancipation. In his analysis things are not mechanical facts, people are not conscious-less bodies, but always condensation of human relations.

*To speak precisely and ordinary language, the members of civil society are not atoms. The characteristic quality of an atom is to have no qualities, and consequently no relations determined by its own nature with other beings outside itself. The atom has no needs and is self-sufficient; the external world is a complete void, has neither content, nor sense, nor meaning, precisely because atom posses everything in itself....* (Marx, 1956:219)

On the other hand we could say that the standpoint of political emancipation is mechanism. “The basis of the modern State is civil society and the individual, whose only link with other individuals is private interest and unconscious, natural necessity, the slave of wage labour, of the selfish needs of himself and others.” (Marx, 1956:218)

One of the most exponent critics of mechanicism was Antonio Gramsci. For Gramsci mechanicism is base on belief in “forza delle cose”. He stated that “concezione meccanicistica sia stata un religione di subalterni” (Gramsci, 1977:1389) and from the point of view of subjects “il determinismo meccanico diventa una forza formidabile di resistenza morale, di coesione, di perserveranza paziente e ostinata” (Gramsci, 1977:1388) According to his opinion transmission of statistics in political science is possible as long as masses are passive or it is presupposed that they are passive.⁹

But when subjects become a governing force, “dirigente e responsabile dell’ ativita economica di massa, il meccanicismo appare a un certo punto un pericolo imminente, avviene una revisione di tutto il modo di pensare perce e avvenuto un mutamento nel modo sociale di essere” (Gramsci, 1977:1388). Yesterday's subject was “una cosa”,

⁹Ma non si è osservato abbastanza che la legge dei ‘grandi numeri’ o della ‘statistica’ può essere applicata alla storia e alla politica solo fino a quando le grandi masse della popolazione rimangono passive /…/ o si suppone che rimangono passive.” (Gramsci, 1977:856)
thing, but today (s)he is not a thing any more, (s)he is “persona storica, un protagonista”. Yesterday (s)he was “irresponsabile perché ‘resistente’ a una volontà estranea”, but today “responsabile … agente necessariamente attivo e intrapredente.”

According to Gramsci mechanicism, fatalism, and determinism go together with stabile relations between the rulers and the governed. In his Quaderni del Carcere he developed a concept for overcoming the mechanicism in politics, and for the beginning of the perception of politics through a concept of hegemony. The basis of his concept is statement that all individuals are intellectuals and philosophers and therefore actors of and for hegemony.

Foucault has developed his criticism of mainstream perception of politics and created an anti-mechanicistic and anti-monarchistic view on politics.

*Individual should not be seen as elementary core, originate atom, a plenty of and inert material on which power should fix itself or on which it should strike and on that way subjugate or break the individual. /.../ Individual does not stay against the power; I think, he is one of its primary effects. Individual is an effect of the power and at the same time, or better, as this effect it is the element of its articulation. Individual, which is constituted from the power is at the same time its bearer.*

(Foucault, 1991:33, translation I.L.)

He did not believe in the great Power but in “multiple and mobile power relations”.

(Foucault, 1990:98) He thinks that

*power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as

10 Foucault shows us clearly that it is “necessary to have an attitude of suspicion towards ‘liberal’ claims that modern subjects are ‘free’ ones, since what we might take to be ‘freedom’ could, in reality, be new forms of control and discipline.” (Ansel-Pearson, 1994:177)
"the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies." (Foucault, 1990:92)

According to Foucault power is omnipresent: “not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere.” (Foucault, 1990:93)

Power is also “the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in a particular society.” (Foucault, 1990:93) “Power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away, power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian an mobile relations.” Relations of power are immanent in the other types of relations, they have “a directly productive role, wherever they come into play”, “power comes from below”, “power relations are both intentional and nonsubjective” “one is always inside power, there is no escaping it, there is no absolute outside”. There is no locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of revolution. Resistances are “the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite”. (Foucault, 1990:96)

Juridical monarchy is according Foucault historical form of perception of power in the West. “In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king. Hence the importance that theory of power gives to the problem of right and violence, law and illegality, freedom and will, and especially the state and sovereignty (even if the latter is questioned insofar as it is personified in a collective being and no longer a sovereign individual).” (Foucault, 1990:89) At the same time model of power is “essentially juridical, centered on nothing more than the statement of the law and the operations of taboos.” (Foucault, 1990:85) Therefore he insists: “We must at the same time conceive of sex without the law, and power without the king.” (Foucault, 1990:91) and “/W/e shall try to rid ourselves of a juridical and negative representation of power, and cease to conceive of it in terms of law, prohibition, liberty, and sovereignty.” (Foucault, 1990:90)
Post-mechanical concept of politics must derive from awareness, which is constructed by the line of thought which main representatives are Hegel, Marx, Gramsci and Foucault.\textsuperscript{11} Additionally, last but not the least, it is very important for surpassing of mechanicism to know what is going on in the field of physics.

D’Espagnat (1994:153) holds that “classical or macroscopic objects and events exists in some absolute sense which is in no need of being defined. Indeed, trying to define it, or even trying to speak about it, would be idle talk.” Everyday experience within our life’s forms is organised around the axis of Newton’s physics. According to that attitude, only classical physics was understandable, and classical physics was a description of reality. Understandable reality ended where classical physics ended.\textsuperscript{12}

In searching of a new reality\textsuperscript{13}, in fact, quantum physics in some most radical interpretations\textsuperscript{14} has taken away from the physics its privilege to define what the nature is and what the reality is. “The non-deterministic character of quantum theory reopens the whole question of the connection of space and time to the ontological categories of existence, being, becoming, etc. “ (Stapp, 1994:259) For that reason it is not surprising that liberal Popper argues: “Today, physics is in crisis.” And this crisis, according to Popper (1995:1), is “as old as the Copenhagen interpretations of quantum physics.” Copenhagen school stated that quantum physics is not a description of reality, because no such reality existed. (Popper, 1995:9-10) Popper is very angry especially with

\textsuperscript{11} It should be mentioned also psychoanalysis with Freud and his school.

\textsuperscript{12} This radical break with everyday comprehension of reality belies all attempts to combine quantum physics with Eastern thought. Bohr choose the motto “opposites are complementary” and the taigitu (yin-yang) sign for his coat of arms when he was awarded the Danish Order of the Elephant. (Wilkins, 1994:342)

\textsuperscript{13} “Pauli said: I think the important and extremely difficult task of our time is to try to build up a fresh idea of reality.” (q. a. Stapp, 1994:257)

\textsuperscript{14} Bohm’s physics has a lot of times been criticised as “metaphysical”, “philosophical”, worlds which nowadays are used as a derogatory euphemism to condemn a theory which doesn’t fit into common consensus. But Bopp openly said: “We say that Bohm’s theory cannot be refuted”, adding, however, that we don’t believe it. (q.a. Hiley and Peat, 1994:8)
Heisenberg's argument that in quantum physics “objective reality has evaporated”. On a similar way is put the question by D'Espagnat (1994:166): “I feel inclined to consider that even space-time (and locality, and events and so on) is a notion that owes much to the structure of our mind and that independent reality is in no way embedded in it.”

Popper very openly expressed his political view, considering the question of reality: “When I first heard that John F. Clauser and Abner Shimony were intending to test Bell’s theorem, I expected that their results would refute quantum theory. But my expectations appear to have been mistaken, since the majority of the tests have gone the other way. Nevertheless I have not abandoned my realistic interpretation of physics…” (Popper, 1995:25) He was prepared to accept a new theory of reality only if it “so related to Newton’s theory that every success of Newtonian theory is also a success for that theory, and which in fact makes slight adjustments to some results of Newtonian theory.” (Popper, 1995:30) For Popper it is clear that there exists only open society and its enemies.15

In fact it is very difficult for in mechanicism schooled consciousness and knowledge to think reality at the same time as non-reality, it is very difficult to understand quantum physics: to understand means precisely to locate it within the horizon of our meaningful comprehension of reality. With quantum physics something that it is not possible, at least it is not so immediately possible. Let’s have a look at very illustrative description by Griggon of what is happening with reality in quantum theory: “First (an electron) appears, popping out of the vacuum like rabbit out of a magician’s hat, then it travels forward in time a short distance before realising its mistake, acknowledging its own unreality, and turning around to go back from whence it came”(q. a. Žižek) that is, Žižek ads, into the abyss of Nothingness. “A whole new domain is thus opened up, the domain of the shadowy pseudo-being of pure

15 In his Open society he describes Hegel’s philosophy as “the philosophy of gambler - of the gangster” (Popper, 1957:78). According to his opinion “The Hegelian farce has done enough harm. We must stop it.” (Popper, 1957:79) It is clear enough that Hegel's and Marx's philosophy doesn't fit “the role of the theories in a natural sciences such as physics” (Popper, 1957:261), which for Popper in its mechanical version of causality present the criterium for defining reality and real philosophers.

16 This trouble is the best described concerning very similar topic by Feynamn: “Trying to think of negative probabilities gave me a cultural shock at first.” (1994:235)
potentialities, of uncanny events which go on ‘in the twinkling of uncertainty … while the universe “isn’t looking”’. (Žižek, 1996: 226)

Leggett (1994:89) clearly insists that “in quantum mechanics events don’t (or don’t necessarily) happen, whereas in our everyday world-view they certainly do: the Geiger counter does or does not fire… and so on.” But quantum physics simply works, it functions. Finklestein (1994:290) believes that for Bohm “there are no elementary particles or any other permanent matter.“ According to Finklestein, Bohm used term plasmon “to illustrate how every particle will ultimately be found to be the reification of a collective vibration of still finer structures.” He is convinced that “every reification and every conservation law are likewise reflections of a certain calmness of the environment, and will eventually be outgrown by the maturing human race.”

(Finklestein, 1994:290)

Therefore the real question is “how the quantum-mechanical description at a microscopic level becomes converted into a classical one at the macroscopic level”, even in cases, where “a literal extrapolation of the quantum mechanical formation would lead to a quite non-classical account of the macroscopic world.” (Leggett, 1994:89)

Several interpretations exist regarding this question. One is starting from the point that there really is a qualitative distinction between the microscopic and macroscopic levels of reality holds that there comes some point on the apparent continuum where one can say that the quantum-mechanical description simply stops. Much more radical approach holds, that the “quantum-mechanical description should be applied right up to the macroscopic level and that the occurrence of specific macroscopic events is a consequence of an interaction of human consciousness with the physical world which cannot be explained within the framework of the laws of physics itself.” (Leggett, 1994:94) According to Legget (1994:95) “the most conservative of these is probably the so-called ‘statistical’ interpretation according to which the formalism is merely a description of our information about the system in question, or more precisely about the

---

17 We can see here very similar position to that of Antonio Gramsci, quoted above, in the case of passivity-activity of individuals.
ensemble from which it is drawn, and says nothing about the actual state of any particular object, even at the macroscopic level.”

The classical reality consists of three-dimensional space. In classical field theory, part of the requirement could be formulation in terms of differential (as distinct from integral) equations in three-plus-one-dimensional space-time. But it seems clear that “quantum mechanics requires a much bigger configuration space.” (Bell, 1994:233)

Within quantum physics it is thinkable more dimensional reality. “For a system of n particles the wave, at fixed time, is a function in a space of 3n dimensions. But we live in a space of only three dimensions. Thus, the wave function, like a classical probability function, represents all things that possibly can happen; it does not single out the one thing that actually does happen.” One of the options which derives from that statement is existence of “myriads of parallel worlds that are all interpreted as objectively real”. (Stapp, 1994:258)

One important feature concerning the quantum reality is that it is not described in space-time terms, but from it space-time is to be abstracted. “Thus we no longer start with an a priori space-time manifold in order to discuss physics; rather, we construct space-time from the underlying process.” (Hiley and Peat, 1994:21)

The question of reality is highly concerned with an attitude towards the whole. Dominant paradigm of modern science is deeply committed to a form of reductionism which holds, in effect, that the behaviour of a complex system of matter must be simply the sum of the behaviour of its constituent parts. In accordance with these assumptions the possibility that “there are new physical laws which appear only at the level of complex system” (Leggett, 1994:99) is excluded. Thus classically, the whole is merely the result of the parts and their pre-assigned interactions, so that the primary reality is the set of parts while the behaviour of the whole is derived entirely from those parts and their interactions. Interaction between the parts is a predetermined function, independent of the state of the whole.

According to Bohm (1994:41) wholeness is “the most important new feature of the quantum theory.” With the quantum potential the whole has “an independent and prior significance such that, indeed, the whole my be said to organise the activities of the
parts…. Clearly, such quantum wholeness of activity is closer to the organised unity of functioning of the parts of a living being than it is to the kind of unity that is obtained by putting together the parts of machine.” 18 (Bohm, 1994:38) “So the whole is, in a deep sense, internally related to the parts. And, since the whole enfolds all parts, these latter are also internally related, though in a weaker way than they are related to the whole.” (Bohm, 1994:41)

Radical rupture of classical belief was made also by understanding of a particle. A particle could not be separated from the surrounding structure because “particle is simply a break in the background structure. Furthermore, two dislocations could not be separated since they are only breaks in the same structure.” (Hiley and Peat, 1994:20) Within this view “separation becomes a contingent rather than a necessary feature of nature.” (Hiley and Peat, 1994:15) This is very different from the way we perceive the macroscopic world around us, where separation seems basic. When we go to low enough temperatures, bulk matter behaves very differently. Because of that feature in quantum theory is possible action to the distance19

Measurement is in quantum theory much discussed topic. There is no description of the individual process except in terms of its possible observation by some suitable measuring device. There is no way to understand what is happening: there is no actual fact. There is “only a sequence of results of measurements, with no possibility of discussing what goes on between measurements.” (Hiley and Peat, 1994:6)

Measurement is therefore creation of facts and meaning. For that reason, crudely speaking, “quantum mechanics forbids us to conclude that it /variable/ actually had that value before the measurement was made.” (Legget, 1994:87) Bohr (1963) holds on that

---

18 Wave function does not factorise, so that the whole cannot be divided into independent sub-wholes. “… the very form of the connection between particles depends on the wave function for the state of the whole. This wave function … does not depend on the state of the parts. …” (Bohm, 1994:38)

19 “The quantum potential does not produce, in general, a vanishing interaction between two particles as the distance between those particles becomes very large. Thus two distant systems may still be strongly and directly connected. This is, of course, contrary to the implicit requirement of classical physics, where it is always assumed that where two systems are sufficiently far apart, they will behave independently.” (Hiley and Peat, 1994:15)
“atomic systems should not even be thought of as possessing definite properties in the absence of a specific experimental set-up designed to measure these properties.” Quantum theory is also very strict towards using of the methods. Quantum mechanics “absolutely forbids a measurement to take place, if by a ‘measurement’ is meant a process which has the features ascribed to it in the standard textbook account.” (Legget, 1994:87)

On the other hand Bohr also maintains that in order to secure unambiguous communication of our results, we must describe the macroscopic apparatus and its behaviour in terms of classical physics (in which, of course, the apparatus must possess definite properties). Thus, it is “the act of measurement that is the bridge between the micro-world, which does not by itself posses definite properties, and the macro-world, which does.” (Legget, 1994:87)

Some authors, like Popper (1995:1), criticised the theory because of “the intrusion subjectivism in physics”20. Meaning is the essence of reality, according to Bohm. (1994a:441) “The result of observation is to change the meaning and therefore change the being. There is a great analogy between how analysis, which adds further meaning, is a change of being, and the observation adds some meaning and therefore there’s a change of being. It gives a good image of how the observer and the observed are one. (Bohm, 1994a:442) “Instead of saying that analysis is just about the thing analysed, the analysis is a change in the thing analysed.” (Bohm, 1994a:442) For that reason it compels us to call into question the ultimate and most resilient philosophical myth, that of the absolute gap that separates nature from man. “Quantum physics opens up path with choosing neither naturalisation of the man nor humanisation of the nature, rather deconstruction very notion of the nature.” (Žižek, 1996)

Quantum theory has broken classical concept of causality and concept of time. “Quantum mechanic has no causal explanation. … It has no explanation of time, how one moment becomes another. That is, quantum mechanics is a theory of one moment,

---

20 Also for D’Espagnat (1994:167) “the central conceptual difficulty of quantum physics is how can we avoid being forced to say that it is the observer, when he looks at the pointer, who fixes it up in one definite macro-state”.
of one measurement, and there’s a statistical probability of getting certain result. Then you drop whatever you have done and start out with next measurement, and apply statistic again.” (Bohm, 1994a:437) For Jammer “elimination of the concept of force from physics would lead to the emancipation of science as a whole from bondage of causality, one of the ‘most obstinate remnants of pre-scientific fetishism.’ ” (1957:15)

The key future of the quantum physics is that “for the first time, it has included this reflectivity into science itself, by positing it as an explicit moment of the scientific process. Because of this self-reflective character of its propositions, quantum physics joins ranks with Marxism and psychoanalysis as one of the three types of knowledge which conceives itself not as a neutral adequate description of its object but as a direct intervention on it.” (Žižek, 1996:208)

With that process we could say with Bohm (1994a:450) that a change has happened which leads us to “a different attitude in the sense that we won’t give that much primary weight to the external and mechanistic side - the side of fragmentary and partiality.”

Mechanical paradigm is losing ground against a new holistic\textsuperscript{21} approach.

\textbf{THIRD WAY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY}

Political philosophy that goes beyond mechanicism is a background for the third way thinking. Without a new perception of reality, all new thinking is just a new package of the old reality, ideas, identities, and power structure.

\textsuperscript{21} Any holistic approach has something in common with Hegel who states: “The true is the whole.” (Hegel, 1966:?)  “The true . . exists only as totality.” (q. a. Förster, 1995:137)

“A moment has its justification only as moment of the whole.” (Hegel, Encyclopaedia, par. 14 )

On the other hand we very often find such formulations among physicists when they are discussing questions of quantum theory: “Rosenfeld brings Bohr more into line with Hegel.” (Wilkins, 1994:343) and “I think the point Hegel made was that analysis doesn’t necessarily mean breaking things into bits, but rather unfolding the meaning. He made the interesting point that analysis is at the same time synthesis, because when you have unfolded the meaning, the being has changed and something has been added to it. It unfolds a meaning which is another order of being.” (Bohm, 1994a:442)
What is human being? Answer to that trivial question is crucial for our perception of politics. Liberalism is convinced that human being is an individual as we've described it above. If human being is not just a mechanical one, not only biological one, but also political actor, creator of him/herself in any moment of time, than he/she is not just one. He/she doesn’t posses fixed borders, mechanical walls around him/herself but is in fact mediated through others and so called reality. Nature and objective reality are according to that perception not just hers/his inorganic body, but he/she himself.

Blair’s team gathered that, without radical shifts in identity of the labour doctrine and the party itself, it would be impossible to lead the party and to seize the power. They had to learn to think anew and to speak anew. They had to learn the language that was establishing itself as a starting point of every politics. The constitution of a political individual simply no longer went along the mechanisms two decades and more old. Collective identities that the labour party targeted became marginal. Labour had to be able to target the new political generation, which they first had to establish and prepare for the take over of power. Thus the third way of Tony Blair primarily meant the transformation of the old party into the new party, that will be able to establish the idea of a new Britain.

The addressee of the third way is the whole world and not only inner state public and that for the period of the next twenty-five years. It doesn't have the ambition to be a new strategy of an old game. Instead it perceives itself as a way forward in a completely new game that goes beyond left and right. The third way looks for new answers to the new questions. Therefore it is still essentially trying to stay in balance. Third way primarily counts on those individuals who do not need clear, personified enemies and the battle to life and death with them, to enter into political life. That is why Blair emphasises as adversaries and friends the emotions and virtues we can detect on the individual level. Third way is therefore without a natural enemy and in that sense an ideology without ideology\textsuperscript{22}.

\textsuperscript{22} In a public sense this means that it looks for support from the middle class, which has enough strength to lean on it’s own resources and enough ambition to pull a vast amount of the society with it. To the
Modern political thought is riding on the division between left and the right. Both sides perceive each other as a great political enemy. Individual could be whole on one or on the other side. He/she is indivisible, his/her political identity is just like monochrome structure. The third way according to Blair stresses new position: “Our values define our enemies. Cynicism and fatalism, prejudice and social exclusion: these are the enemies of talent and ambition, of aspiration and achievement.” (Blair 1998, 4)

Enemies are not only outside in the other political wing. We wear enemy with ourselves in our consciousness and identity, it is part of us. And this is the most important change in political thinking: perception of individual is no more mechanical, but political. Individual is holder of many elements that should be thematised in or by political wings and therefore very flexible.

Mechanical view sees the third way thinking as being something between liberalism and social democracy or socialism. But we can clearly see that third way is voicing its ideas also from other political doctrines such as conservatism, corporatism and in some ways also other, more unpopular and negative doctrines.

The third way of Tony Blair is therefore a way across the ruins of self destruction of communism and neo-liberalism and at the same time a way of knowing that it is impossible to go further in any of the old manners. Third way is thus also an introduction to the search of new, an affirmation of politics as a conscious experiment with strong curb conditions that are represented by civilisation values, upgraded with the values of a modern social democracy. That is why it is primarily an offer to the young generation to think and frame it’s political standpoint independently and free of pressure from all existing ways and doctrines, to pinpoint it’s own goals and establish it’s own values. For the young generation is a doctrine, that still does not have totally clear and fortified connections and which is in that manner open for creativity and ideas in general, not only at the unimportant limits, always the most inspirational. The young generation is being invited to join the essence of politics, the decision making process middle class it always appears that society does not need ideologies. The latter are supposed to be reserved mainly for the lower classes, social groups that are left out or marginal.
about the strategy of the new third millennium society, new Europe and new world development.

Many are linking the third way with the americanisation of politics. With that they primarily aim at the media dimension of politics that is becoming dominant. The theoretical emptiness of the social democratic leaders, who could in the past always kindle themselves with a great knowledge on society, economy, politics and all open theoretical dilemmas of political sciences, goes along that. It is difficult to imagine the old social democracy and the old left in general without leaders like Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Karl Liebnecht, August Bebel, Rosa Luxemburg, Eduard Bernstein, Georgij Plehanov, Karl Kautsky, Max and Victor Adler, Karl Renner, Otto Bauer, Lenin for that matter or Willy Brandt, Francois Mitterand and Bruno Kraisky, who were all masters of spirit and pen. The same applied to the founders of Slovene social democratic movement, like Dragotin Lončar, Henrik Tuma, Etbin Kristan and Albin Prepeluh. If they were placed in front of television cameras they probably would not do to well, even though they were good orators and knew how to speak to a live public. Modern politics forces the main actors into likeable approach in front of the media and thus into emptiness of ideas. The division of work has appeared through which experts for political communication are writing speeches, brain trusts are dealing with the strategy, and the task of a politician is to represent this with credence, primarily through visual communication, which is the strongest politically in a modern society.

Importance of the media in the third way politics is only the first step in understanding non-mechanical reality as a suprareality. Emotional management, management of identity is becoming more and more important, even more than facti bruti of so called real life. Suprareality of media permits plurality of all kinds of mechanical realities of different cultures, races, stills of life, genders, generations and physical ones. On the level of politics mediated also through media we could live our freedom. Here other physical Individual is not a limit of my freedom, as it is in liberal concepts, but a needed medium for living my own freedom. I can live my freedom only through others so extensive and deep I accept and live their freedom they are living through me. Other man or women other being is just opportunity for me, not an obstacle. (The smallest particles of mater as there has been already recognised by Nobel Prize winner … also
co-operate among each other and are not in competition as Newton physical bodies were)

The third way commences from the assumption that we no longer live in a totally antagonistic culture. In the third way political doctrine main value is partnership and not antagonism. It also includes competition, but not as a main principle. “Our approach is competition where possible, regulation where necessary.” (Blair, 1998:10) In the modern world everybody should learn to collaborate for competition. Therefore it defends the business culture, which creates new jobs and at the same time implements the values of responsibility of every individual for his or her own destiny. Work for everybody remains an imperative, although work is no longer understood as once in a life time occupation. It is primarily about fostering the social capital of the individual and the society, that enables the individual to create emotionally, intellectually, morally and materially his or her own life. On the flag of the social democracy social program, passive policy of help to the abandoned does not come first, instead it is the active policy of development. Social policy is brought down to those that permanently don’t have access to the labour force market. Everybody else is placed into the context of the policy of education for new challenges and new opportunities. Social democrats have in the period of industrial revolution and the social state turned solidarity into “certain passiveness instead of initiative and responsibility for itself” (Gonzales, 1998:12).

Modern idea of the division between public-private and division between civil society-state based on liberal legacy is becoming more and more outdated. The state in no more necessary evil, as Thomas Paine put it, but necessary good. On the other hand the era of statolatrija (Gramsci), of glorifying the state in the socialdemocratic movement, is over. Civil society and the state have to become partners. “A strong civil society enshrining rights and responsibilities, where the government is a partner to strong communities.” (Blair, 1998:7)

Third way is based on few values. And after that “a large measure of pragmatism is essential.” (Blair 1998, 4) That means all people should become more flexible and in particular those political forces that are trying to become leading, hegemonical power of the contemporary world. The third way is therefore primarily something new and
only after that something left. It is left only because it is new, progressive, emancipatorial, open to the whole world and all political forces. In fact it is not left in classical terms any more, but it should be (self)recognised as a left because of mobilising power of the left in today’s Europe. Old left had become right, conservative part of the world politics understanding nothing of a new world. Ties of old left are ties to the old society and to the old, mechanical categories. The question of pragmatism versus principals is not moral question, but political one. It is a question of political will becoming and being leading political power or not, or to put it differently, of being a creator of reality or just a radical critic of creators of reality.

And at the end. Property was the crucial topic of the modern political thought. Liberals have always opted for privatisation, socialists for nationalisation. The third way philosophy could state not that the solution is in between, which is the position of the common sense, but that the mechanical property doesn’t count any more as a crucial factor of political. Instead of property, which was the cornerstone of the modern man, his political power, social security, capacity and status, in new politics more capacity of processing information, analysing and making decisions is important for position of a human being. Not hardware but software is becoming the most important in politics. Software is here not only as the other name of mechanical equipment (which in fact is hardware), but capacity of original perception of the world based around non-mechanical axis. Therefore not economical capital but social and political capital is top quality of personal equipment.

THE THIRD WAY IN SLOVENIA

Third way represents for Slovenia the connection with the temporary strategic thinking among the ranks of social democracy in the world. It confronts the Slovene political and intellectual forces with the task of rethinking and deciding, in what kind of the world they would like to see Slovenia and what kind of Slovenia they want to create. This rethinking can no longer be of partial nature, national or nationalistic. It can only be global and common. Only those intellectual and political forces that are included into common work on the European and world level can do a relevant rethinking. The third way is a political program of modern and therefore world oriented, however Slovene
social democracy, that the United List of Social Democrats, member of the Socialist
International and joint member of Party of European Socialists is trying to establish in
Slovene political arena. Through that it shares all the troubles of weighing between
good and bad in the old social democracy and the new strategy of the third way.

The third way means surpassing the en bloc division of Slovenia under the criteria of
belonging to the political program of the Catholic church in Slovenia, which forces the
Slovene policy into an antagonistic struggle between Catholics and non Catholics. It is
about a new politics of co-operation and bonding, instead of the politics of digging in
and fostering the front line. The policy of motivation of individuals to “throw”
themselves into the world and realise their ideas must be built into the school system
and all other ideological apparatuses of the state.

United List of Social Democrats was established in 1993 when four parties merged:
Party of Democratic Renewal, Social democratic Union, Labor Party and Peasants
Party. One of the aims of the party was to become a member of the Socialist
International. It was because of the Socialdemocratic Party of Slovenia, that had good
relations with SPD in Germany and democratic image, that the inclusion into
membership of the SI was such a difficult project. Party established its new programme
in 1995. And in that program we can find some elements of a new political philosophy.
Individual has been put in the forefront “Individual is starting point and the aim of our
societal and political activity.” (Programme of the ULSD, 1995:24) Defining basic
values the Program postulates: “Basic value of social democracy is life of an individual.
All other values are important only as much as they strengthen his/hers life power and
happiness.” (Programme of the ULSD, 1995:30) Other basic values are peace: absence
of war, state stability and peace of every individual; equality; liberty; fairness;
solidarity; and partnership\textsuperscript{23} as a new value. Program is talking about “partner
democracy” (Programme of the ULSD, 1995:25) considering relations between gender
and generations and about “partnership of the state, labour and capital” (Programme of

\textsuperscript{23} “Partnership is a new value, which appears at the end of 20\textsuperscript{th} century. This value preserves the human
relations there where through the history has been created social inequalities. This value build on mutual
trust and it strengthen it.” (Program, 1995, 32)
the ULSD, 1995:44) “State should play an active role and support transition of
economy.” (Programme of the ULSD, 1995:48)

In 1997 young leader Borut Pahor took over the presidency of the ULSD. At the first party conference in 1998, which went on for two months, the party began developing new identity as a prelude into changing of the identity of the country To maintain national identity in the process of joining European integration and globalisation Slovenia needs a new identity. In the process of changing identity emotions appear and the ULSD stressed that emotions are part of the political situation and also energy for changes. The task of the politicians is to manage the emotions in transformation.\(^\text{24}\)

Party should therefore activate the courage for rebellion against dominant fear and other bad feelings and to promote aspirations of the individuals. After the conference ULSD prepared promotional material titled *For Learning Society and Sustainable Development* which stressed that change of mentality: education, science, training, knowledge\(^\text{25}\) and ecology were placed at the top of the agenda. The Party wrote in the introduction: “This will raise the expectations of people for their own lives and their own country. Therefore we must inspire citizen’s courage, the boldness to stand up to the new enemies – intolerance, fear, disbelief, stuffiness. We understand politics as an area of connecting creativeness for common good.” (Odprimo ta prostor, 1998)

Next year it opted for the third way. The yearly conference has been organised and titled *The Third Way – The Alliance for a New Slovenia*. President in his introductory speech stressed the globalisation of markets and culture, the extraordinary technological speedups, the demand for greater and greater capability and knowledge for new jobs, the emancipation of women and last but not least, the changes in the very structures of policies and institutions themselves, that hold a great democratic setback and minimal accountability among people. He continued: “These are the circumstances within which we look to the future with the program changes that have been made in the last years. We name this view the third way view.” “First, because it expresses on

\(^{24}\) On of the speakers define politics as “an art of dealing with emotions and feelings of individual persons.” (Dokuments, 1998, 3)

\(^{25}\) “To us, knowledge is the only alternative. It is the means of freedom of a modern person. The quality of an individual’s life is in the modern world more and more depended on constant education and qualifying.” (Odprimo ta prostor, 1998)
symbolic level an ambition, the decision for new and for an alternative.” “Second, because no other term in the modern European political history marks the commitment for the creation of a better world more vividly. “ “And third, because there is a clearly expressed need in the current Slovenian experience for a new, modern social democratic option, an alliance for the newly born millennium that would replace the existing neo liberal political practice.” “Our aim is an open society, a society of solidarity, that enables the individual to develop his/her talents, knowledge and creativity that enables the individual to fully develop his/her life style.” (Tretja pot, 1999, 14,15)

The conference during one-day session prepared basic views on all important fields of party policies such as economy, social policy, technology, youth, agriculture, education. In the debate was also stressed, that “the formation of a new political force is always conducted simultaneously with the introduction of new ways of thinking and new priorities or setting the priorities altogether.” Another element of new thinking is contained in the position, “that what is now marginal must be put in the centre. Here lies the possibility of reaching a new national consensus that will represent the political force of the third way” (Tretja pot, 1999,23) such as drug policy and gender policy. “Social security lays in enabling an individual to flexibly react to changes and to take risks. “

Among values partnership was put on top of the agenda. “The third way is a politics without a natural enemy. That is why partnership is its main value.” (Tretja pot, 1999,24)

The third way is a way of voluntary activism and political activism that are not reduced in political parties. It is about affirmation of civic consciousness, political consciousness that is strong in the process of learning the management of public good in a civil society, interest organisations, clubs, magazines, media. The civic spirit means at the same time cosmopolitanism and Europeanism.

In 2000 the ULSD was preparing for the general elections. For this purpose it has promoted literature on the third way. Giddens's The Third Way was translated in Slovene and a compendium of five discussions on the third way published in a book
titled *New Social Democracy. Definitions and Controversies of the Third Way*. The United List organised promotional activities of the book elaborating ideas on e-society. In its electoral program the knowledge, science and education were stressed at most. Party got 3% more votes than at previous general elections and became part of the ruling coalition.

The other party Liberal Democracy of Slovenia, LDS has not prepared any written material on the topic. They just wanted to be in the mainstream of the European politics. The party has been on power for almost ten years, and despite being both liberal and conservative on crucial policies voters have perceived it as a center-left oriented party, since some of its leading figures were leaders of the Socialist Youth Organisation under socialism. In public they wanted to show themselves as a third way party.

Right wing oriented Socialdemocratic party has also taken some elements from the third way philosophy, nevertheless it refused the term itself. They are convinced that ULSD has occupied the space and that there is no more room for them.

On the basis of this section we could conclude that third way political philosophy has been developed in Slovenia in the middle of the nineties and only after that influenced by Blair's success and rhetoric. Third way in Slovenia is not just a copy of British or German concepts, but autonomous thinking that is taking into consideration the heritage of Slovene political culture, power structure and, though marginal, position of Slovenia in the process of globalisation.

**CONCLUSION**

Mechanism has become core structure of common sense since Newtonian times. It presents a way of thinking and the way of living. Crises of life’s forms brings with it questions about new conceptualization of reality. We've briefly described the problem with mechanism in politics and in political sciences. Mechanism is not something standing outside the politics and political science, rather it is something inherent to it - mechanism is a dominant consciousness of the modern era. We can see that mechanical view on politics in fact denies existence of politics, because politics is not
sensual object, it is not a thing, it is “res publica” but without being “res” in mechanical way of thinking. Disciplinary division of labour between the modern sciences itself naturalises the distinctive social forms of modernity. States, markets, individuals - precisely the things we need to explain - are already assumed to be natural starting points. By conceptualising particular structures of modern social relations in isolation from each other, “this division of labour tends to reify them into self-sufficient actors with their own distinctive properties” (Rosenberg, 1994:4)

We've also briefly demonstrated few traditions in political philosophy and in political science which go beyond mechanical conceptualisation of politics or main topics in the field. But in the circumstances where physics still plays the leading role in the science, we should legitimise non-mechanical position also through physics. Nowadays, political science hasn't got the power to define what reality is. Thus it is forced to take the concept of reality and nature from the physics, “the science of material nature in all of its manifestations” (Rosen, 1994:315). Physics is therefore granted status of generality, other sciences, among them also political science, are in status of particularity.

We need new, but scientific concept of reality, to legitimise politics as a scientific phenomenon or as a real reality. Quantum theory has given us “a picture of the world full of surprises and insights, one far removed from that of Newton’s clockwork universe.” (Wallace, 1996:161) And for the reason that quantum theory is the most profound and deep critic and also the most accepted new practice of understanding reality, science, etc. New concept of politics should be based on the quantizem, that is experience of this actual reflection of what is going on in the end of twentieth century. Quantizem left a free space for politics as being its own reality and at the same time involving in other realities among them also in that of mechanics. Object of political science is the whole, whole political reality, reality as it exists through politics. Through

---

26 Quantizem has become a concept of non-mechanical, classical approach. Bobi de Porter, for example wrote a book on neurolinguistic programming titled Quantum Learning (Judy Piatkus LTD, London, 1993) and Rober A. Wilson wrote a book on how brain software programs the individual titled Quantum Psychology (New Falcon Publications, Temple, Arizona USA). “Librarians and bookstore owners have some difficulty deciding when those books should be shelved under “science” and when under “New Age” tracts”, reports an orthodox physicist Wallace (1996:V)
this politics is defined in every occasion from the situation, which constructive element is also definer, scientist and all of his (that of consciousness and mechanical) equipment. It should be clear that “wenn wir von einem formierten Dinge das wieder wegnehmen, was das Werkzeug daran gethan hat, so ist uns das Ding. - hier das Absolute - gerade wieder so viel als vor dieser somit überflüssige Bemühung.” (Hegel, 1980:53) and that “die Prüfung ist nicht nur eine Prüfung des Wissens, sondern auch ihres Massstabes.” (Hegel, 1980:60)

According to Bohm (1994a:441) not “ding an sich” but “meaning27 is the essence of reality”. “A change of meaning is a change of being.” (Bohm, 1994a:436) “The whole point of meaning is that the content is in a context, which in turn is in a context, and therefore meaning is not final. We are always discovering it, and that discovery of meaning is itself a part of the reality.”28 (Bohm, 1994a:441)

Quantizem allows us to denaturalize the political science and world of politics, or to put it differently, to dissolve the reified political forms of state and market back into the historically specific political relations between people who constitute them. “The substantive aspect of ‘the political’ is not a concrete political ‘thing’ at all; rather, it is the main dynamism of modernity itself. No action of a particular existing structure, no momentous choice, no particular orientative value specific to politics alone, is the criterion or the standard of ‘the political’.” (Heller, 1991:341)

The only adequate formulation of quantum physics and also of political theory would be to replace all terms which, in any way whatsoever, relate to the universe of our everyday experience. In absolute terms we could say, that we first have to invent new language and then find a way to apply that language to the problem at hand. Not to be too radical we need at least new theory, presumably non-linear, non-mechanical and

27 Wheeler urges us “to abandon for the foundation of existence a physics hardware located ‘out there’ and put in instead a ‘meaning’ software who knows where”. (D’Espagnat, 1994:155)

28 We can identify here the similar position as Marx has: “With me, in the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by human mind, and translated into forms of thought.” (Marx, 1962:456)
non-deterministic. And in the same time we need new political practice for and of that theory, for the reason that we could think reified political relations on de-reified way.

Social democracy has stepped down from Heglo-Marxism to Kant. On the theoretical-political level this means among others the works of Bernstein and New-Kantians\(^{29}\). However, this phase is definitely not final. All attempts of the revitalisation of the social democracy project lead in some way to the thinking that was brought into philosophy by Hegel and was developed by the hegelian branch of Marxism. But firstly, social democracy will have to get rid of the prejudice that communism and real socialism were concocts of Western Marxism or even Marx himself. Also because of that, third way has an open perspective on the theoretical level, for it still has to do a huge theoretical work. Only with this deep rethinking of its roots in modern society and politics, social democracy can avoid the danger of her policy becoming a soap opera, where a lot is happening, but nothing ever happens.
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