

**Кароліна ЦИНК,**  
докторка соціологічних наук, ад'юнкт (доцент),  
Колегіум суспільних наук  
Жешувського університету (Польща)

## **РОЛЬ МОРАЛІ В ДИПЛОМАТИЧНІЙ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ДЕЯКИХ ПОЛІТИКІВ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ**

*Анотація.* У статті розкрито теоретичний бік питання ролі етики та моралі в дипломатії, визначено поняття моралі, розкрито походження терміна «мораль» та перелічено основні дослідницькі питання й гіпотези, що їх висували інші науковці в цій царині; представлено загальні моральні критерії для оцінювання вчинків людини як правильних і неправильних. Охарактеризовано типи мотивацій, якими найчастіше послуговуються політики під час ухвалення різноманітних рішень у межах дипломатичної діяльності. У другій частині статті подано три профілі відомих громадських та політичних акторів, які у ХХ столітті діяли в зовнішній політиці відповідно до голосу совісті та своїх моральних принципів: Магатма Ґанді – соціальний лідер Індії в 1920–1948 роках, Віллі Брандт – Канцлер Федеративної Республіки Німеччина в 1969–1974 роках і Джиммі Картер – Президент США в 1977–1981 роках.

Використовуючи теоретичний аналіз, узагальнення наукових фактів і результатів дослідження, а також послуговуючись методом рефлексії, авторка описала й проаналізувала мотиви, що стали провідними для трьох зазначених політиків під час ухвалення складних політичних рішень у конкретних історичних ситуаціях. Результат аналізу підтвердив таку гіпотезу щодо Ґанді: голос совісті, до якого прислухаються політики, пов'язаний здебільшого з історичним і культурним контекстом, унікальним для кожної країни. У випадку з Брандтом і Картером було підтверджено гіпотезу, згідно з якою совість і кар'єрна мотивація можуть пропонувати однакові дії, а отже, здатні функціонувати паралельно. Дипломати, які діють відповідно до своїх моральних принципів, мають спільну рису: ухвалюючи деякі політичні рішення, вони переживають внутрішній конфлікт.

*Ключові слова:* мораль, совість, політика, дипломатія, зовнішня політика, соціологія моралі, Магатма Ґанді, Віллі Брандт, Джиммі Картер.

**Karolina CYNK,**  
Doctor of Social Sciences,  
Adjunct (Associate) Professor,  
Institute of Sociology, University of Rzeszów (Poland)

## **THE ROLE OF MORALITY IN THE DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY OF SELECTED POLITICIANS IN THE 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY**

*Abstract.* The purpose of article is to describe the role of ethics and morality in foreign policy and diplomacy. The article is theoretical. The introduction defines the concept of morality and presents the main research questions and hypotheses. The first part of this text presents general moral criteria for determining what human actions are right and what are wrong. Also presented are the types of motivations that most often affect politicians when making certain decisions in diplomatic activity. The second part of the article presents three profiles of famous politicians who in the 20<sup>th</sup> century acted in accordance with the voice of conscience and moral principles in their foreign policy. They are Mahatma Gandhi, India's social leader in 1920–1948, Willy Brandt, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1969–1974, and Jimmy Carter, U.S. President in 1977–1981.

Using theoretical analysis, the generalisation of scientific facts and research findings, the author, on the basis of the reflection method, has described and analysed the motives that guided the three politicians in making difficult political decisions in specific historical situations. Understanding such motives is important because the measures adopted on the basis of them have had consequences not only for politicians but also for citizens and, sometimes, even for the entire world. As a result of the analysis, in the case of Gandhi, the following hypothesis has been confirmed: The voice of conscience to which politicians heed and its meaning are mostly associated with the historical and cultural context, unique for each country. In the case of Brandt and Carter, the author has verified the hypothesis that very often conscience and career motivation propose the same way of acting, which is why we cannot exclude career motivation in such a situation.

*Keywords:* morality, conscience, policy, diplomacy, foreign policy, sociology of morality.

### **Introduction**

An important concept used in this article is morality. The word morality comes from the Latin word *moralis* and deals with what actions are right and what are wrong. Morality is an area of decisions and actions that become the object of moral judgment. Morality concerns the judgments, rules, norms, attitudes, and institutions that guide human behaviour (Ricken, 2001, pp. 8–9). Many motivations depend on human character, and good character is recognised by conscientiousness. Conscientiousness consists in strict adherence to moral rules, a conscientious person avoids conduct that it considers to be wrong and devotes itself

to actions that he or she deems right (Brandt, 1996, pp. 780, 789–792). The aim of this article is to describe the role of morality in foreign policy and diplomacy in selected countries. The author decided to undertake this task by presenting in the text the profiles of three famous politicians who in the 20<sup>th</sup> century became famous for their moral way of conducting international politics. These politicians were Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948), Willy Brandt (1913–1992), and Jimmy Carter (1924). Though falling beyond the historical circumstances in which they functioned, they were guided by the moral principles to which they were faithful.

The knowing and assessing the motivations of politicians working in diplomacy is important from a scientific and practical point of view because it allows one to understand what guides them in their professional duties. Understanding such motivations is important because the actions taken on their basis cause specific effects, not only for the politicians but also for the society and sometimes even for the whole world.

This article is theoretical and includes an analysis of the motives of selected politicians in making specific political decisions while performing leadership functions. The method of analysis is deliberation and reflection on the motives behind actions taken by Gandhi, Brandt, and Carter. The two main research problems were formulated as follows: What determines the degree to which politicians are guided by conscience in diplomacy? Are conscience and career motives mutually exclusive? These problems correspond to two hypotheses, the first being spelled out in the following manner: the voice of conscience to which politicians heed and its meaning are mostly associated with the historical and cultural context, unique for each country. According to the second hypothesis, it is conjectured that very often conscience and career motivation propose the same way of acting. Although the article proposes more hypotheses regarding the motivation of politicians, the two aforementioned statements in the context of the profiles analysed merit special attention.

The issue of morality in politics is not often raised by scientists and is difficult to explore, firstly, due to the problems associated with discovering the real motives of politicians and, secondly, due to the essence of diplomacy, in which specific protocol norms are applied and which is rather a mysterious research area for scientists. However, there are scholars who look into this issue. One can mention, for example, such scientists as C. Bjola, who deals with the role of morality in diplomatic theory and practice (2018), O. Harries, who studies the relationship of power and morality in the U.S. foreign policy (2005), M.C. Bligh, and J. L. Robinson, who explore charisma and the phenomenon of Mahatma Gandhi's leadership (2010). The works of D. Mattinigli concern the activities of J. Carter with regard to women's rights in Islamic countries (2019), while D. Carleton and M. Stohl examine the role of human rights in foreign policy during the presidential terms of J. Carter and R. Reagan (1985). Similarly, D. F. Schmitz and V. Walker address

the issue of human rights during Carter's presidency, who sought to create a post-Cold War foreign policy (2004).

This article supplements and clarifies the existing knowledge contained in the abovementioned texts. It is the author's belief that presenting specific examples of politicians guided by conscience will help to better understand the subject of morality in diplomacy.

### **The moral evaluation of human actions**

A reflection on the moral motivations of politicians requires prior consideration of what makes some actions considered as good or bad. That can be the source of morality. The subject is determined mostly by the belonging of a certain action to some type. "The moral object of act is what it heads for by its nature. (...) The object of the act determines the morality of an act considered by itself" (Oesterle, 1965, pp. 132–133). Motivation is the next source of morality. To a large extent, it depends on whether an action is right or not. When taking action, a person is directed by motivation, including the consideration of various options and differences related to the recognition of this and no other alternative. Sometimes, there can be a meritorious or reprehensible deed because of the strength of motivation in some circumstances. The assessment of the act which results from good motives but leads to negative consequences will be different from the act which stems from bad motives. A good motive shall have a general tendency to cause acts of legitimate character, though not always the right action is the result of these motives. Similarly, it is not always true that bad motives cause wrongful behaviour (Moore, 1980, pp. 120–121, 123). Actions can be equitable or inequitable depending on real consequences, i.e. the result, the outcome of the action; in this case, however, you need additional information whether such an act was done deliberately or accidentally (Ibid., pp. 112–115, 117, 119–120). Finally, when attempting a moral assessment of an act, one must also take into account the intentions and all beliefs of a particular person related to the consequences of the act. For determining the moral value of action, besides the subject, one must take into account the consequences, intentions, and motivations; the latter has the highest impact on the recognition of an act as meritorious or reprehensible (Brandt, 1996, pp. 781–783).

Many human motivations have their basis in human character. By the streak, we can determine those personal features which are relatively constant. When something is a streak it comprises dispositions to react in a particular way. Each streak has its own peculiarity, which, from the social point of view, can be advantageous or disadvantageous. It is commonly known that a good character can be recognised by thoroughness. A conscientious person always tries to avoid a behaviour he or she deems inappropriate. When appealing to conscience, we reflect over other possibilities of acting and their correspondence to moral rules

(Ibid., pp. 780, 789, 791–792, 794–796). Conscience consists in defining, by subject, his own acts in the categories of good, evil or a moral duty. Conscience can be generally defined as ‘a formed estimation concerning the moral good or evil of a human intentional act, whose realisation becomes a source of internal approval or guilt, a good or bad human’ (Ślipko, 2004, pp. 368, 377).

It cannot be forgotten that an act which brings a personal welfare, such as personal career development, can be a moral duty. According to presumptions of egotism theory, everyone should take care of themselves. In that case, duty is considered as doing or not doing something in order to be happy. According to J. Bentham, happiness is defined as pleasure and lack of pain. The volume of those feelings can be determined on the basis of such criteria as intensity, longevity, reliability, depth, postponement, wealth, and purity (Vardy, Grosch, 1995, p. 70). Happiness can also be defined as a rational goal of a human being. An individual is motivated to act when he or she knows that the situation would be desirable. In case of choosing some options, he will be more likely to opt for action, which will provide the most favourable condition. In the long term, fulfilling once moral obligations can serve personal interests (Brandt, 1996, pp. 533, 613–614, 626, 635–637). If everyone respected the rules and complied with their obligations, it would increase the general well-being and provide the basis for the well-being of the individual. However, we cannot determine whether or not someone should undertake the obligation that is inconsistent with self-interest.

### **Morality in politics**

Albeit generally desirable, acts that could be quoted as a model of behaviour are also extremely rare, all the more so in politics. To demonstrate how the stimulus affects the behaviour of a politician, we should review individually each theme which could have an impact on the behaviour of a diplomat. The statement concerning what affects politicians is extremely difficult because it often happens that motives of conscience and career are not mutually exclusive. In such a situation, it is almost impossible to separate them and determine what motivated the politician to make certain decisions (Steiner, 1997, pp. 170–171).

It should be noted that it is usually not one but many motives that affect the behaviour of politicians. Trying to present them, I formulate a preliminary hypothesis:

1. The voice of conscience to which politicians heed and its meaning are mostly associated with the historical and cultural context, unique for each country (Ibid., p. 64).

2. Strong motivations can also be defined by political beliefs. There is no shortage of people in the history of politics who could be called ideologues.

3. There are also politicians who are motivated by the desire to ‘go down in history’ and they subordinate their behaviour to that purpose.

4. In undertaking political activities, politicians also often rely on their deep religious faith. In such cases, their motivation is mainly guided by conscience or, in some cases, by their career.

5. It is commonly believed that in politics there can be no question of any conscience, that politics and conscience are mutually exclusive concepts. This is a further assumption, which limits the behaviour of diplomats solely to their personal motives. However, the vast majority of politicians in democratic countries argue that political decision-making is guided by 'what is good and right for society'. They realise that admitting that their actions are primarily motivated by the desire to develop their own career would be contrary to their interest. Thus, a 'moral statement' is not always premised on sincere intentions. Thus, the greater the individual costs and benefits for politicians involved in decision-making processes are, the greater role personal interests may play (Ibid., pp. 54–55, 30, 99).

J. Steiner, a Swiss scholar, has distinguished the motives affecting political decisions and highlighted the following categories:

- a direct motivation of career that takes place when a politician takes certain steps counting on direct benefits or refrains from acting when he does not see such benefits. Very often conscience and career motivation propose the same way of acting. That is why career motivation cannot be excluded in such a situation;
- an indirect motivation of career; a manifestation of such behaviour can occur when a decision taken by a particular politician does not give him or her direct benefits. However, there may occur some benefits for a broader group of people, which could also be an indirect source of benefit to the politician;
- lack of career motivation; this category includes cases where as a result of a certain behaviour the politician does not gain anything but does not lose anything either;
- a motivation against career; this category may occur in the case when a politician harms his or her career by his actions;
- a neutral position, which occurs when politicians do not clearly indicate their position, restricting themselves to a summary of a political issue (Ibid., pp. 81–83).

Taking action favourable to the multiplication of one's benefits is not always a bad thing. In addition to politicians, voters also take care of their own interests, and it depends on them whether they will give the trust to politicians for another term of office or not; it is an example of a policy based on free market principles (Ibid., p. 107).

6. Coming to the next motives, you should realise that in some particular situation different people sometimes behave in a very different way, which can be explained by a different streak of every human. The results of numerous studies (which should be remotely taken into account) argue that politicians have a



greater predisposition to use manipulation in real-life situations than the rest of society. Incumbent politicians are also more likely than representatives of other professions to behave in a particular situation in a way expected from them by society, which does not change the fact that, at the same time, they seek to earn some benefits for themselves. These features, however, do not need to be clearly reprehensible, if there is a limit to which one can proceed in manipulation. We should be aware that these abilities are certainly not the only ones that characterise politicians (Nowicka-Włodarczyk, 1998, pp. 72–73).

7. It is clear that in different circumstances different politicians are guided by different motivations, and you can never be quite sure, what pushes them into action; sometimes, they themselves may not be aware of it. Politicians want to be seen as persons who have the will to do what is good because they often they see themselves in this way. Even though these are exceptional cases, sometimes politicians also consider what is right for others. Those are cases where individuals are willing to sacrifice their political career in order to protect their independence (Steiner, 1997, pp. 53–54, 173, 175).

### **Mahatma Gandhi – the man of great spirit**

Politics is too extensive a field, which is why I would like to analyse only a small part of it, diplomacy. Diplomatic activities are undertaken within the foreign policy framework. One of the instruments of foreign policy are diplomatic negotiations (Sutor, 1979, p. 71).

I would like to present the profiles of several prominent politicians. Although the motivations guiding them in foreign policy activities are generally considered right and good, they require a more detailed and deeper analysis.

Mahatma Gandhi is an example of a man who was involved in political affairs to fulfill his moral obligation. The politician of this format could probably succeed only in India. He would be unlikely to succeed in a country with a different culture and traditions. The conditions in Indian society, which traditionally respects moral obligations and spiritual attitudes (Mrozek, 1977, p. 198), allowed Gandhi to expand his activity. In everything what he did he was guided by several fundamental principles, one of which is called *ahimsa*, consisting in not doing somebody injustice and a general spread of kindness. As part of *ahimsa*, he championed fighting without violence, the use of physical superiority or the threat of its use, which is otherwise known as passive resistance. This attitude is reflected in the use of such methods as the refusal to cooperate or civil disobedience. Gandhi believed in using those methods and viewed them as a moral duty. Through ascetic lifestyle and hunger strikes, Gandhi wanted to improve himself, whilst also ennobling others and their approach to the truth (Lazari-Pawłowska, 1965, pp. 12, 23–24, 30–31, 51, 53, 57–59, 137, 146).

Gandhi sought to introduce a gradual democratisation of social relations. It was connected with his activities to regain India's independence after World War II and required him to be involved in international affairs. Gandhi believed that if the British were not able to recognise the will of the people of India, who sought to regain freedom, it could only mean their moral bankruptcy. He was convinced that if the British friends had restored India's freedom, they would never have to be afraid of it because, in return, India would remain their greatest friend. He hoped that the friendship would be extended also to other countries (Silvester, 2005, pp. 257–258). Gandhi was willing to go anywhere, even to Nazi Germany, for the good of humanity to beg for peace.

The struggle for the independence of India was led simultaneously with the intense Hindu-Muslim antagonism. Gandhi's purpose was to put an end to it. For that reason, he decided to stand up for the interests of Muslims who were in minority in India and thus the weaker party (Lazari-Pawłowska, 1965, pp. 84–85, 106). He strove for consensus and compromise through mutual concessions. The way of his policies proved to be ineffective, as nobody wanted to listen to Gandhi. His requests were ignored more and more often, which he, too, seemed to realise. However, he never abandoned the idea of non-violence. For his attitude, he paid a heavy price for the proclamation of the terms of reconciliation with Pakistan: On 30 January 1948, Mahatma Gandhi – The Great Spirit – was shot dead (Wolpert, 2003, pp. 349, 350, 352). The greatest heroism of his was acceptance of death in that way in order not to feel hatred towards the oppressor.

Gandhi never sought to achieve positions of authority, nor did he lay claims on any position in the government of India. He did not expect any benefit for himself, as proven by the fact that he walked dressed only in linen pants and sandals and had only the most necessary things, such as a wooden spoon, a bowl, a pen, and a watch. He was very charismatic and possessed the mind of a democrat, though some people accused him of being a nationalist. His motivations consisted in the principle of ahimsa as well as deep faith, character, and culture of India. Among the persons analysed in this article, Gandhi is the best example of the people who in their activity were guided more by moral duty than their career. No other politician had stronger convictions than Gandhi, 'the conscience of the world' (Lazari-Pawłowska, 1965, pp. 15, 19, 93, 139, 153).

### **Willy Brandt – the conscience of the German people**

Herbert Ernst Karl Frahm, known under the pseudonym Willy Brandt, is another example of a politician who in his deeds was probably motivated by moral duty and conscience. In his life, politics had a very important role, while his strength laid in the ability to integrate and reconcile. Brandt was characterised by ambition and, at the same time, sensitivity; he never lost hope. He had



a proclivity to self-criticism and was no stranger to depression, melancholy, long silence, recalling recent events, and pondering over the morality of life. In addition, he was sentimental. He often challenged fate, putting to the test his sovereignty and independence, apart from the ambient pressure. Brandt's political style was characterised by the appreciation of discussion about problems, balancing the arguments of both parties, empathising with the situation, listening to amendments, and, consequently, making decisions. That reflects the will of persuasion, the need to seek consensus, and aversion to authoritarian decisions. Brandt uncomplicated and opened the way for easily soliciting the favour of subordinates. He claimed that the politician who sought just popularity would lose the trust of voters. Brandt often had doubts whether he was the right man to fulfill the role of a leader or rather was a burden for the SPD (Stern, 1996, pp. 15, 38, 70–71, 108). He realistically assessed the situation and had no illusions as to the fate of post-war Germany, but still wanted to make an attempt to bring it back to Europe. Brandt was aware that he would face a number of disappointments but also hoped that each defeat suffered would be accompanied by the realisation that his duty was fulfilled (Ibid., p. 36).

An important moment in Brandt's life was the brutal suppression of the insurrection in Hungary. In response to this situation, people from West Germany took to the streets as a sign of protest. Brandt wanted to prevent the march of several thousand people to the eastern sector and similar disturbances. After arriving at the border, he urged the crowd to control their emotions and do not fall into the trap of violence. In this way, the situation calmed down; however, Brandt did not recognise that final as his merit (Ibid., p. 44).

Brandt mentioned that one of the saddest day in his life occurred when he arrived at the border between sectors and saw that East Berlin was blocked by military divisions and the construction of the Berlin Wall had begun. He was terrified by the enormity of human suffering caused by the action taken by East Germany and the Soviet Union. He believed that if someone wanted to help the inhabitants of the divided city, he should talk to the governments of these countries. Brandt argued that he could not rest until the wall fell. '(...) We have to think – patiently and thoroughly – how we can make it transparent. It should not only be removed, but we have to make it superfluous in a larger context' (Ibid., p. 51).

The Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed to the GDR to have talks without preconditions, willing to create the possibility of mutual contacts. For that purpose, a meeting in Erfurt was organised. In front of the hotel where Brandt stopped, crowds were waiting. When he approached the hotel window, people were in euphoria. He asked the people about peace. Probably, he honestly felt a deep, moral, and emotional inner tension. As he later said,

'I walked away from the window with a heavy heart. (...) I was afraid to awake unable to meet expectations, I started behaving more cautiously' (Ash, 1996, p. 222). Memories of that day made Brandt wonder if he had ever experienced more heart-touching moments.

Brandt's government agreed to some concessions to the Eastern bloc to remove the obstacle on the road to the easing of tensions. When signing the agreement with Poland on the normalisation of relations in 1970, Brandt had in his mind the welfare of future generations and therefore decided to treat morality as a political force. Such attitude is a manifestation of a rational policy conducted by the chancellor and not of the policy of resignation (Stern, 1996, pp. 96–97). Although it is not easy to put intellectual and moral impulses into the language of practical policy, Brandt attempted to do that. A symbolic gesture occurred on the day of signing the treaty with Poland. In the place of the former Jewish ghetto, the chancellor approached to a monumental stone dedicated to 500,000 Jews murdered by the Nazis, bowed his head, and knelt. What could he be thinking of at the moment? As he himself admitted, 'The gesture should speak for itself. It was not planned. It just happened and I am not ashamed of that' (Dönhoff, 1999, p. 165). On another occasion he said: '(...) Thinking about the millions murdered, I did – also on behalf of my countrymen – what people do when words fail' (Ibid., pp. 165–166). It is possible that by so doing Brandt fulfilled his moral duty and was willing to acknowledge moral responsibility. This gesture could be a manifestation of human and moral sovereignty on the part of the chancellor. This single, lonely, and humble tribute to the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto could also be a Christian need to erase the fault of the Germans. He believed that it was high time that the people forgot what divided them and focused on what they had in common.

Brandt's chancellorship was also characterised by great confidence from others, credulity, loyalty impaired by human, not a party-political nature and insufficient knowledge of people in political decision making process. His reaction to the disloyal behaviour of members of the cabinet and the coalition was a greater degree of confidence, he responded with understanding and compassion for human weakness and avoided granting resign. Strengths explain the weakness of Brandt, who in politics sometimes suffered lacked of perseverance and strength in conduct (Stern, 1996, p. 110). After the arrest of one of his closest associates, which turned out to be an East German spy, Brandt for that situation blamed himself, he resigned and in 1974 left the chancellorship. The resignation can be explained by Brandt's personality. Honour and ethical standards were more important than political authority, and he did not want to throw the responsibility on others.

Brandt's diplomacy was repeatedly appreciated and it was connected with receiving personal benefit. His political activities were also acclaimed by the

Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, which decided that the Peace Prize for the year of 1971 should be given to the German Chancellor. The explanatory memorandum stated that the head of the Federal Government had taken the first step towards reconciliation with the former enemy countries and that this expression of good would significantly contribute to the creation of conditions for the construction of peace in Europe (Kozub, 1973, p. 43). Brandt's decisions in principle matters were more marked by ethical considerations than political or tactical calculations. Common sense and conscience, decency and tolerance were part and parcel of how he understood policy-making. Given the chancellor's moral credibility, it is difficult to overestimate his success. Of course, there may occur questions whether his political career, symbolic gestures, and words were not dictated by motivations in the form of personal benefits, which Brandt did not want to admit. Although this cannot be excluded, more evidence suggests that Brandt, in conducting the policy of 'warming' relations between the East and the West, was guided by the desire to fulfill his moral obligation and the voice of conscience. Such activities could be led by the man with the right character.

### **Jimmy Carter – the moral president**

Jimmy Carter is another politician worth of mentioning. It is a man who at a dizzying pace rose to the heights of American politics. During the election campaign in the second half of the 1970s, he presented himself as a representative of ordinary people, having not much in common with the typical politicians. In his personality, we recognize honesty, human-centered attitude to many phenomena and problems, as well as a hidden strength of character. Besides, Carter is seen as a quiet, precise, calm, strong, and kind person. He is characterised by prudence and a clear ability for systematic planning. He had the ability to understand others' perspectives and a talent of winning an interlocutor's trust, while encouraging him or her to restraint and changing positions (Brzeziński, 1989, pp. 4–5, 11–12, 19–20, 60, 492–493, 499).

Carter came to the White House without any specific knowledge of international affairs. He took office with a determination to use the enormous possibilities of the United States in the service of humanity. It is believed that Carter is a man of genuine and deep religiosity. Owing to that religious and political sense, during the period of his presidency he took care of human rights. Carter was aware that the issue of human rights was a pressing one. As he himself put it, 'I wish that the morality of our country were the model. I am deeply convinced that if (...) someone deprives people of basic human rights, the President of the United States should show his discontent and do something about it... I would like the people in our country to be interested in the issue of human rights that are violated worldwide (...) our commitment to human rights must be absolute'

(Brzeziński, 1989, pp. 117, 120–121, 136). Carter's conviction stemmed partly from his religious beliefs and partly from the fact that it would be useful in the campaign to lead the policy of the United States in a more humane and moral way. He was also aware that his political beliefs could be helpful in obtaining personal benefits. In such a situation, it seems that it cannot be excluded that Carter was motivated by career considerations. Nevertheless, we should rather look for sources of his political views in the Christian faith (Brzeziński, 1989, pp. 7, 23, 27, 44, 64, 116, 285).

The big challenge for Carter was the conflict in the Middle East, especially between Israel and Egypt. In an effort to put an end to hostilities, he organised a conference at Camp David in 1978. On this occasion, Carter presented himself as a polemicist, psychologist, and mediator. Finally, the president excelled and his effort resulted in signing a peace treaty. Carter's defeat, however, was caused by the Iran hostage crisis, an assault conducted at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran in 1980. Carter was frustrated because of prolonged disability to break the deadlock in the issue of imprisoned hostages. The U.S. administration eventually decided to send commandos to Iran who were supposed to release the prisoners. An attempt to release them failed. Carter said that it was one of the worst days in his life and that all the time he was haunted by memories of that day. He also said that he was personally responsible for this mission (Pastusiak, 1991, pp. 397–398).

Carter knew that the president sometimes has to use force, and in such cases he should have confidence. However, using force was not something instinctive for him, which he did not conceal. Carter's reluctance to use force proved in public awareness his weaknesses. As a result, trust to him as president suffered. After Carter's loss in the next election, there appeared an opinion that his foreign policy was excessively moralistic and insufficiently militaristic. Carter did not really know how to enlist support, he did not induce enthusiasm in the society and did not arouse fear in the enemy. People believed him but only as a man, not as president. His advantages – honesty, integrity, compassion, sensitivity to human misery – not necessarily equaled the advantages of a statesman. Trying to figure out what motives guided Carter, we should ask ourselves whether he took political action in order to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. When asked about it, he replied: '(...) what would happen if I had a goal of just getting the Nobel Peace Prize and never got it? Or rather, I do not get. (...) What an embittered, disillusioned, and frustrated man would I have become then? (Steiner, 1997, p. 52)' Carter admitted that he always acted in accordance with his duty and that it was a pleasure for him. He certainly could not reveal the truth about his aspirations for the Nobel Prize. In addition, his personality could be so complicated that it makes it impossible to determine his motivation in a simple way. Nevertheless, there are good reasons for saying that during his political activity

Carter was led by his religious faith, conscience, and moral obligation. All of these motivations were rooted in his righteous character. Although not elected for another term, he did not abandon his ideas, still trying to spread them. It is therefore possible that Carter, as he saw himself, corresponded to the way he presented himself to the public (Steiner, 1997, pp. 51–54).

### **Conclusion**

In summary, the presented profiles of politicians allow saying that diplomats who in their political activities sought to fulfill their moral obligation were mainly motivated by their own conscience and character streaks, and sometimes religiosity. It should be noted that politicians who put as an objective fulfilling their moral obligation normally disappeared from the political scene undervalued and quickly forgotten; in extreme cases, they met tragic fate, as Mahatma Gandhi did. It is worth asking whether the policy pursued by people guided by conscience is effective. The examples of Gandhi and Carter suggest that it is not always the case. One might consider whether the politicians described above can win only the memory of next generations, which are usually more likely to consider Gandhi, Carter, and Brandt as moral authorities than contemporary generations.

It is also worth noting that politicians with the described attitude appeared especially in the 1970s, as evidenced by the examples of Brandt and Carter. It was the time of intense humanism (human rights), arms reduction, and alleviation of tensions in the international arena. Both in the earlier and later times, those issues were not themes of interest. Perhaps, the time and set of circumstances led to the emergence of that type of politicians.

In this situation, a question can be asked whether it is worth in the world of politics to be guided by conscience. If we had put this question to the abovementioned politicians, they would probably had provided an affirmative response. But if to try making an objective assessment, the answer is not clear. Many political decisions require different kinds of behaviour, often resulting from different motives. It is also important to remember that many politicians' behaviour is guided by various factors, such as the time and place in which they live, the international situation, and other politicians with which they must work.

Finally, the two main hypotheses should be verified. In the case of Brandt and Carter, it is confirmed that very often conscience and career motivation propose the same way of acting that we cannot exclude in such a situation. In the case of Gandhi, it can be assumed that the voice of conscience to which politicians heed and its meaning are mostly associated with the historical and cultural context, unique for each country. Diplomats acting in accordance with their moral obligation have a common feature, which is experiencing internal conflicts related to making certain political decisions. Such conditions characterised Gandhi, Brandt, and Carter. This mainly results from the personality streaks of the politician

because most of the motivations are based just on character. Although history shows that being guided solely by one's own political career makes it slightly more effective than listening to one's own conscience and politicians acting in accordance with personal interest generally enjoy greater respect, it goes unchallenged that politicians for whom the most important thing is the fulfillment of a moral obligation are needed. The attitudes of selected politicians presented herein are indomitable patterns of behaviour, which are frequently lacking in the current public life. For this reason alone, such people are worth remembering.

This article can serve as an impetus for further research on this important and interesting issue.

- 
- Ricken, F. (2001). *Etyka ogólna* [General Ethics]. Kęty: Antyk Marek Derewiecki. [in Polish].
  - Brandt, R. (1996). *Etyka: zagadnienia etyki normatywnej i metaetyki* [Ethics: Questions of Normative Ethics and Meta-ethics]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. [in Polish].
  - Oesterle, J. (1965). *Etyka* [Ethics]. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax. [in Polish].
  - Moore, G. (1980). *Etyka* [Ethics]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe. [in Polish].
  - Ślipko, T. (2004). *Zarys etyki ogólnej* [An Outline of General Ethics]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM. [in Polish].
  - Vardy, P., Grosch, P. (1995). *Etyka: poglądy i problem* [Ethics: Views and Problems]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka. [in Polish].
  - Steiner, J. (1997). *Sumienie w polityce: empiryczne badania przypadków trafności decyzji politycznych w Szwajcarii* [Conscience in Politics: Empirical Studies of Cases of Validity of Political Decisions in Switzerland]. Rzeszów: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Rzeszowie. [in Polish].
  - Nowicka-Włodarczyk, E. (ed.). (1998). *Etyka i polityka: wybrane problem* [Ethics and Politics: Selected Problems], z. 24. Kraków: F 'MCRD'. [in Polish].
  - Sutor, J. (1979). *Pokojowe załatwianie sporów międzynarodowych* [Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. [in Polish].
  - Mrozek, B. (1977). *Mahatma Gandhi – przywódca Indii* [Mahatma Gandhi – The Leader of India]. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza. [in Polish].
  - Lazari-Pawłowska, I. (1965). *Etyka Gandhiego* [The Ethics of Gandhi]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe. [in Polish].
  - Silvester, C. (2005). *Wywiady prasowe wszech czasów* [All-Time Press Interviews]. Warszawa: Iskry. [in Polish].
  - Wolpert, P. (2003). *Gandhi*. Warszawa: Folio. [in Polish].
  - Stern, K. (1996). *Brandt*. Warszawa: Oficyna Historii XIX i XX Wieku. [in Polish].
  - Ash, T. (1996). *W imieniu Europy: Niemcy i podzielony kontynent* [On Behalf of Europe: Germany and the Divided Continent]. Londyn: Aneks. [in Polish].
  - Dönhoff, M. (1999). *Kanclerze Republiki Federalnej Niemiec jakich nie znamy* [Chancellors of the Federal Republic of Germany Whom We Do Not Know]. Warszawa: Bellona. [in Polish].
  - Kozub, K. (1973). *Politycy z pierwszych stron gazet* [Politicians from the front pages of newspapers]. Warszawa: Iskry. [in Polish].
  - Brzeziński, Z. (1989). *Cztery lata w Białym Domu: Wspomnienia Doradcy do Spraw Bezpieczeństwa Państwa 1977–1981* [Four Years in the White House: Memoirs of the National Security Advisor 1977–1981]. Warszawa: Wszelchnica Społeczno-Polityczna. [in Polish].
  - Pastusiak, L. (1991). *Prezydenci: od George'a Waszyngtona do George'a Busha* [Presidents: from George Washington to George Bush]. Warszawa: Dom Książki. [in Polish].