DOI-10.53571/NJESR.2020.2.1.20-33

Freedom Of Ethics And Legitimate Jurisprudence

Dr.Kiran Joshi

Principal

Sardar Patel Law College

Sriganganagar

Rajasthan

(Received:20December2019/Revised:12January2020/Accepted:20January2020/Published:25January2020)

Abstract

This paper argues that temporal legal systems need a better defined space for freedom of heart because this important right has been crowded out by both freedom of religion and freedom of study. Grounded on the principles of the Protestant Reformation, American constitutionalism expanded the idea of freedom of heart to the point of making it nearly exchangeable with freedom of religion. On the other hand, transnational law, followed by European indigenous law, reduced the political force of the conception of freedom of heart by assimilating it to freedom of study. And yet freedom of heart cannot be treated just the same as either religious freedom or freedom of study. By nature, the temporal legal systems of political communities are moral, butnon-religious. So morality and religion affect legal systems in different ways; for this reason, freedom of heart and freedom of religion should be defended using different legal bias. The so-called honor of abstaining(beneficium abstinendi) stylish protects freedom of heart; freedom of religion, by discrepancy, is meetly defended by what I'll call the religious exception(exceptio religiosa). The consequences of applying these legal tools in particular cases, and their proper reaches, depend on the indigenous model of the political community in question. But in general, our globalized, different, and multilateral society demands a wider operation of both these legal tools.

Keywords: Freedom Of Conscience, Freedom Of Religion, Freedom Of Thought, Accommodation, Exemptions, Public Morality

Introduction

This paper makes the case for a well- defined legal space for freedom of heart, as distinct from freedom of study and freedom of religion. Freedom of study is needed for the mortal person as a

rational being(homo rationalis); freedom of heart is needed for the mortal person as a moral being(homo moralis); and freedom of religion is needed for the mortal person as a religious being(homo religiosus). These three liberties are nearly affiliated, but ontologically distinct. therefore, although they're defended under the same universal mortal right in numerous transnational instruments, because of their natural affections, they affect the temporal legal system in different ways; and in some cases, the legal means used to save and cover them should be specific to each freedom[1]

In American indigenous law, freedom of heart has been contained into religious freedom. Hence the inconsistency and volatility ofU.S. Supreme Court doctrines on religious and moral issues in the last many decades. Belief in the actuality of God and in his invaluable gift of freedom were the original pillars of both freedom of heart and freedom of religion. So these two freedoms, as we shall see, were(if not relatively synonymous) largely exchangeable in social and revolutionary America, as they were in the Protestant Reformation. This sheds light on two questions First, why freedom of heart was considered not just an inner moral freedom, as it's in transnational and European law, but a genuine political freedom, a real limit on government that protects particular choices as well as moral judgments; 3 and second, why both the culture of religious accommodation and the religious impunity strategy4 have been developed largely in American indigenous law. Still, in transnational and recent European law, freedom of heart has been contained into freedom of study and, in some surrounds, freedom of religion. This subsuming of freedom of heart into freedoms of study and religion may be justified by strong parallels among all three freedoms, as well as certain literal and artistic developments. The three freedoms are analogous in two felicitations. First, they're all related to the forum internum that is, the internal and private realm in which no state hindrance is ever justified. Second, they're all liberties in the negative sense, to bring Berlin's notorious distinction; they help define " the area within which the subject – a person or groups of persons is or should be left to do or be what he's suitable to do or be, without hindrance by other persons. " As for literal and artistic developments, all three liberties were philosophically developed as corridor of a single, natural continuum, whose capstone was the public practice and expression of one's religious or analogous persuasions. In this paper, I'll first dissect how the original right to freedom of heart has been brainwashed by a shift from a religious frame, veritably much present in the American indigenous tradition, to a frame dissociated from religion, which has been current in

transnational and European law. Second, I'll argue that this secularization of the rights of heart necessitates a clearer distinction between freedom of heart and freedom of religion. Eventually, I'll show that legal systems should cover and promote freedom of heart in its brainwashed form using legal instruments peculiar to it, and different from those used to cover freedom of religion. The honor of abstaining(beneficium abstinendi) is the applicable legal device for guarding freedom of heart, while the religious exception(exceptio religiosa) is the proper legal tool for guarding freedom of religion[2]

Freedom Of Conscience: A Shifting Paradigm

With the rise of Fustiness, and specifically in the American colonizer and latterly indigenous experience, freedom of heart was understood as a broad and flexible right that embraced numerous rights and liberties related to religion. Expressions similar as religious freedom, religious liberty, rights of heart, religious equivalency, free exercise of religion, and religious rights were used interchangeably in the jottings and speeches of the framers(especially the American framers) of the right to religious freedom[3]

Indeed, under American law, religion and heart remained thick. Conscience was the door to religion; separating the two sounded unbelievable. To cover heart was to cover religion, and vice versa. In fact, the three most important practical factors of freedom of heart were the right of private judgment in religious matters, the prohibition of any kind of religiously- grounded demarcation, and the guarantee of freedom and an impunity from legal duty and legal conditions in religious matters, which was understood as a licit response to the pressures between religion and the legal system.9 Religious rights aimed to cover the actuality of a plurality of persuasions, the birthrights of individual heart, the separation of religious and political structures, and the free exercise of religion as a genuine path to finding and praising God. So freedom of heart defended acts grounded on religion, but not those grounded on purely temporal moral conviction[3]

Still, religion and heart weren't considered identical. Of course, the First Amendment to theU.S. Constitution mentions religion, not heart. Famously, James Madison’s original offer would have defended the “ rights of heart ” rather than the “ free exercise of religion, ” but it was revised. maybe the change was just a matter of taste, but it has legal counteraccusations it's naturally admissible, at least theoretically, to separate heart and religion, similar that the First Amendment fails to cover those matters of heart unconnected to the free exercise of religion or itsnon-establishment.

Both in Reformation- period Europe and inpost-Revolutionary America, where the actuality of God was a matter of broad social agreement, the perceived natural relation between religion and heart had its ultimate foundation in people's understanding of God. Religion, as utmost also saw it, couldn't be understood without reference to God — since it was seen as a way of seeking and praising God but neither could heart, for it was understood to " remind us of what we owe to God, " as John Calvin wrote in his Institutes.12 It was the internal substantiation to the actuality of God as legislator. Indeed, in Lutheran theology, heart was deduced directly from faith. therefore, God handed meaning and concinnity to all the rights related to religion that came under the right of freedom of heart. Indeed, the need to cover this freedom was a natural recrimination of the Calvinist doctrine of God's absolute sovereignty over men's ethics. This absolute power needed that every human being believe according to his or her will. It ruled out any kind of external duty, political compulsion, or cerebral constraint, so that God could do his work through each person's heart.The liberation of individual heart indeed from institutionalized religion was the starting point of a process, explosively told by the Enlightenment, that led to the secularization of heart. That is, heart was separated from religion, as religion was separated from God. moment, there are numerous persuasions without any idea of God or heart, just as there are intriguing approaches to heart that make no reference to God or religion. On the other hand, it's possible to believe in God without having any religion and to regard heart as just a " society-forming instinct. " Once heart has been separated from religion, temporal legal systems are interested in it just insofar as it's connected with morality, in which legal systems inescapably take an interest[4]

The new legal defense of this brainwashed form of freedom of heart is no longer God's actuality or sovereignty, but mortal quality, considered as a pillar of all mortal rights and legal systems. quality is further than the set of all mortal rights. It's also further than a introductory good, a value, or a principle. It's the unique, absolute, and endless ontological status of the person; it's what makes the person an ultimate reality — that is, the ultimate concern of all our institutions. Thanks to quality, the mortal person can save his or her identity while living in colorful forms of harmony with others. In this way, quality unites the legal, the moral, the ethical, and the religious — indeed all the confines of the mortal person. Or to put it another way, mortal quality lies at the crossroad of two core axes the vertical axis linking persons among themselves(political community); and the perpendicular axis linking the person(and communities) to preponderancy.

quality opens the door to God, but the idea of quality doesn't presume any concrete idea of God. So quality is a pillar that can be participated by religionists andnon-believers, and is therefore a good starting point for resting freedom of heart[4]

The secularization of heart doesn't indicate reducing freedom of heart to a bare expression of freedom of study, as if moral judgments had no special legal applicability(thereby giving in to what we can call the " European temptation "). Nor does it mean regarding freedom of heart as a right simply to exercise one's morality in all its confines(the American temptation). Eventually, it doesn't mean the secularization of religion. It means, rather, that there are certain protections that temporal legal systems must cover, grounded on mortal quality and no longer simply on religion.

Historically, religion and morality have been veritably nearly affiliated. But they're different ideas, different realities, different metalegal generalities. So they affect temporal legal systems in different ways. Morality doesn't evidentially depend on religion and religion, or at least a great part of it, doesn't depend on morality. Although religion and morality are naturally connected and mutually supporting, especially according to the Abrahamic persuasions, they don't have definitional connections. So it's possible to talk, logically and fairly, about religion without morality and morality without religion. We can fete as exercises of religion beliefs and practices that don't stem from a sense of moral obligation, and we can cite and develop moral accounts for an act of heart that are independent of religion. So in the age of secularization, a legal system can — and, I argue, should — distinguish religious freedom from freedom of heart in order to give further acceptable, specific protections for these important liberties[5]

This is no place to give an account of the nature of religion and its relation to morality or metaethics. For our legal purposes, it's enough to note that temporal legal systems are suitable to separate moral logic temporal rationality from the logic specific of theological traditions what we might call religious supra- rationality(to indicate a type of logic that might avowedly go beyond natural reason, without inescapably going against it — without immoderation). For legal system characteristically operate in the realm of rationality; they are by nature moral, but not religious. If they were otherwise, they would fail to be both either legal or secular: They wouldn't be legal, inasmuch as law is characteristically an expression and a branch of political morality. And they wouldn't be secular, since secularity implies a structural and substantive separation of legal sources from religious ones.

A word about this latter point: Legal systems can rest their features on non-religious justifications because there is, in addition to any revealed truths, a common human reason capable of providing moral justifications. But to say that secular legal systems properly draw exclusively on legal sources and authorities is not to require strict political neutrality on religious issues, let alone to ostracize religion in the public sphere. Insofar as the populace controls politics and the populace practices religion, the political community will necessarily be influenced by religion[6]

Freedom Of Conscience: Between Freedom Of Thought And Freedom Of Religion

Though internationally protected under the same umbrella, freedom of conscience is ontologically different and legally separable from freedom of thought and freedom of religion. This fact should be reflected in all secular legal systems; the proper legal mechanisms for protecting these three freedoms are different. The three freedoms are intrinsically united by their status as 'inner freedoms.' In this sense, they are absolute freedoms and together make up an indefeasible right. They protect the inward space in which human beings can escape from any kind of external coercion. They watch over the space in which the tone has the final say. Together, the three freedoms constitute a kind of hendiatris, like the Roman hendiatris of fortunae, composed of concordia(harmony), salus(health) and pax(peace). The General Comment of the Human Rights Committee captures the inward character of this right, which " does not permit any limitations whatsoever on the freedom of study and heart or on the freedom to have or borrow a religion or belief of one's choice. " So it's only as beliefs are personified or made manifest that political communities can intrude fairly. But it's also then, in the external realm, that the three freedoms are divisible, for study, morality and religion are different realities, from the perspective of the law. Freedom of study doesn't operate externally. It remains in the forum internum. The external operation of freedom of heart, as I'll argue, is stylish defended by a legal" honor of abstaining," a authorization not to do commodity. And the external exercise of freedom of religion is stylish defended, I'll show, by an affirmative" right to commodity."[7]

The right to freedom of study, heart and religion is therefore a complex right that includes three interdependent but distinguishable factors. They're interdependent, because without freedom of study, there's no freedom of heart, and without freedom of heart, there's no religious freedom. And yet these freedoms aren't identical Freedom of heart demands freedom of study because free logic is a necessary condition for making moral judgments. Freedom of religion demands

freedom of heart because the decision to be religious or not is a particular moral decision, one of heart, and not rigorously a religious decision — just as, say, the decision to be married or not(or to work or not) is a moral decision and not precisely a connubial(or labor) decision.(It would make no sense to say that Peter makes the" connubial" decision not to marry, or that Mary makes the" labor" decision noway to work.) In this sense, freedom of heart is at the heart of the introductory structure of" rights to commodity" (religion, marriage, labor) since the object of this kind of of right is always either an act or an elision.

Freedom of study, for its part, is the utmost introductory form of freedom. No bone can live as he or she wishes without allowing as he or she sees fit. It's the pillar, the necessary condition of all other freedoms. Freedom of study is a moral, i.e. an inner and nonpolitical freedom. It protects the person as a rational being(homo rationalis). Freedom of study refers to the freedom to suppose of ideas or arrangements of ideas, but it also embraces opinions, Weltanschauungen, shoes, and ideas formed as a result of passions, sentiments, feelings, or interpretations, all without regard to the quality of the supporting reasons or arguments. Using Alexy's language, we can say that freedom of study is also a right to an elision on the part of the political community — a right against its meddling in the most introductory exercises of one's rationality. Since the colorful ways of materializing studies are defended by the rights to freedom of speech, religion, and association, freedom of study itself remains a fully unlimited right. Indeed, though not entirely implausible, its violation is largely questionable. So freedom of study only needs legal recognition as an inalienable inner moral freedom. But for its eventuality flourishing, it depends on other rights, especially freedom of speech or expression[8]

Insofar as they aren't yet expressed or acted upon, moral and religious studies, shoes, and opinions are also defended under freedom of study. From a legal system's perspective, the kind of study is inapplicable all are free by description and without exception. also, while no bone is innocently or fairly obliged to express his or her own studies in general, we're all Obliged to act on our moral persuasions. This obligation is precisely what separates freedom of study from freedom of heart(and, as we shall see, requires special legal treatment).

Freedom of heart is the freedom needed for mortal beings insofar as we're moral beings(homo moralis). Because it presupposes freedom of study, freedom of heart comes second in the logical progression of freedoms bandied then. Just as freedom of study protects not only reason but the product of reason(studies and opinions), so freedom of heart protects not just heart — i.e., the

capacity to make moral judgments but its end- product moral judgments, opinions or conclusions. Using Alexy's language, we can say that freedom of heart is a right to an elision on the part of the political community — a right against its meddling in the exercises of one's" being moral."

Freedom of heart protects individual moral judgments since they're conclusive and so should be followed by the person making them. It provides legal recognition of, and protection for, the idea of moral obligation. What differentiates freedom of study and freedom of heart is that freedom of heart protects the list decision of an acting person to do commodity then and now. It protects the fact that this decision is a list decision, i.e., one that generates a moral obligation. What freedom of study protects(a set of ideas) is not, as similar, binding. But like freedom of study, freedom of heart is an absolute inner freedom it doesn't permit any political hindrance in the process of making a final moral judgment.

By distinguishing freedom of heart from freedom of study, legal systems bestow specifically legal significance on moral obligation. They fete that mortal persons can be innocently bound bynon-legal sources of moral obligation. also, legal systems fete that mortal quality binds of its own power, and that a political autonomous binds only as an extension of individual quality. By feting that the mortal person can bind himself or herself by virtue of his or her own quality, rather than the command of a autonomous legal systems implicitly fete the principle of particular responsibility, which is crucial for the development of any legal system. They also implicitly fete the precedence of quality over sovereignty, and, thus, the centrality of the person in the political community[9]

The temporal legal system doesn't take into account the verity or moral quality of a person's judgment of heart, the implicit donation of any kind of transcendent law to that judgment, or the person's degree of praiseworthiness or guilt for(not) adhering heart. This isn't its business. Freedom of heart in temporal legal systems protects conscientious judgments as similar, on the ground that they've been reached by persons with quality and are, for them, binding. Under this standard, the legal system demands a defense for accommodating someone's acts of heart, since every legal act confining the operation of a law requires public defense to avoid being discriminative.

The secularization of freedom of heart should lead us to expand it to embrace the fulfillment of purely-moral(as opposed to religious) scores. Indeed, if in the contemporary understanding

freedom of heart is to be grounded on quality rather than religion, religious freedom can not remain the only way to cover the expression of judgments of heart. In other words, if religious freedom and freedom of heart are no longer inescapably linked, freedom of heart must extend to acts grounded on heart but not religion. After all, the point of a moral decision isn't the decision as similar but the fulfillment of the matching obligation. scores are to be performed, not just generated.

So freedom of heart protects this minimal area of freedom which must not, under any circumstances, be violated. But precisely where the border between private life and political authority should be drawn is " a matter of argument, indeed of dealing, " as Isaiah Berlin said. The compass of freedom of heart should be narrower than that of religious freedom, since the temporal legal systems of popular political communities are by description moral and non-religious.(That is, they ca n't avoid staking positions on certain moral questions pertaining to the common good, but they must avoid staking positions on specifically religious matters.) So they can limit individual morality in order to develop a public morality, but they can not limit religion and belief in order to develop a" public religion." More precisely, temporal legal systems can not limit religion if there's no ground of public order or public morality for doing so. Because of our interdependence, the exercise of freedom by some citizens always comes at the expenditure of confining the freedom of others. In a country where raw strands are allowed, the exercise of freedom by those who want to affect similar strands requires confining the freedom of those who believe they must avoid them on moral grounds. On the other hand, the prohibition of raw strands grounded on reasons of public morality implies a restriction of the freedom of those who want to affect them.

The free practice of individual morality isn't a proper indigenous limit on the public morality of the legal system. To be a member of a political community means renouncing one's own practice of morality when it isn't in agreement with a defense honored by the legal system. Public morality prevails over individual morality just as public opinions prevail over private opinions ius publicum privatorum pactis mutari non potest Public law can not be altered by the agreements of private persons, let alone by individual opinions[10]

Indeed so, the precise boundaries between individual morality and public morality will depend on the indigenous model of the political community in question. A liberal indigenous model will emphasize individual moral freedom as against public morality, rigorously checking programs

that might limit individual morality. On the other hand, a communitarian model will emphasize the precedence of public morality over individual morality in order to promote the common good of society, as well as the strong link between public and private morality. But in any system, the practice of one's individual morality can not be considered a mortal right as similar. What freedom of heart protects is the value of individual moral scores, as an expression of quality, not the right to exercise one's own morality, including one's own moral preferences which would indicate a denial of the unnaturally moral nature of the political community's legal morals.

Where there's moral obligation, there's moral responsibility, which in turn requires moral freedom. This is what freedom of heart protects. Where there's a bare moral preference, there's neither moral obligation nor moral responsibility. So there's no freedom of heart, rigorously speaking. And in an innately moral community like the political community, there's no legal argument for guarding similar preference.

On the other hand, to be a member of a political community doesn't indicate renouncing one's practice of religion, because temporal legal systems are by description anon-religious. So it's the legal system, not the citizen, that must renounce the ' practice of religion ' — in this case, the legal duty of religious scores. In other words, the most important legal difference between freedom of heart and freedom of religion is that, in the case of freedom of heart, it's the citizen who renounces the practice of his or her morality when it conflicts with that of the legal system. But in the case of religious freedom, it's the political community that must renounce any ' practice ' of religion on its part, to make room for citizens ' colorful persuasions. temporal legal systems may limit religious freedom with the end of guarding " public safety, order, health, or morals or the abecedarian rights and freedoms of other. " But they may limit the practice of citizens' individual morality more astronomically, so long as they stay within the popular norms of equivalency and protection of nonages[11]

This explains how a moral reason could constitute enough of a defense indeed to regulate religion.(The legal prohibition of religious polygamy grounded on moral logic is a good illustration). On the other hand, a purely religious reason or argument could no way justify a political community's duty of moral morals or standards. However, say, it must be on rational moral grounds, If a political community bans revocation. Freedom of heart is the starting- point — but by no means the endpoint or capstone — of religious freedom. As John Stuart Mill correctly affirms " The great pens to whom the world owes what religious liberty it possesses,

have substantially asserted freedom of heart as an indefeasible right, and denied absolutely that a mortal being is responsible to others for his religious belief. ”

Religious freedom protects the religious dimension of the mortal being(homo religiosus). It's the result of linking freedom and religion. Just as freedom of study protects not just a certain freedom but the value of studies themselves, and freedom of heart protects not just freedom but the value of heart as a way of reaching binding moral judgments, so religious freedom protects not just freedom but religion as similar, as a source of natural value, a defensible idea, and a good in itself.

The legal treatment of religion demands a" multifactor approach," since what counts as religion may vary according to the legal issues at stake. But the ultimate defense for fairly guarding religion falsehoods in the need to cover what I've called supra- rationality(a mode of allowing that goes further, without inescapably contradicting, the conclusions of natural reason) as a dimension of mortal quality as well as a temporal value. Again, this doesn't mean that substantiation of “ suprarational ” modes of study and logic should be the single factor in determining whether a belief system should be defended as a religion. It just means that suprarationality is the starting point and the ultimate defense of this determination, since it's a value in itself in a way that should have legal counteraccusations .

The reason that suprarationality justifies the protection of religion is that respect for it imposes an foreign indigenous limit on temporal legal systems. And this is so because our capability to pierce to suprarationality and to conduct our lives according to its conclusions requires complete individual and collaborative freedom(religious freedom). This freedom can not be handed by the temporal legal system of a political community. It can only be defended by law. This freedom can be set up intimately(private suprarationality) or within a community of voluntary class, like a religious community(public suprarationality). Where it can not be set up is in a community of mandatory class, like the political community. So the most genuine acts of suprarationality should be developed beyond the reach of the legal and the political[12]

Suprarationality as a indigenous limit has at least three important legal counteraccusations a) religious acts in the strictest sense aren't and shouldn't be turned into legal acts — that is, they shouldn't be made, let alone assessed, by political authorities as similar or by temporal legal systems; b) suprarational(religious) arguments shouldn't be used by popular communities in legal converse; and c) political and religious authority should be separate, since religious

communities and political communities are reciprocal. These three counteraccusations are expressions of the natural incompatibility between legal compulsion and religious freedom. temporal legal systems should guarantee the free exercise or practice of religion in the political sphere handed that this practice doesn't breach public order and the public morality of the political community. This freedom should extend to choosing one's religion and freely changing it in the forum internum, and also to worship and other forms of religious incarnation, as well as religious education. It should cover, that is, all expressions of religion in the private and public spheres, which go further but not against the nature and pretensions of the political community. So the right to religious freedom should be configured not just as a freedom but as a" right to commodity," as a" right to religion."[13]

In sum, the right to freedom of study, heart and religion has just two forms of instantiation through morality(freedom of heart) and through religion(freedom of religion). These two forms have different situations of significance and should be defended in different ways by the legal system. " No bone pretends that conduct should be as free as opinions, " Mill says categorically. Rephrasing him, we can say that in keeping with the inescapably moral but non-religious nature of temporal legal systems, no bone pretends that moral conduct should be as free as religious bones[14]

Conclusion

In the American indigenous experience, freedom of heart has been superseded by religious freedom. In transnational and European law, on the other hand, freedom of heart has been crowded out by freedom of study. So freedom of heart needs to recover its own space in temporal legal systems; it adds to freedom of allowed the protection of moral obligation as a political value. List moral opinions bear specific legal protections handed that they not intrude with the public morality of legal systems. Since the temporal legal system of a political community is by nature moral, the right of freedom of heart doesn't indicate a right to exercise one's morality. On the negative, to be part of a political community means giving up the freedom to live by one's morality when doing so is needed by the rules of the community. When there's a conflict between a command of public morality and a categorical individual moral obligation, collaborative sovereignty prevails over individual quality. still, as an expression of the supremacy of the mortal person, legal systems should give a honor of abstaining(beneficium abstentionis) to cover quality. The honor of abstaining doesn't indicate a violation of the legal

system as such the legal system simply remains silent to cover quality as a reasonable response to the citizen's abstention. Silent leges dignitatis causa the laws fall silent because of quality, we can say, rephrasing Cicero's notorious dictum.

Unlike freedom of heart, religious freedom is grounded on the idea that temporal legal systems arenon-religious by description. Thisnon-religious character justifies the actuality of a political right to religious freedom that protects citizens against political intrusion in religious matters, indeed grounded on supposedly religiously neutral legislation. The proper specific legal tool for guarding religious freedom as an affirmative defense is the exceptio religiosa, which should be honored by the bar. The exceptio religiosa opens the door to acts in accord with the legal system but at odds with a general enactment. The legal defense of the exceptio religiosa is that temporal legal systems should prefer to hesitate from the operation of a law, indeed a neutral law, in cases of conflict with religion. In doing so, temporal legal systems cover their own legal nature, which again is innatelynon-religious. Trying to distinguish the legal tools for guarding freedom of heart and freedom of religion is the stylish way to fairly separate two introductory freedoms, which are indeed ontologically different freedom of heart and freedom of religion.

References

1) Valero, M. J. (2022). Freedom of Conscience of Healthcare Professionals and Conscientious Objection in the European Court of Human Rights. Religions, 13(6), 558.

2) Sellers, B. G., & Arrigo, B. A. (2022). The narrative framework of psychological jurisprudence: Virtue ethics as criminal justice practice. Aggression and violent behavior, 63, 101671.

3) Kamali, M. H. (2022). Between Separation and Unity: The Interplay of Law and Morality in Islamic Jurisprudence. Sharia Law In The Twenty-first Century, 21.

4) Scharffs, B. G. (2010). Symposium Introduction: The Freedom of Religion and Belief Jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights: Legal, Moral, Political and Religious Perspectives. Journal of Law and Religion, 26(1), 249-260.

5) Voorhoof, D. (2022). Freedom of expression, the media and journalists: case-law of the European Court of Human Rights.

6) Bustamante, T. (2022). Between unity and incommensurability: Dworkin and Raz on moral and ethical values. Jurisprudence, 13(2), 169-193.

7) Strandén, A. (2022). Not Every Act Motivated by Religion is Protected-The interrelations between freedom of religion, freedom of expression and hate speech based on sexual orientation in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.'

8) Redondo, S. P., & Sarrazin, J. P. (2022). Religious freedom and education. A modern dilemma expressed in the jurisprudence of Colombia. Justicia, 27(41), 191-204.

9) Coyle, S. (2022). Modern Jurisprudence: A Philosophical Guide. Bloomsbury Publishing.

10) Williams, C., & Arrigo, B. (2022). The virtues of justice: toward a moral and jurisprudential psychology. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 66(9), 962-979.

11) Szabla, C. (2022). A New Foundation for Freedom of Movement in an Age of Sovereign Control: The Liberal Jurisprudence of August Wilhelm Heffter. Law and History Review, 40(1), 63-90.

12) Ahmadi, A. (2022). Traditions and Qur'anic research on the evidence for the freedom of e-commerce contracts. Quarterly Sabzevaran Fadak, 13(49).

13) Dube, F. (2022). The ethos of tolerance of diversity in post-apartheid jurisprudence. Obiter, 43(1), 124-141.

14) Breskaya, O., De Stefani, P., & Giordan, G. (2022). The Lautsi Legacy: A New Judgment on the Crucifix in Classrooms and the Multiculturalist Turn on Freedom of/from Religion in Italy. Religions, 13(7), 666.

15) Marshall, D. C. (2022). Le charme discret du droit bourgeois: reflections on the treatment of collective labour rights in the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the European Union (Doctoral dissertation, European University Institute).