



Conference Proceedings

LEGAL AND ETHICAL ASPECTS OF BUSINESS WITH A VIEW TO THE ISSUE OF LANGUAGE

Vladimir Radulović¹

Zoran Radulović²

Vesna Cogoljević³

DOI: 10.5937/EEE24060R

JEL: K12, K31, M21

Review Scientific Paper

ABSTRACT

The legal scholar and critical theorist Jeanne Lorraine Schroeder applied a unique interdisciplinary approach to the philosophy of law which uses linguistically driven Lacanian psychoanalysis, more precisely the theory of four discourses, as well as critical theories about the relationship of ideology and critique, to examine values, subjective roles and tendencies in scholarship which in jurisprudence correspond to the four discourses: the master's, hysteric's, university's and the analyst's. Through this approach, she investigates, among other issues, the relationship of morality with positive law and policy. Our thesis in this paper is that we can analogously apply Schroeder's perspective to business and economics, announcing potential innovations in psychoanalytically and linguistically informed interdisciplinary studies in the philosophy of business. Besides the most relevant subjective roles, we look at how this approach applies to some of the most prominent theories on the social responsibility of businesses. Towards the end, we address the language of marketing in advertising and other forms of promotion to see how our novel interdisciplinary approach may lead to improvements in consumer advocacy and much more effective moral criticisms of marketing policies.

KEYWORDS

interdisciplinary studies, business, law, socio-linguistics, ethics, morality, consumer advocacy, ideology, critique, psychoanalysis, four discourses

INTRODUCTION

Due to its nature which is more normative in essence, jurisprudence is a field of work and scholarship in which there is a greater need for detailed discussions of ethics and morality than there is in business and economics. Regardless, both disciplines involve many important open questions, some of which may potentially be dangerous blind spots when it comes to their relationship with morals and ethics. In this paper, we suggest that the interdisciplinary approach taken by the law professor and critical theorist Jean Lorraine Schroeder in her work *Four Lacanian Discourses or turning the Law Inside Out* (Schroeder, 2008) can shed light on issues of the moral and the ethical, not only in studies and practice of law to which the author applies it, but also for analogous phenomena in the field of business.

We shall first present her theory of Four discourses as she applies it to jurisprudence, maintaining our focus on questions of morality, followed by our own suggestions about possible analogous

¹ Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Belgrade, Serbia, vladimir.radulovic@vspep.edu.rs

² Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Belgrade, Serbia, zoran.radulovic@vspep.edu.rs

³ Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Belgrade, Serbia, cogacogoljevic@gmail.com



Conference Proceedings

applications in business. We will particularly aim to contextualise the business – consumer relations and apply this approach to some known moral problems and dilemmas in business, with a special focus on the language of marketing. After describing a possible Schroederian approach to the posed ethical dilemmas, we shall draw general conclusions about the potential for academic and practical implementations of the presented hypothesis.

Schroeder's philosophy of law relies on Lacanian psychoanalysis, namely the theory of four discourses, to propose that many legal phenomena, especially roles of various participants in legal processes, correspond to one of the four discourses described by the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan: the Master, the University, the Hysteric and the Analyst. Her starting point is to designate legal positivism, especially the strict descriptivist approach of H.L.A. Hart, as an iteration of the repressive master discourse. A more practical example of a master in jurisprudence would be a judge presiding over a court process and applying the positive law, while legal counselors may speak either as Analysts or a Hysteries, depending on what they're currently providing for the client - *counseling proper* or *advocacy*. After a short rundown of Schroeder's theory with a special focus on how it envisions the relationship of law and morality, we shall attempt to provide some preliminary hypotheses on how it may be analogously applied to business relationships.

In terms of subjective roles in the field of business, we shall first quickly point out the obvious relevance of the relationship between owners and company management as Masters on the one side, and workers as potential Hysteries on the other. However, we shall dwell much longer on another essential duality – that of the business and the consumer. Here, special focus will be placed on relations that pertain to consumer advocacy as an instance of the discourse of the hysteric, which will open up some possibilities for more effective critiques of anti-consumer practices. After describing the roles of other three discourses, we shall relate the hypothesis about the economic application of the four discourses to some of the most widespread concepts of social responsibility of businesses. This include the views of Andrew Carnegie, Milton Friedman and the somewhat more compatible contractarian theory of business ethics.

After these general considerations, through ethically controversial examples from the history of marketing, including a simple case of misleading advertisement, but also an infamous and deleterious case of exploitation of consumer vulnerability, we shall attempt to illustrate how the language used in marketing, particularly in advertisement and other forms of promotion, affects the values, subjective roles and corresponding academic approaches in business that correspond to each of the four discourses.

The conclusion will point out some caveats and emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary studies which rely on jurisprudence, business, economics, linguistics, philosophy, psychoanalysis and other related disciplines for posing and answering these critical questions.

LAW, MORALITY AND THE FOUR DISCOURSES

One question that stands out in post-World War II philosophy of law is the question of the legal status of inhumanely immoral laws. In this discussion, mostly motivated by the atrocities of The Second World War, Gustav Radbruch was one of the earliest and most famous advocates of the view that extremely immoral and violent legal acts ought to be deemed illegal. While having many conceptual predecessors that appeared in writing at various times in history, including St Augustin's maxim: *Lex iniusta non est lex*, - *An unjust law is no law at all*, the difficult task that history laid in front of Radbruch urgently required a drastic yet immediately applicable solution to the problem of unjust laws. Under the premise that pure positivism can assert validity of positive law merely by showing "sufficient power behind it to



Conference Proceedings

prevail”, Radbruch concludes that a purely positivist approach is “in and of itself wholly incapable of establishing the validity of statutes” (Radbruch, 2006).

Ultimately, he reaches his famous formula: “The positive law, secured by legislation and power, takes precedence even when its content is unjust and fails to benefit the people, unless the conflict between statute and justice reaches such an intolerable degree that the statute, as ‘flawed law’, must yield to justice” (Radbruch, 2006).

However, despite being seen as many as an apt response to an extremely difficult dilemma, the opposing camp of positivist descriptivism, a prominent representative of which was H. L. A. Hart, promoted the view that, put in simplest terms, *law is law*. They do not deny that laws indeed often do accord with common ethical positions of the day while moral questioning ought to be a critical corrective on both legislation and application of the law.

However, they, from their perspective which limits legal scholarship to a descriptive analytic role, claim that none of it does or should affect a law’s status as being legal. His project of strictly descriptivist jurisprudence relies on the separation thesis, which distinguishes “firmly and with the maximum of clarity, law as it is from law as it ought to be” (Hart, 1985). With such radically opposing views gaining prominence, a famous debate on the issue ensued between Hart and Lon Fuller in 1958. Fuller adopted a position closer to Radbruch’s view and criticised Hart, among other things, as having an inconsistent approach to the distinction between normative and descriptive claims. Criticising Hart’s separation thesis as potentially leading to immorality, Fuller finds his approach particularly frustrating since it “purports to merely describe, when it not only plainly prescribes, but owes its prescriptive powers precisely to the fact that it disclaims prescriptive intentions” (Fuller, 1958).

In order to better understand Hart’s controversial theories and their ideological motivation, many years later Jeanne Lorraine Schroeder formulated a critique that probed deeper into the driving forces behind such rationalisations. Observing Hart as an author through the lens of Lacanian psychoanalysis and critique of ideology, she recognised in his work symptoms of what will later be shown to be Lacan’s master’s discourse, using this recognition as a starting point to formulate a more complex and speculative philosophy of law by analyzing its relation to the other three discourses.

Her central critique is that Hart’s separation thesis *as is* renders the supposed corrective role of morality effectively powerless, among other reasons, due to Hart’s insufficient reflection on how that corrective role would actually affect any aspect of the legal system within Hart’s descriptivist vision of law and jurisprudence. While questioning what is even the meaning of “morality” in Hart’s work upon closer inspection, she applies her lens of feminist Lacanian psychoanalysis to recognize in Hart a repressive masculine tendency to “[immure] virgin morality behind convent walls to preserve her from temptation (Schroeder, 2008).

As we alluded, Schroeder sees this positivist angle *law is law*, along with Hartian exclusion of morality from effective discussion, as a particular case of what Lacan dubbed the master’s discourse. Unfortunately, the scope of this article does not allow us to reflect in depth at the signifiers which constitute the psycholinguistic structure of the four discourses, namely the master signifier, the barred subject, knowledge and product / truth. For present purposes, it will suffice to describe each of the discourses – Master’s, University’s, Hysteric’s and Analyst’s – in terms of values, subjective roles and streams of scholarship which embody each of them in law and jurisprudence according to Schroeder’s theory (with the aim of later describing analogous phenomena in business). As a practical example of the master discourse in the legal profession, Schroeder claims that Hart’s descriptivism also imposes the effects of its master’s discourse on the subjective role of the judge in the court of law.



Conference Proceedings

In Hart's view, the discretion of judges ought to be strictly minimized, with no discretion applied in a "core of easy cases where law is determinate ... surrounded by a penumbra of hard cases in which a judge will be forced to use her discretion" (Hart, 1961). Schroeder sees this as another case of Hart's theory engaging in repression, namely that, just like morality, most of judge's discretion is expelled by the master discourse as *objet petit a* (object cause of desire). The master discourse "creates itself" (Schroeder, 2008) by expelling the signifier of desire that Lacan named *object small a*, which „can function as the object cause of the discourse's desire precisely because it is missing". Schroeder lays bare the problems with Hart by warning us about Lacan's point that the master simultaneously desires and represses their own desire, in this case "morality *per se*" being both the true desire and the repressed product of the legal positivist master (Schroeder, 2008).

In this Lacanian constellation dominated by the more immediate and imposing desires of the master, the most immediate critic of the master comes from the hysteric. As a synthesis of Freud's idea on neurosis and Hegel's master – slave dialectic, Lacan posits the figure of the hysteric as a psychoanalyzed equivalent of the Hegelian slave. The hysteric "rants and raves against the master" (Schroeder, 2008), but in the end "the Hysteric is no anarchist, the Law is her desire." A crucial insight here is that, while presenting his Seventeenth Seminar in which Lacan introduced the four discourses for the first time, he told the excited Parisian students engaged in 1968 protests that „What you aspire to as revolutionaries is a master. You will get one" (Lacan, 2007). In accordance with her views on the Hysteric's discourse as "true critique" which doesn't initiate "revolution or the impossible search for perfection, but the possibility of imperfect reform" (Schroeder, 2008), she advises a partial acceptance of Hart's positivism, but importantly mediated by the external critique of the hysteric or the other discourse which may provide a criticism of the pure letter of the law, the analyst's discourse.

However, since the *objet petit a* functions in the hysteric's discourse as its hidden truth, also unconscious, but positive driving force, rather than its expelled and repressed product, it is the hysteric which can provide the most immediate, subjective and intimate critique of the master while she speaks to him as the barred subject, the "wretched" void of subjectivity itself. Thus, only those directly affected by the mastery of the positive law can initially inspire a genuine quest for its critique, leading Schroeder to conclude that the hysteric is always the initial bearer of "morality as critique", with the analyst providing more *post facto* reflections on the contradictions of master's desire as the master's true inversion. Schroeder's attitude towards Hart's separation thesis is that the separation should certainly be maintained, with clear distinction between positive law and morality as the master's and the hysteric's discourse respectively, but not at the cost of effective exclusion of morality from the discussion, which is why the hysteric, often perceived as a psychosexually feminist figure, should be given special attention as such.

As was pointed out, the discourse of the analyst is another discourse that critiques the ideology of the master, while the university discourse supports the master by providing justifications and rationalizations, something master is "not allowed" to do. Schroeder sees this discourse as primarily embodied in jurisprudence, not by any kind of legal scholarship, but precisely by the kind of scholarship that is excessively oriented on legislation and policy as almost omnipotent forces.

As presented, Schroeder's theory recognizes two discourses as aligned with the defense of dominant ideology, masculinity and obsessional neurosis – the unconditional, self-contained master and the conditional, knowledge driven university, while the other two discourses, the hysteric and the analyst, are seen as aligned with the critique of ideology, femininity and hysterical neurosis. In the rest of this paper where we attempt to apply the presented theory to business phenomena, a special focus will be placed on the roles of the master and the hysteric, the latter of which is particularly important for the actualization of the aforementioned moral criticism of the letter of the law.



Conference Proceedings

FOUR DISCOURSES AND MORALITY IN BUSINESS

If we attempt to analogously apply this jurisprudential relationship of the master and the hysteric to business, perhaps the most obvious potential application is the employer-employee relationship. We can potentially see values, subjective roles and scholarship that are focused on the desires of the management and the owners as a form of master's discourse, perhaps labor organization through unions as that of a hysteric etc. However, it would perhaps be even more beneficial to the study of business as such if we focus on another key relationship of power within the economy – the relationship between businesses and consumers.

First it should be pointed out that, in contrast with hysterical subjects of legal processes or employees, consumers do possess a greater power of choice. However, as we shall see in the following section, that power may become much more malleable and relativised than what an idealised model of rational agents may suggest. Although not speaking from that discourse as often as defendants in court or employees, we may expect consumers to be in that position whenever business decisions are made at their expense. In that sense, one aspect of the work of consumer organizations that is crucial here is consumer advocacy. One possible difference with Schroeder's legal advocacy as hysteria is that, unlike in legal proceedings where it is usually highly inadvisable for one to represent (ie advocate) for one's self, we are expected to make decisions of consumers on our own on a regular basis. That is why, when this paper mentions the potentials of consumer advocacy, we also include self-advocacy by individuals and small local groups of people.

In the position of the master we may see businesses themselves and values such as maximisation of profit, or, in the subsequently examined field of marketing, the necessity or *compulsion* for the consumers to keep buying. As we shall see in the case of the infamous Nestle scandal, as natural as it is for businesses to desire and need paying customers, such mastery and compulsion can lead to devastating effects if left unchecked.

Another discourse which will be better illustrated in the following section is the discourse of the university. In parallel to Schroeder's critique of scholarship and politics that are strictly oriented on creating laws and government policies, we may recognise the university discourse in business actors who are focused on government policies, but here we can equally include private, autonomous business policies. In the following section we shall argue for the recognition of another form of this discourse - it is also embodied in the consumer oriented aspects of marketing, such as market research, promotion and advertisement. All of these functions obviously correlate to university's general ideological function of justifying and bolstering the master's position of authority.

Besides consumer organizations and individuals engaged in consumer (self-) advocacy, the function of consumer advocacy may also be taken up by speculative and critical scholars who introduce critique in either business studies proper or in interdisciplinary studies, inserting questions of vital consumer interest and moral gravity into the academic discussion on business. They may also aid this function by giving guidance or a platform to consumer organizations and consumer self-advocacy. All the while, within this paradigm at least, they should accept that true consumer advocacy is not there to supplant business decision makers, but to supplement them, as Schroeder advises for hysterics in jurisprudence (Schroeder, 2008). It crucially should not supplement businesses as a subordinate factor - a servant to a master - but as a separate entity, partially, but not absolutely opposed to it, aiming to be a radical agent of "imperfect reform" (Schroeder, 2008).

Another role that both speculative and critical scholars, but also consumer organizations may embody would be that of an analyst. In parallel to Schroeder's view on law, counseling is a function of the analyst



Conference Proceedings

and in this we see the opposite situation to that of the hysteric – scholarship may be in advantage when fulfilling this role over consumer organizations. In any role, the goal of analyst's counseling should be to speak as *objet petit a* and be the inversion of the subject in the master position who represses and expels this object while simultaneously chasing it. That is, they should hold a mirror to business and illustrate where their institutionalized desires lead and how they conflict.

The general question that is of outmost importance for all of these relationships is that of the social responsibility of businesses. One such concept that became extremely influential came from Andrew Carnegie in his famous essay *The Gospel of Wealth* (Carnegie, 1889), where social responsibility is defined through principles of charity and stewardship. While charity is mainly about the wealthier and more fortunate members of the society helping out those less fortunate by donations to charitable institutions, stewardship represents the “duty of entrepreneurs to, through enlargement of their own wealth and prudent investment, enlarge the overall social wealth” (Carnegie, 1889).

Albeit commendable in some ways, a more accute analysis of this concept and its implied power dynamics reveals a certain paternalistic slant to Carnegie's philanthropy. Regardless of how empathetic in some of its intentions, at no point does Carnegie's leave any room for the “less fortunate” to express their voice or wield any tangible social power. Despite the fact that Carnegie was a world class industrialist and about as highly situated as one could be in the social hierarchy, this aspect of *justification* of mastery reveals that Carnegie is not talking from the discourse of the master. In fact, these justifications, along with grand solutions that blur the line between the regular state within institutions and extraordinary interventions, remind us the most of Schroeder's view on policy promotion and policy scholarship as within the discourse of the university.

In order to find a perspective on social responsibility of business that speaks from the master's dicourse itself, we need to look no further than Milton Friedman. In his view, the primary social responsibility of every business is to maximise profits (Friedman, 1970). Donations by corporations for any public interests, common goods etc are seen as unfair *taxation* on shareholders and employees, while the maximisation of profit reduces the responsibilities to efficient production of goods and services (Friedman, 1970). This approach preemptively represses all demands for recognition of any other / other and demands unconditional recognition of the business's mastery to do as they please, clear signs of the voice of master's discourse.

A newer approach to this crucial issue that may potentially be better harmonised with our Schroederian-Lacanian project is the idea of contractarian business ethics. Seeing “value creation in its various forms” (Vučković, 2006) as the primary goal of a business operation already surpasses previous two theories by challenging the central position of the master signifier of money. Seeing profits and social merit of a business as results of other goals rather than the main goal (Vučković, 2006) extends much needed contextual flexibility and leaves a better opening for psychoanalytic reflections on desire and need. Approaching the problems of business and management as a form of “interpersonal communication” (Vučković, 2006) is another key feature of contractarian business ethics that shows potential to communicate better with Lacanian views on intersubjectivity. However, contractarian business ethics in our view still does not reflect enough on power imbalances and conscious or unconscious desire for subordination of the other. That is why in the future we should aim for additional critical interpretations of the relationship between this ethical theory and the two critical discourses, particularly that of the hysteric.

After setting the stage with basic actors and roles, as well as the most general theories on social responsibility, we will move on to more specific and practical examples taken from the history of marketing and talk about the crucial topic of the language of marketing as it pertains to the business - consumer relationship. But before we go on, we shall revise and summarize by presenting a table of



Conference Proceedings

symbolic values (Table 1), subjective roles and relevant approaches in scholarship which correlate with the four discourses – both in Schroeder's work on law, as well as in our propositions on business application:

Table 1. A summary of the key instances of four discourses in law and business

Discourse	Law	Business
Master	the letter of the positive law, judges, descriptivist positivist scholarship	maximization of profit, shareholders, top management
University	policy projects, policy oriented legal scholarship	market research, advertisement, economic scholarship oriented towards business and/or government policy
Hysteric	legal advocacy, speculative and "true" doctrinal scholarship of law	consumer (self-)advocacy, labor politics, speculative scholarship & interdisciplinary studies in business ethics
Analyst	legal counseling, analytic scholarship	analytic, historical and philosophical studies in business & economics

CRITIQUING THE LANGUAGE OF MARKETING

After introducing these general pointers, we shall ask the question how the language of marketing can be more effectively subordinated to the moral criticisms of negatively affected consumers by applying the theory of the four discourses. In his succinct textbook on business and morality, Željko Vučković quotes John Galbraith as saying that "advertising is by its nature manipulative" and that it always entails a "creation of consumers' needs" (Galbraith, 1958). A particularly cynical example that is pointed out in the textbook is the typical case of promoting sales of dangerous goods such as weapons, alcohol and tobacco under an aspirational but trite advertising slogan such as *Be free* (Vučković, 2006). Here we see something particularly important about the way that language of marketing functions, especially in promotion and advertising: in regard to the master's discourse in marketing, the master signifier is not directly and strictly reserved for the "masters of business".

Instead, it usually applies manipulative language to assert an illusion of consumer's mastery as a decision maker, while simultaneously assisting and legitimizing the manipulative process of manufacturing perceived consumer needs and desires. Here at least a part of the function of the signifier *free* is to create an illusion of consumer mastery while the opportunistic language and studies of consumer behavior that allow for such an illusion represent the knowledge (S2) of the university discourse. Effectively, consumer oriented aspects of marketing such as promotion and advertising act to reserve real, effective mastery as the domain of the message sender, i.e. business as a master, thus performing their ideological role as instances of university discourse.

Such common situations of illusory advertising in this and many other cases rely on the fact that government regulation can never exhaustively regulate such messaging without gravely affecting freedom of speech and other rights. However, there are far worse historical examples of marketing manipulation that came at a significant cost to consumers, which not only raised questions of morality, but also became a cause for belated legal regulation of certain promotional activities. In particular, we will analyze the infamous and long lasting Nestle's 20th century campaign to promote baby formula in



Conference Proceedings

Africa. With intent to increase the sales of their baby formula, Nestle engaged in a campaign of promotion that became infamous and raised many concerns about the morality of such campaigns. It is already somewhat questionable that promoters went directly to maternity hospitals, where new mothers would be found in a particularly sensitive and susceptible state, in order to present them with leaflets which showed richer white women using Nestle baby formula, strongly implying that that's the baby food of choice for modern women (Vučković, 2006). However, this problematic power dynamic was far exacerbated by the fact that, as a move of obvious manipulation and illusionary authority, Nestle's promoters walked around hospitals in white coats (Vučković, 2006).

One of the most egregious consequences of this campaign were numerous situations where African mothers' conviction about the superiority of the substitute over mother's milk led them to dilute the formula, as they could not afford the recommended amounts, which directly lead to child malnourishment (Vučković, 2006). The seven years boycott over these dubious practices, initiated by African NGOs, stopped in 1984 when Nestle was finally forced to cease these deeply morally questionable practices by the World Health Organisation's International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes which was enacted four years prior (WHO, 1980). Thus, a pretty egregious case of consumer exploitation was stopped only after a boycott which lasted several years was aided by explicit international policy, in the meantime leaving a moral vacuum as regulation was not keeping up with exploitative business practices.

It is indeed very important to acknowledge the necessity and the beneficial effect of the policy solution ultimately enacted by the WHO and also to speak even more highly of the consumer advocacy embodied in the boycott. However, if we aim for consumer advocacy to be truly critical of such business behavior, we must not lull ourselves into thinking that occasional enactments of such specific policy changes will be enough to tame the kind of mastery that was exhibited in African clinics. The idea: *now we have a better policy and that is that* is the kind of conclusion that the master would like us to reach, and certainly a conclusion of which the university forces will attempt to convince us.

What is required in the long run is moral and political vigilance to recognize possible abhorrent behavior and react to it as soon as possible, which is why the boycotters and their actions should be given more focus in our reflections than the WHO itself. Between the recognition of the moral problem and committing to the reaction, an in-depth analysis would be well advised if feasible, especially for the critics who are in the position of the analyst. However, hysterics and their voicing of real problems and suffering often cannot afford in-depth analyses and we should be ready to listen to - and avoid participating in the ideological repression of - people in such positions, even when available information is scarce and their level of organization is lackluster.

A large problem for any project aiming to advance consumer advocacy today is the issue of promoting the relevant messages in the current media landscape. If a cigarette brand is promising us freedom and enjoyment while an advocacy group is promising only lessons in responsibility, a severe socio- and psycho-linguistic limitation is placed on the ability to immediately capture the imagination of the intended audience, exacerbated in the modern era by the shortening of average audience attention span. In this situation, we might say that the ubiquitous psychological phenomenon of loss aversion applies even to our short term mood. This requires the difficult endeavor which is balancing the aesthetic appeal and economics of attention in promotion and advertisement with the social responsibility and the gravity of the message.

Unfortunately, here we reach the limit when it comes to analyzing further socio-linguistic implications of marketing language, as probing into the forms which determine the content of both ideological and critical messages would require us to extensively engage with signifiers which constitute discourses and their mutual positions, something we have already excluded from this work for the sake of brevity. While the issue of scope precludes us from delving any deeper into



Conference Proceedings

this sensitive issue and proposing extensive solutions, we may point out that these are the questions which deserve at least some attention within socio- and psycho-linguistic critiques of marketing strategies for the sake of the strengthening of consumer advocacy.

CONCLUSION

Hopefully, we have shown that Jeanne Lorraine Schroeder's intriguing interdisciplinary project, using the psychoanalytic theory of four discourses to introduce a vital critique of desires and ideologies to the philosophy of law, may potentially be applied in a tentatively analogous manner to philosophy and interdisciplinary studies of business.

While consumer (self-)advocacy as an instance of the discourse of the hysteric proved to be the key critical process standing in parallel to of legal advocacy through representation and speculative scholarship in Schroeder's theory, we have seen that the discourse of the master informs phenomena such as management, maximization of profit, minimizing consumer awareness and exploiting their vulnerabilities. The discourse of the university showed its face in marketing techniques of consumer manipulation, in misplaced academic and practical trust in business and/or government policy, but also in philanthropic attitudes to the social responsibility of business. Finally, the position of the analyst was mainly seen in speculative and critical scholarship and brief allusions to the processes counseling. An analysis of the factor of language in marketing was only given in broad strokes, but we hope that some potential for further developments is present and apparent.

We should note that J. L. Schroeder approached her interventions in philosophy of law, not only as a feminist critical theorist using psychoanalysis to critique social structures and ideologies, but also as a competent legal scholar. Perhaps the main deficiency of this paper is the lack of input of colleagues with expertise business and economics, a lack which we hope to amend in any future extensions of this endeavor. And beyond that, we hope to spark a conversation which will eventually ask the question which further disciplines of social theory and practice, beyond business and jurisprudence, may benefit from this interdisciplinary approach to social critique and analysis through the lens of the four discourses.

REFERENCES

- Carnegie, A. (1889). The Gospel of Wealth. The Pall Mall Gazette, 1-2.
- Friedman, M. (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. The New York Times Magazine, 5.
- Fuller, L. (1958). Positivism and Fidelity to Law – A Reply to Professor Hart. Harvard Law Review, 632.
- Galbraith, J. (1958). The Affluent Society. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1961). The Concept of Law. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1985). Positivism and the Separation of Law and Morals. Harvard Law Review, 594.



Conference Proceedings

Lacan, J. (2007). The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book XVII, The Other Side of Psychoanalysis (trans. Russell Grig, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller). Norton & Company, New York.

Radbruch, G. (2006). Statutory Lawlessness and Supra-Statutory Law. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 26(1), 6-7.

Schroeder, J. L. (2008). The Four Lacanian Discourses Or Turning Law Inside-Out. Birkbeck Law Press, Cavendish.

Vučković, Ž. (2006). Biznis i moral. Cekom Books, Novi Sad.

World Health Organization (1980). International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes. World Health Organization, Geneva.