

# Is law as discipline a science? An examination of South African legislation, jurisprudence and contemporary philosophy of science

MC Roos  
10212760

Mini-dissertation submitted in *partial* fulfillment of the requirements for the degree *Masters in Philosophy* at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University

Supervisor: Prof Renato Coletto

May 2014



This mini-dissertation is submitted in the format of a manuscript for proposed publication in the Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal, an accredited open-access journal.

Style requirements can be found at <http://www.nwu.ac.za/p-per/style>.

For purposes of examination, a table of contents is included, although it is not required by the journal.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Abstract.....	ii
1	Introduction.....	1
2	Traditional acceptance that law is a science.....	3
3	Theoretical exploration.....	9
3.1	Science uses the scientific method.....	9
3.2	Science is susceptible to falsification.....	10
3.3	Science is puzzle-solving within a paradigm.....	14
3.4	Science renders beneficial results.....	16
3.5	Science is abstraction.....	18
4	Statutory provisions in South Africa.....	26
5	Suggested approach.....	29
6	(When) Are lawyers then practicing science?.....	30
7	Conclusion.....	34
	List of sources.....	35

## ABSTRACT

The question this contribution sets out to address is whether law can be regarded as a science. This notion is readily accepted by many, yet it is submitted that a proper theoretical justification for such an assumption is usually missing. The traditional primary sources of law, South African case law and legislation, distinguish between legal practice and legal science, but the basis of the distinction is not clear. However, an entire body of literature in the philosophy of science has developed around the question of when a discipline will amount to science. Various demarcation criteria proposed in philosophy of science are considered. These include that science uses the scientific method, is susceptible to falsification, is puzzle-solving within a paradigm or renders beneficial results. None of these criteria offer a satisfactory solution to the problem. The proposition by a group of philosophers including Herman Dooyeweerd, Marinus Stafleu and DFM Strauss, that the answer to the demarcation question is to be found in modal abstraction, is then considered. Modal abstraction amounts to a consideration of reality (persons, things, theories and rules) from one or more defined point(s) of entry. It is an artificial and learnt manner of thinking as it approaches reality from the perspective of one of the modalities of being. For example, juridical abstraction would mean that a cow is considered as the object of someone's proprietary rights. An abstract idea of the cow's characteristics, from a juridical point of view, is formed and the rules of property law are applied. A number of South African legal philosophers, amongst others Van Zyl, Van der Vyver and LM du Plessis, have followed this approach. The South African legislature also attempted to define the terms "science" and "research", mainly for funding purposes. These definitions are considered and the conclusion is that they do not provide the clear-cut answers one would expect. It will be argued that the nature of activities will determine whether an endeavour is scientific or not. The conclusion is that an alignment of the demarcation criterion developed by Strauss and others and the statutory definitions can provide a workable demarcation criterion. This "test" is then applied to activities of law students, academics, practitioners and judicial officers to determine *when* they will be practicing "science".

## KEYWORDS

Law as science – Philosophy of science – Demarcation criteria – Scientific nature of law

## 1. Introduction

In 1935 legal philosopher Huntington Cairns stated that:

It is the contemporary belief, in American legal circles at all events, that law or jurisprudence, whatever it may have been in the past, has now the status of a social science. This is an assumption easier to make than to substantiate and in view of the increasing insistence upon this point, it is now appropriate to inquire whether or not it possesses a tangible foundation.<sup>1</sup>

This sentiment, expressed in 1935, still applies in 2013. In 2002 an American legal journal published an article where the question was rephrased into whether – or when – a Nobel Prize in “legal science” would be awarded.<sup>2</sup> This article attempts to contribute to the debate from a South African perspective.

In the current standard work prescribed to most first year students in Introduction to Law, “law” is defined as the body of rules or regulations that facilitate and regulate human interaction, order society, create certainty and that are applied, interpreted and enforced by state institutions.<sup>3</sup> The authors of the textbook mention that law should reflect shared values. They state that “the law is a set of norms distinguishing good from bad. A norm is a rule regulating human conduct.”<sup>4</sup> Earlier authors also describe the law with reference to its ordering function. As humans are capable of making choices, law as a normative phenomenon is typical of human society.<sup>5</sup> Law is a product of custom, legislation and judicial development – it is a social ordering

---

1 Cairns 1935 *Philosophy of Science* 484.

2 Ulen 2002 *UILR* 875.

3 Kleyn and Viljoen *Beginner's Guide* 2.

4 Kleyn and Viljoen *Beginner's Guide* 3.

5 Van Warmelo *Regsleer, Regswetenskap, Regsfilosofie* 29; Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 1-5. Post *Introduction to the Law* 2 asserts that law would be superfluous, had “men lived in a state of complete isolation from each other” and that even the most primitive societies function subject to law. Although law should reflect justice, there is a distinction – law is a body of rules, justice is an ideal – Post *Introduction to the Law* 10, 17.

instrument that operates bottom-up as well as top-down.<sup>6</sup> This composite description of law will be accepted for purposes of this contribution.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, lawyers<sup>8</sup> often refer to their discipline as a science, but this premise should not be accepted uncritically. The first answer typically offered to the question “is law a science?” is that law is indeed a science as it is generally accepted that it is, but this “default” response will be analysed and be shown to offer inadequate theoretical justification for the conclusion reached. Other proposed demarcation criteria should therefore be examined. It is submitted that legal theory will benefit from and indeed requires application of philosophical perspectives, in order to answer the central question posed in this contribution: is law a science?

However, this exercise is not as unproblematic as one may suppose, as views on science and what science is, have changed considerably over the ages. The demarcation criteria (i.e. “tests” or “standards” to determine whether a discipline amounts to “science”) that have been proposed by different philosophers of science

---

6 For present purposes the author accepts the explanation of Berman *Law and Revolution* 557 that the Western concept of law is that it is both “part of the material base” and “part of the ideological superstructure” after explaining on 556 that the positivist theory of law (that it reflects the will of the lawmaker and can be used as an instrument of domination), the natural law view (that law is an expression of moral standards) and the social theory of law (that law is “an outgrowth of custom, a product of the historically rooted values and norms of the community) each provides “one-third of the truth” regarding the nature of law.

7 A detailed discussion of what law is, does not form the focus of the present investigation. There are indeed many different approaches and views to defining the concept – see for example Berman and Greiner *The Nature and Functions of Law* 16-37 and Post *Introduction to the Law* 7-17. Berman and Greiner 25-26 state: “The legal aspect of social order must be approached partly in terms of the particular moral principles which it embodies, partly in terms of the particular political authorities which shape it, and partly in terms of the particular historical experience and values which it expresses. Indeed, these are not three things but one thing viewed from three different angles.” It is asserted that law should be defined in terms of its functions or objectives, not its origins or sanctions – Berman and Greiner *The Nature and Functions of Law* 26; Post *Introduction to the Law* 7. Law exists to provide solutions when something goes wrong, when there are “actual or potential disruptions of patterns or norms of social behaviour” or conflict. It is there to resolve disputes; maintain social order; restore the social *equilibrium*; serve as framework for establishing appropriate behaviour; regulate state, social or commercial action and to mould the legal and moral attitudes of society – Berman and Greiner *The Nature and Functions of Law* 27-28, 31-34; Post *Introduction to the Law* 4-5.

8 The term “lawyer” will be defined in section 5 of this article. It is used in its generic sense for the moment.

differ substantially.<sup>9</sup> An analysis of the views that science is practised when the scientific method is used, that it can be falsified, that it amounts to puzzle-solving within a certain paradigm, that it renders beneficial results or that it involves abstraction and theorisation, will be provided in section 3. The hypothesis is that the last option, to wit that science amounts to abstraction in a technical sense, offers the best theoretical basis in the present context. On this basis, the statutory definitions of “science” and “research” in South Africa also require examination. The analysis is therefore an attempt to solve the central question in this article by allowing commentators on law, philosophers of science, philosophers of law and creators of law a say in the matter.<sup>10</sup>

The emphasis on science as a type of *activity* (as opposed to a *discipline*) that can either be classified as science or not, will be explored in section 5. The activities of law students, practitioners, academics and law-makers will be measured against the proposed demarcation criterion to establish which, if any, activities would amount to “science”.

However, to provide the requisite contextual background, the first point to consider is the traditional acceptance by lawyers that law is a science.

## **2 Traditional acceptance that law is a science<sup>11</sup>**

Very few South African legal textbooks address the question of what legal or juridical science is, probably because its status as a science is assumed and elaboration is deemed unnecessary. Even in American textbooks, law is described as a science, albeit “an inexact science”, without elaboration on the reasons for the scientific status.<sup>12</sup>

---

9 The 2400 year long attempt to reach consensus on demarcation criteria, has justly been classified as “not a very successful one” as there is still no general consensus on what the criterion is – Coletto 2013 *TD* 2.

10 Cf. Coletto 2013 *TD* 1-2.

11 Although reference will be made to theorists from different international origin, the practical application of theories to determine the status of law as (possible) science will focus on the South African context.

12 Post *Introduction to the Law* 8.

Since the earliest establishment of schools by the Romans, law formed part of the curriculum taught to free persons.<sup>13</sup> After the establishment of universities in Europe during the Middle Ages, law has been taught at universities and law faculties have even been regarded as *facultates superiores*, where a second degree could be obtained.<sup>14</sup> In most countries this remains the case to the present day. In South Africa, as in most other countries, a university degree is required for admission to the legal professions.<sup>15</sup>

In the United States of America, Christopher Columbus Langdell (1826-1906), dean at Harvard Law School from 1870 to 1895, reformed the perceptions of law and legal education and distinguished between law as a science and law as a vocational legal training.<sup>16</sup> The “science of law” would require that students distil the general and fundamental principles of law from decided cases, which are seen as the “dataset” of the science, by using inductive reasoning.<sup>17</sup>

The legal principles so derived functioned as the constituent ontological units within the construct. From them, through the rigorous and almost Cartesian application of logic and deductive reasoning, a series of clear specific rules would be derived that would govern any given case. The specific rules themselves were formalistic in conception, meaning that they were framed in a manner that made their application uncontroversial when applied to stipulated facts. The rules would then be the bases of decision-making in future cases.<sup>18</sup>

Langdell stated:

If law not be a science, a university best consult its own dignity in declining to teach it. If it be not a science, it is a species of handicraft, and may best be learned by serving an apprenticeship to one who practises.<sup>19</sup>

---

13 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 5.

14 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 7. The other “superior” faculties were theology and medicine. A student had to obtain a first degree from a *subtilissima facultas* (like arts).

15 Currently a *baccalaureus legum* (LLB) or equivalent – *Attorneys Act* 53 of 1997 s 2(1); *Admission of Advocates Act* 74 of 1964 s 3(2)(a), *Legal Practice Bill* B20-2012 s 26(1)(a). Although legal subjects are taught at various other tertiary institutions, including training colleges and universities of technology, the qualifications conferred do not offer access to the professions.

16 Garvin 2003 *Harvard Magazine* 56-58; <http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/spotlight/classroom/related/hls-deans.html>. He also introduced the combined Socratic and case law method, now commonly used in law schools over the world.

17 Hamoudi 2007 *CILJ* 98; Stevens *Law School: Legal Education in America* 56; Speziale 1980 *VLR* 1-3.

18 Hamoudi 2007 *CILJ* 98-99, footnotes omitted.

19 As quoted by Stevens *Law School: Legal Education in America* 52. Speziale 1980 *VLR* 4 relates how apprenticeships were the precursor to formal legal education in the USA.



His distinction between law as a handicraft and as a science may be tenuous, as his method of teaching law was the method used by practising lawyers.<sup>20</sup>

Like Langdell, the influential South African Professor Paul Van Warmelo<sup>21</sup> also came to the conclusion that the library is the legal scientist's "workshop",<sup>22</sup> a view that is hardly disputed today. For Langdell scientific study meant using the original sources, i.e. cases, and not relying on someone else's interpretation thereof.<sup>23</sup> He argued that law consists of doctrines and principles developed through the cases, often over centuries.<sup>24</sup>

Law should be taught at universities, as "in the rest of the civilised world" and only universities could offer access to the required sources to study law as he proposed.<sup>25</sup> Unfortunately, Langdell never substantiated his argument with a definition of what science is and his own conceptions of science are unclear.<sup>26</sup>

Langdell's sentiments are also endorsed by the South African legal philosopher LM du Plessis, when he observes that the twofold task of a university, to wit teaching and research, requires a critical and creative engagement with knowledge. He refers to Pauw, who likewise distinguishes between a university and a vocational school, on the basis that the latter merely focuses on training in techniques. A university, on the other hand, provides theoretical knowledge that will enable the student to react to unfamiliar situations and to offer creative solutions to problems.<sup>27</sup>

This approach defines (legal) science with reference to what it is not and how it is practised. It is not a handicraft; neither the mere application of techniques. It is all

---

20 Speziale 1980 *VLR* 14-15.

21 Van Warmelo *Regsleer, Regswetenskap, Regsfilosofie* 93.

22 Stevens *Law School: Legal Education in America* 53; Speziale 1980 *VLR* 16.

23 Speziale 1980 *VLR* 7-8.

24 Langdell as quoted by Speziale 1980 *VLR* 12.

25 Langdell as quoted by Speziale 1980 *VLR* 14.

26 Speziale 1980 *VLR* 13.

27 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 11-12.

about the distillation of principles through a process of reasoning and for this reason it is taught at university.<sup>28</sup> This approach provides a basis for distinguishing between science and non-science, yet it is submitted that it is still rudimentary and needs further development. A child who is scolded after grabbing a sibling's toy, may also distil the principle(s) of accepted behaviour through reasoning, but that would not be regarded as a scientific activity by anyone.

In addition, the idea is created that the scientific nature of law and the university as an institution are intertwined. It is true that development in many other disciplines is closely tied to universities and research institutions, but legal academics are not the sole creators of legal texts and, more importantly, they are not the (direct) authors of legal development. In South Africa, the unique Constitutional Assembly was responsible for this in the recent past, and legislatures and courts currently perform this function.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, the view of these two institutions on law and its possible scientific status should also be considered.

A search of the Juta law reports of South Africa yielded three results for the term "legal science". In the one case the term appeared as part of a title of a source referred to in a footnote.<sup>30</sup> In the other two cases the term appeared as part of a quotation by authors who assumed the status of law as science without elaboration.<sup>31</sup> A search for "juridical science" resulted in four cases, but all four are references to articles published in the accredited journal titled "Tydskrif vir Regswetenskap / Journal for Juridical Science".<sup>32</sup> A search with the term "law as science" yielded no results while "science of law" was more fruitful, with a total of 11

---

28 The nature of universities and whether all subjects taught at universities amount to science, is a debate that will not be entered into here.

29 The influence of legal academics' efforts on legal development will be explored in section 5 of this article.

30 *National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality and Another v Minister of Justice and Others* 1999 1 SA 6 (CC) footnote 17.

31 *Intercompany Security Services (Cape) (Pty) Ltd v Transport & General Workers Union* (1995) 16 ILJ 854 (LAC) 859 I; *Brady-Hamilton Stevedore Co and Others v MV Kalantiao* 1987 4 SA 250 D 258 D.

32 *Netshituka v Netshituka and Others* 2011 5 SA 453 (SCA) par 10, footnote 5; *Napier v Barkhuizen* 2006 4 SA 1 (SCA) footnote 4; *Taylor v Kurtstag NO and Others* 2005 1 SA 362 (W) 377 C-D; *Bhe and Others v Magistrate, Khayelitsha, and Others (Commission for Gender Equality as Amicus Curiae)*; *Shibi v Sithole and Others*; *South African Human Rights Commission and Another v President of The Republic of South Africa and Another* 2005 1 SA 580 (CC) footnote 172.

reported and 8 unreported South African cases.<sup>33</sup> However, in 17<sup>34</sup> of these cases the reference was included as part of (an obviously often quoted) statement by the American Justice Sutherland in *Powel v Alabama*,<sup>35</sup> which deals with an unrepresented accused's precarious position due to a lack of knowledge of the "science of law". The other two references<sup>36</sup> appeared in a quotation of the classic author Voet, discussing the personal liability of judges for incorrect judgements due to lack of knowledge, skill or simply mistake.

Although some reference to the "scientific status" of law can thus be found, in none of these cases the legitimacy of regarding law as a science was considered.

Judges writing in Afrikaans seem fonder of the term "regswetenskap", as a search with this term yielded 25 South African judgements. In 10 of these the reference was to an article published in the "Tydskrif vir Regswetenskap / Journal for Juridical Science".<sup>37</sup> In 7 of the cases the term is used as a synonym for law or the legal system,<sup>38</sup> in three cases "regswetenskap" is contrasted with legislation, without

---

33 Juta also includes reportable judgements originating in Zimbabwe and Namibia. One Zimbabwean and three Namibian cases were also found.

34 *S v Nkambule* 2011 JDR 0520 (GNP) par 41; *S v Pitso* 2002 2 SACR 686 (O) 593 C-D; *S v Mbambo* 1999 2 SACR 421 (W) 426 G-H; *S v Maduna en 'n Ander* 1997 1 SA SACR 646 (T) 651 I-J; *S v Philemon* 1997 2 SACR 651 (W) 665 B-C; *Mgcina v Regional Magistrate, Lenasia and Another* 1997 2 SACR 711 (W) 716 E-F; *Maduna v Die Streeklanddros T J La Grange (Klerksdorp)* 1997 JDR 0337 (T) 7; *S v Ramokone* 1995 1 SACR 634 (O) 636 H-I; *S v Zulu* 1990 1 SA 655 (T) 660 H-I; *Nakani v Attorney-General, Ciskei and Another* 1989 3 SA 655 (CK) 657 B-C; *S v Radebe*; *S v Mbonani* 1988 1 SA 191 (T) 195 E-G; *S v Khanyile and Another* 1988 3 SA 795 (N) 803 H-J; *S v Mabeti* 2005 JDR 1031 (T) 3 par 5; *S v Viljoen* 2003 JDR 0104 (T) 21 par 30; *S v Maake* 2003 JDR 0848 (T) 6 par 5; *S v Maema* 2002 JDR 0593 (T) 3 par 5; *S v Masogo* 2001 JDR 0582 (T) 4 par 5.

35 287 US 45 (1932) at 68-69.

36 *Telematrix (Pty) Ltd t/a Matrix Vehicle Tracking v Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa* 2005 JDR 0985 (W) 11 par 7 and *Telematrix (Pty) Ltd t/a Matrix Vehicle Tracking v Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa* 2006 1 SA 461 (SCA) 470 D-E.

37 *Northview Shopping Centre (Pty) Ltd v Revelas Properties Johannesburg CC and Another* 2010 3 SA 630 (SCA) par 25 / fn 16; *S v Damoyi* 2004 1 SACR 121 (C) 126 E; *Sempapalele v Sempapalele and Another* 2001 2 SA 306 (O) 310 F-G; *Erlax Properties (Pty) Ltd v Registrar of Deeds and Others* 1992 1 SA 879 (A) 881; *Black v Barklays Zimbabwe Nominees (Pvt) Ltd* 1990 1 SACR 433 (W) 434 E-F; *De Kock v Jacobson and Another* 1999 4 SA 346 (W) 348 H; *S v Adams* 1986 4 SA 882 (A) 899 H; *Britz v Britz* 2000 JDR 0194 (SCA) 11 par 16; *Olivier v Jonck BK h/a Bothaville Vleismark* 1999 JDR 0068 (O) 12; *Die Prokureursorde van die Oranje-Vrystaat v Schoeman* 1977 4 SA 588 (O) 592 A.

38 *Grobler v Naspers Bpk en 'n Ander* 2004 4 SA 220 (C) 286 B: refers to vicarious liability as a field of the "regswetenskap"; *Van den Berg & Kie Rekenkundige Beamptes v Boomprops* 1028 BK 1999 1 SA 780 (T) 792 G: developments in English law should not necessarily determine

elaboration.<sup>39</sup> In two cases the practice and science of law are referred to as separate aspects but they are not defined or distinguished.<sup>40</sup> In two other cases the reference is respectively to the title of a book and journal article.<sup>41</sup>

The only judgement that offers some distinction between legal science and legal practice, is that of Judge Mostert in *Universiteit van Pretoria v Tommie Meyer Films (Edms) Bpk*<sup>42</sup> where the extensive development of the concept “subjective right” and its accompanying system by academics in their theses, articles and books are clearly categorised as legal science that can, according to the court, be beneficially applied in legal practice<sup>43</sup> or law.

South African courts therefore accept a distinction between legal practice and legal science, without attempting any definitions of legal science or law as science. The highest courts in the country, the Constitutional Court and Supreme Court of Appeal, have never deemed it necessary to address the issue.

The only statutory reference to law as a science is found in section 46 of the *Attorneys Act*<sup>44</sup> where grants by the Attorneys Fidelity Fund’s Board of Control to universities for “education or research in the science of law or in legal practice” are

---

development in the South African “regswetenskap”; *Rand Waterraad v Bothma en ’n Ander* 1997 3 SA 120 (O) 134 D-E: some notions with Greek origin where received in Roman law; in *Jubelius v Griesel NO en Andere* 1988 2 SA SA 610 (C) 624 C-D the reference is to something that can be described as a title “in die regswetenskap”; *Kahn v Volschenk* 1986 3 SA 84 (A) 99 H-I contains a translation of the classic author Van Bynkershoek who states that “daardie regswetenskap” would accommodate something; in *S v Bailey* 1982 3 SA 772 (A) 774D-E the state’s counsel argued “die regswetenskap ken twee strafregtelike skuldbegrippe”; *Nortje en ’n Ander v Pool NO* 1966 3 SA 96 (A) 115A-B refers to “Duitse en Italiaanse regswetenskap”.

39 In *S v Mbele* 1991 1 SA 307 (W) 309 H – 310 B it was stated that an accused would not be guilty of a crime if he is not liable in terms of “die regswetenskap en selfs die 1988-Wet” (this statement was quoted with approval in *S v Pietersen* 1994 2 SACR 434 (C) 438 D-G); *Lean v Van der Mescht* 1972 2 SA 100 (O) 107 G: a certain question was not even answered in Dutch “regswetenskap of wetgewing”.

40 *S v Chavulla en Andere* 1999 1 SACR 39 (C) 46 I-J: certain rules have crystallised over years in both legal science and legal practice; *Moeketsi v Minister van Justisie en ’n Ander* 1988 4 SA 707 (T) 714 A.

41 *Mota en Andere v Moloantoa en Andere* 1984 44 SA 761 (O) 801F-G and 806F-G; *S v Collop* 1981 1 SA 150 (A) 155C.

42 1977 4 SA 376 (T) 381-383.

43 The Afrikaans judgement refers to “praktiese hantering van regsprobleme”. *Universiteit van Pretoria v Tommie Meyer Films (Edms) Bpk* 1977 4 SA 376 (T) 381-383.

44 53 of 1979.

permitted. None of the terms is defined, yet it is clear that the distinction as unpacked above, is accepted.

It is submitted that the distinction which the courts and legislature make between law as science and law as practice echoes academics' distinction between legal education as "scientific" and university based, versus "vocational" training, which is focused on techniques. Nonetheless, this distinction made by academics and courts does not provide a satisfactory answer to the questions of what a science is and why law should be regarded as such. The assistance of the theories developed by philosophers of science should therefore be elicited to provide a sound theoretical framework to formulate a demarcation criterion, as this kind of question is a typical (though not exclusively) philosophical project.<sup>45</sup>

### **3 Theoretical exploration**

#### **3.1 Science uses the scientific method**

By the late 19<sup>th</sup> century positivism had become the most influential movement in Western philosophy of science. Its main tenet is that the only reliable knowledge is scientific knowledge resulting from empirical data derived from experience. Scientific knowledge is based on sense-experience and science is the description and explanation of empirical facts – the content of science is therefore positive facts, established by the scientific method.<sup>46</sup>

For Auguste Comte (1794-1859), the father of positivist philosophy, the third and highest stage of human development is the positive phase, where all superstition (religion included) and metaphysics are abandoned and (empirical) science rules.<sup>47</sup> For him, the main aims of science are prediction and explanation of phenomena.<sup>48</sup> He distinguishes between meaning and demarcation, but it seems as if he conflated these concepts. In his view, science is predictive (denoting meaning) and verifiable (demarcation); and metaphysics cannot be scientific as it is neither predictive nor

---

45 Coletto 2013 *TD* 1.

46 Stafleu *Time and Again* 1; Strauss 2004 *JNGS* 58.

47 Mautner *Dictionary of Philosophy* 114, 482; Speziale 1980 *VLR* 2.

48 Laudan 1971 *Philosophy of Science* 36, 37.

verifiable. Isolated facts that do not form part of a system are verifiable, but nonpredictive, and are thus not scientific.<sup>49</sup>

The view that science could provide irrefutable and objective answers to problems and that it is indeed the only defensible path to the truth became the norm in Western thought.<sup>50</sup> This view obviously did not accommodate any discipline that did not use the “scientific method” – natural sciences that were developed using experiments and empirically verifiable data provided the model to be emulated. Although this view is still prevalent in some circles even today, there has been a dramatic shift from this position in the twentieth century.<sup>51</sup> Karl Popper was among the first philosophers of science to move away from the position that science is an exact, objective and purely value free enterprise that comprises observations and inductive reasoning.

### **3.2 Science is susceptible to falsification**

Karl Popper (1902-1994) states that metaphysical beliefs, the scientist’s “horizon of expectations”<sup>52</sup> and scientific hypotheses influence science – a move away from the positivists’ and empiricists’ contention that objective empirical facts are obtainable by using the “scientific method” of observation and verification. Popper himself emphasises observation, but adds that it “is always preceded by a particular interest, a question or a problem – in short, by something theoretical”.<sup>53</sup> A problem is identified and a hypothesis is formed and only then does the planned observation

---

49 Laudan 1971 *Philosophy of Science* 40-41. Comte required “a systematicity and a generality” for “genuine scientific systems”, Laudan 1971 *Philosophy of Science* 40. Later in life Comte included sociology and ethics in his list of sciences, but not disciplines like law or history, Coletto 2011 *TCW* 65; Coletto 2013 *Koers* 2.

50 From 1923 onward the members of the Vienna Circle advocated logical positivism, accepting only analytical statements and those that could be tested by means of perceptual experience as scientific – Mautner *Dictionary of Philosophy* 646. Science replaced the primacy of religion as the ultimate answer to life’s questions.

51 Laudan 1987 *American Philosophical Quarterly* 19. Stafleu 1980 *PR* 47 calls his move away from logical empiricism a “revolution”. Caudill 2011 *Pro Rege* 4 points out that the idealised view of science as an objective enterprise did not take into account the realities of “ambition, persuasion, funding bias, or cultural values ... personal values, consensus, or institutional gatekeeping”.

52 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 47.

53 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 342. Strauss 2004 *JNGS* 60 labels Popper as a “neopositivist”.

take place. After this a theory is formulated and accepted, as long as it is not falsified.<sup>54</sup>

For Popper, science is the activity of problem-solving with a critical attitude.<sup>55</sup> His approach to problems in science has been likened to a preacher's approach to sin: redemption cannot be preached without acceptance of the existence of sin.<sup>56</sup> If there is no problem, there is no science. The aim of science is to establish truth, in the sense of correspondence with facts,<sup>57</sup> although one cannot be absolutely sure when it has been found.<sup>58</sup> Scientific progress occurs when theories are refuted and new ones are proposed – in this way we move closer to the truth, and a higher level of verisimilitude or truth-likeness is reached.<sup>59</sup> Scientific tradition consist of the passing on of theories coupled with a critical attitude, a willingness to question, test and even abandon refuted theories.<sup>60</sup>

The task of science is twofold: it must theoretically explain phenomena (i.e. make the unknown known) and it is then used for prediction or technically applied.<sup>61</sup> Scientific theories must “transcend the empirical instances which gave rise to them”, otherwise they will merely amount to circular explanations.<sup>62</sup> Science can also probe the procedure of testing, and theories must be testable. Theories that are easier to falsify are also those that are “better testable”.<sup>63</sup>

In Popper's words:

The progress of science consists in trials, in the elimination of errors, and in further trials guided by the experience acquired in the course of previous trial and errors. No particular theory may ever be regarded as absolutely certain: every theory may become problematical, no matter how well corroborated it may seem now. No scientific theory is sacrosanct or beyond criticism.<sup>64</sup>

---

54 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 47-48; Popper *Objective Knowledge* 343-344, 346.

55 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 347.

56 Settle 1979 SZ 521; Strauss 2004 JNGS 63.

57 Coletto 2009 TCW 158.

58 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 56; Settle 1979 SZ 524; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 4.

59 Coletto 2009 TCW 158; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 10, 11.

60 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 50.

61 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 349.

62 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 353.

63 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 353, 356.

64 Popper *Objective Knowledge* 359-360.

For Popper the demarcation question, i.e. what type of activity qualifies as science and what not, was central. The criterion applied for demarcation is “falsifiability, or refutability, or testability”.<sup>65</sup> This entailed that confirmation of a theory is not a measure of its scientific status, as confirmations are easily obtained. As a consequence, an irrefutable theory is not a scientific theory. Only refutable or falsifiable theories (and especially those that are more testable) are scientific. A refutable theory is one that is “capable of conflicting with possible, or conceivable, observations”.<sup>66</sup> Corroborating evidence should only be taken into account if it is the result of a genuine (but unsuccessful) attempt to falsify the theory. Even when falsified, some adherents will still uphold a theory by adding *ad hoc* adjustments or re-interpretations that will “save” it from being refuted. This will however, lead to a lowering of the theory’s “scientific status”.<sup>67</sup>

By applying Popper’s demarcation criterion, astrology does not qualify as a science but as a pseudo-science as its vaguely formulated predictions are virtually irrefutable and are not really predictive. The same applies to Marx’s theory of history – the added *ad hoc* adjustments to save the theory from refutation diminish its status. The psycho-analytic theories of Freud and Adler also do not qualify as science as they simply cannot be tested and “no conceivable human behaviour ... could contradict them”.<sup>68</sup> However, they are pre-scientific as they contain useful truths and have the potential to develop into scientific theories.<sup>69</sup> Although many scientific theories originate from myths, the myths themselves are not scientific; nobody even attempts to falsify them. Metaphysics and religion would therefore not qualify as science.

Falsifiability as demarcation criterion should be seen against the background of Popper’s construction of science: the presumption that problems exist, the realist aim of reaching true explanations on an empirical basis, as well as the stimulation of criticism of existing theories.<sup>70</sup> Falsification does not occur after one refuting observation, but after a “critical mass” of refutations has been recognised.

---

65 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 37.

66 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 39.

67 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 36-37.

68 Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* 37, 38; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 4-5.

69 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 6.

70 Cf. Settle 1979 SZ 529; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 6.



For Stafleu, Popper's criterion of falsification is a welcome move away from positivism, but

... is only sufficient to "demarcate" scientific from non-scientific law statements. Regardless of how much evidence may "corroborate" a natural law statement, acceptance of the statement as law is always a matter of faith. A law statement is ultimately *believed* to be true, because of convincing evidence supporting it. This belief does not *prove* that the law statement is true, for such proof does not exist.<sup>71</sup>

Although he has probably never intended the net to be cast so wide, Popper has in fact opened up the possibility that disciplines that were previously not regarded as scientific, could now be classified as such. His criterion is, however, still partly couched in the language and style of the empiricists and non-natural sciences still do not conform to his criterion.<sup>72</sup>

Nevertheless, Popper is criticised for not supplying an exact criterion for the conclusive acknowledgement of falsification and consequently acceptance of a new theory. His statement that the abandonment of the old theory in favour of the new is a "free decision" may in fact be seen as arbitrary. In addition, most theories continue to thrive in the face of anomalies.<sup>73</sup>

Popper was also sharply criticised by Thomas Kuhn, who argued that Popper was not a naïve falsificationist but may "legitimately be treated as one" as the question still remains what falsification is "if it is not conclusive disproof?"<sup>74</sup> He therefore suggested an alternative approach.

Popper denies the existence of a single "scientific method" but states that theories can be arrived at in many ways. His approach is a move away from empiricism but not a total abandonment thereof, as he states that experience does not determine theory but can refute it.<sup>75</sup> Unwritten codes exist in the scientific community that prescribe which empirical "evidence" and which theory is acceptable.<sup>76</sup>

---

71 Stafleu *Time and Again* 9. Note that the term "law" is here applied in the non-juristic sense, as a rule that is true or absolute, as the term is used in the natural sciences.

72 Coletto 2011 *TCW* 68.

73 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 20-21; Ulen 2002 *UILR* 883.

74 Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 14, 15.

75 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> 6, 8.

76 Stafleu *Time and Again* 9.

### 3.3 Science is puzzle-solving within a paradigm

According to Thomas Kuhn (1922–1996), science is not the series of dramatic moments of refutation depicted by Popper. The acceptance of a new theory is actually a rare and extraordinary occurrence.<sup>77</sup> Kuhn sees science not primarily as a series of revolutionary discoveries or great events, but more modestly as puzzle-solving.<sup>78</sup> In the case of a revolutionary discovery, the solution may be hypothesised but it is not pre-established. When solving a puzzle, the final picture or desired result is known from the outset.<sup>79</sup>

Most of the time, scientists practice “normal science”, that is fitting the pieces of the puzzle.<sup>80</sup> “It is normal science ... rather than extraordinary science which most clearly distinguishes science from other enterprises”.<sup>81</sup> This type of science seldom attracts interest outside the profession, as the general public is not interested in working out the finer nuances, but in the principles underlying the paradigm.<sup>82</sup>

He established the concept of paradigm as a “well-articulated and widely received theory” or shared set of beliefs that demand shared educational goals and techniques.<sup>83</sup> Once a paradigm has been established, the debate on fundamentals ceases and the serious and specialised scientific work (or paradigm-articulation) can commence as the paradigm or theory itself still leaves important practical questions unanswered.<sup>84</sup>

A pre-scientific community has no single, accepted theory or paradigm, but once such a theory or paradigm has been accepted, the discipline becomes a mature science where energy and time are spent on solving the puzzles left by acceptance of the paradigm. Typically after some time a number of anomalies will arise and if these accrue, they will lead to a crisis in the scientific community, which will result in

---

77 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 358, Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 19.

78 Coletto 2009 *TCW* 159.

79 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 362.

80 Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 4-5.

81 Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 6.

82 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 359-360.

83 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 356, 359, Kuhn *Postscript* 177.

84 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 356-358, 360.

a brief period of extraordinary science, marked by critical discourse. After this, a new theory is accepted as paradigm. The process then repeats itself.<sup>85</sup>

The “abandonment of critical discourse” (not its acceptance, as Popper has it) and acceptance of a *single* paradigm “marks the transition into a science”.<sup>86</sup> Later Kuhn stated that the presence of a paradigm is not decisive, but its nature is. A paradigm should identify challenging puzzles, supply clues to their solution and guarantee success to the competent.<sup>87</sup> The purpose of normal science is to bring the current paradigm “into closer and closer agreement with nature”.<sup>88</sup>

The paradigm also functions as a “dogma”, so to speak. Scientific education inculcates a specific way of thinking, “viewing the world and ... practicing science in it”.<sup>89</sup> This is so rigid that only systematic theology may possibly trump it.<sup>90</sup> Students are presented with a range of givens – since the early nineteenth century science textbooks generally do not expose differing views, but present the “facts” in terms of the current predominant paradigm.<sup>91</sup> The paradigm determines the problems as well as acceptable solutions to it. Students are dogmatically initiated into a discipline and method they cannot criticise or evaluate as they are not exposed to alternatives.<sup>92</sup> In fact, adherents to old paradigms are hardly ever convinced of the merits of a new paradigm. The problem of scientific dialogue is nevertheless solved when they are eventually replaced by a new generation.<sup>93</sup> This new generation then banishes the old textbooks “from the active departmental library to desuetude in the general university depository”.<sup>94</sup>

---

85 Kuhn *Postscript* 177, Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 7.

86 Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?* 6, Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 352.

87 Kuhn *Postscript* 180.

88 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 300.

89 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 349.

90 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 350.

91 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 350, 351.

92 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 351.

93 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 348.

94 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 352-353.

Kuhn distinguishes between “the sciences”, the humanities and the social sciences.<sup>95</sup> The arts, humanities and most of the social sciences are similar to pre-paradigmatic science, i.e. not yet sciences in Kuhn’s view.<sup>96</sup>

His theory would leave room for the acceptance of the so-called humanities, or the disciplines concerned with human culture, to be classified as sciences. The theory itself has, however, been developed from the perspective of and has been formulated in the language of the natural sciences. In a discipline like law, where jurisdiction-specific binding legal rules are continuously developed by competent lawmakers, it is difficult if not impossible to identify a single paradigm or disciplinary matrix. It is even more difficult to argue that what legal practitioners or scholars do, will bring them or their discipline “into closer and closer agreement with nature”.

Kuhn’s approach thus reveals a predilection towards natural sciences and an antipathy towards disciplines where no definite “paradigm” can be identified. It can be argued that it unintentionally broadens the net of “science” to a broad range of activities, as long as they are performed within a certain paradigm. It can not be stated that Kuhn’s theory has been generally accepted. His insistence on exclusivity of a paradigm as indicator of a mature or true science, is called a “monomaniac concern with only one single point of view” by Feyerabend<sup>97</sup> who also describes this as dogmatic, authoritarian and narrow-minded. Feyerabend even states that in effect a “closing of [the scientist’s] mind” is required to practice normal science.<sup>98</sup> Popper describes the normal scientist as “a person one ought to be sorry for”,<sup>99</sup> as opposed to Kuhn’s optimistic insistence on the positive role dogma plays in science.

It is submitted that a more precise criterion is needed. The next possibility to be investigated is the unconventional, more radical view proposed by a next wave of philosophers of science, also referred to as the anarchist stance.

---

95 Kuhn *The Function of Dogma* 350.

96 Coletto 2011 *TCW* 72.

97 Feyerabend *Consolation for the Specialist* 201.

98 *Consolation for the Specialist* 205. This actually leads to the questioning of how competing paradigms originate - Feyerabend *Consolation for the Specialist* 206-207.

99 *Normal Science and its Dangers* 52.

### 3.4 Science renders beneficial results

To a certain extent Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994) avoids the question as to what a science is. He sometimes distinguishes between pre-scientific suppositions and scientific endeavours, but never really provides a clear set of demarcation criteria. He was branded an anti-scientist, as he unequivocally rejected the exalted status attributed to natural science in most contemporary Western societies.

He approaches the issue with a pragmatist view. The question is not what science is, but “what is so great about science?”<sup>100</sup> Science is useful as a method of acquiring knowledge, but it should not be seen as the only or best method in which reliable knowledge can be obtained. All solutions offered by science should also not be accepted as the gospel truth and theories proposed by scientists should not automatically be preferred to popular theories.<sup>101</sup>

He proposes that the broadest possible range of alternatives should be left open, as the emphasis is not on the process but on the result, the impact on society.<sup>102</sup> A useful judgement should be facilitated, and to get there “anything goes”.<sup>103</sup>

Feyerabend does not always take up a position with the seriousness one expects, and often repudiates earlier statements or explains them away as jest. His declared boredom with astrology contrasts with his defence thereof in the face of attacks by physicists who deemed themselves as non-superstitious.<sup>104</sup> Whether the defence was indeed serious, will not be known.

Feyerabend was severely criticised for his pragmatic view, as it was argued that all non-scientists can now question and attack theories they know virtually nothing about.<sup>105</sup> It was even stated that acceptance of “anything goes” will eventually lead to the demise or collapse of all demarcation criteria for science and technology. This

---

100 Preston *Paul Feyerabend* 27.

101 Lugg 1977 *CJP* 769, 771. Coletto 2013 *Koers* 5 argues that we no longer live in the “age of science” or “reason” and that postmodernism has brought with it a measure of distrust in “science”.

102 Coletto 2009 *TCW* 164.

103 Feyerabend *Against Method* 23.

104 Lloyd 1997 *Philosophy of Science* 401-402.

105 Meynell 1978 *TPQ* 249.

rests on the premise that “anything goes” refers to a value judgement. However, it does not, as he regards some theories as better than others and (even) radical anarchists would make rational choices once confronted with the options.<sup>106</sup>

Preston<sup>107</sup> notes that Feyerabend later rejected the idea of “science”, stating that it was an empty label. He bases this on a quotation to the effect that terms like *science* or *art* are “temporary collecting-bags containing a great variety of product” of varying quality. Being only collecting-bags, they are not necessary for reality and can be discarded. Farrell<sup>108</sup> disagrees with this interpretation as he, like Lloyd and Lugg, constructs Feyerabend’s theory more moderately. Feyerabend rhetorically proposed the possibility of believing the Homeric gods, astrology and witchcraft, to emphasise their swift and possibly unfounded dismissal by science. He held that they should be entertained as part of the “range of possible unique circumstances and conditions”. This interpretation, that acknowledges that Feyerabend retains (a measure of) realism, is based on a broader reading of Feyerabend’s writings and not merely on selected phrases, but Farrell acknowledges that Feyerabend’s ambiguousness and isolated remarks open up the possibility for an interpretation such as Preston’s.

Feyerabend thus made the ultimate move to do away with demarcation criteria. He seems to define science as one of the many enterprises that yield interesting or useful knowledge. This approach will not be to ask how the knowledge was obtained or even what it is about, but to which extent it could be usefully employed. The problem with this approach is that it in essence sidesteps the demarcation question and leaves the problem unsolved.

Numerous other demarcation criteria have been proposed over the years, but it is practically impossible to analyse all of them. It is submitted that the next group of scholars offers a plausible solution to the problem.

### **3.5 Science is abstraction**

---

106 Lugg 1977 *CJP* 770.

107 Preston 1997 *Philosophy of Science* 424.

108 Farrell 2001 *JGPS* 364-367.

Although relatively few South African legal scholars have engaged with the question this article addresses, most of them seem to be in agreement that law is a science, as it involves abstraction (or “lifting up”) in the sense envisaged by a relatively small philosophical school of which the Dutch philosophers Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977), Dirk Stafleu (1937-) and South African Danie Strauss (1946-) are proponents.<sup>109</sup> The views of these philosophers and their South African adherents in the legal fraternity will now be considered.

Herman Dooyeweerd regards scientific knowledge as a systematic and coherent unit.<sup>110</sup> He defines science in terms of activity leading to knowledge. However, not any thought process will “qualify” as being scientific. So-called naive experience of reality or thinking observes reality in an undifferentiated way without any theorisation, whilst scientific thinking approaches reality from the angle of one or a few of the modalities that Dooyeweerd identified and involves abstraction of that aspect.<sup>111</sup> The modalities are aspects of reality itself and “ways of observing the world in which we live”.<sup>112</sup> For example: Should a shipwrecked person who is washed ashore recognise a strange tree and seek shelter in its shade, it will be regarded as a naive experience. However, if the same person (subject) studies the same tree (object) to ascertain what its botanical properties are to establish how it should be classified, the subject is approaching the object and analyses individual properties in a theoretical way, using the biotic modality as entry point or “channel” through which the object is approached.<sup>113</sup>

Such an act of abstraction to “make an aspect into a problem” is theoretical thinking.<sup>114</sup> The so-called “special sciences” like mathematics, biology and law (which Dooyeweerd deems a science as defined), thus approach reality from

---

109 A number of others contributed to this debate, but for practical purposes the present discussion will be limited to Dooyeweerd, Stafleu and Strauss. For a more comprehensive discussion, see Coletto 2011 *Acta Academica* 41-61.

110 Dooyeweerd *Dictaat* 57 states that the contribution of legal commentators during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were not systematic and lacked a proper philosophical basis (“behoorlijk wijsgeerige fundering”).

111 Dooyeweerd *Encyclopaedia* 23; 26-27. The fifteen modalities are: numeric, spatial, kinematic, physical, biotic, sensory, logical, historical, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, legal, ethical and certitudinal (Coletto 2013 *TD* 7). See Strauss 2006 *TCW* 61-80 for an in-depth discussion of Dooyeweerd’s theory of modal aspects.

112 Coletto 2013 *TD* 7.

113 Coletto 2013 *TD* 7.

114 Dooyeweerd *Encyclopaedia* 28.

different perspectives and focus on changeable phenomena *within* a specific modality and with that specific point of entry. Each modality and special science deals with the cosmos and reality in its own way.<sup>115</sup> The human subject distinguishes different aspects of an object, examines the object from the antithetic position (i.e. as opposed to the logical function of the act of thinking) and synthesises this knowledge to form a logical comprehension of the object.<sup>116</sup> This also leads to the phenomenon of subject-specific terminology.<sup>117</sup>

According to the system proposed by Dooyeweerd, the six “lower” or foundational modalities relate to nature, where certain laws apply to objects, whereas the nine “higher” or more complex modalities represent the normative side of the cosmos. Positivised laws in these modalities are referred to as *norms*. Whereas a law of nature states what is, a norm states what should be.<sup>118</sup> As the juridical aspect of reality or the cosmos is thus defined as a distinct sphere by Dooyeweerd, the analysis, abstraction and synthesis of its rules on the one hand and persons and things on the other hand, will be a science. As the juridical modality falls within the normative category, law is regarded as a normative science.

This approach does not distinguish “social sciences”, “humanities” or “natural sciences” and avoids the vague distinctions and regular overlaps that characterise such a classification.<sup>119</sup>

Under the influence of Stoker and Dooyeweerd, Van Zyl and Van der Vyver (writing in the 1980s) regard law as a science as it is knowledge that has been, as far as possible, technically methodologically verified and systematised or categorised.<sup>120</sup>

---

115 Dooyeweerd *Encyclopaedia* 28. Philosophy is not a special science as it considers the totality of modalities themselves as well as their coherence.

116 Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 26. The example used is the process to establish what the legal function of the object *chair* would be.

117 Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 33. This construction is subject to the principle of sphere sovereignty, which means that every sphere has its own laws and the one cannot be reduced to the other. One sphere should also not be absolutised as this would lead to “isms”, like historicism which reduces the entire universe, including law, to an inevitable result of historical developments (Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 30-31). Whereas sphere sovereignty describes the uniqueness of each modality, sphere universality refers to the cohesion of the different spheres (Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 34).

118 Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 37, Coletto 2013 *TD* 7.

119 Coletto 2013 *TD* 8, 10-11.

120 HG Stoker, as quoted by Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 25.



They distinguish two main categories of science: philosophy and the special disciplines.<sup>121</sup> Philosophy asks how the cosmos, laws and modalities differ, correspond and “hang together”, while the special sciences are linked to the modalities. The specific sciences abstract a certain modality and focus the enquiry on that. In this regard law as science deals with the juridical laws that create, limit and harmonise power, rights and duties of persons through the principle of retribution. Each modality consists of objects and subjects and the laws they are subjected to. The juridical modality entails legal principles and positive law<sup>122</sup> on the law side and on the subject side it entails persons, animals, plants, things, etcetera.<sup>123</sup>

In their wake, Van Niekerk states that legal phenomena encountered in the positive law are juridically qualified by means of an empirical inductive method and that this results in empirical legal notions. The process of classification entails definitions “*per genus proximum et differentia specificum*”.<sup>124</sup> Through this continuous process of abstraction and comparison with the positive law, general notions are developed inductively and this leads to the “highest empirical legal notions”.<sup>125</sup> Although Van Niekerk states that he aims to define law and legal science, unfortunately these definitions are never supplied as his discussion ventures into an analysis of Dooyeweerd’s theory.<sup>126</sup>

In 1990 Venter *et al* describe science as having three characteristics or “components” that are constantly and dynamically interacting: abstraction, systemisation and reflection.<sup>127</sup> These three human capabilities are employed to explain reality in a “rational” manner. In the authors’ view abstraction implies generalisation and the creation of categories, which leads to the need for

---

121 Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 26-27.

122 In a technical sense this refers to laws that have been properly promulgated or legal principles that have been authoritatively laid down – i.e. the positive law is the law as it is, as it is laid down by the legislator and enforced by the courts. Stoker *Die Aard en Rol van die Reg* 9-10 states that it is *positive law*, as it has been positivised by man. A reluctance to question the positive law on normative level leads to legal positivism, which should be avoided as the deeper or “ontic” law which is grounded in God’s creation and divine Providence.

123 Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding* 28.

124 Van Niekerk *Algemene Regsleer* 70.

125 Author’s own translation from Afrikaans.

126 Van Niekerk *Algemene Regsleer* 74-96.

127 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 8, 11. In Afrikaans, the language they wrote in: “abstraksie, sisteem/sistematiek en nadenke”.

systemisation. Abstraction also leads to creative cognitive functioning and the ability to cope with more complex tasks or situations.<sup>128</sup> Data that have been extracted from reality through abstraction must be systematically organised. This happens during the acquisition of knowledge, the verification of knowledge and the organisation of acquired and tested knowledge.<sup>129</sup> In the last instance reflection is the process of thinking and of thinking about thinking, which leads the scientist out of the domain of the specific disciplines and into the realm of philosophy, a step they regard as inevitable.<sup>130</sup> By using these criteria they distinguish between scientific and pre-scientific knowledge<sup>131</sup> as well as legal practice and legal science.<sup>132</sup> They conclude that reality, viewed from the juridical perspective, is not comprehensively defined by either legal practice or legal theory (as synonym for legal science).<sup>133</sup>

Writing independently, LM Du Plessis also states that theoretical knowledge displays these three characteristics: it is abstract knowledge, it is systematic and involves reflection.<sup>134</sup> Although theoretical knowledge of law cannot be empirically verified, as law itself is intangible, it is of utmost importance as it is the map used to navigate the law. Due to its nature, theoretical knowledge is universal and not applied to individual situations.<sup>135</sup> Theoretical abstraction is conducted according to an intended plan or pattern – this is done by drawing distinctions, making classifications, creating classifications or describing distinctive criteria. Those who create theories also reflect upon their thought patterns and approaches.<sup>136</sup>

Swanepoel<sup>137</sup> uses the term “regswetenskap” as a given and it is not clear how or whether he distinguishes legal science from the law, although it can be deduced that he regards theorising of the law as legal science. In his opinion legal science should not be limited to the objective description of legal phenomena, but legal science is

---

128 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 9-10.

129 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 10.

130 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 11.

131 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 15-18.

132 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 18-21.

133 Venter *et al Regsnavorsing* 21-22.

134 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 1-5.

135 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 2-3.

136 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 4.

137 Swanepoel 2007 *Regswetenskap en Regsfilosofie aan 'n Waardegedrewe Universiteit* 1-2.

also normative and should establish the principles that determine the phenomena,<sup>138</sup> echoing Van Niekerk's thoughts.<sup>139</sup>

It is clear that "abstraction" is a constant ingredient in these South African legal philosophers' proposed view of science. However, no reference to the further development of Dooyeweerd's theory by Stafleu and Strauss is found in any of their works. In what follows, an attempt will be made to fill that gap.

Stafleu departs from but also refines the work of Dooyeweerd on demarcation and provides a complex yet convincing account of science as human activity. For him, a philosophical theory on science breaks down into three basic and irreducible, yet correlated, facets.<sup>140</sup>

The first is that laws apply to knowing subjects (humans) and objects. Without laws, subjects and objects, there is no science.

Every science worth its name is concerned with laws. These laws are concerned either with more or less concrete things, events, signs, living beings, artefacts, social communities, etc., or with more or less abstract concepts, ideas, constructs, etc.<sup>141</sup>

Without subjects, there can be no laws and without laws there cannot be subjects. Over-emphasis on the subject-side leads to irrationalism and over-emphasis on the law-side leads to rationalism. The subject/law distinction is an ontological matter, while "the primary aim of science is to render these laws explicit, i.e. to explicate them".<sup>142</sup> These *a priori* laws that exist independent of human intervention should be distinguished from human hypotheses, theories or models, which are epistemological in nature.<sup>143</sup> All knowledge of facts is theory-laden and there is an inescapable correlation between subject and law.<sup>144</sup>

---

138 Swanepoel 2007 *Regswetenskap en Regsfilosofie aan 'n Waardegedrewe Universiteit* 24.

139 Van Zyl, Van der Vyver, Du Plessis, Van Niekerk and Swanepoel were all at one time academics in the Faculty of Law at the then Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, known at the time for its adherence to the reformed Christian philosophy of Dooyeweerd *et al.*

140 Stafleu *Time and Again* 5-8.

141 Stafleu *Time and Again* 6.

142 Stafleu *Time and Again* 8.

143 Stafleu *Time and Again* 9.

144 Stafleu *Time and Again* 10.

Secondly he points out the link between typicality and modality. Typical laws only apply to a certain class of subjects and are “found by induction and generalization of empirical facts or lower-level law statements”.<sup>145</sup> Modal laws are explanations or descriptions of a mode, apply universally and can only be formulated by means of abstraction,<sup>146</sup> i.e. rational processes are required. Not only laws can be distinguished as either typical or modal, but the same holds true for subjects and objects. A particular wave may be typical, but the “wave packet” does not exist in the real sense of the word: it is an abstracted concept, yet existing nonetheless. Thus he regards abstraction as an aim of science. Abstraction can entail “the formulation of modal, universal laws,” but it also includes “modal analysis of concrete reality on both the law side and the subject side”.<sup>147</sup>

Science studies the relationship between subjects and objects in modal terms. The “reconstruction or synthesis of typical laws” is the next aim of science. This facet is characterised by abstraction and subsequent reconstruction as well as analysis and synthesis.<sup>148</sup>

In the third instance he argues that a range of irreducible modal aspects exist. All modalities exist at once, intertwined and interrelated.<sup>149</sup> Science designates and distinguishes modal aspects and explores their retrocipations and anticipations, as described by Dooyeweerd.<sup>150</sup> “Science” occurs when modalities are “opened up” and that happens once they are recognised as principles of explanation and their retrocipations and anticipations are explored.<sup>151</sup> This is what Kuhn refers to as revolutionary science,<sup>152</sup> but Stafleu proposes the following reformulation of Kuhn’s theory:

In the pre-paradigm phase, scientists are not yet aware of the meaning of their concepts. With the formation of the first paradigms, it is mainly the retrocipatory analogies of the modal aspects or typical structures that are discovered (this includes the search for objectivity ... ). Paradigm change is brought about by the discovery of

---

145 Stafleu *Time and Again* 12.

146 Stafleu *Time and Again* 11-12.

147 Stafleu *Time and Again* 12.

148 Stafleu *Time and Again* 13-14.

149 Stafleu *Time and Again* 21.

150 Stafleu *Time and Again* 18. The retrocipations and anticipations are analogies, links or connections between earlier or later modalities.

151 Stafleu *Time and Again* 30 - conclusions on the law-side of reality can be verified on the subject-side.

152 Stafleu *Time and Again* 23-24.

either a new retrocipatory analogy or, even more spectacularly, by the discovery of an anticipatory analogy. Such discoveries are made possible by an increasing degree of abstraction and, simultaneously, the opening up of new typical structures, both theoretically and technically.<sup>153</sup>

The effect of this complex demarcation criterion is that a vast range of activities are recognised as scientific, but due to his focus on the natural sciences, it is not sure whether Stafleu himself regards disciplines other than those traditionally regarded as natural sciences, as being scientific.<sup>154</sup> Nevertheless, abstraction remains a central feature of the demarcation criterion, followed by the formulation and construction of laws.

Strauss also distinguishes between concrete or entitary abstraction (which is not scientific) and modal abstraction (which is scientific).<sup>155</sup> Entitary abstraction is required for humans to make sense of the world – even children will abstract certain parts or features to identify a certain animal as a horse or a cow. By contrast, modal abstraction or analysis concerns the aspectual dimension of reality, as opposed to the entitary dimension. To rephrase: modal abstraction deals with the *how*, entitary abstraction deals with the *what*.<sup>156</sup> Strauss explains in his own words that

[m]odal abstraction entails theoretical analysis and *analysis* always proceeds on the basis of *similarities* and *differences*. It is aimed at the *identification* and *distinction* of data.<sup>157</sup>

Due to the nature of scientific thought, distinction and theoretical thinking will always involve more than one modality. A comparison or analogy is made “when what is similar is evinced in what is different”.<sup>158</sup> Entitary abstraction is not scientific;<sup>159</sup> only modal abstraction focuses on one particular aspect (or a few, but not all) and will “provide access to the analysis of the structures of such entities”.<sup>160</sup> In fact, the “only

---

153 Stafleu *Time and Again* 26-27.

154 Coletto 2011 *Acta Academica* 55.

155 Strauss 2001 *TCW* 29-30.

156 Strauss 2001 *TCW* 30. For him too (30-31), the special sciences are limited to the perspective of one or a few particular aspects, whilst philosophy concerns the “foundational coherent interlacement among all aspects of reality”. This idea is further developed in his major work, tellingly titled *Philosophy: Discipline of the Disciplines*.

157 Strauss 2001 *TCW* 31. Another example would be the typonimical classification of plants in biology on the one hand and a concept like growth as modal function on the other, Strauss 2006 *TCW* 69.

158 Strauss 2006 *TCW* 70.

159 Strauss *Philosophy* 48.

160 Strauss *Philosophy* 49.

exclusive trait of a science is the specific modal aspect ... through which it observes the world".<sup>161</sup>

Strauss rejects verifiability as a demarcation criterion because trustworthiness is not a feature exclusive to science.<sup>162</sup> He similarly rejects method and the distinction between *knowing subject* and *studied object* as reliable demarcation criteria, as "method at most has the role of a servant" in science and because the "subject-object relation is common to non-scientific human experience as well".<sup>163</sup>

It can thus be concluded that abstraction is regarded as the key element of science by this group. With the concept of modal abstraction, these philosophers provide a demarcation criterion "of both simplicity and solidity",<sup>164</sup> but it cannot be stated that philosophy of science has now, after centuries, come up with one generally accepted view on what science is. It is interesting that the South African legislator has provided such a definition in order to regulate the distribution of research funding and stimulation of research. For the sake of completeness, Parliament's contribution to the debate will be considered next.

#### **4 Statutory provisions in South Arica**

The National Research Foundation (NRF) is the principal public institution for funding and promoting scientific endeavours in South Africa.<sup>165</sup> In section 1 of the *National Research Foundation Act*<sup>166</sup> research, science and technology are defined as follows:

'research' is the generation, preservation, augmentation and improvement of knowledge by means of scientific investigations and methods in the field of science and technology;  
'science' includes any system of knowledge attained by verifiable means and the organised body of knowledge humans have gained by research;

---

161 Coletto 2013 *TD* 9.

162 Strauss *Philosophy* 46.

163 Strauss *Philosophy* 47.

164 Coletto 2011 *Acta Academica* 59.

165 The *National Research Foundation Act* 23 of 1998 section 3 provides that its purpose is to "support and promote research through funding, human resource development and the provision of the necessary research facilities in order to facilitate the creation of knowledge, innovation and development in all fields of science and technology, including indigenous knowledge and thereby to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people of the Republic".

166 23 of 1998.

'technology' includes indigenous technology, and means knowledge accumulated through research or observation, and the practical application thereof.<sup>167</sup>

The *Human Sciences Research Council Act*<sup>168</sup> defines human sciences as

... the investigation of human life and society through systematic, rational and verifiable methods that recognise the validity of both objective and subjective data.<sup>169</sup>

The definition of research is repeated in the *National Research Foundation Act*.<sup>170</sup>

There are no definitions of “scientific method”, “scientific investigations”, “verifiable means”, “systematic, rational and verifiable methods”, “objective data” or “subjective data” in either of these Acts.

The definitions of “research” and “science” in these Acts are linked to and reminiscent of the (philosophically abandoned) positivist approach, due to the references to verifiable or scientific method. The lack of definition of such a method is glaring. However, the notion that science is a body of knowledge accumulated by means of defined *activities*, is repeated.

On its official website the Human Sciences Research Council states that it “conducts research that generates critical and independent knowledge relative to all aspects of human and social development” and lists a number of research areas but none of these directly include law.<sup>171</sup> On its official website where guidelines for research

---

167 Section 1 of the *National Research Foundation Act* 23 of 1998. Prior to the enactment of the present definition in 2001 (the previous definition of “science” was substituted by s 19 (f) of the *Science and Technology Laws Amendment Act* 16 of 2011) the definition of science followed a totally different approach. It read: “ ‘science’ includes the natural sciences, engineering sciences, medical sciences, agricultural sciences, social sciences and humanities”.

168 *Human Sciences Research Council Act* 17 of 2008.

169 *Human Sciences Research Council Act* 17 of 2008: section 1. Prior to 1990, the Afrikaans version of the *Human Sciences Research Act* 23 of 1968 included “regswetenskap” in the definition of human sciences, whereas the English version simply referred to “law”. After the promulgation of the *Human Sciences Research Amendment Act* 99 of 1990, human sciences were broadly defined in section 1 as “those sciences concerned with the study of the creations and the manner of mental activity of man, human development, or mutual relationships, institutions or conditions in society”. The entire *Human Sciences Research Act* 23 of 1968 was repealed in 2008 and replaced by the *Human Sciences Research Council Act* 17 of 2008.

170 23 of 1998.

171 <http://www.hsrc.ac.za/en/research-outputs> [29 September 2013]. The research areas listed are: Democracy, Governance and Service Delivery; Economic Performance and Development; Education and Skills Development; HIV, AIDS, STIS and Tuberculosis; Human and Social Development; Population Health, Health Systems and Innovation; Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators.

awards are provided, the NRF provides assistance and widens the scope of activities that are regarded as “research” for its purposes:

For purposes of the NRF, research is original investigation undertaken to gain knowledge and/or enhance understanding.

Research specifically includes

- the creation and development of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines (e.g., through dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases);
- the invention or generation of ideas, images, performances and artefacts where these manifestly embody new or substantially developed insights; and
- building on existing knowledge to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, policies or processes.

It specifically excludes:

- routine testing and analysis of materials, components, instruments and processes, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques; and
- the development of teaching materials and teaching practices that do not embody substantial original enquiry.<sup>172</sup>

Legal academics receive funding from the NRF and are voluntarily graded according to the Foundation’s criteria. Of the 2636 rated researchers listed by the NRF, 120 have “law” in one or other sense as field of specialisation.<sup>173</sup> All of these researchers hold posts at universities or are retired academics.

However, the question remains whether law qualifies as science for purposes of the statutory definitions. It is not clear whether law (or any other discipline for that matter) is a human science in terms of the current definition, as the definition is vague and clarification of the terms “objective” and “subjective” data is required. In addition, the reference to “life and society” (a “what”) that is studied or observed with verifiable, rational, systematic methods does not contribute to denoting an activity as scientific; this can just as easily hold true for poetry, art, journalism or financial investments.

Is the body of knowledge called “law” then a science as such? It can be accepted without any fear of contradiction that law is a system of knowledge and that it forms part of the organised body of knowledge humans have gained, but the question is

---

172 [http://www.nrf.ac.za/presidents\\_awards.php](http://www.nrf.ac.za/presidents_awards.php) .

173 <http://www.nrf.ac.za/projects.php?pid=34>, list as at 10 April 2013.



whether this was achieved by means of “verifiable means” or through “generation, preservation, augmentation and improvement of knowledge by means of scientific investigations and methods in the field of science and technology”.

These terms have not been judicially considered yet, but the definitions cannot be ignored or disregarded due to the mere fact that they do not conform to contemporary thinking, as they remain legally enforceable. However, it is submitted that the statutory provisions and philosophy of science can be usefully aligned to offer a workable demarcation criterion, even if limited to the South African context.

## 5 Suggested approach

It is proposed that the demarcation criterion proposed by Strauss and others, modal abstraction, can be used to constructively interpret the statutory definitions. According to the legislation, *research* is the *activity* that generates *scientific knowledge*. Modal abstraction as an intellectual mode of thinking described by Strauss *et al* can be regarded as an *activity* that develops “subjects and disciplines,” that embodies “new or substantially developed insights” and builds on existing knowledge to substantially improve or create new “materials, devices, products, policies or processes”. It is submitted that this will offer a useful and flexible standard whilst providing new meaning to the term “scientific method”.

To summarise:

- (a) Scientific thinking, as an action, can be satisfactorily characterised by modal abstraction. It is theoretical, artificial thinking that identifies problems through the lens of a particular modality, in the present case the juridical.
- (b) Modal abstraction is used to provide (or suggest) answers to the problem at hand, by using analysis, analogies and synthesis. In other words, some original work is done or some development or refinement of theory is achieved. This activity has been labelled “research” by the legislature.
- (c) The body of work resulting from scientific thinking makes up the (special) scientific discipline, in this case “law”, consisting of subjects, objects, norms and theories.

It is clear that “science” is the result of a defined activity. Even in his early published work, Strauss refers to law as a science,<sup>174</sup> but he readily acknowledges that not all activities within the legal field are scientific. He employs the example of a judge preparing a verdict – although the verdict may be arrived at systematically, it does not necessarily amount to a “legal scientific treatise”.<sup>175</sup> It follows that the various *activities* of those involved in the discipline of law in various capacities, as already referred to in sections 2 and 3 above, should be considered to ascertain whether any of them qualifies as scientific, in order to answer the central question posed in this article.

## 6 (When) Are lawyers then practicing science?

The term *lawyer* is used as a generic description of any person who has received legal training and occupies him- or herself with the law. In South Africa the two legal professions, i.e. that of advocate and attorney, are regulated by statute and strict professional codes apply.<sup>176</sup> However, a significant number of those who hold law degrees earn their living in different capacities that are just as essential in society and to the legal system. They include public prosecutors, legal advisers in state departments or commercial entities, magistrates, judges, mediators, members of tribunals or boards and legal academics.

Divergent activities are at stake: the first encounter is normally when a student learns about (the theory of) law, usually followed by a period of learning how to practice law (in whichever capacity, regardless of whether it is as attorney, advocate, public prosecutor, legal adviser, state official or administrative officer). Then follows a period of actually applying the theoretical knowledge and practical skills acquired to

---

174 Strauss *Wysbegeerte en Vakwetenskap* 59.

175 Strauss *Philosophy* 46.

176 The *Attorneys Act* 53 of 1979 and the *Admission of Advocates Act* 74 of 1964. Although the professions are due to be restructured, the *Legal Practice Bill* B20-2012 also contains provisions on regulation of practitioners (Chapter 3) and professional conduct (Chapter 4) – [http://www.parliament.gov.za/live/content.php?Item\\_ID=216&DocumentNumber=432016](http://www.parliament.gov.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=216&DocumentNumber=432016); currently debated in the National Assembly and in the making for over 10 years – for a history of and divergent views on the Bill see the entire *De Rebus* April 2013. Professional bodies do not shy away from disciplining and even excommunicating errant members. Examples abound; recent incidents include inter alia *General Council Of The Bar Of South Africa v Geach and Others* 2013 2 SA 52 (SCA); *Mda v Law Society Of The Cape Of Good Hope* 2012 1 SA 15 (SCA).

solve problems or assist clients or the public (paying or not). Some start teaching or sharing what they know, whether it is theoretical knowledge or practical skills and knowledge gained from experience. When disputes are settled by courts of law, legal rules and principles are considered and applied by magistrates and judges. New legal rules are created when judges offer a new interpretation or when a solution to a new problem is fashioned by applying existing principles in a novel way.<sup>177</sup>

In essence students are learning about the law and what law is. In Strauss's terms, they are acquainting themselves with the entities (rules, subjects, objects) within the juridical sphere, they are "learning to count using the abacus".<sup>178</sup> Gradually they will start disregarding the irrelevant detail and focus on the juridical aspect within a given situation, i.e. engage in theoretical thought. This is probably how the undergraduate student would function.<sup>179</sup> Once students identify and distinguish characteristics of objects (persons, concrete situations) and laws (legal norms), they are entering the scientific arena, probably at master's level.<sup>180</sup>

The doctoral student, for whom the ability to "conceptualise new research initiatives and create new knowledge or practice" and "develop new methods, techniques, processes, systems or technologies in original, creative and innovative ways appropriate to specialised and complex contexts" are amongst the required competencies,<sup>181</sup> will definitely perform scientific work, as modal abstraction will be used to develop legal theory or refine current theory, thus adding to the body of legal knowledge.

The learning process is thus a continuum, starting from a position of pre-scientific thinking that is gradually developed into scientific thinking and then the culmination

---

177 In accordance with the doctrine of precedent (*stare decisis*) judgements on points of law by a High Court or court of higher stature will in principle be binding on courts within that jurisdiction.

178 Cf Strauss *Philosophy* 48.

179 [http://www.nqf.org.za/download\\_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf](http://www.nqf.org.za/download_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf) Level Descriptors for NQF levels 5 to 8, pages 8-11.

180 [http://www.nqf.org.za/download\\_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf](http://www.nqf.org.za/download_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf) Level Descriptor for NQF level 9, pages 11-12.

181 [http://www.nqf.org.za/download\\_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf](http://www.nqf.org.za/download_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf) Level Descriptor for NQF level 10, page 12.

of such thinking in the creation of new knowledge, or the development of existing theory.

This process is facilitated by legal academics who teach law, provide mentorship and undertake research in law.<sup>182</sup> Legal research is an activity mainly characterised by literature studies on problematic issues and the formulation of proposed solutions to specific problems. Options are analysed, arguments are considered and the theoretically justified proposed solution is published as an article in an accredited journal, a book, report or conference paper. The “clients” who are served with the results of this research is a varied group comprising practising professionals, the judiciary, the state administration, fellow academics and those concerned with reforming the law or politics. These “clients” expect assistance from the legal academic to “perform their functions ... more efficiently or more effectively”.<sup>183</sup> Their expectations are based on the “conviction that such research can be made beneficial to the administration of justice” in the sense that it can lead to law reform.<sup>184</sup> It can be stated that the task of an academic is that of a

...feedback mechanism[s] for error correction and truth propagation ... At a minimum, the legal academy points up logical or empirical flaws. At its best, this knowledge system provides both the grounds for understanding the (legal) world and the conditions for offering new and better ways of being in that world.<sup>185</sup>

The task of the academic is to step back and suggest “how a body of law hangs together” or if it doesn’t, why not. Woolman uses the apt image of academics offering “the intellectual scaffolding on which to build a better – a more just – legal system”.<sup>186</sup> The role of the academic lawyer is limited in the creation of new law, but needed in the continuous dialogue between lawmakers, practitioners, academics

---

182 Twining 1974 *British Journal of Law and Society* 151. On 153 the author states: “[...] [academics in other disciplines] academic lawyers often appear to be some kind of hybrid technologist, concerned with an applied subject which hovers rather uneasily on the fringes of the worlds of the social sciences and the liberal humanities”.

183 Twining 1974 *British Journal of Law and Society* 151. The author (on 151-152) notes that in the United Kingdom the needs of legal practice and commercial viability dictate choices on what is taught or published by legal academics, a matter that may well be the topic of a separate discussion.

184 Cairns 1935 *Philosophy of Science* 485. The author incidentally argues that for this very reason, legal research amounts to a “technology” and will not be a science as long as this ideal prevails (Cairns 1935 *Philosophy of Science* 487-488).

185 Woolman 2010 *SAPL* 527.

186 Woolman 2010 *SAPL* 527 fn 15.

and the public.<sup>187</sup> The legal academic plays a vital part in what he calls *theory building*, as academics may offer the courts critical reflection on the coherence of theories while not being constrained by time pressure, or the demands of clients, formal courtesy or collegiality.<sup>188</sup>

When a legal academic unlocks new knowledge or creatively re-exposes or reinterprets existing knowledge as described above,<sup>189</sup> the activity will be scientific as it complies with the criteria of modal abstraction and creation of new knowledge or development of existing theory. It goes without saying that a mere summary of existing principles or a compilation of applicable rules will not be a scientific activity; a view supported by the legislature.<sup>190</sup>

The distinction between legal practice and legal science made by the authors Langdell, Van Warmelo and Du Plessis, as well as the South African courts and legislature,<sup>191</sup> may be justified with reference to the demarcation criterion proposed in section 5, but it is submitted that it cannot be stated that legal practitioners never engage in scientific activities. To state that the activity is not scientific when the practitioner is *doing* rather than *thinking*, is an oversimplification.<sup>192</sup> Practitioners also think about and reflect upon the personality traits of their clients and the particular strategy that should be adopted in a particular matter, but that does not amount to modal abstraction. The mere application of rules and principles learnt as a student and through experience will amount to entitary abstraction, not modal abstraction, and will not develop existing theory or add to the existing body of knowledge.

However, the legal system would have remained stagnant if not for those practitioners who actually rethink existing approaches (with or without the input of academics) and have the courage to convince their clients to pursue litigation in

---

187 Woolman 2010 *SAPL* 521, 534, 539.

188 Woolman 2012 *SAPL* 543.

189 Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg* 11.

190 As discussed in section 4.

191 As discussed in section 2.

192 *Cf Venter et al Regsnavorsing* 19. Thinking is, after all, also a form of doing.

order to bring about legal reform, based on their proposed reinterpretation of existing rules and theory arrived at through modal abstraction. To state that legal practitioners are never practicing science, will disregard the undeniable impact the legal counsel of a Ms Carmichele<sup>193</sup> or Ms Fourie<sup>194</sup> had on the development of legal theory in South Africa.

Similarly, judicial officers will always engage in entitatory abstraction during adjudication but will also engage in modal abstraction when a judgement is written and will contribute towards development of legal theory where a legal norm is reinterpreted or developed. These activities all correspond with those Stafleu associate with “opening up” of a modality.

The demarcation criterion proposed in section 5 can therefore be successfully utilised to analyse the activities of different categories of persons who are trained as lawyers.

## **7 Conclusion**

The answer to the question whether the discipline of law is a science, will be qualified. The submission is that the analysis of South African legislation, jurisprudence and contemporary philosophy of science in this article has demonstrated that the question should rather be rephrased, as the type of *activity* a person is engaging in, would be the determining factor. The demarcation criterion proposed here, which is in essence an alignment of the criterion proposed by

---

193 *Carmichele v Minister of Safety and Security and Another (Centre for Applied Legal Studies Intervening)* 2001 (4) SA 938 (CC) changed the approach to the determination of state liability (and more particularly the test for unlawfulness) for omissions of its servants where citizens' fundamental rights are infringed – see Van der Walt 2003 *SAJHR* 517-540.

194 *Fourie and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2003 5 SA 301 (CC) reconsidered the common law rule that marriage is concluded between a man and a woman, which led to the legal recognition of same sex unions, see Schafer 2006 *SALJ* 626-647.

Strauss and others and the applicable statutory definitions, has been used to answer the proper question, to wit *when* are lawyers practicing science?

## LIST OF SOURCES

### Authors

Berman *Law and Revolution*

Berman HJ *Law and Revolution - The formation of the Western legal tradition* (Harvard University Press Cambridge Massachusetts 1983)

Berman and Greiner *The Nature and Functions of Law*

Berman HJ and Greiner WR *The Nature and Functions of Law* 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed (The Foundation press Inc Brooklyn 1966)

Cairns 1935 *Philosophy of Science*

Cairns H "Law as a Social Science" 1935 *Philosophy of Science* 2(4) 484-498

Caudill 2011 *Pro Rege*

Caudill DS "Science in Law: Reliance, Idealization and Some Calvinist Insights" 2011 *Pro Rege* 39(3) 1-9

Coletto 2009 *TCW*

Coletto R "The progress of Scientific Knowledge: evolution, Revolution or Involution?" 2009 *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap* 155-174

Coletto 2011 *Acta Academica*

Coletto R "The elaboration of a demarcation criterion in reformational philosophy" 2011 *Acta Academica* 43(2) 41-65

Coletto 2011 *TCW*

Coletto R "Science and non-science: the search for a demarcation criterion in the 20<sup>th</sup> century" 2011 *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap* 63-79

Coletto 2013 *Koers*

Coletto R "The re-appreciation of the humanities in contemporary philosophy of science: From recognition to exaggeration?" 2013 *Koers* 78(2) 1-7

Coletto 2013 *TD*

Coletto R "Transdisciplinarity: two preliminary issues" 2013 *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa* 9(1) 1-16



Dooyeweerd *Dictaat*

Dooyeweerd H *Encyclopedie der Rechtswetenschap: Inleiding en Historisch Gedeelte: Dictaat* (Drukkerij D.A.V.I.D. Amsterdam 1930)

Dooyeweerd *Encyclopaedia*

Dooyeweerd H *Encyclopaedia of the Science of Law* (Translation of *Encyclopedie van de Rechtswetenschap: Inleiding*, 1967, by Knudsen RN, edited by Cameron AM) (The Edwin Mellen Press Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter 2002)

Du Plessis *Inleiding tot die Reg*

Du Plessis LM *Inleiding tot die Reg* 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed (Juta Lansdowne 1999, reprinted 2003)

Farrell 2001 *JGPS*

Farrel RP "Feyerabend's metaphysics: Process-realism, or voluntarist-idealism?" 2001 *Journal for the General Philosophy of Science* 32(2) 351-369

Feyerabend *Against Method*

Feyerabend PK *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (NLB London 1975)

Feyerabend *Consolation for the Specialist*

Feyerabend PK "Consolation for the Specialist" in Lakatos I and Musgrave A (Eds) *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (Cambridge University Press Cambridge 1970) 197-230

Garvin 2003 *Harvard Magazine*

Garvin D "Making the Case - Professional education for the world of practice" September-October 2003 *Harvard Magazine* 106(1) 56-65, 107

Hamoudi 2007 *CILJ*

Hamoudi HA "Muhammad's Social Justice or Muslim Cant?: Langdellianism and the Failures of Islamic Finance" 2007 *Cornell International Law Journal* 40(1) 89-133

Kleyn and Viljoen *Beginner's Guide*

Kleyn D and Viljoen F *Beginner's Guide for Law Students* 4<sup>th</sup> Ed (Juta Lansdowne 2013)

Kuhn *Logic of discovery or psychology of research?*

Kuhn TS "Logic of discovery or psychology of research?" in Lakatos I and Musgrave A (Eds) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge University Press Cambridge 1970) 1-23

Kuhn *Postscript*

Kuhn TS "Postscript" in *The structure of scientific revolutions* (University of Chicago Press Chicago 1996) 174-210

Kuhn *The Function of Dogma*

Kuhn TS "The Function of Dogma in Scientific Research" In Crombie AC (Ed) *Scientific Change: historical studies in the intellectual, social and technical conditions for scientific discovery and technical invention, from antiquity to the present* (Heinemann London 1963) 347-369

Laudan 1971 *Philosophy of Science*

Laudan L "Towards a reassessment of Comte's 'méthode positive'" 1971 *Philosophy of Science* 38(1) 35-53

Laudan 1987 *American Philosophical Quarterly*

Laudan L "Progress or rationality? The prospects for normative naturalism" 1987 *American Philosophical Quarterly* 24(1) 19-31

Lloyd 1997 *Philosophy of Science*

Lloyd EA "Feyerabend, Mill and Pluralism" 1997 *Philosophy of Science* 64(Supplement) 396-407

Lugg 1977 *CJP*

Lugg A "Feyerabend's Rationalism" 1977 *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 7(4) 755-775

Mautner *Dictionary of Philosophy*

Mautner T *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Penguin Books London 2005)

Meynell 1978 *TPQ*

Meynell H "Feyerabend's Method" 1978 *The Philosophy Quarterly* 28(112) 242-252

Popper *Conjectures and Refutations*

Popper KR *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Science and Knowledge* (Routledge and Kegan Paul London 1963)

Popper *Normal Science and its Dangers*

Popper KR "Normal Science and its Dangers" in Lakatos I and Musgrave A (Eds) *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (Cambridge University Press Cambridge 1970) 51-58

Popper *Objective Knowledge*

Popper KR *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach* (Clarendon Press Oxford 1979)

Post *Introduction to the Law*

Post CG *An Introduction to the Law* (Prentice-Hall Inc Englewood Cliffs NJ 1963)

Preston 1997 *Philosophy of Science*

Preston J "Feyerabend's retreat from realism" 1997 *Philosophy of Science* 64(Supplement) 421-431

Preston *Paul Feyerabend*

Preston J *Paul Feyerabend* 2009 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feyerabend/>  
Date of download 24 March 2010

Schafer 2006 *SALJ*

Schafer L "Marriage and marriage-like relationships: constructing a new hierarchy of life partnerships" 2006 *South African Law Journal* 123(4) 626-647

Settle 1979 *SZ*

Settle T "Popper on 'When is a Science not a Science'" 1979 *Systematic Zoology* 28(4) 521-529

Speziale 1980 *VLR*

Speziale M "Langdell's concept of law as science: The beginning of anti-formalism in American legal theory" 1980 *Vermont Law Review* 5(1) 1-37

Stafleu 1979 *PR*

Stafleu MD "Isolation of a field of Science" 1979 *Philosophia Reformata* 44(1) 1-15

Stafleu 1980 *PR*

Stafleu MD "The opening up of a field of science by abstraction and synthesis" 1980 *Philosophia Reformata* (45) 47-76

Stafleu 1981 *PR*

Stafleu MD "Theories as logically qualified artefacts (I)" 1981 *Philosophia Reformata* (46) 164-189

Stafleu 1982 *PR*

Stafleu MD "Theories as logically qualified artefacts (II)" 1982 *Philosophia Reformata* (47) 20-41

Stafleu *Time and Again*

Stafleu MD *Time and Again: A Systematic Analysis of the Foundation of Physics*. (Wedge Toronto / Sacrum Beperk Bloemfontein 1980) Found on [http://www.freewebs.com/stafleu/stafleu\\_time\\_and\\_again\\_Ch1.pdf](http://www.freewebs.com/stafleu/stafleu_time_and_again_Ch1.pdf) date of download 18 May 2010.

Stevens *Law School: Legal Education in America*

Stevens RB *Law School: Legal Education in America from the 1850s to the 1980s* (The University of North Carolina Press Chapel Hill 1983)

Stoker *Die Aard en Rol van die Reg*

Stoker HG *Die Aard en Rol van die Reg – 'n Wysgerige Besinning*. Publication series of the Rand Afrikaans University A36 (Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit Johannesburg 1970)

Strauss 2001 *TCW*

Strauss DFM "Does it make sense to distinguish between the natural sciences and humanities?" 2001 *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap* 25-36

Strauss 2004 *JNGS*

Strauss DFM "Science and Scholarship in Historical Perspective" 2004 *Journal for New Generation Sciences* 2(1) 55-72

Strauss 2006 *TCW*

Straus DFM "The best known but least understood part of Dooyeweerd's philosophy" 2006 *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap* 61-80

Strauss *Philosophy*

Straus DFM *Philosophy: Discipline of the Disciplines* Paideia Press Grand Rapids MI 2009)

Strauss *Wysbegeerte en Vakwetenskap*

Strauss DFM *Wysbegeerte en Vakwetenskap* MA Dissertation University of the Orange Free State (Bloemfontein 1969)

Swanepoel 2007 *Regswetenskap en Regsfilosofie aan 'n Waardegedrewe Universiteit*

Swanepoel J *Regswetenskap en Regsfilosofie aan 'n Waardegedrewe Universiteit: Ou Wyn in Nuwe Sakke?* Scientific Contribution Series H: Inaugural speech number 201 (North-West University Potchefstroom 2007)

Twining 1974 *British Journal of Law and Society*

Twining W "Some jobs for Jurisprudence" 1974 *British Journal for Law and Society* 1(2) 149-174

Ulen 2002 *UILR*

Ulen TS "A Nobel Prize in Legal Science: Theory, Empirical Work and the Scientific Method in the Study of Law" 2002 *University of Illinois Law Review* 875-920

Van der Walt 2003 *SAJHR*

Van der Walt J “Horizontal application of fundamental rights and the threshold of the law in view of the *Carmichele* saga” 2003 *South African Journal on Human Rights* 1994) 517-540

Van Niekerk *Algemene Regsleer*

Van Niekerk PJ *PRF 212: Algemene Regsleer Diktaat* (PU for CHE: Potchefstroom 1989)

Van Warmelo *Regsleer, Regswetenskap, Regsfilosofie*

Van Warmelo P *Regsleer, Regswetenskap, Regsfilosofie* (Juta Cape Town 1973)

Van Zyl and Van der Vyver *Inleiding*

Van Zyl FJ and Van der Vyver JD *Inleiding tot die Regswetenskap* 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed (Butterworths Durban 1982)

Venter *et al Regsnavorsing*

Venter F, Van der Walt AJ, Van der Walt CFC, Olivier NJJ, Pienaar GJ and Du Plessis LM *Regsnavorsing: Metode en Publikasie* (Juta Cape Town 1990)

Woolman 2010 *SAPL*

Woolman S “On the common saying ‘what’s true in golf is true in law’: The relationship between theory and practice across forms of life” 2010 *South African Public Law* (25) 520-543

## **Internet sources**

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/> [4 February 2010, 24 August 2013]

<http://www.allofliferedeemed.co.uk/stafleu.htm> [18 May 2010, 24 August 2013]

<http://www.hsrc.ac.za/en/research-outputs> [29 September 2013]

<http://www.law.harvard.edu/news/spotlight/classroom/related/hls-deans.html> [24 August 2013]

[http://www.nqf.org.za/download\\_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf](http://www.nqf.org.za/download_files/Level-Descriptors-for-the-NQF-2012.pdf) [27 October 2013]

[http://www.nrf.ac.za/presidents\\_awards.php](http://www.nrf.ac.za/presidents_awards.php) [24 August 2013]

<http://www.nrf.ac.za/projects.php?pid=34> [24 August 2013]

[http://www.parliament.gov.za/live/content.php?Item\\_ID=216&DocumentNumber=432016](http://www.parliament.gov.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=216&DocumentNumber=432016) [24 August 2013]

## Cases

*Bhe and Others v Magistrate, Khayelitsha, and Others (Commission for Gender Equality as Amicus Curiae); Shibi v Sithole and Others; South African Human Rights Commission and Another v President of The Republic of South Africa and Another* 2005 1 SA 580 (CC)

*Black v Barklays Zimbabwe Nominees (Pvt) Ltd* 1990 1 SACR 433 (W)

*Brady-Hamilton Stevedore Co and Others v MV Kalantiao* 1987 4 SA 250 (D)

*Britz v Britz* 2000 JDR 0194 (SCA)

*Carmichele v Minister of Safety and Security and Another (Centre for Applied Legal Studies Intervening)* 2001 (4) SA 938 (CC)

*De Kock v Jacobson and Another* 1999 4 SA 346 (W)

*Die Prokureursorde van die Oranje-Vrystaat v Schoeman* 1977 4 SA 588 (O)

*Erlax Properties (Pty) Ltd v Registrar of Deeds and Others* 1992 1 SA 879 (A)

*Fourie and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2003 5 SA 301 (CC)

*General Council Of The Bar Of South Africa v Geach and Others* 2013 2 SA 52 (SCA)

*Grobler v Naspers Bpk en 'n Ander* 2004 4 SA 220 (C)

*Intercompany Security Services (Cape) (Pty) Ltd v Transport & General Workers Union* (1995) 16 ILJ 854 (LAC)

*Jubelius v Griesel NO en Andere* 1988 2 SA SA 610 (C)

*Kahn v Volschenk* 1986 3 SA 84 (A)

*Lean v Van der Mescht* 1972 2 SA 100 (O)

*Mda v Law Society Of The Cape Of Good Hope* 2012 1 SA 15 (SCA)

*Mgcina v Regional Magistrate, Lenasia and Another* 1997 2 SACR 711 (W)

*Moeketsi v Minister van Justisie en 'n Ander* 1988 4 SA 707 (T)

*Mota en Andere v Moloantoa en Andere* 1984 44 SA 761 (O)

*Netshituka v Netshituka and Others* 2011 5 SA 453 (SCA)

*Nakani v Attorney-General, Ciskei and Another* 1989 3 SA 655 (CK)

*Napier v Barkhuizen* 2006 4 SA 1 (SCA)

*National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality and Another v Minister of Justice and Others* 1999 1 SA 6 (CC)

*Northview Shopping Centre (Pty) Ltd v Revelas Properties Johannesburg CC and Another* 2010 3 SA 630 (SCA)

*Nortje en 'n Ander v Pool NO* 1966 3 SA 96 (A)

*Nyathi v MEC for Health, Gauteng and Another* 2008 5 SA 94 (CC)

*Powel v Alabama* 287 US 45 (1932)

*Olivier v Jonck BK h/a Bothaville Vleismark* 1999 JDR 0068 (O)

*Rand Waterraad v Bothma en 'n Ander* 1997 3 SA 120 (O)

*S v Adams* 1986 4 SA 882 (A)

*S v Bailey* 1982 3 SA 772 (A)

*S v Chavulla en Andere* 1999 1 SACR 39 (C)

*S v Collop* 1981 1 SA 150 (A)

*S v Damoyi* 2004 1 SACR 121 (C)

*S v Khanyile and Another* 1988 3 SA 795 (N)

*S v Maake* 2003 JDR 0848 (T)

*S v Mabeti* 2005 JDR 1031 (T)

*S v Maduna en 'n Ander* 1997 1 SA SACR 646 (T)

*S v Maema* 2002 JDR 0593 (T)

*S v Masogo* 2001 JDR 0582 (T)

*S v Mbambo* 1999 2 SACR 421 (W)

*S v Mbele* 1991 1 SA 307 (W)

*S v Nkambule* 2011 JDR 0520 (GNP)

*S v Philemon* 1997 2 SACR 651 (W)

*S v Pietersen* 1994 2 SACR 434 (C)

*S v Pitso* 2002 2 SACR 686 (O)

*S v Radebe; S v Mbonani* 1988 1 SA 191 (T)

*S v Ramokone* 1995 1 SACR 634 (O)

*S v Viljoen* 2003 JDR 0104 (T)



*S v Zulu* 1990 1 SA 655 (T)

*Sempapalele v Sempapalele and Another* 2001 2 SA 306 (O)

*Taylor v Kurtstag NO and Others* 2005 1 SA 362 (W)

*Telematrix (Pty) Ltd t/a Matrix Vehicle Tracking v Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa* 2005 JDR 0985 (W)

*Telematrix (Pty) Ltd t/a Matrix Vehicle Tracking v Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa* 2006 1 SA 461 (SCA)

*Universiteit van Pretoria v Tommie Meyer Films (Edms) Bpk* 1977 4 SA 376 (T)

*Van den Berg & Kie Rekenkundige Beamptes v Boomprops* 1028 BK 1999 1 SA 780 (T)

## **Statutes**

*Admission of Advocates Act* 74 of 1964

*Attorneys Act* 53 of 1979

*Human Sciences Research Act* 23 of 1968

*Human Sciences Research Amendment Act* 99 of 1990

*Human Sciences Research Council Act* 17 of 2008

*Legal Practice Bill* B20-2012 GG 35357 of 15 May 2012

*National Research Foundation Act* 23 of 1998

*Science and Technology Laws Amendment Act* 16 of 2011