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**INTRODUCTION**

The subject of the discipline is the elementary information from the English-language political philosophy, the conceptual apparatus, the content, the problems of modern English-language discourse of political philosophy. Students are offered an introduction to the terminology used in works on political philosophy and in teaching the subject in English. Attention is paid to the formulation of the main problems of political philosophy in English. The most relevant material of philosophical discussions is covered, as well as widespread principles, formulations, definitions, arguments. The course presents various examples of English-language political and philosophical discourse, provides an opportunity to get acquainted with relevant literature, develop the skills of reading and listening to professional texts. The course study is carried out in the form of lectures, practical classes, independent work of students. In the lecture course, the main attention is paid to mastering the philosophical and political vocabulary, the perception of the coherent text of professional orientation.

The need to study political philosophy in a foreign language follows from the content of studying specialty "Philosophy" with the specialization "Political Philosophy". Specialists in the field of political philosophy must freely possess English-speaking philosophical and political terminology. Knowledge and skills from the course "Political philosophy in a foreign language" is one of the important aspects of the professional competencies formation for specialists in political philosophy. Mastering these knowledge and skills will allow graduates of the magistracy to solve professional tasks, to take on theoretical activities and practice of political counseling, it will become the basis for their career development.

**Lecture №1. Political Philosophy: Basic Concepts**

1. Political philosophy

2. Politics and policy

3. Political system

4. Political power

**1. Political philosophy**

Political philosophy is a branch of philosophy that is concerned, at the most abstract level, with the concepts and arguments involved in political opinion. The meaning of the term political is itself one of the major problems of political philosophy. Broadly, however, one may characterize as political all those practices and institutions that are concerned with government. The central problem of political philosophy is how to deploy or limit public power so as to maintain the survival and enhance the quality of human life. Like all aspects of human experience, political philosophy is conditioned by environment and by the scope and limitations of mind. Political philosophy, as distinct from the study of political and administrative organization, is more theoretical and normative than descriptive. It is inevitably related to general philosophy and is itself a subject of cultural anthropology, sociology, and the sociology of knowledge. As a normative discipline it is thus concerned with what ought to be and how this purpose can be promoted, rather than with a description of facts — although any realistic political theory is necessarily related to these facts. The political philosopher is thus not concerned so much, for example, with how pressure groups work or how, by various systems of voting, decisions are arrived at as with what the aims of the whole political process should be. There is thus a distinction between political philosophy, which reflects the world outlook of successive theorists, and modern political science proper, which, insofar as it can be called a science, is empirical and descriptive. Political philosophy may thus be viewed as one of the most important intellectual disciplines, for it sets standards of judgment and defines constructive purposes for the use of public power. Such consideration of the purposes for which power should be used is in a sense more urgent today than it was in earlier periodsю. The humankind has at its disposal the power either to create a world civilization in which modern technology can benefit the human race or to destroy itself in pursuit of political myths. The scope for political philosophy is thus great, the clarification of its purpose and limitations is an aspect, indeed, of civilization’s survival. Despite this unique aspect of the contemporary situation, and although ancient political philosophies were formulated under very different conditions, their study still illuminates vital questions today. Questions concerning the aims of government, the grounds of political obligation, the rights of individuals against the state, the basis of sovereignty, the relation of executive to legislative power, and the nature of political liberty and social justice have been asked and answered in many ways over the centuries. They are all fundamental to political philosophy and demand answers in terms of modern knowledge and opinion.

**2. Politics and policy**

Politics is part of the government system, and a policy can be called a plan. Politics can be defined as a science or art of governing or government, especially governing a political entity like a nation. A policy can be defined as an overall plan that embraces the general goals. A policy can also be said to be a course or action that is proposed by a government, an individual, business firm, or any party. Politics refers to authority and refers to public life. Politics generally revolves round government and its activities. “Politics” is a term that refers to the organizational process. It also refers to the theory and practice of governance. Political parties run the government which adhere to certain policies. A policy can also be termed as a commitment or statement of intent. It is because of the policy that people, an organization, or a party is held accountable. A policy is a set of rules or principles that guide decisions. “Politics” is a word that has been derived from the Greek word “politikos,” meaning “an official” which has been modeled on “Affairs of the City” by Aristotle. “Policy” is a term that has been derived from the Old French word “policie,” from Late Latin “politia,” and ancient Greek “politeia.” How much do the terms politics, policy, and polity differ from one another and how helpful is their distinction for the research on political communication? In Anglo-American technical terminology, each of these terms describes a different nuance of the political. Polity is used in the sense of “community.” The term comes from the Greek word polis and includes not only the city state, but also other forms of politically organized societies such as the nation-state and the empire. Politics describes the theory and practice of the power struggle between the players inside the polity. It constitutes the core of the political system. Policy aims at the planned formation of social domains such as economy, environment, or education through collectively binding decisions (“policy making”).

**3. Political system**

A political system is a system of politics and government. It is usually compared to the legal system, economic system, cultural system, and other social systems. There are several definitions of "political system": A political system is a complete set of institutions, interest groups (such as political parties, trade unions, lobby groups), the relationships between those institutions and the political norms and rules that govern their functions (constitution, election law). A political system is composed of the members of a social organization (group) who are in power. A political system is a system that necessarily has two properties: a set of interdependent components and boundaries toward the environment with which it interacts. A political system is one that ensures the maintaining of order and rationality in the society. Each society must have a political system in order to maintain recognized procedures for allocating valued resources. In large complex societies, many decisions must be made about the duties and responsibilities of citizens and also about the rights and privileges. If the society is to be orderly, people must obey the rules that are made. The political institution determines and enforces the laws and punishes those who disobey them. Even in stateless societies which had no developed formal central institutions there were some kind of decision-making and rule-making processes which were dominated by some members. As societies become wealthier and more complex, political systems develop and grow more powerful. Political system is that system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which performs the functions of integration and adaptation by means of legitimate physical compulsion. There are three main functions of a political system. To maintain integration of society by determining norms. To adapt and change elements of social, economic, religious systems necessary for achieving collective (political) goals. To protect the integrity of the political system from outside threats. Throughout history, people have created political systems, ranging from monarchies to republics. Each can have its own advantages, disadvantages and degrees of success. Governments formed as people sought protection from outside invaders and their fellow citizens, giving rise to national defense, common laws and economic systems. Eventually, governments expanded to include regulating the economy, providing social services and protecting personal rights.

**4. Political power**

In order to be successful, societies have had to develop political institutions capable of limiting internal violence. They do it by the development of police and military institutions capable of preventing citizens and other nations from using violent strategies to pursue their interests. These political institutions provide nonviolent (or at least less violent) mechanisms for making broad policy decisions and enacting laws. These political institutions also specify the exact circumstances under which police and military can use their monopoly on overwhelming violent force. In the very simple language, power is the ability to exercise one’s will over others. In other words, power is the ability of individuals or groups to make their own interests or concerns count, even when others resist. According to Max Weber, power is ‘the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests’. Political power is based upon the relationships to the legal structure, party affiliation and extensive bureaucracy. Political power is institutionalized in the form of large-scale government bureaucracies. One of the persistent ideas has been that they are controlled by elites, that is, small, select, privileged groups. Political power concerns the activities of the states which is not confined to national boundaries. The networks of political power can stretch across countries and across the globe. Political power involves the power to tax and power to distribute resources to the citizens. There are three basic sources of power: force, influence and authority. Force is the actual (physical force) or threatened (latent force) use of coercion to impose one’s will on others. Often, however, sheer force accomplishes little. Although people can be physically restrained, they cannot be made to perform complicated tasks by force alone. Influence refers to the exercise of power through the process of persuasion. It is the ability to affect the decisions and actions of others. A citizen may change his or her position after listening a stirring speech at a rally by a political leader. Authority refers to power that has been institutionalized and is recognized by the people over whom it is exercised. It is a form of legitimate power. Legitimacy means that those subject to a government’s authority consent to it.
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**Lecture 2. Political Power**

1. The General Concept of Power

2. Measuring Power

3. The Forms of Power

4. Social Power

**1. The General Concept of Power**

Without question, power is one of the most discussed concepts in political and social theory. In defining power, it is difficult to improve on Thomas Hobbes. ‘The power of a man (to take it universally),’ he writes, is just ‘his present means, to obtain some future apparent good’. Power should not be confused with authority, which Hobbes defines as ‘the right of doing any action’. In other words, to have or not have power is a descriptive fact, whereas to have or not have authority is a normative fact. Thus when Locke defines political power as ‘a right of making laws’, he should have said political authority. Of course, if many citizens believe that their government has the authority to rule over them, this may in turn increase the power of that government. Whether a person or group has power in a given situation depends not only on the means available to them (and to others), but also on the structure of the context itself. It depends, for instance, on our background expectations regarding the behaviour of others. This leads us to a second issue. Hobbes describes power as the ability to obtain ‘future apparent goods’. We must be careful, however, to define power in desire-independent terms. In other words, power is not the ability to do what, as a matter of fact, one actually wants, but rather the ability to do whatever one might happen to want. We might propose a statement of the basic concept power as follows. The power of a person or group is their ability, as given by particular means in a particular context, to bring about, if desired, future states of the world. By another definition power is ‘the ability of an actor to bring about or help bring about outcomes’. One of the modern authors defines power in a ‘very broad’ sense as ‘the ability to bring about desired states of the world by acting’. This is not to say there are no longer any debates concerning power. This is to say that these debates are not best understood as concerning the concept itself.

**2. Measuring Power**

One persistent set of debates concerns whether power can be measured, and if so, how. Now of course power cannot be measured directly. The relevant question here is just whether or not we can measure it with some tolerable accuracy indirectly. While none of the various attempts to do so have succeeded so far, this remains an open question. Serious efforts to develop a method for measuring power began in the mid-twentieth century. This, of course, should be no surprise. With the behavioural revolution in the social sciences well underway, it was only natural that such efforts would be forthcoming. Broadly speaking, there have been two main approaches. The first derives from the quantitative empirical research tradition. The second derives from the formal modelling tradition. To measure the power of a social actor requires not only that we know how an outcome would have been different had she acted differently than she did. It also requires that we know how much of a difference she could have made if things were different than they were. We have to know also how likely it was that things might have been different than they were. The king may seem to have the ability to force his subjects to do what he wants. But this presumably supposes that his subjects will respond rationally to coercive threats. Is there a likely possible world in which they do not? And so on. None of this is to say that developing a practical indirect measure of power is impossible, only that it remains a long way off yet.

**3. The Forms of Power**

So far we have only discussed the concept of power in a very general sense. But power comes in many forms, and often it is only one of these forms that we are interested in studying. How precisely to define these different forms has been a second area of persistent debate. Frequently it is complained that some important dimension of power has been improperly excluded or ignored in the literature. Usually, this is due to the confusion of an argument about some particular form of power with an argument about the general concept itself. We will focus on two forms of power that have been of particular interest to social scientists and theorists. The first might be called collective or co-operative power. This is the ability that groups of people have to bring about some desired future state of the world. It is supposed that each member of the group does his or her respective part. So, to give an example, two people may not individually have the ability to surmount a wall, but they do have this ability collectively. One can lift up the other, who can then pull the first up afterwards. This is, of course, an extremely important domain in the general field of power, but collective action has been written about extensively, and there is no need to describe all those debates here. Instead, we will merely note two points of particular interest. There is a tendency to assume that the distribution of power, like the distribution of money, say, must be zero-sum. It is that if one person or group seems to lack power, it must be because some other person or group has lots of it. The point is only that the power of one group cannot be inferred from another’s lack of power alone. The second point of interest concerns whether the actions of a group must be deliberately coordinated in order to count as a form of collective or co-operative power. Consider three cases: first, the influence that consumers have over firms; second, the influence that voters have over elected politicians; and third, the influence that the owners of capital have over government. In each case, the former act en masse (though never unanimously, of course) out of similar preferences or interests, but usually without deliberate co-ordination. And in each case, the latter respond accordingly: firms produce what people will buy, politicians enact popular policies and governments cater to business to prevent capital flight.

**4. Social Power**

Apart from collective or co-operative power, social scientists and theorists are most often interested in what is called ‘social power’. Max Weber roughly defined this as ‘the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance’. We must add that actual resistance is not necessary – only that, if there were resistance, it could be overcome. In the current literature, power-over is variably defined as the ability of one social agent to ‘strategically constrain’ the ‘action-environment’ of another. In other words, ‘the ability of an actor deliberately to change the incentive structure of another actor or actors to bring about, or help bring about outcomes’. Or ‘the ability to bring about desired states of the world by acting in such a way as to overcome the resistance of others’. When one person or group is free to exercise this sort of power over another arbitrarily or without constraint, it is sometimes said that the latter is subject to domination. The differences between these various formulations are, on the whole, slight, and evident in only a few marginal cases. But notice that, however defined, power-over is an instance of power in the general sense. The only way I might bring about future states of the world is by getting others to do things they would not otherwise do. Power-to and power-over are not competing conceptions of power (as is sometimes believed). Broadly speaking, there are two ways that one person or group might change what another would otherwise do. Either (a) the former can raise or lower the costs and benefits attached by the latter to different options in their opportunity set. Or else (b) the former can influence the latter’s preferences over those options. Loosely speaking, this is the difference between making a television set cost less, and making me desire one more. One can raise the cost of options by issuing (credible) threats; one can raise the benefits of options by issuing (credible) offers; or one can do some combination of these simultaneously. We often call this sort of power-over ‘coercive’ in the narrow sense. The other, and often more subtle, way of changing what someone would otherwise do is to influence their preferences. Here there is also a range of cases. At one end of the spectrum we have persuasion, either by force of argument or by rhetorical device. At the other end of the spectrum we have the more sinister cases of propaganda and preference manipulation. The ability to change preferences is limited as a form of power in that the manipulator usually cannot benefit from strategic anticipation on the part of the manipulated. Nevertheless the significance of strategic anticipation is highlighted by paradox of the hated dictator. Consider a universally hated dictator who, with aid of his henchmen, can force anyone in the country to do whatever he wishes. He is, nevertheless, just a man: even the very weakest of his henchmen could kill him easily while he slept. How then is his power maintained? As Machiavelli observed, the difficulty is that no one of his henchmen can be sufficiently confident that a critical mass of the others will support a coup. Thus the dictator maintains power, despite being hated by all.
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**Lecture 3. Political system**

1. The state

2. Legislative power

3. Executive power

4. Judicial power

**1. The state**

The state is a set of organized institutions with a level of connectedness or cohesion, The state operates in a given spatial territory, inhabited by a substantial population organized as a distinct ‘society’. The state is an institution with socially accepted function to define and enforce collectively binding decisions on the members of society. Its existence creates a ‘public’ sphere differentiated from the realm of ‘private’ activity or decision making. Such institution must also claim sovereignty over all other social institutions and effectively monopolize the legitimate use of force within the given territory. It must be able to define members and non-members of the society, and control entry to and exit from the territory. Another function is to make strong ideological or ethical claims to be advancing the common interests or general will of members of the society. The state needs to be accepted as legitimate by significant groups or elements in the society. For the benefit of all it commands bureaucratic resources so as to be able to collect taxation and order governmental affairs effectively. It also substantially regulates social activities by means of a legal apparatus, and government activities by means of a constitution. The necessary condition of its existence is to be recognized as a ‘state’ by other states. Contemporary nation-states commonly meet all these criteria simultaneously. But historically, this complex governmental form has been developed slowly and partially. Its particular characteristics were developing unevenly in different locales and becoming generalized over long time periods. The processes of state formation have been strongly influenced by many factors – the transition from feudalism to capitalism, changes in military technology, wars, revolutions, imitative effects, geopolitical situations. Other factors are the rise of nationalism and of liberal democracy, and the experience of communism, fascism and other forms of ‘exceptional regimes’ in industrialized countries. Within the defining characteristics of the state, there can be many different state variants, with contrasting institutional arrangements. Circumstances quite often arise where most defining characteristics are present but one or several features are missing or called in question. It creates difficult cases where the attribution of statehood becomes problematic. There are some different views on the nature of the state including an ‘organic’ view of the state and a methodological individualist view of the state as a composite set of public institutions or of public officials.

**2. Legislative power**

Legislative power is the authority under the constitution to make laws and to alter or repeal them. In other words it is an officially elected or otherwise selected body of people vested with the responsibility and power to make laws for a political unit, such as a state or nation. "Legislative power" is a distinctly modern conception which presupposes a modern understanding of "law." In medieval Europe the authority of laws was variously attributed to God, nature, or custom. Human authorities "found" or "declared" or enforced the law but were not thought to create it. Consequently, medieval jurists did not distinguish "legislative" from "judicial" powers. The modern conception traces the authority of law precisely to the will of the lawmakers. In acknowledging law as the creation of particular human wills, the modern view liberates government from tradition, from superstition, above all from legalistic manipulation. At the same time, however, this view of law opens the prospect of an unlimited coercive power. Therefore many constitutions includes legal constraints on the power to create the laws. The legislative branch is one of three divisions of the state that works in conjunction with the executive and judicial branches. In democratic countries executive power is formed by law-making bodies acting on behalf of electors. Often these bodies are called parliaments after British parliament which historically became an example of elective state body. The parliament usually is an assembly of elected representatives that forms the legislature of a state or a nation and may have one house or both an upper and a lower house. Parliament represents all citizens, the sovereign power, which is why it plays a central role in the political system. It gives democratic legitimacy to the other powers and institutions: the executive, the judicial and the Constitutional Court, and it proposes the appointment of their members. It checks and controls the conduct of the government and the administration. It approves general budgets, that is, government spending. Above all it approves the laws that all institutions and citizens must obey. Its main responsibility is the creation of laws. The legislative branch is the only branch that can create laws or change existing laws. Laws reflect public policies and establish everyone's rights and duties.

**3. Executive power**

The power to run the State is divided in three – legislative power (make law), executive power (enforce law) and judicial power (apply the law). The Executive power is the branch that ensures the law is put into practice. In other words it is the authority to enforce orders and to ensure they are carried out as intended. The two most prevalent structural forms of the executive are the presidential and the cabinet systems. The source of executive power has shifted from hereditary right, co-optation, and the use of force to election, either direct or indirect. The principal functions of the contemporary political executive are increasingly being carried out by specialized structures. These functions are representation and integration, leadership, deliberation and decision making, control and supervision of subordinate decision-making and enforcement organs. The executive office consists of a number of elected and appointed officials responsible for the performances of the functions associated with it. While the executive is a collective entity, ultimate responsibility for decision making is sometimes lodged in the hands of one man. This is notably the case in presidential systems and in many of the cabinet systems in which a well-disciplined party controls a majority in the legislature. In totalitarian one-party systems the leader of the party is in law or in fact — and often in both — in charge of the executive. In the presidential system, the president is elected by the people. He holds the highest executive office over a given period of time, during which he is not politically accountable to the legislature. All top executive officials are nominated by him and can be removed by him. In the cabinet system, on the other hand, the prime minister and his cabinet are responsible to the legislature. They are formally invested with executive power by a vote of the legislature, and their term can be suspended at any time by an adverse vote. In the cabinet system, the leader of the majority party becomes prime minister. If the party is disciplined, it is unlikely that it will overthrow the prime minister. Thus, while the prime minister is technically responsible to the legislature, he is just as immune to it as the president. The prime minister or president is surrounded by concentric circles of advisers and staff and line agencies. The first is the immediate circle of personal advisers and agents; the second consists of specialized coordinating agencies with functions that cut across departmental or ministerial responsibilities (economic planning, national security, atomic energy, space programs, administrative reorganization, etc.). The third is the cabinet, consisting of top officials responsible for policy making and administration of functionally defined governmental activities (foreign affairs, trade, labor, welfare, defense, etc.). The fourth circle consists of an increasing number of independent or semi-independent agencies with regulatory and supervisory responsibilities, some of which operate or control economic services.

**4. Judicial power**

Judicial power is the constitutional authority vested in courts and judges to hear and decide justiciable cases, and to interpret, and enforce or void, statutes when disputes arise over their scope or constitutionality. The judiciary (also known as the judicial system or court system) is the system of courts that interprets and applies the law in the name of the state. The judiciary also provides a mechanism for the resolution of disputes. In most nations, under doctrines of separation of powers, the judiciary generally does not make law (which is the responsibility of the legislature) or enforce law (which is the responsibility of the executive). It rather interprets law and applies it to the facts of each case. In other nations, the judiciary can make law, known as Common Law, by setting precedent for other judges to follow, as opposed to Statutory Law made by the legislature. In many jurisdictions the judicial branch has the power to change laws through the process of judicial review. Courts with judicial review power, may annul the laws and rules of the state when it finds them incompatible with a higher norm, such as primary legislation, the provisions of the constitution or international law. Judges constitute a critical force for interpretation and implementation of a constitution, thus in common law countries creating the body of constitutional law. Laws are universal, but they must be applied to particular cases with unique circumstances. To do this, judges interpret the law, determining its meaning and sometimes the intent of those who wrote it. Sometimes judges are elected and sometimes are appointed. For a people to establish and keep the 'Rule of Law' great care must be taken in the election or appointment of unbiased and thoughtful legal scholars. Their loyalty to an oath of office must be without reproach. If law is to govern and find general acceptance courts must exercise fidelity to justice. Judicial power as a concept is connected with several similar concepts often discussed in the literature: “judicial autonomy,” “judicial effectiveness,” and “judicial independence”. Autonomy’ refers to judges’ ability to develop opinions independent of the preferences of other political actors. Effectiveness refers to the extent to which courts can compel the state to comply with adverse decisions. Judicial power is thus a two-dimensional concept that is greater the greater the level of autonomy and effectiveness that a court possesses. An autonomous court that is not effective borders on being irrelevant to political outcomes: it makes sincere decisions that are then ignored. Similarly a court that is not autonomous may appear effective, but is in fact an instrument in the hands of some political actors.
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**Lecture 4. Forms of government. Administrative-territorial forms of states**

1. Monarchy

2. Republic

3. Unitary state

4. Federal state

**1. Monarchy**

Government comprises the set of legal and political institutions that regulate the relationships among members of a society and between the society and outsiders. These institutions have the authority to make decisions. Such decisions are made for the society on policies affecting the maintenance of order and the achievement of certain social goals. Aristotle, a Greek political philosopher of the 4th century B.C., distinguished three principal kinds of government: monarchy, aristocracy, and polity (a kind of enlightened democracy). The differences among them chiefly concerned whether power were held by one, by a few, or by many. Modern writers have developed a variety of schemes for classifying governments. These schemes are based on the nature of the ruling class, the economic system, the government's political institutions, the principles of authority, the acquisition and exercise of power, and other factors. The two main forms of government in modern classifications are monarchy and republic.

Monarchy is a form of rule in which there is a single head of state, a monarch, with the title of King (or Queen) or its equivalent. The monarch holds his or her office for life. The position of monarch normally descends by rules of heredity only to members of a specific royal family. The monarch is popularly believed to be possessed of a religious or similar symbolic significance for the state and its institutions that legitimate his or her privileges. When the monarch rules with full or nearly full executive, legislative and judicial powers practically unlimited by constitutional or legal restrictions, the system is often referred to as an "absolute monarchy." When the powers of the monarch are effectively limited and restricted by law, the system is normally referred to as "constitutional monarchy." In constitutional monarchy the law restrictions at least insure respect for the subjects' recognized rights to personal freedom and property. The laws in constitutional monarchy often also limit the monarch's powers of legislation and taxation.

**2. Republic**

Republic is a form of government in which a state is ruled by representatives of the citizen body. A republic is a form of government in which the country is considered a "public matter", not the private concern or property of the rulers. The primary positions of power within a republic are not inherited, but are attained through elections expressing the consent of the governed. The term republic may be applied to any form of government in which the head of state is not a hereditary monarch. Modern republics are founded on the idea that sovereignty rests with the people, though who is included and excluded from the category of the people has varied across history. Because citizens do not govern the state themselves but through representatives, republics may be distinguished from direct democracy. It is the fact, although, that modern representative democracies are by and large republics. As of 2017, 159 of the world's 206 sovereign states use the word "republic" as part of their official names. With no monarch, most modern republics use the title president for the head of state. The first republic to adopt the title was the United States of America. If the head of state of a republic is also the head of government, this is called a presidential system. There are a number of forms of presidential government. A full-presidential system has a president with substantial authority and a central political role. In other states the legislature is dominant and the presidential role is almost purely ceremonial, such as in Germany and India. These states are parliamentary republics and operate similarly to constitutional monarchies with parliamentary systems where the power of the monarch is also greatly limited. In parliamentary systems the head of government, most often titled prime minister, exercises the most real political power. Semi-presidential systems have a president as an active head of state, but also have a head of government with important powers. In some countries, like Switzerland, Bosnia and San Marino, the head of state is not a single person but a committee (council) of several persons holding that office.

**3. Unitary state**

One of the most important questions a government, or а nation must ask itself is, 'how will we divide power and responsibility between a central (often national) government and its political sub-units (often states, counties, and provinces, etc.)?' There are two different types of states according to such division of power: unitary and federal states. A unitary state is a state governed as one single unit in which the central government is supreme. Any administrative divisions exercise only powers that their central government chooses to delegate. In a unitary state, subnational units are created and abolished and their powers may be broadened and narrowed, by the central government. Political power in unitary states may be delegated to local governments. Still the central government remains supreme; it may abolish the acts of authorized governments or cut their powers. In a unitary state, sub-national units are created and abolished, and their powers may be broadened and narrowed, by the central government. Many unitary states have no areas possessing a degree of autonomy.[ In such countries, sub-national regions cannot decide their own laws. The majority of states in the world have a unitary system of government. Of the 193 UN member states, 165 are governed as unitary states. This type of government system works best in nation-states where few cultural differences exist within the state and a strong sense of national pride and unity is prevalent. Since the power is centralized in a unitary system, there must be efficient communication throughout the country. Therefore smaller states tend to have unitary government systems. When a unitary system exists in a multinational state, it is often predictable that values and beliefs of one nationality are imposed over the lesser ones.

**4. Federal state**

A federal state is a political entity characterized by a union of partially self-governing states or regions under a central (federal) government. In a federation, the self-governing status of the component states, as well as the division of power between them and the central government, is typically constitutionally adopted. It may not be altered by a unilateral decision of either party, the states or the federal political body. Alternatively, federation is a form of government in which sovereign power is formally divided between a central authority and a number of constituent regions. So each region retains some degree of control over its internal affairs. Federations are often multiethnic and cover a large area of territory (such as Russia, the United States, India, or Brazil), but neither is necessarily the case. In some cases, a federation is created from a union of political entities, which are either independent, or dependent territories of another sovereign entity. In other cases, federated states have been created out of the regions of previously unitary states. In countries with federal constitutions, there is a division of power between the central government and the component regions. These regions - states, provinces, counties, cantons, etc. - are partially self-governing. They are afforded a degree of constitutionally guaranteed autonomy that varies substantially from one federation to another. Depending on the form the decentralization of powers takes, a federated state's legislative powers may or may not be overruled or vetoed by the federal government. The constitution usually defines how power is shared between national, state, and local governments. Multinational states tend to adopt a federal system of government to empower different nationalities and avoid political instability. The federal system also works effectively for larger states because the capital may be too far away to efficiently control further regions.
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**Lecture 5. Political regime**

1. Representative democracy

2. Direct democracy

3. Authoritarianism

4. Totalitarianism

**1. Representative democracy**

In a representative democracy citizens elect representatives who actually make laws. Nearly all modern Western democracies are types of representative democracies. In it the power is in the hands of the elected representatives who are elected by the people in elections. Representatives are elected by the public, as in national elections for the national legislature. Elected representatives may hold the power to select other representatives, presidents, or other officers of the government or of the legislature, as the Prime Minister. The power of representatives is usually limited by a constitution (as in a constitutional democracy or a constitutional monarchy) or other measures to balance representative power. In some cases, a bicameral legislature may have an "upper house" that is not directly elected, such as the Canadian Senate, which was in turn modelled on the British House of Lords. For a representative democracy to work, there are several conditions that have to be met. First, there has to be an opportunity for genuine competition in the selection of leadership. If people think that elections are rigged, or predetermined, there can be no meaningfully honest competition. Second, there has to be free communication, both among the people and in the press. Third, voters have to believe that a meaningful choice exists between candidates and that differences in policy are honestly reflected in each. The degree to which these three factors are present determines the effectiveness of a representative democracy. It's generally agreed that there are five criteria that are necessary for any society to call itself democratic. They are: Equality in voting, Effective participation, Enlightened understanding, Citizen control of the agenda, Inclusion (democratic rules must be open to all citizens within a nation). There are also some problems with representative democracy. One problem is that not everyone has voted for the person who gets elected and so minorities may not feel that they are really represented. Although it is always assumed that representatives have the people’s best interests in mind, they do not always follow what most of them really want. They can be influenced by other factors and decide according to what they think is important. Most representative democracies also have some features that are present in direct democracies. They hold referendums wherein citizens can vote directly on whether to pass or reject a certain law, initiate amendments to laws, and recall or remove public officials.

**2. Direct democracy**

A democracy in a more traditional sense is a political system that allows for each individual to participate. There are two rather popular types of democracy. In direct democracy every citizen has an equal say in the workings of the government. The qualifications for being considered a citizen are completely different. Citizens could show up at a meeting, and then directly participate in the governing process, and the process of making laws. In direct democracy, people decide on policies without any intermediary. Depending on the particular system in use, direct democracy might entail passing executive decisions, making laws, directly electing or dismissing officials, and conducting trials. Two leading forms of direct democracy are participatory democracy and deliberative democracy. Participatory democracy creates opportunities for all members of a population to make meaningful contributions to decision-making. It seeks to broaden the range of people who have access to such opportunities. Deliberative democracy or discursive democracy is a form of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision-making. Deliberative democracy holds that, for a democratic decision to be legitimate, it must be preceded by authentic deliberation. If the decision-makers cannot reach consensus after authentically deliberating on a proposal, then they vote on the proposal using a form of majority rule. Semi-direct democracies are those in which representatives administer day-to-day governance, but the citizens remain the sovereign. Semi-direct democracy allows for three forms of popular action: referendum (plebiscite), initiative, and recall. The first two forms—referendums and initiatives—are examples of direct legislation. Compulsory referendum subjects the legislation drafted by political elites to a binding popular vote. This is the most common form of direct legislation. Popular referendum empowers citizens to make a petition that subdues existing legislation to a vote by the citizens. Power of initiative allows members of the general public to propose specific laws. Power of recall gives the public the power to remove elected officials from office before the end of their term.

**3. Authoritarianism**

A political regime is a set of political structures that make up a state. Political regimes range from direct democracies to totalitarian regimes, such as military dictatorships. Authoritarianism is a form of government characterized by strong central power and limited political freedoms. Individual freedoms are subordinate to the state and there is no constitutional accountability under an authoritarian regime. Authoritarian regimes place limits on political institutions and groups like legislatures, political parties and interest groups. A basis for legitimacy is based on emotion, especially the identification of the regime as a necessary evil. It is necessary in order to combat "easily recognizable societal problems" such as underdevelopment or insurgency. Minimal social mobilization in such regimes is most often caused by constraints on the public activity such as suppression of political opponents and anti-regime activity. The range of executive power is informally defined with often vague and shifting powers. Authoritarianism also tends to embrace the informal and unregulated exercise of political power. The leadership is self-appointed and even if elected cannot be displaced by citizens' free choice among competitors. Political stability is maintained by control over and support of the armed forces It is also maintained by bureaucracy staffed by the regime. Authoritarianism subdues individual rights and goals to group goals and expectations and conformities. Unlike totalitarian states, the authoritarian regime relies on passive mass acceptance rather than popular support. Compared to totalitarianism, the authoritarian state still maintains a certain distinction between state and society. It is only concerned with political power and as long as that is not contested it gives society a certain degree of liberty. Authoritarianism and democracy are not fundamentally opposed to one another, as it is possible for democracies to possess authoritarian elements. Authoritarian governments usually have no highly developed guiding ideology. They tolerate some pluralism in social organization and exercise power within relatively predictable limits. The two most basic subtypes of authoritarian regimes are traditional authoritarian regimes and bureaucratic-military authoritarian regimes.

**4. Totalitarianism**

Totalitarianism is the most extreme form of authoritarianism. Totalitarianism is a political system in which the state recognizes no limits to its authority and strives to regulate every aspect of public and private life. A distinctive feature of totalitarian governments is an elaborate ideology, a set of ideas that gives meaning and direction to the whole society. A totalitarian regime attempts to control virtually all aspects of the social life, including the economy, education, art, science, private life, and morals of citizens. The totalitarian government seeks to completely control the thoughts and actions of its citizens. It also mobilizes the whole population in pursuit of its goals. In the broadest sense, totalitarianism is characterized by strong central rule that attempts to control and direct all aspects of individual life through coercion and repression. There is decentralized or popular totalitarianism, in which the state achieved overwhelming popular support for its leadership. That support is not spontaneous: its genesis depended on a charismatic leader. Such support is made possible only by modern developments in communication and transportation. Totalitarianism is often distinguished from dictatorship, despotism, or tyranny. Its difference is in its replacing of all political institutions with new ones and its sweeping away of all legal, social, and political traditions. The totalitarian state pursues some special goal, such as industrialization or conquest, to the exclusion of all others. All resources are directed toward its attainment regardless of the cost. Whatever might help to achieve the goal is supported; whatever might prevent from succeeding the goal is rejected. Because pursuit of the goal is the only ideological foundation for the totalitarian state, achievement of the goal can never be acknowledged. Under totalitarian rule, traditional social institutions and organizations are suppressed. Participation in approved public organizations is at first encouraged and then required. Old religious and social ties are replaced by artificial ties to the state and its ideology. Large-scale organized violence becomes permissible and sometimes necessary under totalitarian rule It is justified by the full commitment to the state ideology and pursuit of the state’s goal.
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**Lecture 6. Political Values**

1. Freedom.

2. Justice.

3. Natural rights.

4. Pluralism

**1. Freedom**

Political freedom is a central concept in Western history and political thought, and one of the most important features of democratic societies. It has been described as a relationship free of oppression or coercion; the absence of disabling conditions for an individual and the fulfillment of enabling conditions; or the absence of lived conditions of compulsion, e.g. economic compulsion, in a society. Although political freedom is often interpreted negatively as the freedom from unreasonable external constraints on action, it can also refer to the positive exercise of rights, capacities and possibilities for action, and the exercise of social or group rights. The concept can also include freedom from "internal" constraints on political action or speech The concept of political freedom is closely connected with the concepts of civil liberties and human rights, which in democratic societies are usually afforded legal protection from the state.

**2. Justice**

The idea of justice occupies centre stage both in ethics, and in legal and political philosophy. We apply it to individual actions, to laws, and to public policies, and we think in each case that if they are unjust this is a strong, maybe even conclusive, reason to reject them. Classically, justice was counted as one of the four cardinal virtues (and sometimes as the most important of the four); in modern times John Rawls famously described it as ‘the first virtue of social institutions’ ‘Justice’ has sometimes been used in a way that makes it virtually indistinguishable from rightness in general. Aristotle, for example, distinguished between ‘universal’ justice that corresponded to ‘virtue as a whole’ and ‘particular’ justice which had a narrower scope. The wide sense may have been more evident in classical Greek than in modern English. But Aristotle also noted that when justice was identified with ‘complete virtue’, this was always ‘in relation to another person’. In other words, if justice is to be identified with morality as such, it must be morality in the sense of ‘what we owe to each other’. But it is anyway questionable whether justice should be understood so widely. At the level of individual ethics, justice is often contrasted with charity on the one hand, and mercy on the other, and these too are other-regarding virtues. At the level of public policy, reasons of justice are distinct from, and often compete with, reasons of other kinds, for example economic efficiency or environmental value.

**3. Natural rights**

Almost every person realizes that they have rights. However, in today's world, it sometimes becomes difficult to understand what those rights are. What are we able to do? What are we entitled to? Well, in this lesson, our main focus is on those natural rights, which are based on the idea that every person has basic rights that the government cannot deny. Natural rights are basic rights that include the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Natural rights are perceived as the inherent and original rights of human nature, which equally belong to all men without exception, and which are possessed solely because of their human condition. Â They are held to stem from a concept of natural law, whatever definition may be attributed to the term. The theory of natural law and natural rights of man is, however, an obscure one. It seems a strange law, which is unwritten, has never been enacted, may even be observed without penalty, and imposes peculiar rights which are entitled prior to all specific claims within an organised society. It may be just an example of 'social mythology', but such an idea is still intriguing. For, to disregard it completely is to deny all its evident psychological, political and legal effects, and to adopt it fully is to be blind to man's own imperfections. "That men are entitled to make certain claims by virtue simply of their common humanity has been equally passionately defended and vehemently denied.

**4. Pluralism**

Pluralism is a theory of the distribution of political power that holds that power is widely and evenly dispersed in society, rather than concentrated in the hands of an elite or ruling class. In particular, pluralists have a positive view of pressure-group politics, believing that groups promote healthy debate and discussion and that they strengthen the democratic process. In political ideologies, pluralism is particularly promoted by liberals, who argue that tolerance of moral, cultural and political diversity is essential for freedom, and only a democracy in which diverse groups of individuals are able to compete, with the state acting as a ‘neutral’ arbiter between those groups, is a truly liberal democracy. A lack of pluralism can lead to alienation of groups from society, and result also in some people abstaining from participating in our political system, seeing there is no point as they are not able to wield any power within it.
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**Lecture 7. Political ideology**

1. Communism

2. Conservatism

3. Liberalism

4. Nationalism

5. Socialism

**1. Communism**

Communism, political and economic doctrine that aims to replace private property and a profit-based economy with public ownership and communal control of at least the major means of production (e.g., mines, mills, and factories) and the natural resources of a society. Communism is thus a form of socialism—a higher and more advanced form, according to its advocates. Exactly how communism differs from socialism has long been a matter of debate, but the distinction rests largely on the communists’ adherence to the revolutionary socialism of Karl Marx. Marx held that human history had progressed through a series of stages, from ancient slave society through feudalism to capitalism. In each stage a dominant class uses its control of the means of production to exploit the labour of a larger class of workers. But internal tensions or “contradictions” in each stage eventually lead to the overthrow and replacement of the ruling class by its successor. Thus, the bourgeoisie overthrew the aristocracy and replaced feudalism with capitalism; so too, Marx predicted, will the proletariat overthrow the bourgeoisie and replace capitalism with communism.

**2. Conservatism**

Conservatism (or conservativism) is any political philosophy that favours tradition (in the sense of various religious, cultural, or nationally-defined beliefs and customs) in the face of external forces for change, and is critical of proposals for radical social change. Some Conservatives seek to preserve the status quo or to reform society slowly, while others seek to return to the values of an earlier time. Classical Conservatism does not reject change per se, but insists that changes be organic, rather than revolutionary, arguing that any attempt to modify the complex web of human interactions that form human society purely for the sake of some doctrine or theory runs the risk of running afoul of the law of unintended consequences and/or of moral hazards. As a general ideology, Conservatism is opposed to the ideals of Liberalism and Socialism. Conservatism generally refers to right-wing politics which advocate the preservation of personal wealth and private ownership (Capitalism) and emphasize self-reliance and Individualism. Conservatives in general are more punitive toward criminals, tend to hold more orthodox religious views, and are often ethnocentric and hostile toward homosexuals and other minority groups. Different cultures have different established values and, in consequence, Conservatives in different cultures have differing goals. Many forms of Conservatism incorporate elements of other ideologies and philosophies, and in turn, Conservatism has influence upon them. For example, Nationalism shares many Conservative values (although usually to a more exaggerated degree), and most Conservatives strongly support the sovereign nation and patriotically identify with their own nation (although most Conservatives distrust the xenophobic or racist sentiments that are prominent in some far-right wing groups).

**3. Liberalism**

Liberalism is a political doctrine that takes protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central problem of politics. Liberals typically believe that government is necessary to protect individuals from being harmed by others, but they also recognize that government itself can pose a threat to liberty. As the revolutionary American pamphleteer Thomas Paine expressed it in Common Sense (1776), government is at best “a necessary evil.” Laws, judges, and police are needed to secure the individual’s life and liberty, but their coercive power may also be turned against him. The problem, then, is to devise a system that gives government the power necessary to protect individual liberty but also prevents those who govern from abusing that power. The problem is compounded when one asks whether this is all that government can or should do on behalf of individual freedom. Some liberals — the so-called neoclassical liberals, or libertarians — answer that it is. Since the late 19th century, however, most liberals have insisted that the powers of government can promote as well as protect the freedom of the individual. According to modern liberalism, the chief task of government is to remove obstacles that prevent individuals from living freely or from fully realizing their potential. Such obstacles include poverty, disease, discrimination, and ignorance. The disagreement among liberals over whether government should promote individual freedom rather than merely protect it is reflected to some extent in the different prevailing conceptions of liberalism in the United States and Europe since the late 20th century. In the United States liberalism is associated with the welfare-state policies of the New Deal program of the Democratic administration of Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whereas in Europe it is more commonly associated with a commitment to limited government and laissez-faire economic policies

**4. Nationalism**

The term “nationalism” is generally used to describe two phenomena: (1) the attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity, and (2) the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve (or sustain) self-determination. (1) raises questions about the concept of a nation (or national identity), which is often defined in terms of common origin, ethnicity, or cultural ties, and specifically about whether an individual's membership in a nation should be regarded as non-voluntary or voluntary. (2) raises questions about whether self-determination must be understood as involving having full statehood with complete authority over domestic and international affairs, or whether something less is required. It is traditional, therefore, to distinguish nations from states — whereas a nation often consists of an ethnic or cultural community, a state is a political entity with a high degree of sovereignty. Surges of nationalism tend to present a morally ambiguous, and for this reason often fascinating, picture. “National awakening” and struggles for political independence are often both heroic and cruel; the formation of a recognizably national state often responds to deep popular sentiment but sometimes yields inhuman consequences, from violent expulsion and “cleansing” of non-nationals to organized mass murder. The moral debate on nationalism reflects a deep moral tension between solidarity with oppressed national groups on the one hand and repulsion in the face of crimes perpetrated in the name of nationalism on the other. Moreover, the issue of nationalism points to a wider domain of problems related to the treatment of ethnic and cultural differences within democratic polity, arguably among the most pressing problems of contemporary political theory.

**5. Socialism**

It refers to a system of social organization in which private property and the distribution of income are subject to social control, but the conception of that control has varied, and the term has been interpreted in widely diverging ways, ranging from statist to libertarian, from Marxist to liberal. In the modern era, "pure" socialism has been seen only rarely and usually briefly in a few Communist regimes. Far more common are systems of social democracy, now often referred to as democratic socialism, in which extensive state regulation, with limited state ownership, has been employed by democratically elected governments (as in Sweden and Denmark) in the belief that it produces a fair distribution of income without impairing economic growth.
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**Lecture 8. Political activity. Electoral process**

1. Political interests

2. Political party

3. Electoral system

4. Electoral campaign

**1. Political interests**

General interest in politics can be considered the basis both for a democratic political belief system and for identity achievement as the outcome of the process of identity development. In terms of political sociology, political interest is the main component of political motivation, a variable indicating ability in ideological conceptualization, which is essential for participation in the democratic process. Thus, political interest is a necessary precondition for the desired characteristics of a responsible and democratic citizen: critical loyalty, ability, and readiness for political participation!. Empirical studies have coherently shown the relevant impact that political interest has on the strength of these desired features, although scholars point out that there is no theoretical reason why political interest as such should produce a democratic character. However, the significance of political interest for the existence of a democratic political identity is empirically evident. But political interest is crucially relevant not only for the existence, but also for the emergence of a democratic political identity. As described in detail in the introduction to this volume, identity achievement requires exploration as well as commitment. Political interest serves as the underlying force for exploration, and without exploration there is no identity achievement. Interest raises questions about the political process, the political system, and incumbents in political positions. Political interest leads people to weigh ideological positions, to assess their pros and cons, and fmally to make a commitment and achieve political identity. Without political interest, political identity stays diffuse: not knowing what to think, not knowing what to believe, not knowing where one's own commitments are.

**2. Political party**

A political party is a group of dedicated people who come together to win elections, operate the government, and determine public policy. There are five main functions that political parties have. Recruiting candidates for public office is one of the most important functions that political parties have. An important goal of political parties is to gain control of the government, and to do this, parties must work to recruit candidates for all elected offices. For example, if a state had an opening for governor, each political party would try and find a person they could support to run for that position. Political parties also actively try to gather volunteers to help register voters as well as organize and run the election day voting. The hope is that the more people that are involved in helping with the election, the more interest there will be in the outcome, which should increase voter turnout. The ultimate goal is to get the person the party supports to win an election. While political parties do end up endorsing or supporting individual candidates, they do so because those people share very similar ideals and political positions of the entire party. Thus, another function of political parties is to present alternative policies to the electorate, called their political platform. A political platform is the ideals and positions a political party has.

**3. Electoral system**

It is a method and rules of counting votes to determine the outcome of elections. Winners may be determined by a plurality, a majority (more than 50% of the vote), an extraordinary majority (a percentage of the vote greater than 50%), or unanimity. Candidates for public office may be elected directly or indirectly. Proportional representation is used in some areas to ensure a fairer distribution of legislative seats to constituencies that may be denied representation under the plurality or majority formulas. At the most basic level, electoral systems translate the votes cast in an election into results – the offices/seats - won by parties and candidates. The key variables are the electoral formula used (i.e. whether a plurality/majority, proportional, mixed or other system is used, and what mathematical formula is used to calculate the seat allocation), the ballot structure (i.e. whether the voter votes for a candidate or a party and whether the voter makes a single choice or expresses a series of preferences) and the district magnitude (not how many voters live in a district, but how many representatives to the legislature that district elects). It must also be stressed that, although this topic area does not focus on the administrative aspects of elections (such as the distribution of polling places, the nomination of candidates, the registration of voters, who runs the elections and so on), these issues are of critical importance, and the possible advantages of any given electoral system choice can sometimes be undermined unless due attention is paid to them. Electoral system design also affects other areas of electoral laws: the choice of electoral system has an influence on the way in which district boundaries are drawn, how voters are registered, the design of ballot papers, how votes are counted, and numerous other aspects of the electoral process. The choice of Electoral System is one of the most important institutional decisions for any democracy. The choice of a particular electoral system has a profound effect on the future political life of the country concerned, and electoral systems, once chosen, often remain fairly constant as political interests solidify around and respond to the incentives presented by them. However, while conscious design has become far more prevalent recently, traditionally it has been rare for electoral systems to be consciously and deliberately selected. Often the choice was essentially accidental, the result of an unusual combination of circumstances, of a passing trend, or of a quirk of history, with the impact of colonialism and the effects of influential neighbours often being especially strong.

**4. Electoral campaign**

The objective of the electoral campaigns of candidates and political parties is to win voter support in the period preceding an election. Candidates use a variety of techniques to reach voters, including by communicating their message through the media. Access to the media may be defined in electoral legislation to ensure that broadcasting time is allocated fairly to parties and candidates. The release of public opinion poll findings may also be controlled by law to prevent potential integrity problems and ensure that voters receive the most balanced information possible. The electoral calendar often sets the dates for the official campaign. This is usually a period of around a month leading up to election day. Actual campaigning may start much earlier, but special benefits or freedoms are available to political parties and candidates only during the period specified in the electoral calendar. (For example, they are assured of access to the media during the official campaign period only.) Perceived integrity problems are often created by early commencement of campaign activities, but often these are not prohibited per se. Election campaigns are increasingly expensive. The need to collect large sums of money raises serious integrity concerns. The sources of these funds, the amounts that may be accepted and the lack of equal resources present potential threats to electoral integrity. To ensure honest campaigns, most countries have adopted campaign financing rules that limit allowed contributions and spending, and require political parties and candidates to publicly disclose the sources of their funding as well as the nature and amount of their spending.
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