

THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF LAW AND POLITICS

DOI: 10.46340/eppd.2024.11.4.3

SCIENTIFIC PARADIGMS AND POLITICAL IDEOLOGY: AN INSEPARABLE CONNECTION USING THE EXAMPLE OF THE METHODOLOGY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Mykhailo Kovalchuk¹, PhD in Political Science;

Khrystyna Khvoynyt'ska-Pereima², PhD in Philosophy

¹ Department of Theory and History of Political Science, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine

² Department of Philosophy, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Lviv, Ukraine

Corresponding author: Mykhailo Kovalchuk; Email: mykhailo.kovalchuk@lnu.edu.ua

Citation: Kovalchuk, M., & Khvoynyt'ska, K. (2024). Scientific Paradigms and Political Ideology: an Inseparable Connection Using the Example of the Methodology of Political Science. *Evropský politický a právní diskurz*, 11, 4, 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.46340/eppd.2024.11.4.3>

Abstract

The article examines the interaction between ideology and political science through the lens of their interaction in the process of constructing scientific knowledge about politics. It substantiates the direct influence of political ideology on the actualization of social demands, which directly determine the formation of the subject and object of political science, as well as its methodology in general, establishing a clear connection between the ideological situation in society and the development of social sciences. It is proposed to consider political ideology not only as an object of political science research but also as a direct participant in the process of forming its methodology and scientific discourse. The extreme manifestations of the ideologization of political science within the framework of the Marxist paradigm of social sciences are outlined through the prism of the scientific discourse of the USSR, which had a significant impact on the formation of the tradition of political science in Ukraine and the former Soviet countries. Scientific communism is considered an extreme manifestation of the ideologization of political science, and the main dangers of this phenomenon in scientific discourse are outlined. The irreversibility of the process of ideologization of scientific discourse is argued within the scientific article, and it is also proven that the situation of dogmatization of scientific theories is a general scientific phenomenon that has a regular character.

The difference between internal scientific dogmatization of the scientific environment and external political ideologization, which is characteristic of political science in both cases, is outlined. The specificity of political science as a system of scientific knowledge within which ideologization is the strongest and most noticeable is characterized. The process of ideologization and dogmatization of scientific theory, as well as the political establishment of scientific theory as a metatheory of scientific discourse, are demonstrated using the example of the Marxist paradigm within the discourse of the social sciences of the USSR. The main challenges facing political science in its close interaction with political ideology are characterized.

Keywords: political science, methodology, political ideology, scientific discourse, Marxism, subject of political science.

Introduction

Social and behavioral sciences can be regarded as a product of the interaction between society as a whole and the scientific community, the mutual influence of which cannot be stopped or divided into main active and secondary passive elements. This is a complex and intricate interaction that inseparably shapes and refines the subject of political science while simultaneously being a direct consumer of the results of scientific research on phenomena that are actualized by society itself (Kovalchuk, 2024, p. 21). Society requires the existence of social sciences because its needs extend beyond the methodological boundaries of exact disciplines, as it cannot be subjected to clear axiomatic explanations through the prism of necessary and objective laws: "With the emergence of science came the understanding that there are many questions that cannot be clarified by the methods of exact sciences, and the most obvious examples here are ideological and ethical questions" (Putnam, 2003, p. 160). Political science is the discipline tasked with resolving these overarching questions and problems. The ideological determinant of the scientific process is a certain type of subjectivity in the scientific process, which we will focus on further, emphasizing the clear division of this principle into two separate components: external political ideologization of scientific discourse and internal paradigmatic ideologization of the scientific community.

Literature Review

In the context of our topic, it is necessary to refer to the ideologization of scientific discourse in Thomas Kuhn's concept of scientific revolutions (Kuhn, 1996), which, despite becoming classic within the methodological discourse of science, has been quite controversial in terms of evaluations and criticisms from other science methodologists. In the context of his theory, the researcher suggests considering the irrational components of the scientific process, such as belief in theory and conviction, which are crucial for our research, as the positive application of scientific theory is inseparably linked to the belief of the scientific community and society in this theory: "If faith is restored, we return to positive predictions; we declare what the implementation will be; we convince those who are ready to recognize everything at once. But to recognize does not mean to know. We easily recognize what we do not know" (Bachelard, 1986, p. 106). Political science as a system of scientific knowledge is directly related to the political sphere, which serves as the object of study, and the phenomena of its manifestation directly shape the boundaries of its research subject (Shypunov, 2021, p. 89). Therefore, it is logical to argue that political science as a system of scientific knowledge is fundamentally closely linked to the political sphere of society's existence and often finds itself under the strict censorship of the dominant type of political ideology. In this interpretation, it is worth referring to the Marxist paradigm of knowledge about society, which was initially conceptualized as a scientific theory of economic development, then evolved into an ideology of social development, and later emerged as a widely accepted political ideology, particularly in the territory of the USSR and its spheres of political influence (Mykhalchenko, 2016, p. 210).

The ideologization of the scientific process has been considered in various methodological works, but in the context of our research, we will focus on Thomas Kuhn's classic work "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (1996), as well as on the work of another researcher of the methodology of science, Paul Feyerabend, "Science in a Free Society" (1978), in which science is considered as a separate and independent ideology. It is worth noting that the position regarding this issue within the community of science methodologists and philosophers varied; for instance, the American researcher Hilary Putnam criticized these two concepts: "In short, if Feyerabend and Kuhn in his greatest incomparability were correct, then we could conceptualize members of other cultures, including scientists of the 17th century, only as animals responding to stimuli (including noises amusingly resembling English or Italian sounds)" (Putnam, 2003, p. 125).

Scientific development, according to Thomas Kuhn, is viewed as an endless change of paradigms that requires constant crises and complete disillusionment in the outdated theory in favor of the new one, which initially is not recognized by the scientific community due to the conviction and loyalty to the old paradigm, but later becomes accepted and becomes the central paradigm. In particular, as another science methodologist, Gaston Bachelard, wrote: "No matter how persistent realism is, it is amazing that all productive revolutions in scientific thinking begin with a crisis that leads to its deep layering. Realistic thought itself never generates its own crisis" (Bachelard, 1986, p. 123). This process is prolonged and always requires crisis situations in the scientific process, and the main reason for this is the ideological belief in the correctness and possibility of transforming the old paradigm, which serves as a metatheory. The fundamental importance of this provision for our research lies in the fact that the choice of a metatheory for interdisciplinary research, which will be considered a model for all scientific systems and according to which the main subjects of scientific

research will be chosen, is based on an irrational belief in scientific theory that has already exhausted itself, which we will call the internal ideologization of scientific discourse.

In this context, it is worth turning to the principle of the pluralism of scientific methods and programs proposed by Paul Feyerabend. The researcher argued that scientific knowledge is necessarily ideologically loaded due to its belonging to a certain tradition, a certain specific type of scientific rationality within science. This is a completely constructive phenomenon within the existence of science as a knowledge system since we cannot claim its monolithic nature in terms of the existence of a single tradition. The science methodologist wrote: "They deny this, saying that equal rights can only be guaranteed if the basic structure of society is 'objective,' not subject to the influence of any one tradition" (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 48). Even the problem of the existence of a clear and unambiguous definition of the subject or object of political science due to the constant variability of the subject field of this science and the absence of a single definition of its object, namely politics, is a consequence of the presence and encounter of different traditions of political thought. And the researcher's affiliation with a particular tradition may already indicate a clear tendency to conceptualize the object of study and further define the subject fields of political science (Harbadyn, 2015, p. 45). Thus, we directly correlate the interpretation of political discourse with the researcher's affiliation with a specific tradition within political science, which we consider a clear illustration of the ideological component in shaping the concept of the subject of political science, as well as its influence on the formation of the entire methodology of political science.

Scientific and Political Ideology: the Problem of Differentiation

Political science is an interdisciplinary field that incorporates general scientific principles and is influenced by social and political spheres (Fedorchuk, 2017, p. 85). The methodology of political science always revolves around a metatheory, leading to a general scientific methodological risk that this metatheory will transform from a dynamic paradigm of scientific knowledge development into a static dogma. Scientists may adhere to this metatheory not because of its positive results but due to their belief in its truth, thereby turning it into an ideology that shapes the worldview of researchers and the construction of the subject fields of scientific research: "Moreover, one could go further, saying: the most brilliant method ends up losing its fertility if its application's object is not renewed" (Bachelard, 1986, p. 34). Therefore, scientific discourse, including that of political science, should be characterized by dynamism and openness, while the ideologization of the scientific process necessarily leads to stagnation and inertia in scientific systems. The ideologization of political science discourse is a dangerous factor for the growth of scientific knowledge but allows for a clear definition of the boundaries of its subject field due to its strict doctrinal nature. In the above interpretation, we should divide the ideology of the scientific process into two components: internal ideology within the scientific community, which manifests itself in the faith of community members in a paradigm that is ineffective and unable to handle the constant emergence of anomalies; and external ideologization of science, originating from the political subsystem of the social system, strictly determining the development of science and its research areas within the boundaries of rational acceptability criteria, clearly declaring a specific scientific paradigm as the only true and comprehensive one, thereby closing the scientific discourse within the strict confines of the postulates of the universally accepted paradigm, which must simultaneously serve as a political and scientific ideology.

The first example can be found in faith in scientific theory regardless of political doctrine and represents a stage in scientific development, as the static nature of science indicates the need for modernization or changes in scientific theory. In other cases: "If this does not happen, it means that the scientific spirit is stuck in dogmatism and axioms accepted on faith" (Bachelard, 1986, p. 105). The second type of ideologization of scientific discourse finds its realization in the context of the relationship and direct influence of the political regime on the political science discourse, creating a situation of direct ideological censorship of scientific discourse (Rotar, 2016, p. 101). It is noteworthy that such censorship is most vividly manifested in social sciences or behavioral sciences, the paradigm of which depends directly on social and political processes.

The Subject Field of Political Science and Ideological Delimitation of its Boundaries

The fundamental complexity in forming the methodological principles and main factors of conceptualizing the scientific discourse of political science lies in the fact that this field is directly linked to the power structures of the state, whose authority is one of the phenomena within its subject field, and state resources often serve as the basis for conducting research. Naturally, political science, in its consideration

and exploration of the boundaries of its subject, extends far beyond the confines of the state, but we can also argue that state support for a particular tradition of political science poses a threat of creating a situation of external ideologicalization of scientific discourse (Rudych, 2003, p. 9).

In the context of the ideologization of political science discourse, it is worth noting that Marxism is entrenched by political bodies as a type of universally accepted criteria of rational acceptability with the right to truth firmly attached to it: "...there can be an understanding of 'rational' according to which any view that can be reasonably and convincingly defended against the assumptions of any culture is a 'rational' point of view, but that understanding cannot be the only or normatively important one" (Putnam, 2003, p. 167). This quote from an American science methodologist draws a clear line between scientific rationality, which is open and necessarily incorporates the principle of pluralism into its structure, which is completely eliminated in the case of Marxism in the USSR, which is recognized as the metatheory of any science of society, including political science, which finds its realization in the concept of scientific communism. Marxism was initially proposed as an economic theory of social development that gained widespread fame and popularity (Shypunov, 2018, p. 368). Political science, as a system of scientific knowledge about society that constantly incorporates interdisciplinary methodology, was directly influenced by it. Arising from the positivist paradigm of universal knowledge, political science was predetermined to constantly straddle the boundary between exact sciences and social sciences, leading to constant critical attitudes within the scientific community, which under the influence of the success of instrumentalism in the natural sciences, formed criteria for scientificity in the methodology of exact disciplines: "In this situation, someone caught up in the cultural influx began to argue that there really was no knowledge outside the exact sciences, and if there was in the social sciences, it was only to the extent that they tried to imitate the exact sciences, and only to that extent" (Putnam, 2003, p. 160). And it is precisely in the concept of the existence of political science within the framework of scientific communism that we find such imitation, hence political science issues are clearly determined by the economic approach of Marxism. The specificity of Marxism and similar theories lies in the fact that due to the success of scientific instrumentalism, any other form of scientific knowledge, to meet the criteria of scientificity, must be endowed with instrumental characteristics and criteria (Shypunov, 2018, p. 197).

Ideologization of Political Science through the Prism of Marxist Interpretation of Social Sciences in the USSR

It is important for us to note that Marxism, having evolved first into Marxism-Leninism and later into Marxism-Stalinism, became the dominant methodological tradition of scientific discourse in the USSR, as well as the officially sanctioned state ideology by political decision (Mykhalchenko, 2016, p. 205). This, on one hand, signified the "death" of Marxism as a dynamic scientific theory due to its crystallization into a universally accepted ideology, and on the other hand, allowed for the extreme ideologization of scientific discourse. The aforementioned ideologization is not a positive historical, political, or scientific phenomenon, but it is a unique experience that holds potential for further methodological research, especially for the topic of our study in the context of examining the Ukrainian school of political science, which in its history has experienced all the described processes and their derivative structural paradigmatic changes: "Feyerabend, like Kuhn, emphasized the way different cultures and historical epochs produce different paradigms of rationality" (Putnam, 2003, p. 124).

In the scientific discourse of the USSR, the science of politics existed exclusively within its tradition as scientific communism, which is not devoid of meaning and possessed epistemic potential. However, the problem lies in reducing the entire scope of political science to this one aforementioned tradition, which is considered entirely reliable without any right to alternative interpretations. In particular, political science was regarded as a science that should study society and social relations from the perspective of their formation in the process of production, exchange, distribution, and consumption of the material results of labor. Most importantly, all these processes were considered to unfold exclusively within the framework of the operation and strict determination of economic laws in specific economic formations of society, which were expected to replace each other in the course of the unfolding economic development of history (Mykhalchenko, 2016, p. 203).

It is important to note that Marxism borrowed many methodological principles from the social and dialectical views of G.W.F. Hegel, giving them a materialistic projection, according to which we will also relate this concept to historical ones in their extreme manifestations: "The historical essence relies on the past, which expands the scope of the given, and overcomes the present with its help" (Patochka, 2001, p. 23).

However, the decisive factor remains the strict ideologization of political knowledge and the subject of political economy, which will be strictly determined by the universally accepted tradition of Marxism: "The modern variety of organic reason has grown out of dissatisfaction with the skeptical and negative position of finiteness; it grew out of the inadequacy of empiricism, primarily from its excessively passive character; it grew where the tradition of positively metaphysical thought remained most alive" (Patochka, 2001, p. 22).

Scientific communism within the scientific discourse of the USSR is considered exclusively as one of the components of the general Marxist doctrine, aptly called Marxism-Leninism, forming a triad with philosophy and scientific communism, and shaping Marxism-Leninism in its entirety. It is important to note here that scientific communism and political economy as its component are not considered as scientific theories that can exist beyond ideology. Instead, they are seen solely as components of ideological tradition. The subject of study of Marxist political economy is the production relations inherent in various historically conditioned modes of production. Therefore, one of the main dogmas of political economy, and at the same time the reason for its name, is that the economy is considered the main basis of the social and political life of formations, where politics is only a superstructure inseparably linked to the economic situation and the dominant type of economic relations.

The theoretical form of objectively existing production relations is economic categories, which must enter the subject fields of research of scientific communism or the dominant tradition of knowledge about politics in the USSR. The most general and repeated causal relationships within the structure of economic phenomena and processes are conceptualized in economic laws. It is worth noting that in this case, scientific communism arms itself with the methodology of exact applied sciences, which is why one of the central components of the subject of its research is economic laws that underlie political shifts and phenomena. Such a focus on objectifying political reality reflects a tendency towards emulating the principle of instrumentalism, the success of which is one of the main factors in popularizing science in society and the main reason for the increase in the authority of science, the truth of whose propositions can be proven through the repetition of the corresponding experiment: "According to the weak version of operationalism, which has become a kind of working philosophy for most scientists, the content of scientific theory consists of results that are available for verification, and these can be expressed in statements by the formula: when we perform such and such an action, then we will get such and such results available for inspection. If the statements made according to this formula are true, then their truth can often be proved by repeating the corresponding experiment" (Putnam, 2003, p. 187). On the other hand, we must recognize that such a tendency of social sciences to turn to the objectivity of natural science systems of knowledge was proposed by positivist theorists but only in the context of conducting political science in such a narrow version as scientific communism. This idea became the real principle at the basis of knowledge about politics. Of course, the excessive level of ideologization within the aforementioned approach stimulated the consideration of such a tradition of political science with critical attitudes. Alongside the above, such an approach is important for our research since it is an extreme manifestation of implementing the principle of ideologization of science in shaping the subject of political science research.

Scientific Communism as an Extreme Form of Ideologization of Political Knowledge

Within the principle of ideology influencing the formation of knowledge about politics as scientific communism, it is worth noting that despite observations and critical attitudes towards the objective foundations of forming scientific discourse among methodologists, we can clearly define the boundaries of its subject. In the system of production relations, ownership relations over the means of production are highlighted as the basis of all production relations. Production relations are subject to study by political economy, and thus by scientific communism, in unity with the productive forces that determine them and the superstructure of the corresponding type of society. With the development of social production and the complication of economic relations, there is a necessary expansion of the subject field of scientific communism. Here the dynamism of the subject of scientific communism is present even despite its strict ideological nature, which proves the potential scientific nature of such an approach to studying politics. The dynamism of science is always evidence of scientific development: "If this does not happen, it means that the scientific spirit is stuck in dogmatism and axioms accepted on faith" (Bachelard, 1986, p. 105).

Scientific communism cannot be limited to studying production relations only within the framework of production, as the complication of the international division of labor, the improvement of economic and political relations between countries with different socio-economic systems, economic competition between socialism and capitalism, and the development of international economic cooperation emphasizes

the importance of considering the economic basis on a global scale. The above includes ways and forms of influence of economic systems on each other through political means, economic relations between states of different systems and their development prospects, characteristics of the structure and social nature of economic relations operating within the global economic system, and economic laws. The separation of production relations as the subject of scientific communism is a characteristic feature of the Marxist paradigm of political science (Fedorchuk, 2017, p. 85).

Additionally, within the framework of Marxist theory, the adaptation of the dialectical method, namely dialectical materialism, was carried out with its subsequent application to the study of production relations in society. Dialectical materialism considers one of the main criteria for the truth of results and conclusions obtained by science to be their correspondence with objective reality. Therefore, we can note that the principle of cognition of objective reality is a fundamental postulate of the epistemology of Marxism, which necessarily indicates the presence of general scientific principles of the positivist conception of science within the structure of the Marxist methodology of scientific knowledge. This is manifested in the identification by Marxists of the concept of rationality with scientific rationality, which consists of constantly referring to the facts of objective reality: "But, of course, this sociological fact has something in common with the increasingly elevated elevation of the concept as if rationality equals scientific rationality, as well as the concept of scientific rationality based, as such, on proving instrumental connections to (potentially) satisfy the vast majority" (Putnam, 2003, p. 189). In this context, it is worth noting that the excessive presence of the ideological component within Marxist theory leads to the situation of using manipulative means in constructing scientific rationality, which is manifested in recognizing as scientific only those concepts and approaches that are built on the principles of using dialectical materialism.

Scientific communism, studying reality, takes the economic situation as its starting point, rejecting all other components as derivative and methodologically unimportant, leading to the reductionism of this approach since only the essential characteristics of economic relations lead to political changes and development. Accordingly, in the process of the movement of scientific consciousness, there is a descent from the abstract to the concrete, from the simple to the complex, the system of economic categories and laws is outlined and analyzed. The method of dialectical materialism requires the unity of quantitative and qualitative analysis of economic processes, but it is worth noting that qualitative characteristics of political or economic changes manifested in the change of formations are favored.

Conclusions

Ideology is a direct participant in the construction of political science discourse, including the determination of its boundaries. It also serves as a methodological principle for conceptualizing the subject fields of specific studies, which becomes relevant at the level of ideologizing scientific paradigms and theories. This approach allows us to view political science as being within the influence zone of the ideology of society, a particular political system, or the scientific discourse itself. As a result, social rationality can be seen as a product of ideological influence. One example of such ideologization is the concept of social science within the scientific discourse of the USSR, where social development is not considered outside the concept of "economic determinism," and all knowledge about society and politics is interpreted through the economic base, with politics being merely a superstructure. Thus, the concept of "political economy" is a product of the Marxist paradigm of political science, which establishes itself not just by spreading this theory among the scientific community, but as an exclusively political ideology that has crystallized as a scientific paradigm under the influence of political processes. The establishment of scientific communism as the main concept of social knowledge within the discourse of social sciences in the USSR directly demonstrates the political ideologization of scientific discourse, clearly showing the interrelation between ideological and scientific environments, which has left a strong imprint on the Ukrainian political science discourse.

An important aspect of this phenomenon is the existence of the unquestionable hegemony of a single approach to studying social reality, leading to the convergence of political and scientific boundaries of the authority of this theory, supported by the state. This implies that an important aspect is the possibility of the state becoming one of the key authorities in the process of forming scientific discourse, signaling the construction of the concept of scientific rationality, where the main criterion of truth is conformity to generally accepted ideological dogmas. Thus, it is logical to conclude that in the extreme manifestations of the ideologization of political science discourse, the ideal of "scientific objectivity" is devalued, and political influence on the formation of scientific discourse in the social sciences becomes apparent.

This devalues the existence of such theories within the framework of scientificity, but at the same time, they have functioned in the past and continue to influence the study of the political system of society even today. This process is an integral part of the functioning of the scientific system, making it impossible for the researcher to step outside the ideological environment in their studies. However, it is important to note the specificity of this phenomenon within political science, where, on the one hand, ideology is a direct object of study and, at the same time, a key component in the formation of the methodological principles of the scientific system itself – political science.

Acknowledgements. None.

Conflict of Interest. None.

References:

- Apel, K.-O. (1980). *Towards a Transformation of Philosophy*. London.
- Bachelard, G. (1986). *The New Scientific Spirit*. Boston.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality : a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York.
- Denysenko, V. (2015). «Mifolohichne znannia»: postanovka problemy shchodo usvidomlennia yoho predmetnosti ["Mythological Knowledge": Framing the Problem of Understanding its Objectivity]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Serii filosofsko-politolohichni studii* [Journal of Lviv University. Series of Philosophical and Political Studies], 6, 6-14. [in Ukrainian].
- Fedorchuk, O. (2017). Evoliutsiia predmeta politolohii: osnovni etapy rozvytku [Evolution of the Subject of Political Science: the Main Stages of Development]. *Evrotsky Politycky a Pravni Diskurz* [European Political and Law Discourse], 3, 83-87. [In Ukrainian]
- Feyerabend, P. (1993). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London.
- Feyerabend, P. (1978). *Science in a Free Society*. London.
- Fukuyama, F. (2006). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York.
- Habermas, Yu. (2006). *Zaluchennia inshoho: studii z politychnoi teorii* [The Inclusion of Other: Studies of Political Theory]. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].
- Harbady, A. (2015). Neklasychni pidkhody do interpretatsii piznavalnykh praktyk subiekta v politytsi [Non-Classical Approaches to the Interpretation of Cognitive Practices of the Subject in Politics]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Serii filosofsko-politolohichni studii* [Journal of Lviv University. Series of Philosophical and Political Studies], 6, 42-49. [in Ukrainian].
- Karmazina, M. (2010). Politychna nauka: predmet, struktura, metodolohiia [Political Science: Subject, Structure, Methodology]. *Politychnyi menedzhment* [Political Management], 1, 19-33. [in Ukrainian].
- Kovalchuk, M., Khvoynyska-Pereima, Kh., Shypunov, H., & Kovalchuk, Yu. (2024). Social Rationality as the Basis of Political Discourse. *Evrotsky Politycky a Pravni Diskurz* [European Political and Law Discourse], 11(1), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.46340/eppd.2024.11.1.3>
- Kuhn, T. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London.
- Mykhalchenko, M. (2016). Politychna problematyka u radianskomu suspilstvoznastvi (1922-1991) [Political Issues in Soviet Social Sciences (1922-1991)]. *Politychna nauka v Ukraini. 1991-2016: Politychna nauka: zachidni trendy rozvytku y ukrainska spetsyfika* [Political Science in Ukraine. 1991-2016. Political Science: Western Development Trends and Ukrainian Specificity]. Kyiv, 200-216. [in Ukrainian].
- Patnem, H. (2003). *Rozum, istyna y istoriia* [Reason, Truth and History]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
- Patochka, Ya. (2001). *Yeretychni ese pro filosofiui istorii* [Heretical Essays on the Philosophy of History]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
- Popper, K. (2002). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Milton Park.
- Rotar, N. (2016). Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidkhody v politychnykh doslidzhenniakh [Theoretical and Methodological Approaches in Political Research]. *Politychna nauka v Ukraini. 1991-2016: Politychna nauka: zachidni trendy rozvytku y ukrainska spetsyfika* [Political Science in Ukraine. 1991-2016. Political Science: Western Development Trends and Ukrainian Specificity]. Kyiv, 92-140. [in Ukrainian].
- Rudych, F. (2003). Politychna nauka v Ukraini: stan i perspektyvy [Political Science in Ukraine: State and Prospects]. *Politychnyi menedzhment* [Political Management], 1, 5-18. [in Ukrainian].
- Rutar, S. (2011). Chy mozhlyva chysta politolohiia v Ukraini? [Is Pure Political Science Possible in Ukraine?]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho Universytetu. Serii filosofsko-politolohichni studii* [Journal of Lviv University. Series of Philosophical and Political Studies], 1, 109-115. [in Ukrainian].
- Shypunov, H., & Kovalchuk, M. (2021). Dialogic Basis of the Categories of “Openness” and “Tolerance” to the “Other” in Modern Political Discourse – Martin Buber and Gabriel Marcel. *Studia Warmińskie* [Warmia Studies], 58, 87-99.

- Shypunov, H. (2018). Neomarksyzm ta ideino-instytutysiina evoliutsiia livoho politychnoho rukhu [Neo-Marxism and the Ideological and Institutional Evolution of the Left Political Movement]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho Universytetu. Seriiia filosofsko-politologichni studii* [Journal of Lviv University. Series of Philosophical and Political Studies], 19, 194-203. [in Ukrainian].
- Shypunov, H. (2018). Ideino-instytutysiina evoliutsiia KPRS v konteksti transformatsii politychnoho rezhymu SRSR [Ideological and Institutional Evolution of the CPSU in the Context of the Transformation of the Political Regime of the USSR]. *Hileia: naukovyi visnyk* [Hileia: Scientific Journal], 137, 365-369. [in Ukrainian].
- Vdovychyn, I. (2015). Perspektyvy zastosuvannia hermenevtychnoho pidkhodu dlia doslidzhennia ukrainskoi politychnoi dumky pershoi polovyny XX stolittia [Prospects for Applying the Hermeneutic Approach to the Study of Ukrainian Political Thought in the First Half of the 20th Century] *Politykus. Naukovyi zhurnal* [Politikus. Scientific Journal], 1, 5-10. [in Ukrainian].