

DOI 10.31558/2519-2949.2024.2.2

UDC 329.12

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7263-1958>

Kuts H., H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University

STATE POWER AGENDA IN THE CLASSICAL LIBERALISM DISCOURSE

The purpose of the article is to identify the specifics of the coverage of state power issues in the basic theories of the classical liberalism founders (J. Locke, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, A. Smith and others).

Methods. In methodological terms, the article focuses on the use of research in various areas of political and ideological knowledge. The set of general and special methods of political science became the methodological basis of the article, which provided a comprehensive approach to the problem of identifying the specifics of coverage of state power in the basic theories of the classical liberalism founders.

The methodological approach used to analyze the state power idea in the basic theories of the classical liberalism discourse founders, was the internalist version of the historical approach (St. Toulmin).

Results. It is stated that the issue of natural human rights (to life, liberty and property) became the basis of the classical liberalism discourse: the equality of all people from birth was postulated, the inalienability of natural rights was substantiated (no one can deprive people of these rights or dispose of them). In the conceptions of the classical liberalism discourse founders, the emphasis was mainly on the idea of the importance of the state power, on the idea of the need for the existence of such an institution as the state. The existence of the state was justified by the need to protect and preserve natural human rights. However, the state is called to protect the privacy and freedom of action (within the law), it was also considered that the scope and sphere of its activities should be restricted by setting limits on the spread of state power (the credo of non-interference «laissez faire»). The establishment of such boundaries presupposes the contractual nature of the relationship between state power and the individual, which excludes all forms of paternalism.

Keywords: *classical liberalism; state power; liberalism; ideology; discourse*

Introduction. The ideology of liberalism has attracted closer attention in various historical periods, in particular, in the context of choosing the most optimal model of government or strategy for its development. This actualizes the identification of dominant explications of the state power idea in the theories of the classical liberalism discourse founders, which would be adequate to modern socio-political realities.

The dominant ideas of classical liberalism are political and economic freedoms, natural rights of the individual, social contract, constitutionalism, separation of powers, limited government, political representation, rule of law, civil society, private property, tolerance, competition and so on. In the conceptual arsenal of liberal discourse of the classical period theoretical developments of different authors coexist, some of them are sometimes difficult to attribute to the liberals. However, their concepts in some way contributed to the formation of liberal ideas (J. Bentham, E. Burke, B. Constant, D. Diderot, G. W. F. Hegel, T. Hobbes, W. von Humboldt, D. Hume, I. Kant, J. Locke, J. St. Mill, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, J.-J. Rousseau, A. Smith, H. Spencer, A. de Tocqueville, Voltaire, etc.).

The political philosophy of classical liberalism, whose origins can be traced to the philosophy of the Stoics and late scholastics, was primarily a moral doctrine, arguing that rationality and charity are inherent in man at the essential level. Strictly speaking, the formation of classical liberalism began with the ideas of religious tolerance. Subsequently, liberalism has been actively expanding into the problems of the economic sphere, mastering in parallel the sphere of political freedoms.

The main task of liberal reforms is to limit the interference of state power in the private life of the individual (the state is the «night watchman», which almost no one notices). This restriction applies to the basic credo of liberalism – «laissez faire» (do not interfere; do not meddle). In classical liberalism, this credo meant the principle of non-interference of state power only in economic relations (both internal and external).

The interpretation of the liberal credo differed in the variety of conceptual explications, which was due not only to cultural and historical factors, but also to the views of individual theorists. For example, J. Locke and J. Madison, in the sense of the principle of «laissez faire», «preferred a government that would be limited

in scope (for purposes), but not in terms of powers (means)» [1, p. 204].

In classical liberalism, it was believed that the free interaction of individuals in various social spheres is balanced by itself (from analogy with the Newtonian picture of the world, according to which the free movement of atoms is eventually balanced). This idea became especially popular in the economic sphere, transforming into the idea of a free market regulated by the «invisible hand». However, modern liberalism has introduced the idea of the need for periodic correction of their activities by the state authorities into these notions of society or the economy as self-regulating spheres.

The pillar of classical liberalism was the philosophy of natural human rights (to life, freedom and property). The reflections of the classical liberalism discourse founders on the issue of state power and the importance of the existence of the state were based on the need to protect and preserve natural human rights.

Research methods. Methodologically, the article focuses on the use of research in various fields of political and ideological knowledge. The set of general and special methods of political science became the methodological basis of the article, which, in general, provided a comprehensive approach to the problem of identifying the specifics of coverage of state power in the basic theories of the classical liberalism founders.

The research methodology is based, in particular, on such general scientific principles as the unity of historical and logical, the ascent from the abstract to the concrete, objectivity, systematicity, the principles of analysis and synthesis, and so on.

The methodological approach used to analyze the idea of state power in the basic theories of the classical liberalism discourse founders was the internalist version of the historical approach (St. Toulmin): «internal» transformation of key ideas within the classical liberal doctrine.

Presenting main material. Classical liberalism is primarily associated with the names of J. Locke, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, A. Smith et al.

Since liberalism owes its origin to a combination of different factors, let us turn to the historical approach to identify them. Applying a historical approach to the analysis of the idea of state power in the classical liberalism discourse involves considering this problem in two interrelated contexts. According to St. Toulmin (post-positivist direction of philosophy of science), when using the historical approach to analyze various phenomena within a particular science, the differences between two styles of historical approach should be taken into account: internalism and externalism [2]. While internalism focuses on changes in the content of a scientific discipline or scientific phenomenon, externalism focuses on the connections of science (or scientific phenomenon) with the wider social context. Thus, it should be borne in mind that different interpretations of the essence of classical liberalism are also due to certain differences in approaches to the study of the problem. Externalists are more interested in «external» considerations (socio-economic, political, religious and other factors that led to the emergence of a particular phenomenon). Internalists study the historical changes due to which different scientific ideas change each other, that is, they are interested in «internal» considerations (ideas that affect the change of scientific views on a particular phenomenon).

Accordingly, in the array of concepts devoted to the study of the phenomenon of classical liberalism, we can distinguish two approaches: external (dependence of the ideas of classical liberalism on external factors: religious, sociocultural, philosophical, socio-political, etc.) and internalist («internal» transformation of liberal ideas within different concepts of classical liberal discourse). Since the scope of application of both internalist and externalist methods is limited, the problem lies in their optimal ratio, synthesis. For example, historiography presents liberalism as a sequence of interrelated processes. Sociology interprets it as a consequence of the success of a particular social order. Both interpretations, respectively, are not equivalent.

Thus, to analyze the idea of state power in the basic theories of the classical liberalism discourse founders, we turn to the internalist version of the historical approach: «internal» transformation of key ideas within the classical liberal doctrine.

John Locke is one of the most famous founders of classical liberalism. In his opinion, all people, being endowed with natural rights, are equal from birth, so no circumstances (except their own consent) can force an individual to obey the will of another. Everyone's natural rights – the right to life, liberty and private property – are inalienable, that is, no one can deprive people of these rights or dispose of them. Since natural rights are the most important for a man, there is a need for the functioning of such a political institution as the state, because the existence of the state is justified by the protection of natural rights. Moreover,

the primary and main goal of uniting people in community and transferring themselves to the power of the government is to preserve property [3, p. 195]. Regarding property, E. Burke noted that the first concern of civilized society is not the requirements of the state, and the property of the individual citizen [4, p. 28]. It should be noted that the concept of property in the interpretation of J. Locke includes three components: Lives, Liberties and Estates. That is, the functions of a liberal state are limited to protecting these rights. All other functions that the state can assume will mean not only interference in the private life of the individual, but also a deviation from liberal principles. Moreover, no argument that the state is forced to expand its obligations because it creates the necessary services for people (which, for example, are currently impossible to find in the service market) is unjustified from the point of view of classical liberalism.

J. Locke's basic ideas (concerning the state of nature, property, social contract, constitutional principles, tolerance, etc.) spread in the XVIII century not only on the European continent, but also in North America. Thus, at the beginning of the text of the American Declaration of Independence, adopted on July 4, 1776 by the US Congress, there are words that embody the fundamental idea of J. Locke's political philosophy: «that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness» [5]. It should be noted that the original «formula» of J. Locke («life, liberty and property») in the Declaration of Independence was replaced by the following: «life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness». This substitution, according to F. Brodi, who was a biographer of T. Jefferson, was conscious. After all, T. Jefferson questioned the identification of freedom with property, which was the cornerstone of J. Locke's political philosophy. The problem was that the identification of freedom with property discriminated against those segments of the population who did not own property. Therefore, T. Jefferson proposed the definition «the pursuit of happiness» instead of the concept of «property» [6, p. 46].

Later, J. Locke's ideas were in a way embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN General Assembly resolution of December 10, 1948: «Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person» [7, art. 3].

J. Locke's doctrine of state power, the necessity of which is determined only by the protection of citizens' rights, is considered indisputable for the entire liberal discourse. It is believed that certain origins of ideas about representative democracy should also be found in his political philosophy. In addition, the categorical apparatus of modern political science includes Locke's «notion of consent, i.e. the recognition of a certain form of *government* by the majority of citizens, and *trust*, i.e. when parliament and government use political power as proxies of the people and may lose that trust» [8, p. 241].

As for the idea of the natural state, as well as the thesis that this state is characterized by complete freedom, we note that they became relevant only in the New Age, being unacceptable for ancient or Renaissance texts. Among the authors of the seventeenth century, these hypotheses gave rise to the doctrine that these original freedoms should be recognized as a God-given innate right, and thus as a set of natural law [9, p. 19]. As noted by L. von Mises, a set of theorems on this idea crystallizes from a variety of doctrines of natural law [10, p. 45]. First, it is an idea that postulates a certain order of things given by nature, in relation to which the individual – if he seeks to succeed – must adapt his/her own actions. Secondly, to know the specified order of things a person can use only one of his/her abilities – thinking and reasoning. Moreover, all social practices or institutions fall under this reasoning (even if it concerns the expediency of these institutions existence). Third, there are no other criteria for evaluating all kinds of individual or social actions but the results of these actions. Eventually, the idea of natural rights led to rationalism and utilitarianism.

The theoretical developments of Ch.-L. de Montesquieu had a significant influence on the formation of the ideas of liberalism. Regarding the understanding of the natural state of the individual, he believed that the key role in this state is played by the desire for security and peace [11]. Thus, T. Hobbes, characterized this state as «war of all against all» [12], loneliness, poverty and brutality. Contrary to this position, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu undermines such an understanding of the natural state, which not only reduces human nature to instincts, but also, by demonstrating the disparate actions of individuals, denies the interaction between them. Accordingly, a man should be perceived as a social being, whose existence is associated with a certain society from birth. In addition, a man – as a social being – has certain moral qualities.

Distinguishing three forms of government (republic, monarchy and despotism), Ch.-L. de Montesquieu takes a double-natured approach to defining their essence, estimating the number of bearers of sovereignty and the method of governance (meaning the institutional division of «sovereign power») [11, p. 22].

If in a republic – where he distinguishes between democratic and aristocratic types – power belongs to a part of the people, then under monarchy or despotism the highest power becomes dependent on the whims of one person. Subsequently, to evaluate these forms of government Ch.-L. de Montesquieu draws on purely anthropological principles, which, being determined by the specifics of human nature, have a significant impact on the system of government. Thus, for example, for the functioning of two types of republic there is a need for the existence of specific anthropological features [11, p. 22]: morality (vertu) – for democracy and moderation – for the aristocracy. If for the monarchy the need for such a trait as ambition (bonheur) is paramount, then for the despotic form of government it is necessary to cultivate fear (crainte). Despotism is considered an unacceptable form of government by Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, because under such conditions freedom is oppressed.

Reflecting on the constitution as a guarantee of freedom, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu distinguishes the legislative, executive and judicial functions of power in order to prevent the destruction of freedom [11]. This is the division of functions he proposed to consolidate between different holders of power in order to prevent its concentration in the hands of one person or association. As the theorist noted: in order to avoid the possibility of abuse of power, we need such an order of things in which different authorities could restrain each other [11]. The idea of separation of powers proposed by Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, becoming the cornerstone of liberal discourse, is embodied today in the Constitutions of most countries.

The contribution to the theory of liberalism of A. Smith, who is considered the founder of classical political economy, relates primarily to the economic sphere. In his opinion, in conditions of competition, individuals, pursuing their own interests, are able to create an optimally balanced social order. Further back, Aristotle noted that «people care most about what belongs to them personally» [13, p. 41].

A person who pursues his own interests, thus serves the interests of society to a greater extent than when he consciously seeks to do so [14, p. 905]. It is in such a society that the economy is organized spontaneously, because the artificial regulation of industry can not be beneficial to society in comparison with the state of the economy in which it would be provided «to itself».

According to A. Smith, the main goal of the state is the policy of non-interference in the activities of individuals, because only when the individual takes into account his own benefit, it inevitably «leads him to choose the occupation that is most beneficial to society» [14, p. 906]. In addition, economic growth mechanisms must be provided: the expansion of markets, the division of labor and the accumulation of capital, which will help increase labor productivity and production performance.

In classical liberal discourse, the philosophy of the Enlightenment led to the understanding of human activity not only as rational but also as responsible [15]. This was an important step in the formation of the theory of liberalism, as it was previously believed that a society based on liberal principles was chosen mainly by selfish individuals. Later it became clear that a liberal can be considered a person who, being highly moral, combines his own interests with public and is able to take responsibility for the realization of these interests. In addition, it was believed that the law (rule of law) should be the main regulator of socio-political relations in society, not individuals.

The end of the XIX century was marked by doubts about the universality of the principles of rationalism and the indisputability of historical progress. It is then that liberalism, having in some way got rid of radicalism, acquires the features of evolution and moderate pragmatism. Not in the least, the concepts of utilitarianism and positivism (J. Bentham, A. Comte, J. St. Mill, H. Spencer, etc.) contributed to this.

The ideas of the philosophy of utilitarianism (J. Bentham, J. St. Mill, etc.) had a significant influence on the further transformation of liberalism. E. Bentham translated the abstract interpretation of liberalism into the practical plane by introducing the concept of utility to understand the motivation of the individual. According to him, a person, seeking pleasure from life, tries to avoid suffering. Therefore, he is guided by the principle of benefit both in relation to other individuals and in relation to the state, which acts as an instrument for the realization of individual motives.

However, it should be noted that the utilitarianism of J. Bentham and J. St. Mill gives more power to the state than classical liberalism. Strictly speaking, utilitarianism gave impetus to the ideas of social security, becoming a kind of harbinger of modern liberalism.

Classical liberalism was based on the fact that there are two types of social evolution: natural, which characterizes the processes taking place in civil society, and artificial, which is imposed by the state from the top down [6, p. 45].

The ideas of evolutionism in the social sphere were most actively developed by H. Spencer, who argued that social evolution should be characterized by complete harmony between practical activities and

beliefs [16, p. 53]. He noted that in the course of social evolution, custom precedes the law [16, p. 45]. Moreover, if the custom was established, it became law, receiving an official sanction and a certain form. Adhering to Darwin's theory of evolution and applying it into the social sphere, H. Spencer noted that if only able individuals survive, then only infinitely happier results are obtained.

With regard to liberalism, H. Spencer believed that at the dawn of its formation, it correlated with the industrial type of social organization, which is based on a voluntary system of cooperation. The Tory political party, which opposed the Liberals, was associated with a militant type of social organization based on a system of forcible cooperation. Over time, truly liberal changes have reduced compulsory cooperation in social life and increased voluntary [16, p. 7]. In his opinion, voluntary cooperation can replace forcible cooperation only gradually, by evolutionary methods.

The idea of the reformist nature of liberalism, which H. Spencer actively developed, does not really belong to him. One of the first theorists to argue for reform was J. St. Mill [17]. However, despite the fact that the oldest reform, according to E. Burke, is the reform of the Grand Charter of Liberties [4, p. 17], I. Kant can be considered the first ideologue of liberal reformism. Linking freedom with reason, he argued that reason restricts in itself unbounded freedom, noting that reason gives laws that are imperatives, ie objective laws of freedom [18, p. 455]. In his opinion, the implementation of reform changes should be gradual, which will exclude methods of violence.

Conclusions. Thus, the ideas of classical liberalism have had a powerful influence on the formation of the entire modern European socio-political landscape.

It has been argued that in general classical liberalism ideas enriched the political discourse: issues of state power, individual freedoms, inalienability of natural rights, separation of powers, constitutionalism, rule of law, parliamentarism and more.

The idea of state power in the basic theories of the classical liberalism discourse founders has been considered (J. Locke, Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, A. Smith, etc.).

It is stated that the issue of natural human rights (to life, freedom and property) became the basis of the classical liberalism discourse: equality of all people from birth was postulated, the inalienability of natural rights (no one can deprive people of these rights or dispose of them) was justified. The existence of the state and, in fact, the idea of state power were justified by the need to protect and preserve natural human rights. However, although the state has to protect the privacy and freedom of action (within the law), it was considered necessary to limit the scope and sphere of its activities, setting limits to the spread of state power (credo of non-interference «laissez faire»). Establishing such boundaries implies a contractual nature of the relationship between government and the individual, which excludes all forms of paternalism.

The discourse of classical liberalism in the perception of socio-political development gives priority to the evolutionary nature of development and spontaneous initiatives, which, on the one hand, involves the implementation of reform strategies in public space, and, on the other – market mechanisms in economic space.

References:

1. Zwesper, J. (2000). «Liberalism», *Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, in Sigov, K., Skurativsky, V., Finberg, L. (Eds.), Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. PP. 203–207.
2. Toulmin, S. E. (1972). *Human Understanding: General Introduction and Part I*. Clarendon Press.
3. Locke, J. (2001). *Two treatises on governance*. Kyiv: Solomiya Pavlychko Publishing House, Osnovy. 265 p.
4. Burke, E. (1790). *Reflections on the Revolution in France*.
URL: <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/burke1790part1.pdf> (accessed: 03.04.2024).
5. The Declaration of Independence. The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America. (1776). URL: <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20220929/115171/HHRG-117-GO00-20220929-SD010.pdf> (accessed: 03.04.2024).
6. Kuts, H. M. (2011). *Liberal transformations of political space*. Kharkiv: Virovets A. P.; Apostrof. 300 p.
7. United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948.
URL: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights> (accessed: 03.04.2024).
8. Prychepiy, Ye. (Ed.). (2002). *Classics of political thought from Plato to Max Weber*. Kyiv: Tandem. 584 p.
9. Skinner, K. (2003). *Liberty before Liberalism*. URL: <https://www.democraziapura.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Quentin-Skinner.-Liberty-before-liberalism.-Cambridge-University-Press-Cambridge-1998.pdf> (accessed: 03.04.2024).
10. Mises, L. von. (2007). *Theory and History: An Interpretation of Social and Economic Evolution*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
URL: https://cdn.mises.org/Theory%20and%20History%20An%20Interpretation%20of%20Social%20and%20Economic%20Evolution_1.pdf (accessed: 03.04.2024).

11. Montesquieu, Ch. De. (2017). *L'esprit des lois*. – URL: http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/montesquieu/de_esprit_des_lois/partie_1/esprit_des_lois_Livre_1.pdf (accessed: 03.04.2024).
12. Hobbes, T. (2000). *Leviathan of The Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Thomas_Hobbes/Leviafan_abo_Sut_budova_i_povnovazhennia_derzhavy_tserkovnoi_ta_svitskoi.pdf (accessed: 03.04.2024).
13. Aristotle. (2000). *Politics*. Kyiv: Osnovy. 239 p. URL: <http://litopys.org.ua/aristotle/arist.htm> (accessed: 03.04.2024).
14. Smith, A. (2018). *An Inquire into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Smit_Adam/Bahatstvo_narodiv_Doslidzhennia_pro_pryrodu_ta_prychyny_dobrobutu_natsii.pdf (accessed: 03.04.2024).
15. Kuts, H. M. (2011). Transformational Potential of Liberalism in the Political Space. Abstract of the D.Sc. diss. (polit. sci). Chernivtsi: Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University. 36 p.
16. Spenser, H. (1884) *The Man versus the State, with Six essays on Government, Society and Freedom*. URL: http://files.libertyfund.org/files/330/Spencer_0020.pdf (accessed: 03.04.2024).
17. Mill, J. St. (2001). *About freedom: essay*. Kyiv: Solomiya Pavlychko Publishing House, Osnovy. 463 p.
18. Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of pure reason*. Kyiv: Universe. 504 p.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Звеспер, Дж. (2000). Лібералізм // *Енциклопедія політичної думки*. Редколег.: К. Сігов, В. Скуратівський, Л. Фінберг. К.: Дух і Літера. С. 203–207.
2. Toulmin, S. E. (1972). *Human Understanding: General Introduction and Part I*. Clarendon Press.
3. Лок, Дж. (2001). *Два трактати про врядування*. – К.: Видавництво Соломії Павличко «Основи». 265 с.
4. Burke, E. (1790). *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. URL: <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/burke1790part1.pdf> (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
5. The Declaration of Independence. The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America. (1776). URL: <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20220929/115171/HHRG-117-GO00-20220929-SD010.pdf> (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
6. Куц, Г. М. (2011). *Ліберальні трансформації політичного простору*. Монографія. Харків: Віровець А. П.; «Апостроф». 300 с.
7. United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948. URL: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights> (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
8. Класики політичної думки від Платона до Макса Вебера (2002). Ред. Є. Причепій. Київ: ВК ТОВ «Тандем». 584 с.
9. Skinner, K. (2003). *Liberty before Liberalism*. URL: <https://www.democraziapura.it/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Quentin-Skinner.-Liberty-before-liberalism.-Cambridge-University-Press-Cambridge-1998.pdf> (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
10. Mises, L. von. (2007). *Theory and History: An Interpretation of Social and Economic Evolution*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute. URL: https://cdn.mises.org/Theory%20and%20History%20An%20Interpretation%20of%20Social%20and%20Economic%20Evolution_1.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
11. Montesquieu, Ch. De. (2017). *L'esprit des lois*. – URL: http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/montesquieu/de_esprit_des_lois/partie_1/esprit_des_lois_Livre_1.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
12. Гоббс, Т. (2000). *Левіафан, або Суть, будова і повноваження держави церковної та цивільної*. Київ: Дух і Літера. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Thomas_Hobbes/Leviafan_abo_Sut_budova_i_povnovazhennia_derzhavy_tserkovnoi_ta_svitskoi.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
13. Арістотель. (2000). *Політика*. Київ: Основи. 239 с. URL: <http://litopys.org.ua/aristotle/arist.htm> (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
14. Сміт, А. (2018). *Дослідження про природу і причини багатства народів*. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Smit_Adam/Bahatstvo_narodiv_Doslidzhennia_pro_pryrodu_ta_prychyny_dobrobutu_natsii.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
15. Куц, Г. М. (2011). Трансформаційний потенціал лібералізму в політичному просторі: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня докт. політ. наук : спец. 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути та процеси». Чернівці: Чернівецький національний університет імені Ю. Федьковича. 36 с.
16. Spenser, H. (1884) *The Man versus the State, with Six essays on Government, Society and Freedom*. URL: http://files.libertyfund.org/files/330/Spencer_0020.pdf (дата звернення: 03.04.2024).
17. Міл, Дж. Ст. (2001). *Про свободу: есе*. Київ: Видавництво Соломії Павличко «Основи». 463 с.
18. Кант, І. (2000). *Критика чистого розуму*. Київ: «Юніверс». 504 с.

Куц Г. М. Питання державної влади в дискурсі класичного лібералізму

Метою статті стало виявлення специфічних особливостей у висвітленні проблематики державної влади у ключових теоріях фундаторів класичного лібералізму (Дж. Локк, Ш-Л. Монтеск'є, А. Сміт та ін.) У методологічному плані стаття зорієнтована на використання досліджень з різних напрямків політико-ідеологічного знання. Сукупність загальнонаукових та спеціальних методів політичної науки стала методологічною основою статті, що забезпечило комплексний підхід до проблеми виявлення специфіки висвітлення проблематики державної влади у базових теоріях фундаторів класичного лібералізму. Методологічним підходом, застосованим для аналізу ідеї державної влади у базових теоріях фундаторів дискурсу класичного лібералізму, став інтерналістський варіант історичного підходу (Ст. Тулмін). Констатовано, що проблематика природних прав людини (на життя, на свободу і на власність) стала основою дискурсу класичного лібералізму: постулювалася рівність усіх людей від народження, обґрунтовувалася невідчужуваність природних прав (ніхто не може ні позбавляти людей цих прав, ні розпоряджатися ними). У концепціях фундаторів дискурсу класичного лібералізму акценти переважно були сфокусовані на ідеї важливості проблематики державної влади, на ідеї необхідності існування такого інституту як держава. Існування держави обґрунтовувалося необхідністю захисту та збереження природних прав людини. Втім, хоча держава й покликана захищати приватне життя індивіда та свободу його дій (в рамках закону), вважалося, що слід обмежити об'єм та сфери її діяльності, встановлюючи межі поширення державної влади (кредо невтручання «laissez faire»). Встановлення таких меж передбачає договірний характер відносин між державною владою та індивідом, що виключає всілякі форми патерналізму.

Ключові слова: класичний лібералізм; державна влада; лібералізм; ідеологія; дискурс.