

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC ACADEMY OF UZBEKISTAN

KHURRAMOV MUSURMAN KELDIYOROVICH

STUDY GUIDE

POLITICAL TECHNOLOGY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Toshkent – 2025

UDC
BBC

**Khurramov M.K. / Political technology in international relations / Study guide.
– Tashkent. 2025. -186 p.**

The study guide explores the role of political technologies in shaping modern political processes, particularly in the international arena. The book delves into key themes such as political communication, the influence of mass media, and the application of information technology in governance and political decision-making.

A significant portion of the guide is dedicated to practical applications, highlighting case studies and real-world examples of political consulting, crisis management, and electoral strategies. Additionally, the book examines how advancements in digital communication and information technology impact political campaigns, state security, and global diplomatic efforts.

Overall, Political Technology in International Relations serves as a valuable resource for students, researchers, and policymakers seeking to understand the evolving dynamics of political influence in a technologically driven world.

Author: M.Khurramov, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Historical Sciences.

Reviewers:

B.Berdiyev – Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Political Sciences, Associate Professor.

A.Johns – Chief Executive, Advance HE, The UK, Professor.

The study guide was recommended for publication pursuant to Order No. 136 of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan, dated April 14, 2025.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	4
1. Political communication.....	6
2. Information technology	27
3. The role of technology in political process	45
4. Political analysis.....	55
5. Political consulting.....	81
6. Political management and political PR	96
7. Decision-making in politics	109
8. Control technology and conflict management	136
9. The genesis and current state of political management	154
10. Political campaign and process in political management	167
Conclusion.....	178
List of references	181

PREFACE

In the 21st century, the intersection of politics and technology has become one of the most dynamic and transformative forces shaping the global landscape. The rapid advancement of information and communication technologies, the proliferation of digital platforms, and the increasing reliance on data-driven decision-making have fundamentally altered the way political processes are conducted, both domestically and internationally. In this context, the study of political technology – the tools, techniques, and methodologies used to influence, manage, and analyze political processes – has emerged as a critical field of inquiry for scholars, practitioners, and students of international relations.

This study guide, *Political Technology in International Relations*, is designed to provide a comprehensive and in-depth exploration of the key themes, concepts, and practices that define the use of political technology in the modern world. The guide is structured around several core themes, each of which addresses a different dimension of political technology, from the intricacies of political communication and the role of mass media to the application of advanced information technologies, political consulting, and decision-making processes. By examining these themes, the guide seeks to bridge the gap between theory and practice, offering both a theoretical foundation and practical insights into the tools and techniques that drive political outcomes.

The first theme, *Political Communication*, delves into the essence of communicative processes in politics, exploring how information is transmitted, interpreted, and utilized by political actors. It examines the role of mass media in shaping public opinion, the structure of political communication systems, and the challenges posed by the rapid dissemination of information in the digital age. The second theme, *Information Technology*, focuses on the role of technology in the political information market, highlighting the use of propaganda, advertising, and computer technologies in political campaigns and decision-making processes.

The guide also explores the concept of *Political Technologies* as a set of methods and tools used to achieve political goals, emphasizing the importance of

rational, effective, and strategic approaches to political action. It further examines the role of Political Analysis in understanding and solving complex political problems, providing a framework for analyzing political phenomena and making informed decisions. The theme of Political Consulting highlights the growing importance of expert advice and strategic planning in political processes, particularly in the context of elections, governance, and crisis management.

Finally, the guide addresses the role of Public Relations and Political Management in shaping the relationship between political actors and the public, emphasizing the importance of transparency, trust, and ethical communication in building a cooperative environment between the state and society. It also explores the complexities of Decision-Making in Politics, examining the processes, technologies, and challenges involved in formulating and implementing political decisions at the state level.

In an era where information is power, understanding how political technologies influence public opinion, shape political narratives, and drive decision-making is essential for anyone engaged in the study or practice of international relations. This guide aims to provide comprehensive and accessible resource for students, researchers, and practitioners, offering both theoretical insights and practical tools for navigating the complex and ever-changing field of political technology.

As you engage with this guide, we encourage you to critically reflect on the ethical implications of political technology and its impact on democracy, governance, and international relations. By doing so, we can ensure that these powerful tools are used not only to achieve strategic objectives but also to promote transparency, accountability, and the public good.

1. POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

1. The essence and specific features of communicative processes in the field of politics. The nature of communication as a political process. The structure of political communication.
2. Mass political communications. The essence and specific features of mass political communications. Mass media in the system of mass communications. The structure of mass media and problems of their activities.
3. Public opinion. The concept of public opinion. Specific features, structure, and functions of public opinion. The formation of public opinion.

The essence and specific features of communicative processes in the field of politics. The nature of communication as a political process. In the sphere of public authority, the formation and activity of various ideologies, values, symbols, doctrines, official rules, and the opinions and oppositional debates of various actors constitute a special political process. Its essence lies in the fact that political subjects, through the transmission and exchange of information, make their existence known to various contracting parties and establish connections that allow them to play various political roles. In turn, the purposeful relationships between people exchanging various information and knowledge unite different levels of the political system. This enables government institutions to carry out their specific tasks in the management of the state and society. The development of democracy, the growth and complexity of political relations and interactions, increase the use of knowledge and information. In the future, if we trust the prediction of A. Toffler, the increasing role of knowledge and intellectual technologies in societal life will not only fundamentally change the means of creating societal wealth but also qualitatively renew the styles of mutual political influence among people, as well as ensure their management by society.

However, not all information is equally valuable to people in politics. Specifically, the information flow that is important to them in the sphere of state

authority or executive tasks, as well as in implementing relevant actions, preparing, and making decisions, is called political information. In this sense, information is the initial condition of every political subject's actions and, at the same time, an important resource that enables effective mutual actions to achieve certain goals in the field of politics.

Information is a basic characteristic of political reality, like matter and energy. Depending on the availability or absence of necessary information, a subject may gain or lose power, influence, and the ability to realize their interests in the political sphere. In this context, obtaining necessary information becomes a specific goal for every subject moving in politics and seeking to exert influence on power. Information is a mechanism that ensures the purposeful actions of subjects, and its accumulation helps coordinate the actions of subjects and government institutions. At the same time, information that cannot find a solution in people's practical actions weakens the basis of their political status and damages corresponding traditions.

The transmission of information in every state necessarily requires the use of certain technical means (from goose feathers to new carriers of electronic information), which is why information processes include corresponding systematic components. These primarily include technical channels for disseminating information, as well as structures that not only transmit and discard information (in correct or incorrect interpretations) but also collect, control, store, and protect it.

Since people interpret the content of information based on certain rules, customs, tools (codes), and even their personal states, the conscious reception of a message by a subject is of great importance in the information exchange process. This aspect of the subjective assimilation and interpretation of information is called the process of establishing conscious connections between communicators (senders of political information) and recipients (receivers). Such precision shows that not all information can establish appropriate connections between political subjects. For example, the politically unacceptable activities of mass media for people lead not to the improvement of relations with them but to their deterioration. In other words, the communicative aspects of information relations show that the exchange of messages

is not a technical process devoid of specific characteristics that do not take into account the specific aspects of recipients as participants in real political relations. In practice, for example, many decisions, even those made at the highest levels of state government, may be made under the influence of the emotions of political managers, contrary to the information received. Therefore, the received information is the initial condition of political actions, not their factor.

Thus, it can be emphasized that from the perspective of people exchanging various information in the sphere of public authority, all government institutions and mechanisms are tools for processing information flows and relatively free structures in the information market. The effectiveness of their activities depends on their ability to regulate information and establish conscious connections with other subjects. At the same time, political subjects themselves also change their appearance, where they can manifest as various information carriers: information elites (deytocracy), technobureaucracy (service personnel controlling shift information), communicators (senders of information), communicants (processors and interpreters of information), recipients (receivers of information), and others.

In this context, based on the consideration of politics from the perspective of information-communicative relations, we understand it as a social unity whose structure and institutions are aimed at producing, receiving, and processing information, requiring political subjects to fulfill their various roles and tasks. From the perspective of the technical parts of information exchange, political institutions can be imagined as a socio-technological system aimed at purposefully transmitting, exchanging, and protecting information.

In turn, in such a political system, information-communicative relations manifest as a connecting process that ensures the interaction and integration of all levels of the system and the performance of all its main tasks: collective relations, organization, justification, control, and others. This is a unique connecting fabric that gives the political system anti-entropic aspects (the ability to preserve integrity) and enriches the activities of institutions, subjects, and power bearers with the

characteristics of independent organization and development, and the ability to eliminate unfavorable conditions for their development.

The theoretical interpretation of information-communicative processes.

K.Deutsch was the first to interpret the political system as an information-communicative system. At the same time, the approach he proposed was later theoretically continued in two forms. In particular, Jürgen Habermas emphasized communicative actions and the corresponding elements of politics (values, rules, teaching actions) and described them as the basis of social and political order. In contrast, the German scholar G.Schelsky formed the idea of a “technical state” (1965) by prioritizing the technical aspects of political organization over social ones. According to this approach, the state should minimally comply with the will and interests of individual citizens and groups. As the direction and means of activity, the logical, strict requirements of modern technology should be considered. The “apparatus of power,” the increasing efficiency of the use of technology, turns the state and politics into a tool for rationally and safely managing all social relations. As a result, to justify the development of such views and the formation of the “information society,” a number of scholars (D.Michn, R.Johnson) proposed a hyper-rational interpretation of political relations, giving a decisive role to computer technology in overcoming social ills (hunger, fear, political conflicts).

The modern level of development of the political system has indeed demonstrated that the role of information-technological tools in organizing political life, especially in industrially developed countries, is increasing to a certain extent. This is particularly evident in the emergence of additional technical capabilities in conducting elections (e.g., the electronic system of interactive relations), the increasing role of mass media in political processes, the fragmentation of many previous hierarchical relations in state management, the strengthening of the autonomy of lower structures in state management, and others. However, these are only initial conditions that expand the capabilities of government institutions and subjects, but they do not eliminate the place of political interests and conflicts between groups.

The structure of political communication. In terms of content, this process, which connects the sphere of politics, reflects the interaction of various information-communicative systems, i.e., the sum of connections and relations formed around a particular flow of messages related to solving a specific task. For example, political information and corresponding relations can be formed in the state based on decision-making, conducting election campaigns, managing a particular political crisis, and others. Therefore, for each such situation, an appropriate database is created, criteria for assessing the reliability and completeness of information are put forward, the structure and forms of communication between subjects are determined (e.g., how federal and regional government bodies should exchange information), and within their framework, political targets and symbols are developed.

The various goals and methods of political processes, the existence of systems and participants, as well as other dimensions of solving specific tasks in the sphere of state authority, lead to a wide range of information-communicative exchanges among people. Under each information process lies a linear structure of communication that highlights important aspects specific to each information exchange system and process. According to G.Lasswell, the basis of such a structure is formed by answering the questions: who speaks? what is said? through which channel? to whom? under what circumstances?

Another, more complex structure of information-communicative processes takes into account the consideration of various levels. In this context, the Canadian scholar D.Thomson proposed distinguishing the semantic, technical, and influential levels of information-communicative relations. The given levels help to identify the most important and qualitatively distinct components of information-communicative processes. These components, on the one hand, ensure their existence, and on the other hand, determine the effective interaction of political subjects with their information partners.

The semantic level reveals the dependence of the processes of information transmission and communication formation between subjects on the applied linguistic and symbolic forms. In other words, this perspective considers people's

ability to use linguistic tools (symbols, signs, images) that preserve or hinder the meaning and essence of transmitted symbols and information and ensure their correct interpretation by recipients. In this sense, the various means of information transmission used by political subjects (official and unofficial), both verbal (oral) and non-verbal (gestures, body movements, speech range, laughter, language rules, etc.), are taken into account. Essentially, the separation of semantic systems shows the meaning of such linguistic forms that may or may not establish communication in mutual information exchange. For example, state bodies often formulate political texts in an overly theoretical manner, which makes them difficult for ordinary citizens to understand and reduces the government's mobilization capabilities. Separate newspapers, magazines, and television channels widely use foreign or special terms, which complicates the semantic reading of information by ordinary people. In this context, the mismatch of semantic structures to the type of information, the capabilities of subjects, or their internal defects can lead not to connecting results in government and public relations but to a communicative vacuum, which can have long-term negative political consequences.

In this regard, as an example, it can be mentioned that during the perestroika years, the communist system lost the information war against democrats mainly because it used a “new party language” that did not correspond to reality and aroused distrust among the population towards terms like “human democratic socialism,” “socialist pluralism of ideas,” and others.

Thus, the state and its official structures should use such linguistic forms that eliminate contradictions between specialized and non-specialized applicants of government information. Official texts should embody linguistic forms that help the population clearly understand their meaning. In this context, leaders in their speeches should use simple words that strengthen the semantic closeness of the language of managers and the managed. Therefore, state information should be linguistically diverse and at the same time semantically unified.

In implementing information relations in politics, the technical means at the disposal of subjects occupy an important place, and this invites discussion about the

technical level of information-communication processes. From this perspective, the information activities of political subjects are considered as the operational activities of special organizational structures, personnel centers, data banks, information transmission and storage technologies, and networks. The place and importance of all such tools of communication are determined by their ability to transmit a particular information unchanged, on time, and to the right place.

The emergence of such organizational-technological, non-social layers of information-communicative processes helps to focus on eliminating various obstacles (noises) that hinder the timely and continuous transmission of information in the political system. Such obstacles include differences between information carriers (paper and electronic), time constraints in obtaining information important for the subject, the low capacity of transmission channels, the low qualification of information-gathering personnel, and others.

The importance of having technical channels in establishing information relations shows that as an important institution of state power, it must have the necessary number of channels for disseminating official information, in particular, speech (briefings, leaders' interviews, etc.) or paper-related (government bulletins, publications in newspapers and magazines), as well as visual and electronic (state television channels, federal and regional communication systems, etc.) channels that ensure continuous communication with its citizens. The state must have the opportunity to choose effective channels (central or local bodies of publishing, radio, or television channels) to establish direct communication with the population and disseminate important information. In this case, information channels must always work accurately, and special means must be used with maximum care. At the same time, the state's technical capabilities must necessarily correspond to the means of receiving information available to the population. Otherwise, information-technical standards may exclude a certain part of the population from communication with the state. At the same time, the state must continuously improve the protection tools of its information networks to protect secret messages from rivals.

Third, the influential level of state information-communicative activity reveals the degree of influence of information on human consciousness. The parts specific to this level of information-communicative relations and interactions are characterized by conditions related to the strength of the spiritual influence of the goals, values, and ideas proposed by the state and the party on citizens. Essentially, this systematic level determines the foundations, primary conditions, and factors of the effectiveness of ideas and representations circulating in the information market.

To increase the effectiveness of their activities in this direction, political subjects must take into account the targeting of information transmission, the specific aspects of the audience working with a particular message. The formed slogans and appeals must correspond to the conditions of the social environment, be based on the main traditions and customs, patterns, and habits in group and mass consciousness. Ensuring the unity of the meaning and time dimensions of information messages is also of great importance. Such unity requires that every idea accepted by people corresponds to the physical time of their existence. For example, one of the reasons for the loss of the previous ideological influence of communist ideology in the USSR was the official propaganda in the 70s and 80s that a “developed socialist” society that had overcome all social conflicts had been built in the country. People who faced many problems and conflicts in life, seeing the replacement of real relations with invented political images, lost respect for this ideology and system.

Mass political communications. The essence and specific features of mass political communications. The various levels of information-communicative relations have specific characteristics depending on their implementation in the processes of interpersonal communication, group, and mass communication. In each of these processes, the acting subjects themselves form their directions, organize technical channels and information exchange systems, and increase the ideological effectiveness of the disseminated directions.

For politics, the primary place is played by mass information-communicative processes. At this level, political agents specially trained to interact with public

opinion operate in the organization of information relations. Usually, they include: official institutions of the state (represented by their leaders and managers, as well as representatives of the information and public relations department); state (national) mass media (mass media); independent and opposition mass media; corporate structures (parties, collective organizations, specialized political advertising agencies, etc.); foreign mass media.

The interaction of these agents mainly forms an information market where they can implement their political strategies aimed at achieving their interests in the sphere of power. Considering the diversity of methods and means used by political agents to establish connections with their counterparts and transmit information, two types of actions in the information field can be distinguished: mobilized, which includes propaganda and agitation, and marketed, which manifests in public relations (PR) styles, as well as in political advertising.

These methods of information interaction are characterized by opposite styles of behavior of subjects in the information field. In this context, propaganda and agitation reflect methods of controlling information behind people and socially directing their political actions. According to the Belgian scholar G. Toveron, propaganda does not provide people with a choice, it instills certain changes in thoughts, beliefs, and actions. According to Gebrels, propaganda is a tool of “social control” that aims not to change people's minds but to attract supporters and ensure their obedient actions. The scheme of such information interaction is: “the information sender said - the information receiver did.” The classic examples of using such one-sided methods of providing the public with information led to totalitarian systems that chose the path of destroying human independence and statism in their consciousness.

In general, no state, no political subject interested in expanding social support for its power-related goals, can influence public opinion without using propaganda and agitation methods. However, the use of these forms of action in the information market can also lead to qualitative changes in both information and communication processes. That is, the desire to systematically control the actions and consciousness

of citizens, continuously manage public consciousness, use false methods, and directly deceive the population can lead to the dissemination of false information. For example, if the use of concealment and biased commentary methods to achieve victory over a political opponent or not fully informing the public about the tasks of its policy is partially characteristic of many states, then the activity of authoritarian and totalitarian systems based on false information distorts public opinion and qualitatively reshapes the information field. Essentially, by using such methods, these systems do not take into account the population's response actions and view their information relations as a supplement to the policy established by force, striving to completely hide the true goals of management.

Such qualitative changes also occur in establishing relations between the government and society. Propaganda and agitation often cross the boundaries of free competition for human consciousness, replacing it with methods of violent instillation of pre-planned evaluations and attitudes, and conducting psychological pressure aimed at instilling certain goals and values without the person's understanding. The use of such methods of transmitting information to a person turns communication into indoctrination, i.e., a method of communication that completely denies human freedom and the right to develop their political views.

A marketing strategy for information is formed in the harmony of demand and supply relations, aimed at ensuring that the information important to the subject is available at the right time and place. Such marketing strategies for information transmission are aimed at persuading the individual, not controlling their consciousness, and they engage more by sparking interest without imposing any specific forms of action. Historically, the reliability of messages and the respect of partners have been essential in the commercial sector for ensuring work-related relationships and generating income. These strategies are primarily directed towards establishing genuine and mutually respectful information exchange about goals and tasks with opposing parties, communication, political subjects, and their counterparts.

This approach in the information market is related to anticipating human information needs and reliably transmitting information, which ultimately guides personal political behavior choices. Such methods are mainly used in states with well-developed democratic values or where opposition forces have recently come to power and are obliged to pursue a more open policy towards the ethical aspects of social behavior of the population, compared to their predecessors.

In the mass communication system, the media serve as the primary tool for implementing political strategies in the information market. In 1840, Honoré de Balzac, foreseeing their political influence, first called the press the “fourth estate.” A century later, with electronic media, especially television, becoming an integral part of political logic and the main tool for conducting election campaigns, this social mechanism transformed into a powerful political institution that completely changed the measures of mass power.

Historically, the media entered the political market as party press and newspaper publishers expanding their readership. In the stages of this process's development, the media not only established connections with the population and gained mass prestige but also helped ordinary citizens feel like participants in general social processes and understand their belonging to the state and political world. The absence of political neutrality and the systematic and direct communication of the media with ordinary citizens turned them into primary institutions of political socialization, like family, church, and the education system. Famous publishers, commentators, advertising specialists, and reporters became interpreters of public opinion and entered the circle of moral and political elites serving the interests of the “average” European, American, and Australian. Political journalists took on the roles of creators of political myths and inviters of citizens to political participation.

Generally, according to G.Lasswell, the activity of the media was aimed at enhancing the political awareness of the population and understanding their interests in the sphere of power. Mass media and television were the first to inform society

about social and political conflicts, inviting them to appeal to the government for the development of appropriate defense mechanisms against threats.

The main reason for the media's high position in the political life of modern societies is that through them, the state and other political subjects can not only inform the population about the aims and values of their policies but also develop their relations with the public in shaping representative bodies of government and ruling elites, preserving the prestige of corresponding aims, traditions, and values. In other words, the media has become a powerful tool for establishing political order, a means for the government to create communication and relations with the public.

In this context, one of the strongest forms of political struggle has become the competition of ruling elites to establish control over electronic media against the opposition. According to qualifications, especially in states where election results can influence political direction or change the state system, government circles use all their opportunities and privileges to prevent opposition leaders from appearing on television, banning their publishing organs, and hindering their appearances in mass newspaper publications. With the increasing importance of the media, they have become one of the engaging mechanisms of political participation for the ruling class and official government institutions. Essentially, the media has become the most effective intermediary in the relations between the population and the government today. In shaping opinions and evaluations, due to a certain openness and promptness, the media has become almost a primary tool in the system of socially manifesting citizens' interests, reflecting the interests of various groups and strata of the population. In this sense, they can influence the rules of the political game and even change them, forming new relations between the “upper” and “lower” classes.

The rapid publication characteristic of the media and the formation of evaluation criteria in television broadcasts increase the activity of government centers. The publicity of expressed opinions, i.e., the population's tolerance level to certain problems and the acceptability of the government's corresponding actions, requires the clarity and correctness of these actions. In a number of situations, the

coordinated actions of the media can bring the government to the court of public opinion, creating an environment of intolerance towards a particular regime. Therefore, in the face of such a strong opponent, the state strives to solve the issue of harmonizing interests on the basis of opposing public opinion. In this sense, the government's official organs are forced to act promptly, striving to stay ahead of public opinion evaluations, promoting personal interpretations of ongoing events.

The organic interdependence of government and society relations by the activity of the media turns the media into a powerful system controlling the actions and consciousness of these subjects. At the same time, as the main “agitator” of public opinion, increasing its activity in important public issues of political development, the media can provoke political conflicts manifested in public resistance or crises in government and society relations. In this sense, as the English publicist D. Ritchie notes, the publication of sharp and sensational materials may not be the main goal of political journalism. The main goal directing its activity should be a way of influencing the audience that increases its political responsibility aimed at maintaining a balance between state and society relations.

Due to its connectivity characteristics, the media has changed not only the methods but also the processes of forming state organs, as well as the selection of ruling elites and conducting major political campaigns in the state. For example, in elections, people often base their decisions not on the candidates' programs or party affiliations but on what television shows about their lives and activities and what information newspapers publish describing these people.

The emergence of mass electronic media, as well as technical capabilities ensuring constant two-way (interactive) relations between communicator and recipient, the world information network (Internet), influenced the formation of public opinion and methods of political decision-making, for example, by reducing intermediate institutions in the state management system, expanding the autonomy of lower levels of management, increasing changes in government vertical and horizontal structures, and others. In this context, the participation of ordinary citizens in televised debates of politicians, electronic voting in elections and

referendums, the free collection of extensive political information, and others ultimately created primary conditions for the emergence of the teledemocracy system as a new form of citizen participation in power.

In the last one and a half to two decades, new political results of media actions in the information market have come to the fore. In this place, to attract the attention of a broader, wider range of readers (listeners, viewers) to the distributed information, they constantly use methods that engage and interest people. In this context, based on mass attention, the media discard some “boring” facts and give a sensational character to others, striving to give their materials unique characteristics, transmitting certain information in a unique way. Such formalization of information about political processes gives them a spectacle character, and politics turns into a show, a theatrical spectacle. Conflicts in the government arena appear in the eyes of narrow-minded individuals not as a fierce competition, a struggle of groups with hidden goals, rich structures, and doctrines, but as a full-fledged life drama or sports competition with their heroes' biographies, moral experiences, external life characteristics, and others. As a result of this way of reporting on political processes, the social meaning of the actions of government institutions and public politicians is lost, and politics takes on non-political forms of action.

The structure of the media and their activity problems. From a political point of view, the media is divided into the following levels: government, opposition, and independent. This division of the media into levels shows the existence of various, mutually contradictory tasks in the information market. Generally, this system shows that no one, including the government, has a monopoly on commands in the information field, where there are forces aimed at reducing the influence of official governments. Independent media can increase the number of government supporters and opponents or take a personal position criticizing the activities of both sides. However, in each situation, public opinion collides with multi-directional information flows and develops its own evaluations and approaches.

The activity of central and peripheral media gives a unique character to this ideological competition. In particular, in many democratic countries, local power is

controlled by opposition forces and corresponding media, and this is usually reflected in creating information barriers to central channel telecasts and hindering central press. In some cases, the local media system has private television channels, a publishing market instead of local press, and others.

The English researcher D. Curran, among the mentioned, also suggests distinguishing commercial private sector media; civic media reflecting the interests of the collective audience or the entire electorate; specialized media expressing the views of trade unions; mass-market media showing the interests of consumer groups; as well as media protecting general social interests and covering a large audience, providing the opportunity to discuss general social problems and helping individuals determine their direction from the majority's point of view.

The distinction of such types of media reflects the existence of a number of problems in the information-political market of modern states. In this context, the activity of commercial media shows that “big business” often sacrifices social and political goals for its interests. In other words, financial control, advertisers, and owners' hidden or explicit influence reduce the importance of public problems if their explanation hinders profit-making. Moreover, emerging large commercial media communities, monopolizing the information field, are making demands on governments.

On a broader scale, the activity of this level of media raises the issue of independent economic support for the media. Practice shows that not only capital but also the state itself can create economic conditions that encourage and even force the media to follow a conformist direction in the information market, promoting political loyalty. By taking control of the media's economic source, especially in transitional societies under conditions of political separation, the state and capital have almost eliminated independent, neutral media levels in the information market and deprived people of the opportunity to freely choose political directions.

Capital and state relations on one hand, and society on the other, indicate deep contradictions between those who own the media and thus have the opportunity to communicate something to society, and those who want to listen to the radio or

watch television but desire to see and hear something entirely different. Such a clash of interests demonstrates that the selection of information by those who possess it is not the same as the free choice among its demanders. The rise of the civil sector's media position serves as an indicator of the increase in entertainment programs, the superficiality of media information policy, and the lack of an analytical approach in their work. As a result, people see more politics but understand it less. Critical evaluations in consciousness are formed even less. Such an increase in conformism is related to the aspiration of individual media to monopolize people's understanding of their interests and the formation of their views. To some extent, this is facilitated by the method of transmitting news in a mixed manner, which forms a discrete and mixed perception of the political world and determines the absence of necessary social dominances. Such an information policy narrows the opportunities for enriching a person's cultural world and increasing the effectiveness of their social and political connections.

The censorship of media materials is also becoming an important political issue today. On one hand, democratic constitutions reject censorship as a means of information control and a tool of political arbitrariness justifying punishments against political rivals. On the other hand, there are issues of ensuring state security, which involve removing, mixing, selectively choosing information messages, and increasing media responsibility.

At the modern stages of development, another important political issue is the activity of media that prefers “openness” journalism and provides the public with scandals and information about the hidden lives of politicians. The type of opposition criticism they practice often goes beyond the accepted moral norms of society and sometimes even legal limits. To prevent such conflicts and eliminate social contradictions in society, prevent the emergence of national disagreements and the negative consequences of journalists' irresponsible activities, democratic states have laws governing the media, i.e., laws that define their activities and establish strict restrictions on the dissemination of public speech by them.

Today, foreign media also bring significant problems in a number of countries. Currently, the main information flows in the world are controlled by international centers (13 donor countries provide 90% of information products). As a result, information centers and local centers dependent on them, distinguished by the weakness of their own information centers and corresponding industry (according to M. McLuhan, “electronic villages”), have formed. Mass information products taken from abroad often contradict national traditions and relations. There are also situations where ancient traditions are fragmented by certain political forces as a factor of cultural and political aggression, “Western violence,” and foreign influence increasing the dependence of the ruling political regime.

If political interests are set aside, one can see the existing problems of the spread of mass culture that has engulfed many societies unprepared for its standards. Along with the strengthening and rise of some cultural standards (especially in the consumption sphere), due to mass culture, the “political person” is turning into a “crowd person,” moving “like everyone else,” striving not for understanding but for action. All this indicates that political forces must find ways to adapt to the internationalization of mass communications while preserving the cultural uniqueness of their society.

The political problems arising today show that media freedom is not absolute. Yes, the media is both a transmitter of societal interests and a creator of politics. However, their activities must be protected, regardless of their political preferences, by the highest criterion, which should be the interests of the entire society. Otherwise, society should be accepted as an indivisible part of the world community. It is precisely these interests that each media's information strategy and tactics should be subordinated to, and from this position, they should accept each interest and opinion. In this sense, preserving the values given to their activities, eliminating the disruptive results of mass media activities striving to monopolize the information and political field, government intervention is possible and necessary.

Public opinion. The concept of public opinion. Public opinion is an important partner of the state, media, and other political subjects interested in expanding their

political base. From a social point of view, public opinion is the main source of information about citizens' interests, a mechanism reflecting their attitude towards the government and its certain actions. For example, a mass society survey is an action that often returns from partially formed evaluations to vague sensations, distinguishing these contradictions.

For every political symbol that has dominance in society, there are special channels for establishing contact with the government. In particular, emotional opinions are reflected in rallies, mass secret meetings, and assemblies. Formed evaluations are usually conveyed by independent leaders and experts speaking on behalf of the public, as well as through newspaper articles, comments, etc.

The most important tasks of public opinion include the following:

- Demonstrating existing politics in the eyes of society;
- Ensuring feedback in the state management system aimed at correcting the direction taken by the regime;
- Increasing the level of legality of the governing system;
- Socialization of citizens entering the sphere of political relations.

There is no single direction in changing the truth in public opinion. The government may or may not take into account the opinions and evaluations expressed by the public (wholly or partially) when making decisions. However, the government must respond to the expressed opinions and express its attitude towards them. Considering the realities of political struggle, it is necessary not to overlook the possibility that the authorities themselves may take on the tasks of expressing public opinion. In particular, using regimes close to the media, governing circles may push forward their “leaders of public opinion”; distribute event materials and commentaries that shape mass feelings according to their will on behalf of one or another group, and later the government may respond from the point of view of its personal interests, expressing public evaluations.

Political practice has provided examples of many types of public opinion, with their own specific measures. In this context, public opinion can be distinguished by the nature of its influence on the government, by the degree of raw fantasy reflecting

dominant misconceptions and prejudices; by structure; by category indicators. Experts also distinguish between homogeneous types of public opinion, consisting of one or another idea and thoughts that strengthen it, and heterogeneous types, consisting of various competing opinions and thoughts. Depending on the forms of manifestation and the degree of closeness to power situations, public opinion can be official and unofficial. For example, in the USSR, all political actions of the government were widely supported by the population in the form of “unanimity” (resulting from the work of party organs and the passivity of the population) (in common people's language - “odobryams”).

The unique, constantly manifesting characteristics of public opinion include the following:

- Internal contradictions and imbalance that create the opportunity for public opinion to shift from one point of view to another;
- Dependence on the movement of political changes, situationality;
- Relative stability that allows the rapid spread of formed opinions until their essence changes;
- Simplification and superficiality of evaluations.

The formation of public opinion. The mechanism of forming public opinion depends on various ways civil society establishes contact with the authorities, the degree of institutionalization of democracy, and the organization of public opinion. And in the most general sense: they distinguish effective, chaotic, and rational-conscious methods of forming public opinion. Effective, emotional methods and mechanisms are formed on the basis of interpersonal relationships. This type of channels requires some time for group and especially mass opinions to mature. Psychological damage mechanisms greatly influence this process.

The chaotic method of formation usually involves using leaders' opinions or media appearances. In the first case, the existing vague thoughts of citizens are formed in the opinions expressed by an authoritative leader, their joining the above opinions on a particular issue expands their political opportunities and increases their resonance.

Within the framework of this method of forming public opinion, by focusing public attention on certain events and media ideas, they strive to eliminate image contradictions and ensure a single meaning of understanding events. In this case, clear attitudes, emotional states, stereotypes, and clichés are established. In this state, they often introduce standardized and simplified, certain evaluative perceptions, single-meaning standards into the flow of news, using subconscious stimulation methods that bring about a positive or negative response from the public to a particular event. For example, social or ethnic prejudices that lead to a value-based approach to the problem of “us versus strangers” fall into this category. In this method of forming public opinion, not only leaders' but also spiritual elite opinions occupy an important place, but there is no guarantee that the government will respond to the expressed opinions and evaluations.

In 1940, American scholars P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, G. Gaudet put forward the idea of the “two-step flow of communication,” according to which information dissemination is carried out in two stages. First, media evaluations are communicated to informal leaders' opinions, and only then are they sent to their followers. Here, the authors highlight the place of “innovation groups” that are the first to understand new directions and apply them to political life.

Public opinion is almost formed on the basis of professionalism through the activities of special structures that develop and communicate certain evaluations on behalf of the public. Such structures include, for example, party movements, analytical groups, etc. Professionalism here is continuously connected with the rational processes of preparing mass opinions, forming channels, and controlling the disseminated information.

Seminar questions:

1. Explain the essence and specific aspects of communicative processes in the field of politics.
2. What is the essence of communication as a political process?
3. What structure does political communication have?

4. What are mass political communications, their essence, and specific aspects?
5. What place does the media occupy in the system of mass communications?
6. What problems exist in the structure and activities of the media?
7. What have you learned about the concept of public opinion?
8. Provide information on the specific aspects, structure, and tasks of public opinion.
9. How is public opinion formed?

2. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

1. Factors in the creation of information technologies
2. Propaganda, advertising, and marketing technologies
3. Computer technologies in the political information market

Factors in the creation of information technologies. In the information market, political actors employ various methods and techniques to achieve their set goals, as these tools enable them to communicate with their partners and counteragents. At the same time, the specific characteristics of these methods and techniques are primarily determined by the information-communication system in the political sphere. Systems that define information flows, the activities of senders and receivers, their goals and methods, communication styles, and other indicators of information exchange include decision-making, election campaigns, resolving international and domestic political crises, and so on.

Within the framework of information-communication systems, senders and receivers also solve various internal tasks, perform specific internal functions, which, in turn, influence their methods of information behavior. Additionally, factors such as the external environment, specific situations, and the self-perception of political actors determine the methods of obtaining and communicating information within this system.

As a fundamental political process that fully describes the entire system of governance, decision-making stands out. Within this major political process, there are functional areas that indicate the presence of non-traditional information technologies. Specifically, there are two broad internal information-communication systems within decision-making. One describes the internal communication mechanisms of governance, through which the state performs information-communication tasks related to preparing and adopting decisions. The second internal system reveals the essence of governance communication in areas where

information, as a decision, enters the external information market and influences public opinion, social interactions, and citizens' attitudes.

The distinction between “internal” and “external” systems highlights the specifics of information-communication interactions that arise to solve two different types of tasks (developing and implementing decisions) by the state. At the same time, it demonstrates the methods and techniques of establishing communication and accessing information that are characteristic of specific stages, levels, and subjects of this process.

Information technologies in decision-making and implementation.

The “internal” information-communication system reveals a model of state governance that requires the creation and direction of specialized, functionally oriented information. Therefore, the information technologies used here are directly determined by the corresponding stages of the information-communication chain. Each stage assigns specific tasks to the subjects.

In general, the sequence of actions from the emergence of information to its implementation in a management decision (the creation of new information) is outlined. This allows for the consideration of the dynamics of information message indicators (completeness, adequacy, widespread dissemination, etc.). Each defined stage imposes its own requirements on the content and direction of information, as well as the quality of communication between governance subjects.

Thus, at the initial stage of primary information input (which can come from both within and outside the governance system), the applied information technologies are closely related to recording information, opinions, messages, and other signals about a formed or forming problematic situation. These technologies maximize the collection of official and unofficial, popular and specialized, previously used or newly received information on various social issues. This can be explained by the fact that after collecting information, it can be used either in decision-making or in understanding future problems. In this case, the collected information is preserved for later use.

Considering the possibility of unforeseen developments in events, the emergence of demand for previously unassessed non-traditional information, all technologies used here are aimed at the mechanical “collection” of messages and enriching the governance system with “reserve” information. This is not without reason, as the limited scope of information is directly proportional to the growth of the governance system's hypothetic properties. As J. von Neumann, the author of the theory of errors, noted, the possibility of reliable operation of a governance system composed of unreliable components is only feasible in one situation, namely, when there is an adequate surplus of information. Therefore, political actors, especially the government, must prevent the centralization of information collection, which limits the sources of information and reduces the reliability of messages due to their surplus (C. Mintzberg).

To accelerate the process of information collection, the state has significant capabilities. Typically, governance structures, especially political ones, have access to various sources of information on any given issue: state statistical bodies, relevant agencies, specialized academic centers, and so on. This information pluralism necessitates a unique position for state governance bodies. By engaging diverse groups of experts (particularly those related to non-traditional means of information gathering, such as parapsychology, extrasensory perception, etc.), governance bodies can continuously reassess situations from different perspectives. As a result, they gain the ability to identify the most unconventional approaches to decision-making. The main problem at this stage is incorrect or false information. Eliminating information, opinions, evaluations, and other messages that contradict the truth is essential to protect governance bodies from the negative consequences of making unacceptable decisions.

A fundamentally important factor influencing the essence of information technologies is the qualitative characteristics of personnel engaged in information collection. Ideological engagement, subjective states, and routine service negligence (e.g., the inability to verify and compare collected information) can lead to bitter consequences for decision-making structures. This applies not only to technical staff

but also to political figures and high-ranking administrators. Their desires to collect information in a one-sided manner, ignoring facts that contradict their goals and interests, can have a strong influence.

The methods of information collection also significantly impact the quality of information technologies. For example, precise social research, social experiments, probabilistic-statistical processes, and technical tools, particularly automated, manual calculations, electronic methods, and so on, play a crucial role. To a large extent, the semantic (sign and language) possibility of unifying information under a single set of rules and the efficient processing of messages, as well as maximizing the time efficiency of accessing information, depend on these factors.

In the next stage of information evaluation and filtering, information technologies are defined by tasks related to organizing acquired knowledge, enhancing its authenticity, and reducing ambiguity. In essence, this involves methods and processes of information distribution, i.e., selecting specific messages and conducting specialized analysis.

The requirements for selecting and evaluating information are primarily guided by two factors: the ideological and strategic directives of governance subjects or state tasks, and the informal desires and wills of individuals involved in decision-making. The information technologies used here are not only functionally related but also shaped under the pressure of various interest groups and external subjects. These subjects, despite being non-institutionalized in the state-administrative sphere, strive to participate in the processes of evaluating and re-evaluating governance information. This “intervention” by external social actors can alter official evaluations of social facts and identify issues requiring state intervention.

In practice, at this stage, information technologies are influenced by various unwritten laws, stereotypes, customs, prejudices, and other standards of thinking formed in society, alongside the governance and administrative apparatus. Particularly, their impact is directed at the consciousness of governance workers striving to maintain or strengthen their position within the system. Under the influence of official and unofficial viewpoints, political leaders and

administrative officials may consciously select or even eliminate specific information confirming the existence of a particular social issue at the state level. For example, it is known that V.I. Lenin, in his 1918 letters to Justice Minister D.I. Kursky, secretly raised the issue of undermining the legal basis of the market economy without any announcement or official government decision. Specifically, he referred to documents legally affirming citizens' private ownership of land, enterprises, and real estate.

Thus, information technologies are built in the realm of contradictions between the necessity of enhancing the authenticity of information and the growing influence of subjective factors in its acceptance. In this sense, their communicative aspects seem to outpace the informational ones.

Decision-making and functional reformation of information technologies. The next stage, characterized by the increasing complexity of information-communication relations, requires the application of information technologies that provide organizational forms corresponding to the norms of state governance bodies' activities and the nature of their interactions with other political subjects.

In other words, at this stage, the specialization level of information technologies increases, enabling the encoding of messages. This process allows governance structures not only to perform personal functions but also to stimulate the actions of their counteragents and information consumers. Primarily, the use of such technologies enables the creation of a database necessary for the activities of various governance structures without creating a deficit in their working communication. At this stage, the leading characteristic of governance structures is the emergence of differences in the use of information bases by various state bodies, such as special services, relevant production-managing ministries, and civil sector governance offices.

With the increase in competition among information consumers, the protection of agency information (including state or service secrets) also becomes significant. One of the problems in applying information technologies is ensuring

the integration of newly received information with previously stored data in systems such as electronic and paper carriers. For example, in our country, there are various systems for encoding and classifying service information: the Unified System of Classification and Coding (USCC), which defines the procedures and basic rules for processing economic and technical information; interstate systems like the Council of Heads of State Information Agencies of the CIS; and systems for managing elections or specific sectors of the national economy by state authorities. These systems often face certain difficulties due to technical differences in information systems used at the center and lower levels of state governance, primarily relying on electronic carriers.

The logical continuation of this stage is the organizational coordination of information with specific subjects and functionaries (politicians, department heads, ministry leaders, etc.) who resolve various governance issues. In such a situation, information technologies must ensure the alignment of information and communication structures with the structure of a specific organization (its branches and individual members performing certain functions in the state governance system). Therefore, the importance of the following aspects sharply increases in their content: the targeting, authenticity, and accessibility of messages, the alignment of information delivery deadlines with the subject's service obligations, and the practical utility of specialized information reaching the subject. The use of incorrectly chosen information delivery methods can lead to confusion in service information destinations, the mixing of its distribution flows, and ultimately, the disintegration of the governance system.

At this stage, information technologies are also associated with filtering information that consolidates data about the governance object, which performs specific functions and possesses the experience and knowledge of governance subjects. Here, the decisions of state agency employees are considered, answering questions such as: which information is used by them, which is passed to superiors, what is retained or sent later, which messages come from official sources, and which from unofficial ones. Additionally, these communications involve multiple

transitions from one subject to another, shifts from one level to another, and changes in vertical and horizontal, semantic, and formal structures (reports, projects, laws, oral complaints, etc.).

The use of information technologies at this stage primarily defines communication challenges. For example, how accurately a subject describes service information; transmitting information from lower to higher levels of governance or vice versa without losing its meaning; how perfectly service information can be expressed in written form on paper or electronic carriers, and so on. For high-ranking state officials, the difficulties of information management pose a significant problem. In many cases, the filtering of information delivered to them is carried out not by the responsible person but by their assistants. This, in turn, can lead to incorrect information and even manipulation of the leader, and to some extent, the state body itself.

Due to the complex organizational structure of state governance bodies, the problem of “altering the content of information” that often arises during communication between different levels of structures also holds significant importance. Electronic tools often provide the opportunity to correct structural differences and facilitate direct communication between leaders and employees. However, negotiation processes, regulations, and conflicts within the scope of authority complicate the movement of information. Even the varying interests of different subjects in information do not always facilitate this exchange. For example, granting a representative of a specific ministry legal access to the information bank of another state structure or legalizing electronic information used by official bodies, since decisions based on computer data are not legally binding, and so on.

At this stage, information technologies overcome various barriers—geographical, institutional, hierarchical, linguistic, positional, and so on. In their application, it is necessary to consider not only the nature of the problem being solved and the social spheres of state governance but also the broader aspects of superior-subordinate relationships, the interaction of employees' formal and informal communications, and many other factors that hinder the proper delivery of

messages. Additionally, in this context, the speed of message formation and delivery is extremely important. Primarily, it concerns the timely and delayed receipt of messages by responsible leaders. At the same time, the very rapid formation of messages can, in some cases, exclude these individuals from the decision-making process.

The concluding and simultaneously central stage of the information-governance chain is the stage of giving state decisions the form of information. The information technologies applied here must ensure the direction of official information, its proportionality, or, in other words, create new information that defines the process of focusing on primary messages.

Before final decision-making, when the significance of every word in state documents rapidly increases, process-specific technologies come to the forefront. These technologies help shape the final information based on summarizing expert evaluations, opinions of ministers, special meetings, committees, positions of high-ranking leaders, and other structures and individuals involved in preparing official documents. These processes require multiple negotiations, coordination, and the like, defining the place and boundaries of responsibility of various structures and bodies. Some await the announcement of state-defined goals, while others must execute and implement the adopted decisions.

At this very stage, according to R. Denton and J. Woodward, technologies demonstrate their most important, albeit governance-phase-concealed, information characteristics and goals (aimed at influencing the audience). Information management technologies are capable of correction but not of defining the essence of state-defined goals.

Characteristics of technologies in the information market. The information technologies used to ensure the execution of defined decisions are determined in connection with other tasks. Generally, their content is shaped by the stages depicted in Diagram 2. The information technologies used here are defined by whether they are considered merely an agent of the state information market, without the appropriate rights to develop society's attitude toward defined goals, shape a

personal image in public opinion, or control their messages. Information technologies are increasingly perfected through the creation of mass re-communications, where the sender and receiver begin to switch places. Such a situation encourages the formation of interactive, communicative connections and the establishment of dialogic information networks rather than monologic ones. This means that when the state enters the external information market, it must constantly improve its actions, take into account the states of its counteragents and the moral environment, and know how to respond quickly and appropriately to changes in the informational situation.

At the same time, it is necessary to consider that the state's counteragents may change, with public opinion taking their place (for example, when the government needs to convey its attitude toward a particular social issue to society); governance structures (in appointing leaders, allocating resources for state bodies); and other counteragents simultaneously (for example, when it is necessary to unite the population to solve a specific state problem); foreign public opinion; international organizations, and so on. Therefore, “the problem associated with the majority of government information,” write G. Simon, D. Smithburg, and V. Thompson, “is that it came to its owner and was used in an unacceptable manner.”

However, in any case, the state is obliged to develop its information technologies and each time seek the most effective means of disseminating information. In particular, the selection of appropriate technical means, for example, to compete with information flows organized to reduce the effectiveness of government decisions by the opposition, to maintain their advantages in political advertising, to assist in disseminating specialized information, is envisaged. But the chosen path of information behavior always carries the threat of democracy if the population's access to information is limited for security reasons.

The strategy of state activity in the information market. The primary factor determining the content of information technologies is the strategy and tactics of the state's activity in the information market. The main directives that impose

fundamental restrictions on the state's information activity and guide the activities of all governance bodies and branches include the following:

Proposing mass support for state-defined goals by the population and engaging broad social layers in their implementation (“persuasion” strategy);

Informing society about a personal position, a decision made on a particular issue, but not about its execution (“supporting communication with society” strategy);

Distributing service-specific instructions to subordinate structures and governance bodies on the execution of decisions (“roles” strategy);

Controlling the execution of adopted and currently implemented decisions (“control” strategy);

Monitoring the activity of the state, political, and public organizations and associations in discussing certain social issues (“maintaining the balance of forces” strategy);

Creating a positive image of the political system and governance type, and naturally, criticizing the opposition (“image-building” strategy);

Diverting public opinion from discussing social issues that are not beneficial to the system (“distraction” strategy).

In practice, in state activity, individual information strategies and the technical tasks subordinate to them replace each other under certain conditions, thereby complicating the problems faced by state bodies. In unstable, critical situations for the system, as a rule, fundamentally different strategic goals are formed (for example, building information support for those fighting an external enemy). Another important factor determining the content of information technologies is the type of information-communication actions that reveal the nature of state and society relations. This type of information delivery and communication methods goes beyond the boundaries of the decision-making system, which is why we consider them more broadly.

Propaganda and marketing-type technologies. Propaganda-type information technologies are generally aimed at controlling people's behavior and consciousness.

The information delivery and communication styles and techniques used here are aimed at artificially constructing political decisions in line with public opinion and the population's demands. In this sense, the most common methods of information delivery, characterized by agitation and propaganda, and corresponding to these goals, include falsification of information, incorrect or false information, and manipulation of the recipients' consciousness.

The term “disinformation” was introduced during World War I by the German high command to define the part of field tactics aimed at misleading the enemy. This tactic involved directly deceiving the opponent, concealing the essence of certain events and facts, and using false, half-truths, and slanders that kept their existence secret. Political history has provided many examples of disinformation being used not only as a partial technology but also as a large-scale information direction of the state, ensuring the achievement of major political goals. For example, a consciously invented and purposefully disseminated system of false messages concealed the beginning of military actions against the former Union by the Nazis, helped eliminate the high military command in our country before World War II, and so on. Today, such methods are widely used not only in interstate relations as a means of not revealing the true goals of certain states but also in the domestic political market in the following forms: false information about the desires and baseless goals of opponents, concealing information about past events, obscuring the meaning of facts with emotional explanations and tendentious evaluations, and so on. In this sense, the smartest technology of disinformation is the partial, dosed use of authentic information. This allows presenting the event in the necessary and altered form.

As a special type of incorrect information influence, manipulative technologies may appear as an inseparable part. Here, it is aimed at concealing personal goals by the sender but simultaneously creates in the recipient impulses that align not with their own desires but with the interests of this sender. In other words, manipulation is a type of hidden, non-obvious information delivery and programming of the recipient's desires and impulses. It is based on the recipient's consciousness ignoring and treating the interests of others as a weapon, a means.

Appropriate information methods are selected according to the goals of very secret control of the counteragent's behavior and consciousness. For example, selective and partial information delivery, when the recipient is given incomplete information about events, and the “information dump” does not allow a person to distinguish the important from the unimportant, “confuses” consciousness in a certain direction and prospects, and puts them in a state of self-loss. The most obvious methods of manipulation include the use of clichés, i.e., meanings, stereotypes, and appearances that do not require critical processing of content and therefore reduce the critical perception of information. For example, in the former Union, the appearances of capitalism and private property were negatively associated, while a number of positive qualities and characteristics (peace, stability, clarity of worldview) were positively associated with socialism. Such clichéd, black-and-white depictions of the political world are often used to create social, national, and religious conflicts among people.

The most prominent and widely used method and techniques in manipulative communication are “hanging labels,” which involve assigning only negative or positive evaluations to certain individuals or their behaviors; “false analogy” – comparing phenomena that are different in meaning but similar in appearance; and others. Manipulative technologies also have the characteristic of abandoning extended argumentation and replacing it with psychological absorption techniques. This information arsenal includes actions that target social pain points, such as exploiting traditional conflicts between various groups within the population, casting doubt on the sincerity of authorities or partners, and similar tactics. These actions generate self-induced fear, anxiety, and sorrow in people. Disinformation is also widespread, involving the disclosure of information that discredits someone, “playing with numbers” by manipulating statistical data, and being capable of “proving” conclusions that are directly contrary to existing realities.

Agitation and propaganda forms, as well as information dissemination and communication, are typically closely linked to provoking political scandals, conducting information and psychological warfare, and carrying out information

terrorism. These, in turn, are aimed at significantly damaging the public standing and interests of opponents, as well as completely discrediting and removing them from the political arena.

Mass communication (MC-PR) technologies. PR technologies organize a system of information-analytical actions, and their principle is considered to ensure respect for the recipient and the implementation of political goals on this basis. Therefore, although certain specific methods of agitation and propaganda may be partially used within the framework of MC, overall, these technologies are aimed at completely abandoning lies and distorting facts and require the recipient to establish back-channel communication with the sender.

Due to this principled direction, MC technologies are aimed at explaining existing political problems to recipients comprehensively, creating a positive image of the sender in their eyes, generating a suitable public atmosphere for the implementation of predetermined steps, and securing and maintaining the high standing of the decision-making Center. Ultimately, such a strict ethical approach in the information space leads to the formation of a strong value orientation towards political events in people, encouraging them to act consciously. In this way, many barriers between the sender and recipients disappear. As a result, ordinary citizens become actively and consistently accustomed to political processes, participating in decision-making and contributing to their implementation.

These foundational tasks define the relevant principles of MC. They are as follows:

- Transparency of information;
- Mutual benefit of the sender and recipient;
- Basing on public opinion; respect for society.

This direction of information activity shows that the principles related to the sender are not only aimed at the information consumer but also at an individual with a personal viewpoint on the world and politics. This guideline means that all political actors operating within the MC framework do not hesitate to spend time determining public positions, analyzing public and individual worker activity. This requires a

clear distinction in the direction of planning the government's information actions, considering the positions and roles of individuals, parties, and movements, as well as the communicative characteristics of various segments of society, partners, competitors, customers, and others.

Today, the technologies used in the political market have crystallized from the history of major business activities. In the information space, as a specific ethical approach, we can consider the American A. Lee as the founder of MC. At the beginning of the 20th century, he was an independent expert in communications and demonstrated the necessity of considering public interests and truthful information as a condition for successful business activity. At the same time, the mass transition to this type of communication relationship with information consumers only took shape after the Second World War and was primarily related to establishing new connections with the press. In the 1950s, leaders of state bodies and corporations began to pay more attention to explaining their aspirations to consumers and the population, striving to answer people's questions, justify their aspirations, and link them to a certain system of philosophical and moral meanings. In the 1970s, MC technologies took the first step in introducing new elements into the global economic situation and the development of interstate politics. In the 1990s, MC was reshaped due to the rapid technical development of mass media, computerization, and the expansion of the international network (Internet). As a result, mass information became the most important “strategic and political raw material” of society, a source of its power and development (K.Matrimon).

The historical evolution of MC has defined a number of relatively independent directions, each with its own technological support. In particular, MC technologies differ according to the tasks they perform. These tasks are diverse: serving the sender's relations with state and public organizations (public affairs), creating a high-level image of an individual (image making), building relations with mass media (media relations), managing the audience's message reception process (message management), working with information center personnel and employees (employee communications), public expertise (public involvement), supporting relations with

investors (investor relations), organizing presentation events: competitions, lotteries, etc. (special events), managing crisis situations (crisis management), and so on.

Each direction of MC forms a certain system of information management. It is related to developing messages using certain methods, attracting audience dictation, interpreting crises, considering each information project with its specific characteristics, transforming standard technologies into non-standard and creative ones, and so on. These directions are aimed at building educational and political environments. In general, such communicative engineering reflects the aspirations of political communicators to capture people's consciousness not by linking them to certain viewpoints but through ideological methods. In this case, information technologies become a tool of democratic society, helping to achieve consensus and form agreements between authorities and society.

Regardless of the differences in MC directions and internal systems, the technologies related to them require the following characteristics in the people involved in their actions: ideological loyalty to the advertised goals, adapting information flows to organizational changes; reducing false methods of information delivery, moving towards consensual technologies; necessary information preparation for political steps; monitoring the actions of counterparts; clarifying and modifying steps; eliminating actions that negatively affect public opinion; and a number of other universal methods and directions of activity.

Information technologies for image creation. One of the most important conceptual MC technologies is creating a positive image of political objects. These objects can include individuals as well as corporate structures (parties, movements) and even states or interstate organizations. Image creation is the conscious construction of certain characteristics and qualities of a subject that make it attractive to society and allow it to fulfill specific political tasks (winning elections, increasing the legitimacy of power, etc.) with its participation. In this sense, the image serves as the most important structural component in politics, helping power subjects maintain connections with the population, support back-channel communication with the public, and attempt to purposefully influence public opinion. The image is

the most important form of political capital for political subjects and, at the same time, a mechanism for increasing it. It is a means of creating communication with the population, a form of managing its mood, and a method of projecting social problems into politics.

The image is formed for specific tasks at a certain time: ensuring the recipient's victory in elections, increasing the popularity rating of a political figure during a legitimacy crisis, and so on. Creating a leader's image is of particular importance, as it primarily reflects society's demands on the ruling style and system. Based on the characteristics expressed in the image, people identify “their” politician by explaining political events and clarifying their needs. In this sense, the image serves as an indicator, and with its help, the general public, without special knowledge or expertise, consciously votes not for a specific individual but for a particular policy.

The image always has certain characteristics: artificiality, persuasive power, stability (inertia) of the formed characteristics, their clarity and realism, simplicity, and even a certain charm (D. Boorstin). However, the direction of public opinion, disseminated by mass media and becoming habitual, imposes strict boundaries on the behavior and activity of politics. Later, this formed image can mainly be corrected, and introducing changes is difficult.

Considering the significant consequences of the image's influence, politicians usually entrust its creation to specialists – psychologists, consultants, and professional analysts. They are not capable of drastically changing something inherent in a person from the beginning, but they create characteristics in this image that are positively accepted and evaluated by the population. Rapid image creation carries serious risks, as the media, through which leaders communicate with the population, may focus on characteristics that reduce their popularity and standing. N.Machiavelli emphasized the extreme importance for a state leader to “appear compassionate, trustworthy, sincere, and benevolent to the public” (author). That is, to appear as the population desires, and in this sense, the image's requirement for well-being is considered, and its characteristics and qualities must correspond to the

demands and values of mass (group) consciousness. In this situation, the image can only be interpreted as a simplified version of mass desires and perceptions, an individual form of their political existence. A correctly formed image allows some politicians, for example, George Washington, to become a national symbol even during their lifetime.

Image formation technologies are based on certain political actions or events in a politician's life. These can be the leader's popular good deeds, thoughts and considerations that have a positive impact on public opinion, and positive aspects of the biography that serve as reasons for creating public closeness. Image formation is mainly carried out based on the type chosen by the political figure: “anti-corruption fighter,” “fighter for truth,” “victim of political intrigues and pressure,” “savior of the homeland,” “intellectual intellectual,” and so on. This type is related to the leader's psychological type, professional qualities, characteristics manifested on the political stage, and, of course, belonging to the type of group whose support the leader relies on and is interconnected with. The goal of creating this image is often organically linked to certain universal external standards: a powerful face – for the “savior of the homeland,” glasses – for the “intellectual,” and so on. Considering the multifaceted nature of a particular political figure's image, the technologies used mainly bypass its important indicators: communication style (formal, fraternal, informal); behavior in non-traditional situations; reaction to crises; appearance (clothing, hair); facial expressions, articulation, and gestures. Naturally, image formation is enhanced by certain techniques and directions: bodybuilding (building muscle reactions, gesture technique), facebuilding (correcting appearance, facial expressions, articulation technique), and others.

Seminar questions:

1. What role do information technologies play in decision-making and decision-taking?

2. What technologies dominate the information market, and what are their characteristics?
3. Provide information about propaganda and agitation types of information technologies.
4. How is an image created, and what are its types?
5. What is political advertising, and what types exist?
6. What do you understand by the atomization of pluralistic politics?

3. THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN POLITICAL PROCESS

1. The Essence and Characteristics of Political Technologies
2. The Formation of Political Technologies

Political processes unfold in unique ways across different countries and societies. On the one hand, political processes have defined boundaries, characterized by the dominance of specific political actors and unique features. On the other hand, political processes involve a set of issues that require resolution by the state and other political institutions.

Solving these issues necessitates purposeful actions and the use of specific resources. In this context, all power-related interactions manifest as the actions and emotions of individuals within a specific time and space. Consequently, a new level of political relationships and interactions emerges.

As a result, the struggle for power takes shape through mechanisms such as governance, decision-making, conflict resolution, and establishing dialogue. In this sense, the processes of governing society and exercising power require consideration of factors that strongly influence the course of events.

Thus, to solve a problem, it is not enough for a person to understand it and know the means to achieve it. Solving a problem requires the practical application of tools that serve its solution, that is, the use of specific technologies. In general, answering the question, “What is the problem, and HOW should it be solved?” is not enough to resolve the issue. Precisely for this reason, power acquires a new essence and meaning through the use of technologies. Technologies demand a unique approach to political events and serve as the foundation for activities aimed at resolving them. An important aspect of the matter is that the essence of political processes is organically linked to the methods used to solve problems.

Therefore, political technologies are a set of methods, styles, and measures applied in a specific sequence, aimed at the most effective and rational implementation of the goals and tasks of a political subject within a defined time and

space. In other words, political technologies are a collection of specific knowledge and skills that enable a political subject to solve tasks related to power.

Typically, standardized, repeatable, and regulated actions necessitate the use of political technologies. More precisely, the reasons for the emergence of political technologies are as follows:

The need for political actors to use rational, convenient, and effective methods to achieve their goals in the exercise of political power;

The need to reduce randomness in interactions over power, foresee sharp “jumps” in political processes, and prevent unexpected “explosions” in social activity;

The necessity of using beneficial and economical methods of state governance;

The availability of opportunities to clearly define the stages and critical “points” of a particular process;

The emergence of opportunities to control and manage situations, as well as to implement effective and beneficial actions that serve the resolution of problems;

The need to stabilize the mutual relations of participants in political processes, as more people gain the ability to quickly master advanced methods of political action.

In other words, the main goal of using political technologies is to enable political subjects to effectively fulfill their tasks and obligations. Technologies are directed toward ensuring that subjects act in accordance with their interests, tasks, and goals. Therefore, technologies serve to attract or save resources, stabilize or destabilize situations, organize election campaigns, provide prompt information, make decisions, and harmonize interests in the development of state programs.

Political technologies, as a set of goal-oriented methods and measures, not only systematize the means of achieving goals but also establish a specific sequence of actions. This sequence can be called the algorithm of a political subject's actions. It is within these algorithms that the most rational and effective methods for solving

problems are selected and reinforced. Moreover, algorithms allow for the sharing of accumulated experience with others.

In essence, algorithms emerge as a result of sorting, standardizing, and simplifying the methods and measures used in a subject's activities. In practice, technologies are based on numerous mechanisms and methods of subject-object relationships.

So, when do political technologies emerge? Political technologies arise when a specific sequence of stages in the process of achieving a goal is established, and the regular use of certain methods and tools at these stages is defined.

It is worth noting that technologies are not the same as individual mechanisms, techniques, or methods of influence. So, what distinguishes political technologies from individual mechanisms of influence? Political technologies are the process and result of a political subject's use of techniques aimed at achieving a goal in real political action.

Of course, not all types of political activity are fully technologized. Sometimes only certain aspects of the process of achieving a political goal take the form of technologies. In such cases, a political subject may use local technologies. Local technologies are those aimed at effectively organizing only a specific part of the political process. When are local technologies used in politics? For example, let us consider the field of decision-making. This process is usually highly complex, with a significant share of unexpected situations. Local technologies consist of actions that serve only specific stages of this process. For instance, local technologies may serve to coordinate the actions of legislative and executive authorities. In general, political technologies are often unable to fully encompass and rationally and effectively organize the entire process.

Thus, political technologies can encompass an entire process or only certain stages and aspects of it. However, complex relationships related to power and governance (such as those between informal groups) cannot be confined to a specific technological framework.

Political technologies, on one hand, depend on the unique characteristics of the individual operating in the political arena (their knowledge, experience, and mood), and on the other hand, they are tied to the material (or spiritual) resources and technical components utilized in their activities. Therefore, the formation and application of technologies, as well as the speed of their implementation, are directly linked to the competence, expertise, experience, and skill of the subject in utilizing technical resources. Typically, a lack of technical capabilities or human resources reduces the effectiveness of technologies. Hence, how political technologies are applied is organically connected to the material condition of the political subject, their ability to utilize available opportunities in a given situation, and their skill in applying accumulated experience related to technologies.

Mistakes and lack of knowledge by political actors not only diminish the significance of political technologies but can also fundamentally alter their direction, ultimately fostering a negative attitude toward political technologies. Therefore, before applying political technologies in areas crucial to the state and society, it is necessary to carefully select the subjects. Specifically, political actors must be evaluated based on their practical experience, psychological resilience, and ability to act in unconventional situations.

Political technologies are not merely a list of the most effective and rational actions but also a method of enhancing control over the process of achieving goals and a unique form of managing such activities. Achieving set goals and obtaining desired results is the highest criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of political technologies. At the same time, it is important to note that assessing the effectiveness of technologies is ultimately a complex task. In the political sphere, the use of numerous resources, the complexity of controlling the exercise of power, and the fact that political technologies presented as attempts to improve political processes may conceal entirely different goals and interests make evaluating political technologies more complicated.

In developed countries, political technologies are widely used in all areas of political power and state governance. Moreover, political technologies are

recognized as a conventional (legal) process for exercising political power. However, in politics, unconventional methods—those prohibited by law or entirely contrary to political traditions—can sometimes be observed (such as technologies of provocation, terrorism, or methods of forcibly directing public opinion).

The time and place for applying political technologies are limited. Each method, style, and tool within a political technology has its own “duration,” or time of application. However, even if the methods, measures, and their timing and location are strictly defined, political technologies sometimes deviate from these frameworks. Such deviations occur due to adaptation and consideration of the situation.

In other words, creativity is always observed in the application of technologies. Sometimes, the use of unconventional methods leads to the improvement of technologies, enriching them with original and unique approaches. At the same time, allowing arbitrariness in the application of technologies can lead to negative consequences. Since technologies are aimed at organizing and facilitating political activities, their formalization, institutionalization, and normative reinforcement are appropriate.

Therefore, there are specific boundaries in the application of technologies, and exceeding them can reduce the effectiveness of political technologies. At the same time, it is also unacceptable to allow them to become disconnected from reality, rigid, or reduced to a set of dogmas.

The structural composition of political technologies can be divided into three parts: specialized knowledge; specific methods and styles of action, measures; and technical-resource components.

In political technologies, knowledge holds a special place. Political technologies essentially reflect political reality and life. Moreover, they are aimed at finding effective tools and methods for practically solving problems related to political power and state governance. Here, technological knowledge is primarily considered. Technological knowledge is a form of scientific-practical knowledge.

Technological knowledge serves both to understand, design, and master reality through practical activity.

Technological knowledge is directly connected to reality and reflects specific events and phenomena. The difference between technological knowledge and scientific knowledge is that the former is not abstract or ideal-oriented but works with specific problems, situations, and events. Political technologies are also distinguished from theoretical knowledge by their focus on solving specific problems within a defined timeframe.

If theoretical knowledge idealizes events (or situations), technological knowledge concretizes them; if theory addresses universal practice, technological knowledge is directed at specific segments of reality. Therefore, political technologies are not about logically understanding a specific part of reality but about providing a practical response to it. Such a practical response does not necessarily require deep theoretical justification for specific events.

It is important to note that any event or phenomenon has its own logic of development, sources of progress, and peak growth, requiring the resolution of specific problems. Therefore, the essence of technological knowledge is:

Reflecting the event or phenomenon to the technologist-analyst;

Addressing the client who seeks to solve the problem;

Connecting to the executor taking action to resolve the issue.

In a technological approach, understanding the nature, structure, forms, and unique characteristics of events, situations, and their changes is of great importance. Naturally, technological information includes specific conclusions and evaluations, such as assessments of the balance of political forces and ideological programs. At the same time, technological information serves to analyze the economic, social, ecological, and other aspects of a given situation.

The relationship between technological knowledge and the theoretical conclusions of political science can vary. This is because, in the application of technologies, the emphasis is not on “knowledge” but on “practical action.” Therefore, in some cases, individuals applying political technologies may not pay

attention to theoretical conclusions while performing their duties. Thus, there are instances where the theoretical conclusions of scientific research are not utilized in solving practical tasks. Moreover, if the meaning of scientific terms is strictly defined in scientific language, in a technological approach, concepts are interpreted more freely. In the lexicon of political technologies, scientific terms are used alongside emotional imagery and variously interpreted concepts. Here, folk oral creativity and everyday communication language play an important role.

Technological knowledge reflects the subjective aspects of political engineering. Political engineering involves political forecasting, planning, program development, and organizing the practical activities of power institutions. Therefore, political technologies are significant not for providing knowledge on how to implement a specific measure but for shaping the competence and skills to act in pursuit of goals.

These skills and competencies manifest in the application of specific methods, styles, and techniques of action, directly tied to the chosen goal. For example, in the field of decision-making, methods for reconciling the interests of parties in developing state policy; in resolving international disputes—methods for reaching agreements between conflicting parties or influencing them through arbitration mechanisms; in the information sphere—methods for countering opponents' slander.

The use of specific methods and measures depends, on one hand, on the condition of the actors operating in the political arena and, on the other hand, on the circumstances in which the problem is being resolved. For instance, a person unfamiliar with modern election campaign technologies cannot apply methods and techniques that ensure the client's victory in elections. In a state where the rule of law is established, it is impossible to use “black” or illegal technologies to compete with opponents during elections.

Factors such as the use of qualified personnel, the technical preparedness of executors, and the amount of funds spent significantly influence the quality and, consequently, the effectiveness of political technologies. For example, applying technologies for the ideological support of state policy requires specialized

structures; a financially constrained candidate in a pre-election campaign may be forced to abandon highly effective but expensive methods, such as television advertising; using decision-making technologies necessitates specialized structures and a reserve of personnel engaged in such activities. Thus, the aforementioned factors can either limit the scope of applying political technologies or enhance their effectiveness.

The creation and application of political technologies essentially serve to streamline, perfect, economize, and simplify the process of performing specific tasks related to the political sphere. Ultimately, these technologies expand the possibilities for controlling and managing areas undergoing political changes. In the process of forming and implementing political technologies, three approaches can be observed: structural, spatiotemporal, and procedural.

The structural approach involves identifying information about the problem, searching for effective methods to solve it, and ensuring the process is technologically supported. The spatiotemporal approach emphasizes the need to adapt the tools being used to the space (territory) and time (context) in which the problem is being addressed. The procedural approach, on the other hand, assumes that the process of achieving a goal consists of several stages. The process of forming such technologies follows this logic: “analysis – diagnosis and situation assessment – forecasting and planning – goal setting – determining the sequence of actions – providing recommendations.”

In general, technologies can be developed for specific situations or adapted to widespread conditions. Technologies can be “top-down,” imposed by ruling structures, or formed based on the generalized experience of actors operating in such conditions. However, most often, technologies are formed through a mixed method. In this case, the norms, goals, and tasks set by the ruling circles are combined with the experience of those directly engaged in solving these tasks.

There are two methods of forming technologies: subjective and analytical. The first method is more based on a subjective approach. The foundation of such technologies lies in common sense, the subject's life experience, their inclinations,

predictive abilities, stereotypes, habits, and unique ways of understanding the world. In fact, without these components, it is impossible to evaluate goals and determine ways to achieve them. However, in subjective technologies, not only are the aforementioned factors prioritized, but the possibility of using other approaches, particularly analytical ones, is limited. Subjective technologies often justify themselves (for example, in crisis situations) and yield positive results. However, applying such technologies does not always guarantee the expected outcome in every situation.

The second method of forming technologies is associated with the use of specific analytical methods and measures, which take precedence in determining the ways to achieve goals. These methods not only limit the arbitrariness of actors in setting goals but also allow for the effective use of foresight and experience-based approaches. In this case, the subject consciously approaches the categories of “goal” and “conditions,” takes into account a range of limiting factors, and can foresee the consequences of the measures and actions being implemented.

In essence, the analytical method of forming technologies involves the following:

- Evaluating actors and the functional and personal relationships between them;

- Taking into account existing activity norms and rules;

- Assessing the balance of political forces;

- Planning actions while considering the influence of internal and external factors;

- Determining the spatial and temporal scope of one's activities;

- Considering the unique characteristics of the environment;

- Accounting for the capabilities and competencies of the individuals involved.

In solving these tasks, all methods that enable the development of the most useful recommendations are utilized.

In short, the analytical method involves using criteria and measurement systems that collectively allow for an adequate understanding of the situation. This, in turn, serves as a catalyst for effectively organizing the subject's activities in

achieving the goal. Essentially, this approach requires breaking down activities into various components, identifying the most important steps and stages, determining their scope, and establishing the pace of implementation. Based on this, the subject can identify the relationships between actors, the temporal and spatial indicators of activities, the influence of the external environment, the probable scenarios of the situation, turning points in the process, and other important indicators, and build their actions accordingly.

At the same time, the analytical approach, which takes into account the uniqueness of individual processes and the internal and external factors influencing them, is inherently exploratory. However, it is important to note that often it is difficult to determine the essence and root causes of specific actors' actions or to calculate the scope of their actions. Nevertheless, the analytical approach serves as a foundation for planning the subject's actions and organizing their activities.

It is evident that studying a situation using analytical methods fundamentally differs from the subjective methods of forming political technologies. However, the formation of political technologies is not limited to the two approaches mentioned above. It is also appropriate to study and effectively utilize similar historical experiences aimed at solving analogous political tasks.

Seminar Questions:

Explain the essence and unique characteristics of political technologies.

How are political technologies formed?

What are subjective technologies?

What are the components of the structural composition of political technologies?

4. POLITICAL ANALYSIS

1. The Essence and Characteristics of Political Analysis
2. The Main Features of Political Analysis
3. Methods of Political Analysis
4. Levels of Political Analysis
- 5 Stages of Political Analysis

The Essence and Characteristics of Political Analysis. The necessity of solving specific tasks in the field of politics and searching for alternative methods and technologies for achieving goals for people requires a special approach to understanding and studying political phenomena. Unlike the approaches of theoretical political science, which focus on defining the characteristics and essence of political phenomena, uncovering fundamental connections and relationships between them, and substantiating the ideas and patterns of their development, this approach is aimed at solving practical problems and has its own unique characteristics.

In general, instead of forming and developing knowledge that systematizes ideas about the similarities and differences of political phenomena and presents political views in a “technological” and diverse way, this approach is focused on applying the available scientific-theoretical potential to solving practical and specific tasks in the political field. In understanding and evaluating the above, along with theoretical ideas, accumulated practical experience, knowledge and skills obtained from solving similar tasks, intuition, and other methodological perceptions of a person also play an important role.

In short, the applied field can make conclusions within the framework of accumulated practical experiences even without using certain general theoretical conclusions. If we take into account the specific orientation of applied political research, it provides a special perspective in understanding political life, compelling a person to view political activities as a type of art.

The methods and techniques used in applied knowledge to study political phenomena form a special branch of political science aimed at studying real political processes, the actions of various subjects, and their mutual relationships. Accordingly, the entire field of applied political science describes various aspects and limits of political activity by individuals seeking to gain public opinion, possessing technical support, different skills, knowledge, and information.

This field serves as an important tool in determining the political will of the people (in the form of ratings of leaders and parties), their reactions to the government's actions in crisis or other situations, and other conditions.

The significance of public opinion as the most important part of governance has been evident since ancient times. For example, according to Protagoras, the “public opinion” of the entire society can distinguish falsehood from truth. Thus, he saw not only the source of moral-legal forces in civil society but also the legitimacy of establishing social order.

Socrates, who gave great importance to public opinion, emphasized the “wisdom of the learned” over the “opinion of the majority” as being closer to the truth. Plato supported this same viewpoint. He studied aristocracy as the primary subject of public opinion. Plato linked public opinion to the “subjective freedom formula” that exists in society, allowing the application of a veto on governance and associating it with “appropriate” individual discussions.

The English poet and statesman D. Salisbury, who lived in the 12th century, introduced the term “public opinion” into science, referring to the moral support of parliament by the people.

The relatively conceptualized theory of public opinion was formed only in the 1950s-60s. Despite the constant attempts by various political institutions to define and explain the interaction of public opinion, scholars have not reached a consensus on this phenomenon. In theory, it is mainly defined as the socio-psychological state of society, a set of moral and ethical attributes, or an evaluative structure. At this point, the subject of public opinion is determined.

For example, Jürgen Habermas understood public opinion as the mutual relationship between informed and publicly engaged individuals and groups influencing the significance of political viewpoints. Habermas believed that public opinion does not have separate subjects; rather, expressed opinions represent the dominant topic that attracts the attention of individuals with different interests.

German researcher Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann viewed public opinion not just as support for the government but as a collection of different viewpoints, including people's passivity, opposition, or preference for isolation (the “spiral of silence”), which leads them to remain silent.

If we rationally generalize all the existing approaches in the field, we can conclude that public opinion is the collective state of people's attitudes toward various political processes (such as changes in state power) that influence political decisions. From this perspective, it serves as a key element in the interaction between governance and public interests, acting as a mechanism for resolving critical and pressing issues for citizens.

Structurally, public opinion is not the entire mass consciousness but rather its peak—a collection of evaluations and instructions uniting specific groups. By shaping the psychological climate, these evaluations influence the political atmosphere in society and carry significant meaning for those in power.

In general, the emergence of public opinion as a political mechanism for expressing social interests is a result of the development of democracy and civil society institutions. Both mass and local viewpoints can be present in the structure of public opinion.

Their formation and interaction depend on the level of competition in society, the mechanisms of political representation, and the existence of individuals who either accept or challenge the generalization of their views. The objects of public opinion may include any acts or events in social life, including speeches by politicians that capture the attention of politically engaged citizens.

Thus, public opinion is always associated with a specific idea. In a broad sense, this term can apply to all scientific studies of politics, while in a narrower

sense, political analysis is seen as a specialized applied field that focuses on identifying the obstacles posed by subjectivity and freedom in the study of specific problems, searching for correct solutions, and determining technological tools and methods.

As an applied field of scientific knowledge, political analysis is carried out by a specialized group of experts, including technologists, analysts, consultants, PR specialists (experts in political structures' informational relations with the public), party staff members, aides to politicians, corporate political structures (such as consulting agencies), representatives of public administration, and others.

The results of this group's work include various recommendations and advice, forecasts, plans and projects for the activities of state and party organizations, analytical materials aimed at improving the functioning of government bodies, and other data designed to solve specific political problems.

Public opinion competes within the framework of events and phenomena. In this process, individuals may change their views and opinions multiple times, reevaluating existing events by reconsidering their positions and conclusions. Prejudices and stereotypes play a significant role in public opinion. Due to its emotional nature, public opinion can sometimes be one-sided. Therefore, public opinion, depending on its opposition to authority and its ability to influence the state according to citizens' will, can sometimes pose a threat.

As a rule, the components of public opinion include the mood, emotions, and ability of the masses to evaluate and discuss the situation.

In times of crisis, it is crucial to make the right strategic choices. In this case, the research subject is not implemented through theoretical or fundamental science but rather through applied research. Unlike fundamental disciplines that study the essence of state power, applied research focuses on influencing people's behavior in specific situations and manifesting particular events.

However, the analysis of such existing phenomena also contributes to enriching fundamental theories, generating new hypotheses, paradigms, and approaches.

Applied research does not cover all aspects of politics but is limited to areas of state governance that hold the greatest practical significance. Today, such areas include conflict resolution and management, the organization of electoral and informational campaigns, political decision-making, negotiations, and several other fields.

Within these areas, specialized branches have emerged, such as policy-making, which highlights problems in political decision-making; policy management, which develops and implements political projects; conflict management, which focuses on resolving political conflicts; and negotiation processes.

Among these, policy analysis stands out as a field that proposes methods and stages for studying specific political problems.

Political analysis, due to its specific subject matter and characteristics, is considered a specialized applied field. At the same time, it serves as a unified research foundation for all applied fields.

The Main Characteristics of Political Analysis. The characteristics of political analysis as a special stage in the study of political reality are determined by several factors and circumstances. As a form of applied knowledge, it is primarily focused on defining and studying a specific problem faced by the subject.

Thus, theoretical political science, based on the defining characteristics of its subject, is formed by expressing a logical hypothesis about a certain area of the political sphere and a specific type of event. In performing its tasks, it reconstructs its knowledge system by logically determining the interrelations of specific phenomena, their defining characteristics, the special boundaries of the constructed objects, their scale of dissemination, and other ideal structural attributes that allow them to be integrated into a particular social unity.

In contrast, political analysis is aimed at investigating a specific problem—that is, the elements of reality related to various areas of the political field that possess specific, undefined sources, applications, and similar attributes.

Unlike sciences operating on logocentrism, which aim to construct knowledge about an object from the outset and explore interconnections in social relations, political analysis develops rational and simplified concepts for understanding an object and, therefore, requires only the minimal necessary information to achieve a specific goal of the subject.

While fundamental sciences aim for a deep and systematic understanding of an object and its mysteries, applied political analysis formulates its views based solely on the subject's specific task. In other words, while science provides a logical representation of an object, political analysis presents a practical description sufficient for the subject to engage in the implementation of a specific task.

If in science the attributes of phenomena are examined using a diachronic approach—meaning a historical, gradual development perspective (i.e., both simultaneous and non-historical analysis)—political analysis is based on a teleological approach, assessing the elements involved in fulfilling real tasks as part of the subject's goal-oriented activities.

The issue posed by political analysis is not just any social conflict or contradiction affecting individuals' roles and responsibilities in the field of power, but rather problems of significant importance to society—those that reflect the interests of broad social groups, express religious views and values, and directly or indirectly impact the activities of governing bodies.

Such problem-oriented focus also defines the structural characteristics of applied political analysis. In particular, due to the competitive nature of the political sphere, different interpretations of the same situation are inevitable among competing forces, often leading to multi-meaningful interpretations of certain events.

This means that the assessment of specific situations is not only conducted by analysts or experts but may also be carried out by individuals responsible for solving the identified problem, depending on their role in the political process. This person evaluates and perceives events based on their own interests, status, position, and personal attitude toward the situation, thereby shaping the set of facts that define the

problem and the situation itself. In this sense, the individual identifying the problem in a given situation acts as the “client” in the decision-making process.

In other words, the structure and composition of political analysis are determined not only by the analyst’s evaluation of a phenomenon but also by the explicit or implicit influence of the “client”—the subject defining the purpose of solving the given problem. The interests of the “client” serve as the foundation for the strategic direction of the analysts' work.

These analysts, in turn, seek ways to modify the situation when necessary to meet the “client's” requirements. The data obtained from analysts and technologists become the property of the “client,” who may choose to publish, keep secret, or use it for other purposes.

Thus, the “client” is a symbolic figure representing the process of solving a situation for a specific purpose or identifying facts within certain conditions that align with the declared position of a participant in the struggle for state power resources.

In some cases, the evaluations provided by the “client” and the analyst may coincide, ensuring an objective and unbiased explanation of the situation. However, in most cases, political analysis within the sphere of power is influenced by the interests of stakeholders, and the direction of analytical work is often guided by pre-determined objectives.

Therefore, in many cases, the technologist-analyst acts as a specialist formulating practical recommendations based on the needs of a particular individual or group interested in interpreting the situation and influencing it for a specific goal.

For example, in elections, both ruling and opposition parties, despite having the same goal of winning, analyze the situation differently based on varied sources of information, resources, regional positions, and political standings.

Additionally, government institutions and social movements advocating for the protection of disadvantaged groups may have different perspectives on political crises.

For some, a crisis may be a situation where the priority is to maintain and strengthen power, while for others, it is a condition that requires exiting the crisis while preserving or improving their social status and other key aspects of life.

Thus, the analysis of a single political situation can reveal different problems. Therefore, analysts may approach the situation from different perspectives, set different tasks, and ultimately propose various solutions to the same issue.

Nevertheless, when structuring political analysis, the evaluation of the situation naturally involves the perspectives and interests of the “client” (or customer), which, to some extent, directs the work of the experts.

The dependence of political analysis on client interests demonstrates its complex and multifaceted nature, which is shaped by the competitive forces in a political environment. Analysts must balance scientific criteria with the goals of the client, but in practice, they may end up fully aligning with the client’s objectives at the expense of their professional independence.

In electoral campaigns, for instance, experts and analysts representing competing political forces may produce completely opposing forecasts to ensure their “client's” success.

The problems arising from real political situations transform political analysis into a form of situational scientific research. In other words, a specific political situation itself constitutes the primary subject of political analysis.

Only within the existing political context can applied political analysis:

Identify the causes of emerging issues,

Determine relevant facts and their composition,

Justify their dissemination, and

Forecast the future development of the situation.

Within political analysis, a situation (political event) is examined as a cohesive phenomenon with identifiable sources of influence, boundaries of development, and other attributes.

In this sense, political analysis must either explain, describe, or rationalize the unique and logical elements of everyday political life.

Thus, a specific situation (event) dictates the necessary relationship between hypothetical, evaluative, theoretical, expert, intuitive, and other types of knowledge required to solve the defined task.

Unlike fundamental science, which relies on mass social experience to draw conclusions, political analysis is primarily aimed at reflecting unique events and situations. Although its body of knowledge is not always universally reliable and is often generalized, it is considered a part of applied science.

The applied goal of political analysis involves studying external conditions, local events, and performing certain universal tasks within the framework of time and space. This includes identifying the main boundaries of the situation, isolating all active subjects, studying the most important actions and interactions, conditions affecting the subject's activities, causes and factors, and predicting the outcomes of ongoing events.

The complexity of any specific situation in the political sphere and the various new connections and relationships that arise when studying it typically have a scientific character. Therefore, political assessment of a situation is often supplemented by psychological, sociological, anthropological, cultural, and other methods used to analyze the behavior of subjects, their positions, and their implementation. Thus, applied research of a situation is carried out through the use of systematic analysis within the framework of solving specific tasks.

The main difficulties in conducting political analysis are related to the ability to connect various approaches and methods of studying a situation, as well as to harmonize conclusions and data obtained through the qualitative application of different methods. Additionally, the problem being studied must adhere to certain research parameters.

The main challenge in studying a problem is that applied analysis, often conducted within a limited timeframe, is required to identify optimal technologies for solving specific problems and controlling the situation. For example, experts and specialists are often required to make decisions in emergency or force majeure situations, or to quickly formulate adequate responses to opponents' challenges.

Therefore, the speed of analysis sometimes becomes a decisive factor in solving the problem.

The Structure of Political Analysis. The ability to adequately assess a specific situation is primarily determined by the analyst's correct selection of tools and methods to solve the problem. Political analysis consists of three main research approaches.

The first approach involves the manifestation of basic theoretical guidelines. Based on these guidelines, specific tasks and goals are defined, and the main boundaries of necessary tools, methods, and resources are established. Such approaches allow for determining the general parameters of the situation, understanding the connection between a specific political situation and its natural and social environment, and forming ideas about politically significant problems in the world surrounding the analyst.

These macro-theoretical approaches may be based on the rules for describing ideal events, the stable ideas and laws of political development, the basic ideas of rational choice theory, and others. However, despite the importance of the existing situation for political analysis, such theoretical approaches are usually not deliberately reflected and exist only in the slow determination of the main methods for analyzing a specific problem.

At the logical intersection of the macro-theoretical model, the conceptual basis for studying the situation is established, and the criteria for the second stage—determining the level and stage of the governance (management) sphere in which the situation arises—are enriched. For example, it may pertain to the field of international or social conflicts and may be part of local or regional processes. Other indicators of the situation are also evaluated: its stability or instability, its inclusion in the subject's medium- and long-term plans, etc. Analyzing the situation from this perspective presupposes the existence of views in the researcher that express a preference for one or another approach to evaluating the concepts of “change” and “development,” revealing an understanding of the mechanisms and sources of

political development. Typically, such a model of political progress emerges based on the synthesis of various theoretical concepts at the intermediate level.

In general, at this stage of analysis, the focus is on identifying the sectoral characteristics of the political process, which involves developing appropriate technologies. The calculation of political process indicators at this stage allows for a better understanding of the characteristics of changes in a specific sector (e.g., related to national and confessional conflicts) and, as a result, enables more precise definition of tasks aimed at more targeted direction of factor activity. For example, in organizing election campaigns, the development of political technologies may influence the formation of working groups in the political sphere, conducting political market research to attract electorate attention, nominating candidates for deputy positions, announcing and advertising programs, and establishing the order of other events. However, even in such situations, political technologies are developed relative to each specific task and may transition to the level of gathering tools for the election campaign or determining specific technical methods and ways to shape public opinion about the candidate's public appearance.

Subsequently, based on this theoretical foundation, a micro-applied situational analysis is conducted, which serves as the main “tool” for “deciphering” the situation. It plays a crucial role in implementing researchers' practices and, in doing so, conditionally reduces the role of macro-theoretical and sectoral systems to the level of conditional knowledge. Micro-analytical research localizes the situation and synchronizes its results with the general picture of the political process. At the micro-analysis stage, one of the most complex tasks in creating technology—the transition of general theoretical structures into practice and their reflection in practical recommendations—is solved.

This stage of analysis is directly related to the immediate reflection of reality arising in a specific situation. Regardless of the methods used at this stage, the analysis of political situations is based on a discrete approach, which proposes constructing the situation as a specific fragment in the chain of political events and changes. Attention is focused on analyzing the activities (practical and imaginary)

of specific (individual, group) subjects, studying the causes, methods, and forms of their behavior. If the main attention is directed to the psychological characteristics of human activity, then political analysis manifests itself as one of the forms of behavioral research.

As a rule, the research approaches used reflect the characteristics of the stages and periods of political analysis.

Political Analysis as a Special Research Process. Political analysis, viewed as a special research process, can be divided into internal logical stages that determine the success of applied activities. According to the perspective of American scholars J.B.Mangheim and R.K.Rich, the political process can be divided into the following main stages: conceptualization of the problem, its materialization, development of a research project for a specific problem, and selection of research methods.

The first stage of political analysis involves the conceptualization of the problem. This entails examining a specific situation from the perspective of its impact on the significant interests of political subjects, the activities of state governance bodies, their interactions with foreign partners, and changes in the overall political context. Identifying such a problem requires careful collection of information, consideration of its distinctive features and components compared to other problematic situations.

In the second stage, the problem is modeled, i.e., simplified representations of its key elements, structure, and external and internal forms are developed. Typically, such a model is created based on a research hypothesis that identifies the necessary characteristics of the problem. Clarifying the problem's characteristics is achieved through its operationalization—transforming the essence of the problem into abstract, qualitative assessments that allow for visual indicators describing the problem's changes. Defining the actions and stages in the process of conducting such observations constitutes the process of instrumentalization. The final stage of these processes is the specification of the problem, i.e., identifying relevant indicators (objective evaluation indicators and specific contents of the situation) that reveal

cause-and-effect relationships, criteria for successful and unsuccessful actions, and constant and temporary indicators of the situation's changes in positive and negative forms.

In general, these actions simplify and shape the content of the situation. Ideally, modeling strives for maximum formalization, using mathematical methods to represent political events. From this perspective, modeling reflects the process of rationalizing the researcher's ideas. As a result of this process, the problem manifests as a fully measurable event, enabling the study of its indicators through the transition from qualitative to quantitative evaluation. Overall, modeling must correspond to and align with the task of logically verifying and validating conclusions.

The third stage involves developing a research project, forming and explaining the logic of studying a specific problem. Within this stage, the specific goals of the research are defined (taking into account the results to be achieved through the study of the problem), the variable indicators of alternative solutions to the task are identified, and the organization and implementation of observations are described. Thus, at this stage, important factors and their positive or negative impacts on solving the problem are specifically expressed, alternative scenarios and forecasts for the situation's development are formulated, the subject's activity strategy is developed, and other tasks are performed. The task of such a project is to organize empirical indicators. However, in solving this task, a multi-stage research construct is formed. This construct, in turn, integrates collected and existing knowledge and envisions the gradual unfolding of research aimed at performing a specific practical task. Therefore, the development of such a project can be evaluated as the emergence of a self-correcting method of capturing the situation.

Depending on the type of situation being analyzed and the goals set, various political analysis projects can be developed: predictive projects aimed at studying hypothetical future situations; retrospective projects aimed at finding new approaches to studying current and past events related to the analysis of existing situations.

There is also a fourth stage of the main content—the stage of selecting methods for studying the problem and solving a specific task. As described above, the methodology used at this stage has an interdisciplinary nature. However, performing any task requires selecting the necessary research methods and tools. This selection is based on the problem, the preparedness of the analysts, and the specific conditions under which the analysis is conducted. This selection requires the compatibility of qualitative and quantitative, theoretical and empirical, and other approaches. The methods used may differ in form (“brainstorming,” individual or group expertise, etc.).

In the process of selecting research methods, one of the components of this stage is determining the sequence of operations that regulate the application of various techniques and methodologies of rules, processes, and cognition. Such rules for applying methods are based on logically sequential methodological and organizational processes aimed at obtaining reliable information about events and consolidating these results for practical application.

As a result of applying political analysis, knowledge is formed in the form of final or intermediate recommendations, advice, or instructions that must later be conveyed to the “client.” Sometimes, in conditions of extreme abstraction, this knowledge may not only consist of ready-made recommendations but also include the very essence of the problem, which slightly reduces the level of uncertainty regarding the studied situation and the “client's” position.

Collecting and continuously clarifying incoming information is of great importance for political analysis. To develop professional recommendations and select appropriate technologies for task execution, the data must meet the following requirements: necessity (corresponding to the nature of the problem being solved), minimal sufficiency for a comprehensive examination of the problem, reliability (the information must be accurate and trustworthy), and timeliness (available at the right time and place). In this case, the information must strive to satisfy the analyst's needs for specific situational data. The analysis results should allow for reprocessing and verification.

Methods of Political Analysis. The basis of the methodological diversity of political analysis is determined, on the one hand, by its characteristics as an applied field, and on the other hand, by the characteristics of political issues as the subject of analysis. The success of applying certain methods to reflect the situation in political analysis, the operability and innovativeness of the methods, often requires proposing relatively simple actions that do not demand significant time, organizational, or other costs, quickly adapt to various problematic situations, and combine the priority of qualitatively substantiating quantitative conclusions.

In general, political analysis can be divided into two groups—general and specific. General methods determine the direction, perspective, and methodological support of all stages of political analysis. These include event analysis (English: Event analysis), situational analysis, and several other types of analysis.

Specific methods include standard methods borrowed from statistics, sociology, economics, and other scientific fields. Their application in various combinations at specific stages of political analysis is determined by specific goals and factors such as the nature of the problem, the research perspective, data availability, organizational considerations, and others. This group of methods includes the selection method, expert evaluation method, correlation and factor analysis, content analysis, mathematical modeling, cost-benefit analysis, and others.

Among the general methods that help shape the most important assessments and approaches to understanding the situation, event analysis holds particular significance. Within this analysis, political processes manifest through a series of events, such as political leaders' speeches, mass demonstrations during elections, the adoption of normative acts, political assassinations, and others. Each of these events influences the situation in one way or another, and behind each event stand individuals with their own interests. Thus, this method regulates the flow of political events by proposing methodological tools. The proposed tools help structure events and sometimes reveal hidden objective ideas for the visible subjects of these processes. As a result, it becomes possible to develop objective assessments, predict and substantiate the development of events.

The exemplary scheme of this method includes the following:

- Identifying political participants in the political process and non-political actors behind each participant or influencing the processes;
- Assessing the degree of political influence and other factors of event participants or political forces supporting them;
- Studying the strategic goals and tactical tasks of political process participants, evaluating the configuration of political forces and interests;
- Identifying possible strategic alliances and tactical coalitions, assessing the characteristics of event development and the reactions of political process participants and subjects, and developing plans for the development of the political situation in one or another direction;
- Developing alternative actions and assessing their potential success;
- Forecasting the development of the political situation and developing an overall strategy based on optimal activity variants, considering implementation tools and resources.

Thus, the event analysis method reflects the following scheme: political situation - event - environment - participants (their resources, interests, interrelations) - alternative solutions - plan (scenario) and forecast - activity strategy.

An example of the practical application of event analysis is the analysis and development of conflict control and stability within the “Conflict Management and Stability System” (CMSS-Russia) project implemented by the Institute.

The Essence of Political Analysis. The need to solve tasks in the field of politics and find convenient methods and technologies to achieve goals requires a unique approach to studying political events. Unlike theoretical-political approaches, this approach must serve the solution of practical issues.

In general, political technologies are not aimed at creating theories or multiplying theoretical knowledge about political events but at using existing scientific-theoretical potential to solve practical tasks in the political field. In this context, theoretical views, accumulated experience, the ability to solve political tasks, and the ability to foresee are of great importance. In other words, without

resorting to deep theoretical generalizations, practical sciences can draw conclusions based on existing practical experience.

Applied political knowledge, in particular, serves to elevate human political activity to the level of art. The methods and techniques used by practical political science are aimed at studying the political process, the behavior of various subjects, their actions, and interrelations. In a narrow sense, the subject of practical political science is narrower than that of theoretical political science. While theoretical political science is concerned with the essence of power or the state, practical political science is interested in the forms of manifestation of power or the state in practice and their impact on human behavior. However, analysis and conclusions made using political technologies contribute to the enrichment of theories, the creation of new hypotheses, paradigms, and approaches.

Practical political research does not cover the entire political space but includes areas of practical importance for the functioning of state power. These include conflict management and resolution, decision-making, negotiations, and organizing election campaigns. Within these areas, several specialized fields have emerged, such as policy-making, policy management, conflict management, and others. Among these specialized fields, political analysis (policy analysis) stands out, which describes the methods and measures for studying specific political problems.

Political analysis is a practical science with its own subject. In a broad sense, the concept of “political analysis” is applied to all political research. In a narrow sense, political analysis sets requirements that prevent arbitrariness and subjectivity in studying specific problems and serves to find the most rational solutions, identifying the necessary technological tools and methods of activity.

A specialized group of professionals is engaged in political analysis, including technologists, analysts, experts, consultants, public relations specialists (PR managers), party apparatus employees, and political assistants. They serve politicians, various political structures, and state administration bodies. These professionals propose recommendations and suggestions, develop forecasts, plans,

and programs related to the activities of state and party bodies, provide analytical information to improve the activities of management bodies, and prepare other documents aimed at facilitating the solution of specific political problems.

The unique characteristics of political analysis are conditioned by a number of reasons and factors. As a form of practical knowledge, political analysis is primarily aimed at defining and studying specific problems faced by the subject. Therefore, while theoretical political science logically isolates and analyzes a specific area of the political space, practical political science focuses on analyzing specific problems, i.e., a part of reality.

If political theory is aimed at deepening knowledge about the research object, political analysis strives to explain the object more simply. While fundamental science allows for a deep and systematic study of the object, political analysis draws conclusions based on the practical needs of the subject, provides recommendations, and does not go beyond the specific task. In other words, if science forms the logical image of the object, political analysis creates the practical image of the object and studies it within a specific time frame.

It is worth noting that not all social contradictions and conflicts arising in the political sphere can be classified as problems requiring political analysis. Only problems of significant importance to society, affecting the interests of broad sections of the population and social values, and directly or indirectly influencing the activities of management bodies require political analysis. This focus on such problems determines the unique characteristics of practical political analysis. In particular, due to the strong competition in the political sphere, rivals understand and interpret the situation differently. In this case, the situation is not only assessed by the specialist or expert conducting the analysis. Additionally, the person who needs to solve the problem provides their own assessment of the situation. This person, based on their interests, worldview, status, and position, assigns the task of analyzing the problematic situation to specialists. Thus, they “order” the solution to the problem they have identified in the current situation.

In other words, the content of political analysis depends not only on the researcher-subject but also on the “client” who assigns the task of analyzing the situation. The “client's” interests determine the strategy of the specialists' actions, and they strive to meet the “client's” requirements.

Thus, the “client's” interests and needs play a priority role in solving the situation. Sometimes, the specialist striving to objectively describe reality and the “client” may interpret the situation similarly. However, in the political sphere, interested parties usually assess the situation, give a certain direction to contradictions, and set specific goals, all of which serve as important guidelines for the research. Therefore, the technologist conducting the analysis interprets the situation and provides practical recommendations based on the needs of the person or group interested in solving the problem. The dependence of technological knowledge on social orders is particularly evident in the stages of defining the situation and developing recommendations.

For example, representatives of both the ruling party and the opposition party may act as “clients.” They want to win the election, but their opportunities to achieve this vary, and the events in different regions differ depending on the course of political processes. Therefore, they interpret the current situation differently. Similarly, the attitudes of state administration officials and social movement members towards political crises differ significantly. Social movements tend to express the interests of social strata more. Therefore, for some, strengthening power and increasing its legitimacy is a primary task in a crisis, while for others, improving the population's standard of living is the only way out of the situation.

Thus, analyzing a specific situation can identify various problems. Therefore, specialists can study the situation from different perspectives, set tasks for themselves, and propose different solutions to the problem.

In conclusion, in political analysis, the “client's” interests must be taken into account, and the situation must be analyzed from this perspective.

The dependence of analysis on the “client's” interests indicates not the flexibility of political analysis, but rather its complexity. This is because political

life itself is intricate, with the interests of competing groups intertwined. A technologist-specialist must align scientific analysis with the “client's” interests. In some cases, political technologists may deviate from professional ethical requirements while harmonizing the “client's” interests with scientific criteria. There are examples from foreign pre-election campaigns where specialists simultaneously served competing forces, providing completely opposite recommendations to one “client,” thereby aiding the victory of another “client.”

Political analysis is essentially a form of scientific investigation of a situation. In other words, a specific political situation constitutes the subject of political analysis. Therefore, within the framework of political analysis, a technologist-specialist must:

- Reveal the causes of the problem;
- Identify its main characteristics;
- Interpret existing data;
- Determine the scope of the problem;
- Define its development pace and prospects.

Within political analysis, the situation is studied as a coherent entity with its own logic, sources of development, growth rate, and other indicators. In this sense, although political analysis may not deeply explain the logic of our daily lives, it should serve to streamline, perfect, and optimize political processes. A notable aspect is that the ratio of evaluative, theoretical, empirical, intuitive, speculative, and other types of knowledge is determined based on the specific political situation.

Political analysis aims to solve the following tasks during the investigation of a situation:

- Determine the conditions, external factors, and the boundaries of events occurring under their influence;
- Clarify the spatial and temporal scope of the situation;
- Identify all active subjects in the given situation;
- Assess the balance of power among these subjects;
- Identify key measures;

- Determine the factors influencing the behavior of the subjects;
- Predict the outcomes of ongoing events.

The methods used in studying political situations are typically interdisciplinary. Therefore, in providing a political assessment of a situation, psychological, sociological, anthropological, cultural, and other methods—systemic analysis—are employed. The main challenge here is the ability to apply various approaches and methods of political analysis in an interconnected manner. Additionally, adhering to specific criteria for interpreting the problem under study is necessary.

Another issue related to political analysis is the limitation of time. For example, sometimes specialists need to quickly provide recommendations to counter opposition in emergency situations. Therefore, the speed of studying a problem often becomes a crucial factor in its effective resolution.

Levels of Political Analysis. To correctly assess a situation, it is first necessary to choose the most appropriate means and methods of cognition. It should be noted that there are three levels of implementing political analysis.

The first level of analysis requires adherence to basic theoretical guidelines. Based on these theoretical principles, scientific hypotheses are formulated, goals and tasks are defined, and the necessary means, methods, and resources for their implementation are selected. At this level, the scope of the political situation is measured, key indicators are identified, and the connection of political events with the social environment is studied. This level of analysis may involve representing ideal types of events, recognizing stable laws of political development, and basing on the principles of rational choice theory.

The second level of analysis is aimed at determining which area of management relations the analyzed situation belongs to. For example, the problem may relate to interethnic or social conflicts and simultaneously manifest as part of a territorial process. Other features and indicators of the political situation are also evaluated from this perspective: whether the situation is stable or unstable, whether it fits into the subject's short-term plans or long-term strategies, and so on.

Generally, at this stage of analysis, the branch of the political process is identified, and corresponding technologies are developed. Considering such indicators of the political process allows for a better understanding of the specific characteristics of changes in a particular area, thereby enabling more precise definition of tasks guiding the actor's activities. For instance, in organizing pre-election campaigns, the sequence of actions such as forming working groups, conducting initial marketing of the political market, studying the electorate's political preferences, supporting a candidate for deputy, announcing their program, and carrying out propaganda work is defined in political technologies. However, separate political technologies can be developed for each of these tasks. Developing a sequence of actions for fundraising in an election campaign and defining the methods and techniques of this process are examples of this.

The third level of analysis carries significant weight in political analysis as it serves to find solutions to the situation. The most complex tasks related to shaping technologies are solved at this stage—transitioning from general theoretical thought to practice, developing practical recommendations. In this process, a discrete approach is used—the political situation is studied as a link or segment in a chain of events and changes. Here, attention is paid to analyzing the subject's behavior, studying the causes and instructions that prompted their actions. Since great importance is given to revealing the psychological causes of human activity, political analysis manifests as one of the directions studying behavior.

Stages of Political Analysis. If we consider political analysis as a unique research process, it is necessary to divide it into logical stages that ensure its success. According to American scholars J.B. Mangheim and R.K. Rich, the analytical process can be divided into the following stages:

- The stage of theoretical justification of the problem;
- The stage of modeling the problem;
- The stage of developing a research program for the problem;
- The stage of selecting methods to solve the problem.

The starting point of political analysis is the conceptualization of the problem, i.e., its theoretical justification. Here, the impact of the situation on the interests of political subjects, the activities of state governance bodies, relations with foreign partners, and ongoing political processes is studied. This requires collecting information, expressing the problem, identifying its specific features and components, and distinguishing it from other problematic situations.

In the second stage of political analysis, the problem is modeled, i.e., concepts are developed that somewhat simplify and explain the problem while allowing for a holistic understanding. Typically, such a model is based on a specific scientific hypothesis. This model also identifies the problem's key indicators and scope. The clarification of the problem's indicators is achieved through consistent operationalization. Here, operationalization is the process of transforming abstract qualitative indicators that aid in understanding the problem into quantitative indicators that define the problem. The next step after this process is instrumentalization, which involves specifying actions and steps. The final step in this process is measuring the problem, i.e., identifying relevant indicators. These indicators serve to reveal cause-and-effect relationships, develop criteria for effective and ineffective actions, and define indicators of the situation's positive and negative changes.

Such actions aim to simplify the essence of the situation and formalize its basic concepts. In fact, modeling strives for maximum formalization, widely using mathematical apparatus to describe these political phenomena. From this perspective, modeling manifests as a process of compacting and perfecting the researcher's ideas. As a result, the scope of the situation is clarified, qualitative indicators are transitioned into quantitative ones, the problem emerges as a fully measurable phenomenon, and changes in its scope can be examined. Generally, the modeling process should be logically consistent and allow the researcher to verify conclusions.

The next—third—stage of political analysis is the stage of developing a research program. At this stage, the logic of studying a specific problem is

substantiated and expressed. Within this stage, the goal of the research is defined (what is to be achieved by studying the problem), alternative ways to solve the defined task are identified, and the process of organizing and implementing the execution is detailed. Thus, at this stage, the positive and negative impacts of key factors on solving the problem are shown, various alternative paths and predictions regarding the situation's expected development are proposed, and the subject's action strategy is developed, among other things.

The task of such a program is to systematize empirical data. As a result, a research construct is formed that combines existing and future knowledge and directs the research toward solving a specific practical task, gradually developing the research step by step. Therefore, the development of such a program is assessed as the emergence of a method for fully controlling the situation.

Depending on the situation being analyzed and the priority goals, various programs of political analysis can be developed. Predictive programs—aimed at studying the expected future development of the situation; current programs—related to the analysis of the current situation; retrospective programs—aimed at finding new approaches to studying past events—are examples of these.

The fourth stage of political analysis—selecting methods to study and solve the problem—is of particular importance. As previously mentioned, the methods used at this stage are interdisciplinary. Nevertheless, solving any task always involves choosing the priority means and methods of research. This choice depends on the nature of the problem, the preparedness of the specialists involved in the analysis, and the conditions under which the analysis is conducted. Such a choice, of course, requires a qualitative and quantitative approach, combining theoretical and empirical approaches. The methods used may also differ in form (“rational attack,” individual or group expertise, etc.). Along with choosing research methods, an integral part of this stage is defining rules and measures, specifying the sequence of actions that systematize the use of various techniques and cognitive methods. Such rules serve to obtain accurate and reliable information about events and apply them in practice.

The knowledge formed as a result of applying political analysis must be conveyed to the “client” in the form of definitive or temporary recommendations, advice, or action instructions. Sometimes, when the situation is unclear, instead of providing ready recommendations, it is possible to be satisfied with information that reduces the uncertainty about the situation being studied and clarifies the “client's” position.

Collecting and continuously clarifying incoming information is of great importance in political analysis. To develop recommendations and select appropriate technologies to solve the problem, the data must meet several requirements:

- The information must be necessary and relevant, corresponding to the nature of the problem being solved;
- The information must be sufficient for a comprehensive study of the problem;
- The information must be reliable (accurate and correct) and timely (provided at the right time and place).

Additionally, the information must satisfy the specialist's need for information about the current situation as much as possible. The information must also allow for verifying the results of the analysis.

Various methods are used in analyzing political processes. Descriptive analysis—aims to identify and describe the relationships between various characteristics of events, assessing the result using generalized quantitative measures. Factor analysis—in studying political events, relies on the analysis of explicit and implicit factors influencing them. Event analysis—can serve as an example of concluding based on describing political events. Here, emphasis is placed on studying four aspects of each event: 1) the event's subject (initiator); 2) the event's object; 3) the type of interaction; 4) the place and time of the event. Content analysis—a method of quantitative analysis of information content, aimed at identifying the presence of specific words and terms in texts (books, interviews, newspaper articles, speeches, historical documents, etc.). The quantitative indicators identified in this way serve to interpret the text's content.

Deterministic analysis—drawing conclusions about specific events based on existing rules in practice. Positional analysis—determining the essence of the studied process by examining the attitudes, views, evaluations, and positions of political forces, individuals, and groups participating in these processes, creating a positional scheme. Resource analysis—a method aimed at identifying hidden and explicit resources for effectively solving a problem, assessing the potential strength of opponents. In political analysis, cognitive maps, statistical analysis, behavioral analysis, and comparative analysis methods are also used.

Seminar Questions:

1. What is the essence and characteristics of political analysis?
2. Provide information on the main criteria of political analysis.
3. What methods are used in political analysis?
4. How is political analysis divided into levels?
5. How many stages does political analysis include?

5. POLITICAL CONSULTING

1. Political consulting
2. Tasks of consulting
3. Stages and methods of consulting
4. Politics as a consulting process

Political Consulting. Political consulting has relatively recently become an integral technological field and mechanism in political processes. For example, in decision-making or electoral processes, the coordination of interests or the election of deputies was carried out directly by the participants in the situation without considering additional specialized functions aimed at achieving goals. However, over time, the situation has changed significantly. There has been a growing need for highly specialized actions in key political processes such as elections and state governance.

The intensification of competition in elections, the increasing demands of voters on candidates, and the complexity of voter motivation have created a need for careful planning and management of voter behavior. This requires knowledge of voter psychology, citizen demands, their reactions to standard and difficult situations, and indicators influencing their political desires and choices. In turn, this situation demanded research into the electoral market, the general experience of previous campaigns, effective tools, planning and forecasting actions, and financing the activities of electoral coalitions. Since the candidate or their close associates could not perform such functions, it became necessary to select specialized professionals to carry out these tasks. Similar processes have occurred in other areas of politics, particularly in decision-making. The increasing complexity of political governance and regulation objects, the rapid development of changes in the sphere of power, and the social costs of mistakes have forced leaders to turn to experts in economics, finance, and other fields.

For a long time, the need for specialized knowledge was satisfied by the staff of the management apparatus. However, over time, it became evident that their actions were insufficient due to the emergence of corporate and personal interests in resolving certain decisions. At the same time, the development of market relations increased competition between state organizations and the private sector in serving the population. This, in turn, led to the redistribution of financial flows. At one point, the activities of several corporations demonstrated the effective functioning of specialized but independent consultants who presented corporate projects for expertise. For example, in 1914, the first modern consulting firm specializing in consulting services was established in Chicago. Such structures gradually expanded, turning consultants into permanent participants in goal-setting and decision-making processes. In the USSR, the widespread use of consultants began in the 1960s. This was due to the increasing complexity of reporting for production enterprises and the regular emergence of leaders' interest in new management methods. Thus, the consultant became a specialist with modern scientific knowledge and qualifications, capable of forming an objective assessment of the situation of interest to the client and satisfying their needs in a particular management area.

In summary, throughout the 20th century, the consulting institution was consistently confirmed as an integral mechanism for improving governance in various areas of political life. It also became a constant participant in the interaction of political factors such as “partner” or “competitor.” Currently, it has become a specialized analysis institute of social and political processes that presents its results to a specific (personal, group) “client.” It cannot satisfy all the needs for improving governance but is an integral part of this process. Today, political consulting is a variety of professional assistance to leaders and political organization personnel (clients) in performing specific tasks, based on reducing risks in work activities. Accordingly, it remains a mechanism for improving the practice of managing and leading political processes and organizations, their rationalization, sequence of actions, and other aspects.

The tasks of political consulting in the political sphere are as follows:

- Providing objective assessments of the situation and correct advice to organizational leadership based on modern national and international experience on issues of interest;
- Delivering these consultations in the appropriate form, at the right time, and in a convenient place for the client;
- Reducing risks in the management activities of clients;
- Increasing the reliability of decisions being made; assisting leadership and organizational personnel in mastering modern management methods.

Despite the variety of management situations, conditions, and client demands, political consulting is carried out in two main forms: reflective and game consulting.

Reflective consulting involves the consultant formulating recommendations and encouraging the leader's reflection on the impact of these recommendations. In this case, the consultant not only directs the leader's activities and corrects their actions and ideas but also acts as an assistant who stimulates thoughts about various aspects of professional activity through their advice. Here, the consultant demonstrates their knowledge, respects the client's knowledge, establishes trusting communication, and can influence the situation by awakening the leader's concern for the fate of their work and using personal characteristics.

The second method—game consulting—is used when the consultant doubts the practical application of their recommendations or cannot fully formulate them and needs additional confidential or private information. In such cases, the consultant uses two forms: the “training” form, which reflects an abstract situation similar to the state of the organization (state, region, etc.) from an external perspective; and the “practical” form, which models problematic situations occurring in the organization (state, region). In the second case, the consultant proposes an “innovation” model aimed at obtaining new information that allows participants to understand and make decisions, or “analytical-activity” models aimed at clarifying and modeling the positions and motivations of key players. Game forms demonstrate a complex methodology for studying situations based on partially designed actions aimed at predicting and assessing the development of events. As a

rule, they all include three main stages: situation diagnosis, solution development, and goal implementation.

In the process of interaction with the client, consultants can play various roles based on their typology of actions. In general, consultants are very diverse. For example, in addition to those recruited from specific organizations, internal consultants working within the organization and capable of performing expert functions, group and individual, national and international, and other consultants can be distinguished.

The typology of consultants by the level of specialized knowledge is very widespread. In particular, the following can be distinguished: “scholar,” “researcher,” and “expert.” The consultant-“scholar” performs the function of carrying scientific views in a broad field (for example, in conflictology) or in narrow fields of science (specialist in ethnic conflicts). The activities of such specialists are usually aimed at forming long-term forecasts and assessments that reduce the ambiguity of perceptions about the emerging situation. The role of this type of consultant is especially valuable in conditions of instability and transition processes.

The consultant-researcher is primarily engaged in scientific research. However, they are a specialist in the narrow range of problems of interest to the client. If this specialist is a conflictologist, then they are a consultant-“researcher” deeply engaged in conflicts between certain states, ethnic groups, residents of a particular region, and others. In this situation, given that their professional activity is based on theoretical knowledge, the client's need for them is not very high.

The third type of consultant is the consultant-“expert.” They are primarily a practitioner specializing in narrow areas of political relations: the interaction of election headquarters with the media, the coordination of interests in electoral structures, political forecasting, and other areas. Expertise itself is the opinion and considerations of highly qualified professionals, presented in the form of structural, qualitative, or quantitative assessments of an object, intended for use in decision-making. The professional status of a political analyst does not require them to have

fundamental, specialized knowledge in all problematic areas that manifest the client's interests.

Expertise can be individual and collective, single-stage and multi-stage, with or without information exchange between experts, anonymous and open. The variety of fields in which expert assessments are applied ensures the versatility and adaptability of the analytical apparatus used in practice.

The consultant-"expert" in this role can perform the functions of an "evaluating consultant," "teacher-mentor" (teaching personnel certain knowledge), and "inspector" (independently monitoring a part of the organization's activities based on the leadership's assignment).

Some specialists in the field of consulting, particularly M.Kubr, divide consultants into "resource" and "process" consultants. The essence of this division is that the activities of the first type of consultants are mainly related to providing information specialized in the leadership's plans, situation diagnostics, proposals, and considerations. This type of consulting is used when the leader wants to use the specialist's knowledge but does not want their intervention in the organizational changes within the leader's divisions. At this time, the "process" consultant not only provides specialized information but also strives to implement certain structural changes in the organization, thus becoming a subjective factor in internal changes.

In summary, the effectiveness of political consulting is determined by the degree of fulfillment of the assigned tasks and the consistency of the results shown and obtained. At the same time, consulting as a process of interaction between the client and the specialist involves identifying specific criteria for their behavior that determine the achievement of a common goal. In this case, moral and ethical factors and adherence to ethical norms in mutual relations significantly influence the resolution of tasks.

In this matter, the nature of the relationship between the client and the consultant is of central importance. The success of their interaction begins with what the client expects from the future meeting with the specialist. Practice shows that in many cases, the client is guided by certain stereotypes that plan their cooperation.

For example, the client may be influenced by various stereotypes: the “consultant-doctor” (according to which the specialist must make the correct diagnosis and “treat” the situation), the “teacher” consultant image (portraying the consultant as a wise and knowledgeable person), the “consultant in the pocket” (portraying the consultant as a person who fulfills any wish of the client), the “consultant-inspector” (having a negative attitude towards the specialist who comes to obtain the necessary information), the “consultant-profane” (treating the consultant as a person who, like the client, does not have much knowledge), and so on.

In turn, consultants may also feel the influence of stereotypes towards the client. They may perceive the client as a “wallet” from which any information can be extracted; as a “spy” who monitors every step and interferes with work; as a “friend” who uses their capabilities in friendly relations and can agree on any issue, and so on. The danger of such images lies in the fact that they can establish rigid and inadequate boundaries in the future relationship between the client and the consultant and hinder the establishment of constructive cooperation. Therefore, the primary requirement for the consulting process is to be free from stereotypical thinking. A unique “psychological” contract should be established, forming the basis for creating a friendly atmosphere of cooperation between the client and the consultant.

The client and the consultant must accept the consulting process as an inevitable interaction. As future specialists and owners of professional knowledge, they may view the problem differently, but they can jointly identify its characteristics and develop ways to find solutions. In this case, the client should not interfere with the consultant's professional activities, and consultants should not expand their information fields at the expense of information unrelated to the task being resolved.

In the process of interaction, the consultant should manage work interests without touching them, not get caught up in the client's aspirations, and not strive to achieve pre-planned results. After receiving certain conclusions and recommendations, they should not pressure the client or demand the immediate

implementation of proposed innovations. The consultant must remember one thing: their recommendations are part of the strategic plans of the client's management information, and only the client is responsible for decision-making.

Consultants have the opportunity to partially possess confidential and exclusive information related to the reputation of an organization or individuals. Therefore, they must be very careful in using this information, keep it secret, and not use it as a source of personal gain. The consultant must protect the reputation and personality of their client. However, in doing so, consultants should not allow themselves to bypass societal ethical norms and professional code rules to preserve the client's status, use methods of information terror, or exert psychological pressure on citizens.

Depending on the situation, the consultant can use methods of interaction with the client within the following boundaries: from “client advocate” type relationships to “position advocate” type relationships. The consultant should not raise ideological issues, restrain themselves from public criticism of the client during project work, and, in case of conflicts, may make critical statements or even terminate the contract and refuse to fulfill obligations.

The consultant can influence the client through the following ways based on their personal human qualities: by demonstrating specialized knowledge and skills beyond the client's knowledge; by showing professional dedication and firmness; by firmly proving the absence of their position; by using the awakening of closed, risky, anxious feelings in the course of work; by encouraging the client's actions and applying sanctions for incorrect use and interpretation of details (in the form of refusing cooperation).

Stages and Methods of Consulting. Given the diversity of political processes and management tasks in which consultants participate, the consulting process has a general logic based on the universal phases and stages of interaction with the client. In particular, it is necessary to separately emphasize consulting provided to certain political and state organizations in the decision-making process.

The initial contacts between the “client” and the consultant serve as the preparatory stage of consulting. At this stage, the consultant must resolve a group of tasks related to the initial acquaintance with the organization. In this case, the consultant must determine the main reasons why the “client” has turned to them. After all, the involvement of external specialists can be carried out for various purposes. For example, compiling a list of tools, using the expert to resolve personal problems of the leadership, forming the “scientific” appearance of decisions in the eyes of the leadership, and so on. However, in most cases, the consultant is invited to solve one problem, but other problems exist in the organization.

To identify such problems, the consultant must conduct an initial diagnosis of the problematic situation aimed at identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the activities of the structure that proposed it. For this, the consultant can conduct interviews, micro-surveys, and questionnaires with the organization's leadership and individual team members and summarize the results of their observations. An integral part of such work is the consultant's familiarity with existing analogous experiences. In this case, the “client,” interested in the success of the work, should guide the consultant with as complete information as possible about the state of work in the problematic area. The consultant should not hide anything; otherwise, it may affect the correct setting of goals and their future achievement. Therefore, the “client's” closed behavior indicates their incompetence in relation to the consultant's work.

As the problematic situation becomes clearer, the consultant prepares the foundation for their future activities. In particular, they determine the criteria for the full or partial success of resolving the situation and then define the measures of their professional activity. When consulting is carried out in a group form, the selection of specialists in the required direction is carried out (for example, a media manager, analyst, manager, etc.).

Another important task performed at the preparatory stage is the technical preparation of consulting. This includes determining the consultant's need for special equipment (communication tools, computer equipment, etc.) and ensuring

conditions for their work (premises, transport, etc.). In other words, this is the process of mobilizing consulting resources. At the end of this process, the consultant concludes a contract with the “client” that defines the work procedure.

After such formalities are completed, the most important stage begins—the diagnosis of the current problematic situation. Based on the content of the work, the consultant conducts an analysis aimed at identifying the internal and external connections of the problem and revealing clear indicators that arrange events in a sequence. As a result, not only the essence of the goal is revealed, but the consultant's opportunities to achieve it are also determined. If previously unnoticed aspects of the problem are revealed, the consultant may make changes to the contract concluded with the “client.”

This repeated diagnosis involves collecting multifaceted information, using qualitative and quantitative research methods, utilizing existing databases, and analyzing structural factors, ongoing events, and changes. Based on this, the causes of the problematic situation and the factors that positively and negatively affect it are identified; the composition of the actors involved in resolving the conflict; the main actions and interactions in this area are determined.

The result of this diagnostic-research stage is the “diagnostic report” prepared by the consultant and presented to the “client,” which should indicate the reasons for the organization's ineffective activities.

Based on the identified causes of the problematic situation and the group of individuals involved in resolving it, the consultant proceeds to the stage of developing proposals for resolving the emerging contradictions.

The central link of this stage is determining the information base of consulting. For this, the consultant aligns their expert knowledge with the information available to the “client.” In this case, the consultant must familiarize themselves with the confidential information managed by the “client.” This helps the consultant understand the general boundaries of the actions the “client” can take to resolve the situation. For example, in election campaigns, the game aimed at defeating the opponent may involve not only violating ethical norms but also the regulations of

the Central Election Commission (CEC) and even laws. Accordingly, the consultant must understand the boundaries of the “client's” actions. In other words, the consultant's efforts should be directed at improving the actions that suit the “client.”

Based on this extensive information, the formulation of proposals involves modeling the situation, creating scenarios for the development of events, and developing rules and norms of activity. The consultant must present the consequences of accepting or not accepting the proposals and the forecast of the development of events. As a result, the consultant formalizes their proposals in a document.

The next stage of implementation involves the consultant's bilateral participation as defined by the contract. If the contract does not specify the participant's involvement in the practical implementation of the project, they occupy a certain position in the organization's practical activities, performing specific functions. If the contract limits the consultant's activities to only formulating proposals, they do not participate in the process of improving activities at this stage. In some cases, the specifics of the consultant's participation are revised and formalized in a separate contract with the “client.”

In this case, if the consultant participates in the implementation of the proposal, their relationships and interactions with various individuals and groups within and outside the organization begin to form. In this case, disagreements may arise. The effectiveness of cooperation in the previous stages may turn into sharp conflicts with the “client” and vice versa. Experience has shown that involving the consultant (participation in the implementation of proposals) is quite appropriate, as practice may reveal new facts that require revision and necessary adjustments to activities. In return, the task of reaching an agreement among all existing subjects is resolved.

The final stage of the interaction between the consultant and the “client” involves summarizing the results of cooperation. In this case, an overall assessment of the consulting is given, the final accounting of the parties' obligations is carried out, and plans for future cooperation are developed.

Politics as a Consulting Process. Political consultation as a process. In post-totalitarian states, the democratic reforms being implemented are complex and systemic in nature. In previously centralized states with a one-party system and a planned economy, building a democratic society and establishing a market economy require profound reforms in various spheres of societal life. Such transformations naturally encompass the state governance system as well. Implementing deep reforms on a state scale gives rise to numerous challenges. One such challenge is the lack of necessary knowledge and experience among those making responsible decisions. This issue can also be explained by the absence of mechanisms for transferring knowledge and experience about democratic governance systems. Additionally, the shortage of specialists capable of providing advisory warnings and recommendations to government bodies on the development and implementation of state strategies further exacerbates the aforementioned problem. It can be said that in the state governance systems of former Soviet countries, there was no practice of utilizing political consultation.

However, advice provided by a qualified specialist or scholar can bring new vitality to democratic reforms and assist in their effective implementation. Political consultation allows for a fresh approach to problems, finding innovative solutions, determining the effectiveness of political decisions, preventing errors, and learning from historical experiences. Under the communist order, there was no need for consultation in developing strategies, defining priority directions of policy, or determining methods for their implementation. Political decision-making relied on ideological principles. In the new political order, the need for advice and recommendations increases. Scientific and pedagogical personnel possess vast intellectual potential and experience that can be utilized in such consultations. Nevertheless, scientific and pedagogical personnel are only occasionally involved in the political consultation process, and their intellectual potential is not always effectively utilized.

In developed countries, so-called “think tanks,” or intellectual technologies, are widely used in political consultation. Emerging in the early 20th century in the

United States and several European countries, “think tanks” aimed to direct scientific knowledge toward solving pressing social problems. The widespread application of knowledge in practice to improve the quality of political decision-making processes became one of their primary activities. The founders of the first “think tanks” viewed their activities as a form of entrepreneurship, measuring their effectiveness by the “sales” volume of ideas.

It is worth noting that “think tanks” attract interest not only through their achievements and influence but also by being “idea centers.” The need to establish social control over the state and explore opportunities to improve politicians' activities also encourages the study of “think tanks.”

Analyzing the activities of “think tanks,” known in the West as “Think Tanks,” allows us to draw conclusions about them. By the second half of the 20th century, “think tanks” opened vast opportunities for social engineering, i.e., designing the future development of society. The more this technology of engaging a country's intellectual potential in societal development is advanced, the more effective the country's politics become, as confirmed by practice. In general, “think tanks” became a customary method of rationally and effectively utilizing intellect and knowledge in social life and receiving compensation in return. “Think tanks” consider their primary task to be the implementation of social engineering, i.e., reforming and improving society based on knowledge. In this process, the idea in the mind of a scholar working in a “think tank” takes the form of an analytical document, is shaped into a political program, and then presented to politicians. Subsequently, this program is transformed into legislative or executive documents by the “think tank.” Thus, in a continuous chain-like process, the “think tank” acts as an idea generator, analyst, forecaster, presenter of conclusions to the public, a party engaging in public communication, the author of draft legislation or executive documents, and, most importantly, a representative of societal interests.

The activities of “think tanks” constitute two interrelated processes. Firstly, the task of developing and utilizing societal intellectual potential is transferred from the state to civil society institutions (non-governmental organizations). These

institutions not only develop and utilize intellectual potential but also organize the social engineering industry. Here, knowledge occupies a central place and forms the foundation of the technologies being applied. The second process is related to the transition from a policy based on the personal responsibility of leaders to a mass policy based on the responsibility of the active part of civil society. In this context, “think tanks” serve to enrich non-specialist citizens with expert knowledge. The interdependence between politicians and expert advisors naturally yields results not only in mass politics but also in the implementation of overall state policy.

Developing a communication strategy between the state and society is one of the primary tasks of “think tanks.” “Think tanks” take the initiative in raising pressing issues for socio-political life. These issues later become public, are discussed, relevant documents are prepared, and eventually, the issue transitions from the realm of mass politics to the legislative and executive spheres of the state, taking the form of a political decision.

The important characteristics of “think tanks” are manifested in the following:

- “Think tanks” do not influence people's consciousness to instill a specific ideology but serve to support and develop communication between the state and civil society institutions.

- “Think tanks” are not the subjects but the participants in the processes of reforms, changes, and innovations in society. In this process, they act as idea generators, representatives of research results, organizers of communication in mass politics, and advisors in institutional politics. However, these roles do not grant them the right to control people's consciousness or influence a specific audience.

- “Think tanks” develop ideas and thoughts not as analytical texts or abstract views but in the form of recommendations. The documents produced by “think tanks” consist of recommendations, and any fundamental research results have an applied nature.

- “Think tanks” present their ideas and projects in practical forms during the political consultation process. However, their recommendations are not in the form

of administrative documents but as projects. These documents envision strategic management, current management, and project management.

- “Think tanks” may also develop and publish documents as participants in mass politics, outlining their activities, stance on specific issues, and future plans.

Previously, information dissemination, political analysis, and political consultation were considered the same, but today, political consulting (consultation) is emerging as a separate field. While consultants previously focused on interpreting available information and making predictions based on scenarios, today they are engaged in developing precise technologies for organizational design, strategic planning, quick problem-solving tools, shaping politicians' images, and brand-building.

A natural question arises: what should the recommendations provided by “think tanks” be like? What issues should they cover? The extent to which recommendations serve justice, truth, and goodness is of significant importance. Additionally, the intended goal, the alignment of the project's implementation with people's desires, and similar issues should also be addressed in the recommendations.

Recommendations must have a specific addressee. That is, it must be clearly expressed who the recommendations are directed to, on whose behalf they are stated, and how closely the addressee's and author's viewpoints align. Recommendations serve to accelerate the adoption of specific laws or executive decisions. From this perspective, recommendations should not present a single solution to a problem but several alternatives. That is, recommendations should not advocate a single viewpoint but should express all thoroughly analyzed and predicted perspectives. Therefore, recommendations always take the form of a project.

The document text presents clear conclusions and directed advice. In this, “think tanks” utilize mass communication institutions (TV shows, briefings, public debates, roundtable discussions, conferences, etc.) with internet networks and interactive communication capabilities to showcase their intellectual products. Additionally, the advisory document indicates sources of financial support for

implementing the recommendations. “Think tanks” are essentially civil society institutions, and state institutions placing orders with them facilitate democratic processes and stimulate the development of civil society.

Seminar questions:

1. What is political consultation, and for what purpose is it used?
2. Is there a difference between consultation and political consultation?
3. What tasks does political consultation have?
4. How many stages does the consultation process have?
5. What methods of consultation exist today?
6. What role does political consultation play as a process?

6. POLITICAL MANAGEMENT AND POLITICAL PR

1. “Public Relations” technologies: essence, forms, and tasks
2. Tasks and basic principles of “Public Relations” technologies
3. The role of “Public Relations” technologies in the political communication system. Propaganda and public relations
4. Stages of applying “Public Relations” technologies

“Public Relations” Technologies: Essence, Forms, and Tasks. Article 29 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan states: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, speech, and belief. Everyone has the right to seek, receive, and disseminate information, except for information directed against the existing constitutional order and other restrictions established by law.” To fully exercise this right, it is necessary to regulate communication between citizens and the state. Developing specific mechanisms for this task and applying modern information technologies have become one of the pressing issues of today. One such mechanism is “Public Relations” (PR) technologies.

Until recently, “Public Relations” technologies were known as an integral part of economic relations. Today, they are widely used in the effective organization of state governance. In developed countries, legislative, executive, and judicial authorities apply “Public Relations” technologies in their activities, which is clear evidence of this.

“Public Relations” technologies serve to create a positive image of organizations, enterprises, and state institutions, shaping public opinion to ensure their effective functioning. This task is carried out through various means, primarily through mass media.

“Public Relations” technologies are the art of establishing communication between state governance bodies, public organizations, and citizens in the interests of society. These technologies are aimed at controlling communicative flows and information emanating from any structure. The goal is to establish positive relations

between the structure and the public, which depends on the content of the information conveyed. Thus, for any organization to function effectively, it must consider not only its employees but also the attitudes and opinions of the public.

“Public Relations” technologies are a unique type of information technology aimed at achieving political goals while respecting the recipient. These technologies are not based on falsehood and serve to improve relations between the communicator and the recipient. Their reliance on truth allows for the free discussion of existing problems among the public and fosters a positive image of decision-making centers among citizens. Such activities increase public trust in political subjects and encourage conscious action. As a result, barriers between the government and the people are removed, and citizens are widely involved in the decision-making process.

“Public Relations” technologies are categorized based on their objectives. For example, they can be used to improve relations between the communicator and state and public organizations (public affairs), create a desired image (image making), strengthen relations with mass media (media relations), manage information delivery and its reception by the audience (message management), work with personnel in information centers (employee communication), conduct public surveys (public involvement), establish close relations with sponsors (investor relations), organize exhibitions and promotional events (special events), and manage crisis situations (crisis management).

In state governance, “Public Relations” technologies serve the following tasks:

- Informing citizens about state activities;
- Ensuring active citizen participation in political processes;
- Gaining public support for politicians and state programs;
- Creating a positive image of state structures.

Thus, “Public Relations” is a specific management task aimed at establishing communication between the state and society, creating a cooperative environment, studying public opinion on existing issues, and taking practical actions based on it.

It focuses on ensuring that governance serves the interests of society, mobilizing the public for reforms, and preventing undesirable situations. “Public Relations” is carried out on the basis of legal, transparent, sincere, and ethical communication.

In summary, “Public Relations” technologies are an integral part of the state governance system, reflecting the views, opinions, values, and interests of society members and ensuring harmony and cooperation among them. In the political sphere, these technologies serve as a unique mechanism for explaining certain ideas to the public and introducing them to leaders. They also help resolve conflicts between the state and society, and between government bodies and citizens.

Tasks and Basic Principles of “Public Relations” Technologies. If state governance bodies are not controlled by the public, and the methods and tools they use to manage society are not transparent, democratic values in society will inevitably suffer. Therefore, public relations services have become an integral part of the governance apparatus in many countries. The functioning of these structures largely depends on the existing order and legal foundations of governance. In the former Soviet system, the lack of public control over state institutions and the administrative-command governance style, along with the absence of a legal framework, were significant issues.

Today, the concept of “democracy” has acquired new meaning. Citizens not only participate in elections but also engage in decision-making processes and addressing societal issues. This requires a new approach to communication between the state and civil society institutions and the support of public organizations. Studying public opinion, basing political decisions on it, and widely informing citizens about upcoming decisions have become fundamental conditions for democracy.

In a democratic environment, the state cannot effectively fulfill its tasks without relying on public opinion and gaining public support. Recently, the state's coercive and command functions have gradually given way to mutually beneficial agreements with citizens, considering the interests of various social strata, and developing strategies acceptable to both the state and the public. As a result, there is

a growing need for structures within state institutions that establish constant communication with citizens and public associations. Of course, these structures cannot solve all problems related to communication between the state and society. They only serve to create a cooperative and harmonious environment between the state and the public on a professional basis. This involves not one-way information dissemination but also considering citizens' opinions, studying their reactions to the information provided, and making decisions accordingly. In developed democratic countries, these services are of great importance.

From the above, it is clear that “ensuring mutual harmony,” “establishing two-way communication,” and “gaining public trust” are key features of public relations. The main goal of “Public Relations” technologies is to professionally manage governance.

Today, achieving goals through coercion, violence, or false information is condemned. Creating a positive public image, promoting ideas, and gaining public attention are preferred. In this regard, “Public Relations” technologies serve to align state and societal interests. In such a governance approach, the subject and object are not opposing poles but a unified entity ready to unite for a common goal.

The application of “Public Relations” technologies not only changes public opinion but also adapts the characteristics of political subjects based on citizens' interests. For example, a company studies the market before producing a product. Based on marketing research, it draws conclusions and changes its activities. It produces goods based on demand and needs. Similarly, “Public Relations” technologies are used in politics. This approach is particularly prominent during election campaigns. Political parties reflect the interests of certain social groups in their programs, seek allies and supporters, and adjust their programs based on current demands. In general, they strive to align their interests with those of other political forces and the public.

In summary, the essence and features of “Public Relations” technologies are manifested in the following:

- Establishing a cooperative environment between state institutions and the public;
- “Public Relations” is a technology that influences public consciousness and opinion;
- “Public Relations” involves collecting and analyzing information and effectively communicating it to the public;
- The main task of “Public Relations” services is to develop recommendations for creating a cooperative environment between citizens and the state in implementing state programs and making political decisions;
- “Public Relations” not only establishes external communication but also ensures internal communication within state institutions.

In politics, “Public Relations” technologies are applied based on certain principles. The first is the principle of democratic governance. In totalitarian and authoritarian systems, communication between the state and the public may resemble “public relations,” but in essence, it is based on one-way influence. In a democratic environment, citizens exercise their rights and freedoms through civil initiatives. Only in a democratic system where human rights are ensured, and public associations and political institutions operate freely, can communication in the form of “public relations” be established.

Another principle arising from democratic governance is competition. The plurality of political subjects allows for the choice of various governance methods. If societal life is strictly limited, and the activities of public associations serve narrow interests, there is no need for “Public Relations” technologies.

Citizens' agreement forms the foundation of public relations. “Public Relations” services predict potential conflicts and provide opportunities for reaching agreements acceptable to opposing parties. It must be acknowledged that in some cases, relying on force and acting from the perspective of one party's interests is considered an effective way to resolve conflicts. However, the main feature of “Public Relations” technologies is that they use only agreements, conscious choices, and “finding common ground” to resolve contradictions.

The attitude of government bodies and the political elite to existing laws, i.e., the rule of law, is also an important principle in establishing public relations. When “Public Relations” technologies are applied in politics, ensuring the rule of law becomes a crucial task of the state. If legislation prioritizes state interests over citizens' interests, it harms cooperation between the state and the public. Considering that communication between the state and citizens is based on mutual trust, the responsibility of state officials becomes clear. Cases of officials abusing their positions, witnessed by citizens, lead to a loss of public trust in the state. Therefore, the strength of communication between the state and the public depends on the quality of work of state officials, the establishment of democratic values in society, citizens' trust in state institutions, and the legitimacy of state power.

In recent years, ensuring the “transparency” of state policy has become one of the fundamental conditions of democracy. Of course, mass media play an incomparable role in establishing democratic communication between the state and the public. Mass media are widely used to inform the public about decisions being made and their implementation. In a democratic society, the cooperation between mass media and political institutions forms the basis for mass media being called the “Fourth Estate.” Mass media provide the opportunity to monitor and, if necessary, control the activities of parliament, government, and administrative bodies.

The “Principles of Organizing Political Campaigns” developed by Samuel Adams in the early 19th century remain valuable today. He recommended the following principles for organizing political campaigns:

- Pay attention to the organizational aspects of political campaigns for effective management;
- Use symbols that remain in people's memories;
- Use short and concise texts along with symbols in visual posters;
- Organize stage performances that provoke debate and strongly influence public opinion;
- Act faster than opponents when commenting on information;

- Continuously influence public opinion using various information dissemination tools.

These principles are widely used in organizing political campaigns and pre-election propaganda in many countries.

The Role of “Public Relations” Technologies in the Political Communication System. Propaganda and Public Relations. In recent times, modern societies are referred to as “information societies.” In the 21st century, known as the “Information Age,” information has become a strategic resource, alongside natural resources and energy sources. In a free market environment, competition has also emerged in delivering information, which serves as a tool for political influence.

G. Lasswell (1902-1978), who studied the problems of delivering information to the public, theoretically substantiated in his 1927 book “Propaganda Techniques in the World War” that delivering information is also a means of promoting certain ideas and influencing public opinion.

Another scholar in the field of influencing public opinion through information, W. Lippmann (1889-1974), noted that people rely on stereotypes to understand reality. Appealing to these stereotypes facilitates communication between the state and the public. Lippmann introduced the new concept of “Agenda Setting” to the field. He believed that it is appropriate to create an “agenda” for the information to be delivered to the public. This involves considering how the information will be discussed and received by the population.

At this point, it is necessary to distinguish between public relations and propaganda. For example, in the former Soviet Union, propaganda was an integral part of state policy. As stated in the “Propagandist's Concise Pedagogical Dictionary” published at that time, “Propaganda serves to instill revolutionary ideas in the masses, convey the party's internal and external policies to citizens, and evoke class attitudes towards events in societal life.” From this perspective, all areas of society were ideologized, and material and intellectual wealth were subordinated to a single utopian goal. Public relations were entirely neglected.

“Public Relations” technologies are not limited to providing information to the public but also respond to the influence coming from the public, based on the principle of mutually beneficial cooperation. In propaganda, the interests, views, and values of the information recipient are not considered. In public relations, all relations are carried out based on citizens' interests. The following formula helps distinguish between these two systems:

Propaganda method:

SPEAKER —> LISTENER

Public Relations method:

SPEAKER <—> LISTENER

Theorists of public relations emphasize that this field is fundamentally different from propaganda. According to F. Taylor: “Propaganda is a method of delivering information where only ideas, ideologies, and information aligned with the communicator's interests are conveyed to the public.”

Sem Black, a scholar in the field of “Public Relations” technologies, states: “If propaganda serves to increase supporters, 'Public Relations' is an activity aimed at creating a cooperative environment based on mutual interests.” F. Jeffkins highlights the difference between public relations and propaganda, stating: “Propaganda is an activity aimed at maintaining political power by the government, while 'Public Relations' is aimed at explaining government policy to the public.”

Of course, both public relations and propaganda involve delivering information. In this regard, these two fields have many similarities. Public relations do not entirely reject propaganda. Propaganda tools are widely used in applying “Public Relations” technologies. However, the truthfulness and impartiality of the information are highly valued. The main difference between “Public Relations” technologies and propaganda lies in this.

Today, scholars identify two types of political communication: vertical and horizontal. “Public Relations” technologies are mainly used in vertical communication systems because there is a strong need for a cooperative

environment in vertical communications. At this point, it is necessary to focus on the meaning and essence of the concept of “political communication.”

Communication is the process of exchanging information between subjects through various means and mutually influencing each other based on it. The communication system consists of five parts: the communicator (subject, source of information, addresser), the recipient (object, receiver of information, addressee), the information (“message,” content), the means of transmitting information, and the means of receiving information. Any political institution requires political communication to function. In general, political communication performs the following tasks:

- Providing communicative support in the establishment and functioning of political parties and movements;
- Influencing public opinion, delivering information to citizens, and gaining public support for the actions of certain groups, parties, or state institutions;
- Studying public opinion, popularizing it, and influencing social opinion;
- Informing the public about ongoing policies and explaining their content and essence;
- Shaping and elevating political consciousness, influencing political socialization processes, and so on.

In general, it is necessary to consider that “Public Relations” is pragmatic, adaptable, and technological in nature. Typically, Information Services, which specialize in delivering state policy to the public and disseminating information about state activities, are used for this purpose. Therefore, press services perform the following tasks:

- Identifying mass media outlets interested in the activities of state institutions—periodicals, TV, and radio channels—and establishing cooperation with them;
- Studying public opinion about state institutions and conducting sociological research in this direction;

- Granting appropriate authority to journalists who wish to cover the activities of state institutions;
- Organizing press conferences, briefings, interviews, and formal or informal meetings between state leaders and journalists;
- Assisting journalists in obtaining information about state institutions that can be published;
- Preparing and distributing written information and press releases about state institutions;
- Preparing photo and video materials about state institutions for the press;
- Covering events organized by state institutions and planning information campaigns;
- Taking measures to eliminate information that may create a negative image of state institutions;
- Delivering all necessary information to the public, including information that may cause rumors, to mass media outlets.

Stages of Applying “Public Relations” Technologies. Although several considerations have been put forward regarding the application of “Public Relations” technologies, the model developed by Frank Jefkins stands out for its practicality. According to this model, the process of using these technologies includes the following stages:

- a) Assessing the current situation;
- b) Defining the objectives;
- c) Identifying the audience;
- d) Determining the channels and techniques of public influence;
- e) Developing a budget;
- f) Drawing final conclusions.

F. Jefkins suggests that in assessing the current situation, efforts should be made to replace feelings of opposition, resistance, caution, apathy, and ignorance among people with attitudes of “knowledge, support, and interest.” Among various proposals, the “four-step” model is considered universal. According to this model:

- 1) Identifying the problem;
- 2) Planning and programming;
- 3) Engaging in communication;
- 4) Drawing final conclusions constitute the “steps” of this model.

In applying “Public Relations” technologies, segmenting the audience—dividing it into various groups and delivering information that reflects their interests—is of great importance. Typically, the audience is segmented based on the following factors:

- Geographical location: Differences in where people live and their regional positions lead to variations in their political activity, views, and values;
- Demographic factors: Differences in age, gender, family status, and living standards result in varying perspectives and values;
- Psychological factors: Although people's mental states are more variable than other factors, they cannot be ignored. It is essential to consider levels of distrust or support, attitudes toward events, and political moods;
- Social status: A person's position and status in society significantly influence how they receive and respond to information;
- Reputation and influence: Using opinion leaders in applying “Public Relations” technologies is one of the most effective ways to deliver information. Influential individuals within groups are utilized to influence others, as identifying and communicating through opinion leaders enhances the effectiveness of propaganda;
- Membership: Members of a particular party or public association share common views and similarities;
- Participation in decision-making: People's involvement in politics affects how they receive information. Those who actively participate in decision-making or consider themselves “small individuals” approach information reception differently.

Segmenting the audience in this way and targeting specific groups is crucial when applying “Public Relations” technologies. Attempting to cover too many objects at once yields little result.

The essence of “Public Relations” technologies can be explained through their four main tasks:

1. Research: Analyzing the situation and identifying necessary tasks;
2. Action: Developing a program and budget for the required tasks;
3. Communication: Implementing the program;
4. Evaluation: Studying the results and making necessary adjustments.

P. Green identifies eight components of “Public Relations” technologies:

- General assessment: The necessity of applying “Public Relations” technologies, focusing on studying existing problems from the perspective of public interests;
- Objectives: Determining the specific characteristics of the PR campaign;
- Target audience: Identifying which social groups need to be engaged;
- Key information: Selecting the information that needs to be delivered based on the characteristics of the target audience;
- Tactics: Determining the tools, resources, and types of activities for the PR campaign;
- Schedule: Setting specific timelines for engaging with the public and completing each task;
- Budget: Developing a precise estimate of the resources and funds required for public engagement;
- Control: Establishing full oversight over the implementation of the PR campaign stages.

In the state governance of the Republic of Uzbekistan, sufficient legal and political foundations have been created for the application of “Public Relations” technologies. Recent reforms and innovations in our country reject outdated approaches to relations between the state and citizens. The transition from the administrative-command governance style of the former Soviet Union to a new method of achieving harmony between the state and citizens is demanded by the times. Applying new technologies, including “Public Relations” technologies, based on clear programs can yield effective results in fulfilling this task.

Seminar Questions:

1. What is the essence of “Public Relations” technologies?
2. What tasks do “Public Relations” technologies have?
3. What is the role of “Public Relations” technologies in the political communication system, and how are they used in propaganda and promotional activities?
4. Into how many stages is the application of “Public Relations” technologies divided?

7. DECISION-MAKING IN POLITICS

1. Decision-making in the field of public administration
2. Technologies for establishing state policy, political forecasting
3. Stages of decision-making

Decision-making in the field of public administration. Political decision-making in the sphere of state authority is considered a combination of actions by various subjects aimed at consciously defining and achieving goals. The term “decision-making” first appeared in the 1930s in the works of American scholars such as Ch. Bernard and E. Stin, primarily to describe the decentralization characteristics of social and organizational processes. This theory reached its peak of development in the 1960s (H. Simon, J. March). Today, various directions of this theory are actively being developed within the frameworks of organizational theory, economics, political science, sociology, and the modeling of social processes.

Due to the diversity of social processes aimed at achieving goals, the issue of a universal, “complete,” and unified algorithm for decision-making has hardly been raised in science. This approach is characterized by an ambiguous explanation of the situation, as it interprets decision-making as a sequence of specific technological actions related to the production of a special intellectual and organizational “product”; a method of implementing the interests of specific subjects; the development of strategies and tactics to achieve goals, and so on. In general, today all these different explanations can be summarized into two main approaches: normative and behavioral.

Proponents of the normative approach view decision-making as a set of rational, conditional actions and processes that lead to the achievement of optimal goals and the application of appropriate means (R. Abelson, A. Levi, etc.). Such research foundations are organically linked to the main premises of the “rational choice” theory, which stems from the concept of a rational individual striving to

develop optimal and ultimately effective decisions. From a procedural perspective, decision-making arises as a set of actions that evaluate the problem, select a solution, and link it to the planned positive outcome. The key methods for ensuring this process are various mathematical models and operations research (B.Lange, V.Sadovsky).

The behavioral approach in explaining decision-making (H.Simon) is based on the idea that the goals faced by real individuals are not always perfect and can be explained not only quantitatively but also qualitatively. Moreover, the number of alternative paths suitable for solving a problem is much greater than the alternatives an individual can consider. When it comes to the methods of implementing these goals, they are often more closed to the individual. Therefore, decision-making is seen as a unique method of interaction between specific subjects who create a purposeful program of actions in newly emerging conditions. Hence, as L.Plunkett and G.Hale note, decision-making is a situational process with goals, methods, and other components that continuously improve in response to changes in the conditions of a specific problem.

In practice, a combined approach is mainly used. It incorporates the advantages of both models and requires not only qualitative methods of explaining the situation but also the use of quantitative analysis tools. However, in such cases, the combined use of normative and behavioral elements has its own unique characteristics in each situation. This, in turn, limits the possibilities of universalization and algorithmization in the decision-making process.

Thus, the technologies and mechanisms used in decision-making are fully dependent on clearly defined processes and their specific characteristics. These, in turn, depend on the scope of influence, the types of active subjects, and other structural factors. Accordingly, it is possible to distinguish procedural features in decision-making within the corporate sector (at the level of individual organizations), public relations (in the societal sector), and the state authority sector.

In the latter case, we are dealing with the most important area of societal life, which has a significant impact on the fate of millions of people.

Characteristics of the state authority sphere. The specificity of the state authority sphere is highly complex, as it reflects the proportional interests of political forces, classes, and nations in the decisions of various state bodies and the actions of other individuals and structures. This is not accidental, as the state addresses a wide range of issues: from shaping political direction to handling individual applications (for example, obtaining a construction permit).

The decision-making process in the state sphere is primarily influenced by the legality of state authority, the formal legal consequences of the administrative system, and the use of administrative coercion methods (including physical coercion). In this context, the entire society is defined as the main object of the state's targeted actions. Society, in turn, is seen as a complex combination of macro- and micro-dependencies that often reject ordinary decisions.

At the same time, society not only determines the perfection and scale of governance but also has certain opportunities to influence decision-making. In other words, in addition to authorized professionals, various groups and public associations with specific rights and freedoms also participate in defining societal goals. Therefore, decision-making in the country becomes a constant dialogue between highly qualified specialists and society, involving both governors and the governed.

Thus, in general, the process of identifying the decision-maker (the person who makes decisions on behalf of the state, i.e., defines the real meaning of the issue and takes responsibility for planned actions) is a constant state of opposition among various groups: representatives of the state's administrative structures (various layers of bureaucracy), different groups of the political elite (both in power and in opposition), advisors and experts, as well as various public bodies (parties, pressure groups, media, etc.).

The intensity of the decision-maker identification process is reflected not only in the competition of interests but also in human desires, emotions, moods, behaviors, mistakes, and so on. The difference in the interests and positions of candidate individuals, as well as the inability to prevent illegal pressure methods,

often turns each stage of decision-making into a negotiation of incomplete interests, positions, and resources. However, in this multifaceted cooperation, formal authority and positions do not always lead to dominance. Despite the activities of public authority and governance centers, decisions are often made by small committees (councils) of officials, boards of large industrial companies, party committees, or groups pursuing their own interests.

This process is highly complex, and according to American scholars like B. Hogwood and L. Gunn, the constant participation of numerous individuals and groups at various levels reduces the likelihood of a rational approach to solving social problems and evaluating them in general.

In the creation of state decisions, the greatest influence is exerted by numerous pressure groups (lobbies) that control economic, financial, informational, and other general resources and protect the interests of certain individuals. According to the law, they do not attempt to influence the development of political decisions and principles, preferring to limit their areas of interest to economic issues. However, in many cases, the state remains subordinate. Under these conditions, the goals of lobby associations take the form of state decisions, while government institutions merely announce these decisions and create the necessary public and legal framework.

World experience shows that different countries use various lobbying methods, but the prevalence of one method or another depends primarily on how the government controls pressure groups. For example, in France, lobbying is formally recognized, while in the United States, strict laws regulate lobbying activities from start to finish.

However, the state itself, or more precisely, “interested” officials, often aligns with private entrepreneurs, industrial sectors, and regions, accepting personal desires and motivations. As a result, for example, officials appoint companies through which a particular agency organizes its relations in all sectors of the economy. At the same time, state-commercial banks are established, and regional offices of various ministries are created in different territories.

In general, the process of negotiating and balancing the interests of candidates striving to actually govern state affairs is highly complex. It involves the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of power, central and local government structures, pressure groups, and state bodies, creating a complex and multi-level organizational structure. This structure is weakened by unchanging divisions, the desire for similarity, and even the appropriation of others' tasks by certain units. The activities of most of these units are characterized by the futility of their actions. This, in turn, does not completely destroy but significantly weakens many mechanisms of interaction between the subject and object in governance. At the same time, the inability of government bodies to appeal to society and the constant use of abstract and non-operational ideas in defining goals make it extremely difficult to rationalize the tasks facing the country.

However, the state's structure has the greatest influence on defining goals, selecting technologies, and specific processes in decision-making and implementation. At each stage of this structure, specific work is carried out on goals and methods of achieving them.

Characteristics of the state as a decision-making subject. As a political decision-making center, the state's main goals are to preserve the country's territorial integrity, independence, and the dominance of the ruling system. Its institutions treat citizens as subordinates. As a result, ideological approaches and principles that ultimately reveal ways to exercise supreme political authority become the basis of their relations.

While emphasizing this governance approach, state bodies also analyze the appropriate definition of common problems and tasks. This analysis is primarily based on non-economic demands, including economic and even international (mainly political) issues. This approach promotes the idea of preserving a certain elite group at the top of power, but at the same time, it distances itself from legal norms and does not take into account the interests of the entire population.

In such a situation, the constant clash between the political values promoted by the state administration and the demands of economic efficiency, social justice,

efficient use of resources, constitutional requirements, and so on, often seriously limits the consistency of decisions made by state structures.

The need to solve the above-mentioned main goals and make decisions often strengthens the irrational nature of political governance components in defining national goals. This situation is also related to the special responsibility of the elite before public opinion. This opinion is aimed not only at clearly understanding the problems being addressed but also at accepting and understanding the actions of the leadership.

The political influence of society, as we all know, often pushes the government to take unexpected steps.

Despite its governance power, the state is forced to distinguish its political influence from the influence of various, sometimes even leading, prestigious political pressure centers on the state decision-making process. Former U.S. Secretary of State H.Kissinger once noted that during his time as an advisor to President Kennedy, the decision-making process seemed primarily intellectual. It was enough to enter the president's office to convince him of the correctness of one's views. However, he soon realized that such an approach, despite its widespread use, was very dangerous.

The political mechanisms of state governance, in many cases, are also subject to dependencies that do not add rationality to decision-making and manifest themselves as a chain of acquaintances. For example, about six months before elections, almost all tasks of state governance are directed toward pre-election goals. For this reason, at the end of their term, governance groups traditionally focus on measures that allow them to retain their positions and increase their popularity. At the same time, the governance apparatus seems to “freeze,” trying not to show loyalty to the current leaders, anticipating the possibility of new leadership. However, after the elections, especially with the arrival of supporters of a new political direction, this apparatus is reformed, taking into account new principles, and thus pays less attention to daily issues.

In other words, the political appearance of the state as a decision-making subject is evaluated as a special part of the system. This part creates broad, ideological goals for societal development and leads the entire state governance system. Its governance capabilities are limited by the influence of other political pressure centers, as well as by the moral and ethical customs and traditions formed in society, the judicial system, and public opinion structures. At the same time, political pressure, as a rule, depends not on the future planning of societal development but on the leadership's attitude to the changing reality. This often turns state bodies into hollow structures, devoid of personal proposals and aimed at implementing the recommendations of the country's political leaders.

Contrary to the above-mentioned methods of defining goals, the state joins the decision-making process as a macro-economic governance and steering body. In this case, its main goal is not power but the socio-economic integrity of society and its integration as a single society. Here, the leading social block in governance is the relations between the governors and the governed.

At this stage, the main subject implementing authority is not political but executive structures, primarily the government, as the supreme economic-distributive body. Its task is to rationally and economically coordinate political leadership plans and values with legal compliance and direction. In decision-making by the government, the main paths are served by law, rationality, and economic efficiency. That is, at this stage, state governance is directed toward defining rationalized goals and tasks. These, in turn, are determined by the need to use taxpayers' funds minimally and achieve the maximum possible results.

This direction, aimed only at governance requirements, requires state bodies to maintain stability and encourages them to develop their activities in accordance with the legislation in force and to solve tasks aimed at improving governance efficiency.

Today, in almost all developed countries, the increasing rates of growth in the coordination sphere contribute to the growing importance of state bodies in societal governance. State administration not only remains a more complete participant in

the process of creating decisions of public importance but is also constantly increasing its independence and self-governing status. If previously, for example, state workers could only in certain cases prepare political decisions and even make changes; at the departmental level, they could make decisions contrary to the political direction or criticize the decisions of political leadership, now state administration has broad opportunities to pursue its own course, influence political leaders, and even “implement politics” without involving public political figures.

Thus, while political institutions are capable of changing the structure of state bodies, their tasks, and even terminating the authority of certain individuals, i.e., seemingly controlling this sector of governance, state administration is rapidly gaining political weight and strengthening its position in decision-making mechanisms.

This trend is especially evident in stable political conditions, where political foundations firmly define the state of public opinion, and state governance bodies increasingly take the lead in defining general goals and identifying problems. Thus, with the growth of economic prosperity and the strengthening of the state's role in these countries, the population's confidence in the fair transition to strengthening the authority of executive bodies is created.

An unconventional contribution is also made to the decision-making process at the administrative level. Here, the government appears as a set of appropriately regulated institutions and organizations. Their activities are directed toward the goals of higher economic and political structures. At this level, the tasks considered by the state are to reproduce the orderly system of functional relations and to serve the population, i.e., to provide special services to citizens in health, education, and other areas.

For this purpose, state bodies transform the decrees of the supreme economic and governmental authorities into departmental manuals, adjust organizational structures to the tasks being performed, and form cadres of public groups to implement planned works. In the implementation of these goals, government bodies primarily use service manuals, work technologies, higher qualifications, and internal

codes. Here, the state treats its citizens as customers using the relevant products and services of certain state institutions and departments.

In other words, this “administrative phase” of state governance (B. Gurney) reveals the characteristics of internal and inter-organizational relations of executive and legislative structures. It covers the processes of creating specific decisions; the system of passing documents through various governance instances; intra-departmental preparation, discussion, and agreement of projects; and other aspects of this type of governance relations.

In the administrative environment, such processes, conditionally, demonstrate the micro-technological level of decision-making technologies. At this level, specific apparatus laws and procedures lead, specific apparatus subjects operate, and an organic chain of service and human relations emerges, seriously influencing the formation and implementation of state tasks (for example, a ministry department head, driven by competitive feelings with colleagues, may delay the preparation of an important state law draft; a military unit commander, based on internal army stereotypes, may escalate a military conflict with neighboring countries contrary to the political leadership's order, and so on).

In addition to the stages announced in the country's actions, there are also logics of mutual organization and self-governance that influence the nature of defining and implementing its decisions. This logic allows the state to limit or even deny its intervention in solving certain problems and to delegate certain tasks to various public organizations. This applies to certain problems (for example, environmental protection in hard-to-reach regions; taking control of a certain stratum of deviant individuals (patronage), and so on).

The mentioned levels of state governance show that in state decision-making, several logics and motivations for advancing (and implementing) issues collide at the same time. The decision-making process on an issue included in the state's mandate is carried out taking into account approaches and mechanisms. These, in turn, can be different and sometimes contradictory, and each ensures a special balance of the state's relations with society. This requires specific requirements for

the effectiveness of decision-making and a demonstration of the power and status of governance bodies. Often, the approaches and evaluations of the analysis of certain problems at each stage of the national state coincide. However, in each situation, it is never possible to say a priori where the real center of creating state goals is located.

Among these stages, there are also certain contradictions. For example, the American researcher H. Mintzberg states that political structures can create conditions and a level of centralization of societal governance that may not correspond to either the opportunities for processing business information or the opportunities for general governance. At the same time, it would be a mistake to absolutize the degree of these internal contradictions, as, in general, a unified state policy is still pursued in each country, and a highly qualified group of managers is formed who are engaged in the preparation and execution of state decisions, and from a functional perspective, this group is diverse.

The technologies for establishing state policy include political forecasting. State policy is aimed at purposefully solving tasks in economic, social, defense, and other areas of societal life and reflects the leading values and priorities of governance. The American theoretical scholar J. Anderson described the process of determining the political direction of the state as a “step-by-step activity plan.” This term encompasses “identifying initial positions, key issues, establishing and approving the political path, implementing it, and evaluating it.” The technologies for shaping and implementing state policy are determined by the choice of the subject of state governance and its nature, the financial capabilities of the country, and other factors (such as obligations to other states). At the same time, the foundation of state policy formation lies in decision-making processes aimed at reconciling interests, distributing goals and methods, and so on, through universal technological chains: political forecasting, planning, and programming.

Political forecasting reveals the overall impact of factors influencing the development of state governance and manifests as a hypothetical representation of future policies. In other words, forecasting is a type of hypothetical and projective methodology that creates a vision of the future. This approach to “looking into the

future” is based on scientific recommendations, accumulated life experience in a particular field, and information about the people who will implement these projects.

Unlike other methods of foreseeing the future, forecasting not only reveals the causal characteristics of the development of events and clarifies the sequence of goals and actions of governance bodies but also requires the search for the boundary meanings of the state coordination object. At the same time, it reflects changes in the environment organically connected to this process, the most general indicators of the state's counter-goals, and so on.

Forecasting is considered an ideal-transformative activity in which objective factors (such as indicators of the population's standard of living) and the subjective thoughts of managers are equally important in practice. Their practical connection primarily takes into account the territorial aspects of problems. This consideration directs analysts to identify consequences that may lead to policies of intervention (or non-intervention) in certain layers of the population living in specific areas. Therefore, forecasting almost always has an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral character, allowing for the consideration of the coordination object's connection with a broad complex of factors and conditions that ensure its development and change.

A comprehensive examination of the state coordination object in the hypothesis structure allows for retrospective and prospective assessments of events. Additionally, each component is based on unified principles of social dynamics measurement, including the diagnosis of local situations, understanding existing and intended trends, and ideas that define prospective paths of development.

The interconnectedness of these internal components depends on the nature of the search or normative forecasting. Search forecasting is aimed at identifying highly probable development trends, foreseeing possible changes in the current situation, and conducting predictive analysis, thereby forming a logic based on “from the present to the future.” Normative forecasting, on the other hand, is tied to defining specific steps that lead to consciously determined goals. In this way, relevant requirements, expectations, approaches to factors, and other characteristics of activity that arise based on the “from the present to the future” logic are determined.

In both cases, various methodologies are used during the forecasting process, but the most important among them is the construction of development scenarios. Scenario technique is a set of basic technological tools that require a hypothetical, step-by-step description of event development. It includes (along with creating general impressions about the dimensions of the future) searching for alternative action options and turning points in the process development, as well as a number of other characteristics. Scenarios can be presented in the form of essays depending on the types of issues, their scope, and the timeframe for consideration.

That is, it presents the development of the situation in a free, publicistic manner, taking into account the characteristics of dramatic human relationships in events.

Additionally, scenarios can be in the form of analytical research or brief descriptions of the main structural dimensions of the situation and their development trends, while also generalizing numerically substantiated ideas based on information. The general logic of constructing predictions requires moving step-by-step from clarifying the scope and nature of goals and constructing working hypotheses to the main hypothetical model. This model consists of analyzing each element of the process, collecting landscape data, constructing dynamic series of indicators, and, finally, the accuracy and reliability of the forecast.

The breadth of the state policy goals and characteristics determines the scope of the prediction. Based on this criterion, the following are distinguished: macroeconomic, regional, sectoral predictions, and so on. Furthermore, predictions are divided into long-term, medium-term, short-term, and operational types, each of which contributes to the establishment of the corresponding state policy.

Planning, programming, and setting plans. Unlike forecasting, planning represents a type of hypothetical proposals. It reveals the obligations of subjects and the specific dimensions of activity, and in this, subjects certainly work within time constraints and under certain conditions to achieve the formulated goals. This is, as it were, a project-construction activity, the task of which is to define the goal's prospect. At the same time, it not only anticipates future decisions but also takes into

account the impact of today's decisions on future situations. This form of anticipation is closely related to governance technologies, which are organically connected to the development of specific dimensions of state institutions, individual organizational structures, and personnel behavior, identifying reserves, and recording control standards aligned with time indicators. This method of developing state policy is aimed at fundamentally eliminating the uncertainty effect that is visible in forecasting.

By focusing on defining goals and tasks, planning is conveniently tied to the process mechanisms of “re-chaining.” That is, this process involves changing the initial dimensions of the goal achievement process based on the information received during the implementation of the goal.

The content of planning technologies and processes is determined based on their strategic or tactical aspects. Thus, for strategic planning, more attention is given to long-term methods of action, less precise and incomparable tasks, taking into account many factors, and anticipating the consequences of conflicting demands, and so on. This explains why medium- and short-term planning is more beneficial within the country.

Another technological method of shaping state policy is programming, which is aimed at solving specific problems, linking tasks firmly, and focusing on the scope of activities to achieve them. This is a less complex process compared to planning. It connects the process of achieving specific goals with budgetary financing and organizational processes, manages the steps of various partners, and so on. Ultimately, programming is aimed at finding and calculating the results achieved in practice.

The main problem in defining the characteristics of the technologies used in programming lies in creating a unified methodological basis. It should conclude the functional-structural fragmentation of state bodies, encompass the entire chain of goal-setting, thereby unifying the activities of various participants in the program and defining the necessary forms of control over their activities. In this regard, creating a unified normative base and institutionalizing the process remain important

issues. The main thing is to ensure continuous financing of the process of solving specific tasks. In general, practice shows that the connection between the financial support process and organizing public actions is fundamental for this type of technological support of state policy.

The content and essence of the technologies and processes of shaping state policy are related to specific state programs aimed at solving tasks addressed by one institution or inter-institutional problems. Based on this, the methodology and techniques used for defining programmatic goals are more or less tied to the following: coordination, mechanisms for aligning the actions of various state structures, or these types of control (direct state financing, state orders, quota allocation, licensing, state entrepreneurship) and indirect forms of program support (tax, customs, credit-monetary, or depreciation policies).

Risk management technologies. The content of the leading technologies for shaping state policy is closely related to risk prevention. This is a unique feature of managing and applying social processes. In its essence, risk is either the deviation of subjects' actions from the set goals (or the development of the situation) or the increase in the likelihood of consequences that are unfavorable for the governance system.

The causes of risk are diverse. They are determined by the impossibility of constructing precise hypothetical models, especially in group activities and the social environment, and by the prediction of the consequences of applying models. Many scholars stop at this concept. The inability to prevent the “unintended consequences of social actions” (R. Merton) often lies in the “multiplicity of various obscure cause-and-effect relationships, where every political change, sooner or later, inevitably leads to opposite results.” Additionally, the causes of risk include the creative nature of managers' activities, the limitations of their knowledge (and even self-deception, where irrational actions are perceived by them as rational, and vice versa), society's misunderstanding of the government's thoughts and goals, insufficient development of governance, excessive actions of managers, and so on. When it comes to predicting and mitigating risks, they are considered relatively

independent operations in decision-making and require the use of certain technologies. The latter are aimed at reducing the risk itself and achieving its goals, focusing on the impact of development.

The development of technologies to protect decisions from highly hazardous risks depends on the type and characteristics of the risk (from global to regional). For example, some countries create ratings that embody the levels of risk for foreign businesses, the likelihood of technological or ecological disasters, and so on. However, the technologies applied in the state are primarily aimed at protecting governance systems from risks. These risks arise from unexpected disruptions, force majeure conditions, and subjective miscalculations by managers.

In the stages of assessing and studying the problem situation, many measures for risk prevention rely on humanitarian or intellectual technologies. They take the form of analytical systems and allow for the differentiation of risk factors and indicators. Risk factors are changes that directly affect the increase, decrease, and level of risk. These appear in the form of economic indicators of living standards, social inequality, interreligious and ethnic conflicts, and so on. Risk symptoms, on the other hand, are clear or unclear signs of the likely worsening of the situation: increasing resistance, declining security, growing instability, and so on, which may occur before or alongside the development of the situation.

Such technologies increase the number of probability models, the volume of considered alternatives, the difference in accounting indicators, and expand the search for “turning points” by specialists. At the same time, they leave room for self-organization and self-governance processes in activity planning.

However, they provide more reliable information about the nature, trends, and dynamics of the interconnections of certain events. The obtained assessment of the probable variants of steps helps to calculate the weakest points in the process of achieving the goal, understand “safe alternatives,” prevent deviations, and develop requirements for the likely quantitative and qualitative damage assessments for certain factors (determining the cost of risk), as well as build the possibility (or impossibility) of quickly compensating for losses.

The construction of probability models for risk assessment is carried out using various methodologies and techniques. For example, scenario techniques, various forms of independent and state expert assessments can be used. Descriptive and evaluation models also play their role. Among them, BYeRI, WPRF (World Political Risk Forecast) include descriptions of the most important indicators of changes in all types of processes. For each of these, a personal probability level is initiated, and dynamic analysis is conducted within the framework of short-, medium-, and long-term forecasting. As an example, to assess the risk of an entire society at a macro level, a series of factors are considered—from political stability to local self-governance bodies. Mathematical methods are also widely used, not only for factors reducing the overall country risk but also for assessing individual processes. A clear example of this is the formula proposed by A. Downs for calculating voter turnout dynamics: $T = (R \times I \times V) + S - D$. Here, T is the voter turnout indicator, R is the level of proximity to elections, V is the level of difference between candidates, S is the cost of voter participation in elections, and D is non-instrumental factors that help determine motivation for participation in pre-election campaigns.

In turn, in the stages of implementing decisions and introducing changes to goals, in addition to analytical processes, social technologies are also widely used. They require the application of specific organizational measures to reduce risks. These include, for example, increasing the independence of expert structures assessing risks or the number of stakeholders in solving the problem. These measures sometimes strengthen the transparency of problem assessment and enhance the coordination of the actions of institutions and structures involved in project implementation, as well as prepare the operational readiness of reserve governance structures and reserves.

As one of the main measures in combating risks, it is possible to consider the purposeful explanation of the naturalness of risks to society and developing skills in people to prevent macro-governance gaps. This reduces the negative impact of government miscalculations. Methods that reduce the rational attitude toward mass causes of fear and hunger and help reduce their spread are also useful and effective.

In this sense, important measures include institutionalizing decisions, accelerating actions that can reliably guide population activity in crisis situations by raising the status of foundations and norms. For it is precisely this direction of activity that preserves its gathering qualities in relation to weakly calculated specific goals.

Crisis technologies. The increasing risks and the emergence of crisis situations for the state necessitate the use of special technologies in establishing and implementing the goals of state governance. How can the state create its “strategy of invulnerability” and at the same time ensure that emergency methods do not become part of routine management practices? In crisis conditions, the main tasks of state governance are significantly reduced, as in such situations, it is impossible to ensure all indicators of the governance system. However, the instructions to maintain the overall governance of society and its individual processes, to prevent the governance and governed systems from crossing catastrophic boundaries, and to ensure the consistency and adaptability of the means of influencing external threats retain their significance even during crises. At the same time, their decisions are aimed at using specific methods and techniques of governance.

In general, state governance bodies respond to crises by building technologies of a preventive nature. In practice, this means that the state must not only strive to respond appropriately to potential crises but also consistently prepare for such actions. The latter task is organically linked to the creation of a reserve system for state governance: in the event of the failure of the main centers of governance and power, it is necessary to fully restore or replace the decision-making process with personnel, technical, information, and other structures. Additionally, this involves the sequential implementation of preventive measures in various spheres of life. First and foremost, the preemptive actions of the governance system are manifested in the political and legal sphere by adopting relevant laws, formalizing open and closed laws that define the activities of governance structures in crisis and emergency situations. In developing this regulatory system, the main tasks should be defined as ensuring the physical protection of the population and the preservation of governance centers. Therefore, as an integral part of this process, it is necessary to

have pure technical preparedness for crises through the redistribution of material reserves. It is also appropriate to create reserves capable of ensuring the necessary activities of governance structures at the center and local levels to maintain the vital capacity of citizens.

Preventive activities must also be linked to the organization of relevant personnel structures: training governance reserves, appropriately retraining personnel, and deploying them based on the potential localization of crises. The state's preventive activities in the information and communication sphere also play a special role. It must take specific steps in relations with the media (improving their technical and personnel capabilities, protecting information sources, etc.), organizing a reliable information dissemination system at the local level, and expanding the possibilities of information flow mobilization.

In turn, the operational type of constructing various techniques and methods of governance influence has a unique character. From a logical point of view, it primarily involves the sequential identification of signs of certain public crises. In other words, the creation of crisis technologies is based on the sequential specification of crises, and the methodology and decision-making processes at all stages involve assessing their dynamics.

The organization of crisis technologies is more related to governance that adapts to the dynamics of other external threats. In this regard, innovative activity techniques and methods are less common in their structure. They are aimed at consciously restructuring the external environment, changing the boundaries of crises (the balance of forces and their regrouping, the structure, organization, direction of the crisis, etc.). Crisis technologies are more personalized and directed towards their application by a specific policy or elite microgroup. As a result, the application of technologies increasingly depends on the leadership style, the type of ruling elite, and the activity of its various segments.

The state's crisis management activities are usually organically linked to adjusting relations with parties, the opposition, foreign partners, and other counterparts. Their actions can significantly limit the state's crisis management tools

and methods. For example, the opposition typically reacts negatively to the imposition of a state of emergency and the restriction of constitutional freedoms, as this limits its control and influence over power, and therefore, not taking its reaction into account can lead not to the mitigation but to the escalation of the crisis. The logic of developing crisis technologies of an operational nature requires the following: identifying the type of crisis - military, financial, socio-economic, etc., and determining the intensity of the crisis that directly impacts the governance system (GS). The nature of the impact of external threats on the GS (which triggers its response reactions) can vary. For example, such impact can manifest in the increasing discomfort of the GS or the tension in performing its professional activities; in the increasing damage to the GS's activities; in threats to the functioning of its individual structures or the most important functions of the GS; in threats to the integrity of the GS; in the risks to the GS's interactions with society or other (international) organizations (where the issue of the functioning of this power system is raised).

Depending on the establishment of homogeneous crisis threats, the GS (taking into account time constraints) can introduce actions that meet the requirements of operationality rather than adaptability. Such a situation more often prompts the GS to use various types of influence tools: from “minimal” actions that recognize the natural mechanisms of self-development of the situation to compulsory (physical and administrative) measures. They aim to minimize the opportunities that threaten the (especially legal) interests and position of the GS, while ensuring minimal insurance against the uncertain consequences of the decision.

In the future, the content of crisis technologies depends on identifying unacceptable, crisis-rooted extreme influencing factors. Only by determining their characteristics, direction, and speed, along with the goal-setting and diagnostic stages of the GS, can the essence of practical steps be clarified at the stage of their clear application in life.

In this sense, the GS's targeted direction has a significant impact on defining specific techniques and forms of response to various types and stages of crisis

situations. This means that the development and application of certain techniques and methods are subordinated to the state's goals. These include maintaining stability in society or reducing governance losses, preserving situational control, or creating a positive image in public opinion, etc. In developing such goals, the reserve provision of governance in specific areas of social, economic, international, and other relations also has an impact.

Crisis management in the country also implies certain transformations. These, in turn, are related to the extension of time in implementing actions at various stages of decision-making. For example, reducing the phases of diagnosing and reviewing step options; selecting alternatives that are strictly dependent on the state's capabilities and reserves to achieve goals, etc.

Decision-making stages. In practice, the stages of developing state policy are always intertwined and approach each other. In this case, numerous parallels are created between the beginning and end of the steps of various governance groups, without clear causes and consequences. However, from a logical point of view, the decisions made by the state are organically linked to the corresponding stages of the process of certain technologies. In them, specific, meaningful governance steps are implemented, the balance of formal and informal (legal and illegal, open and closed) mechanisms of interest coordination is determined, certain methods of the administrative approach of managers are adopted, and thus the sequence of using specific techniques and processes in state governance is established.

Usually, in the theoretical sphere, efforts are made to differentiate the decision-making process from various points of view. But the simplest of them is to identify 3 main stages that allow gradually reducing the uncertainty of knowledge in setting the goals of state governance: preparation, goal-setting stage, and implementation stage.

In the preparation stage of the decision-making process, the problem is identified and defined. For this purpose, an information base sufficient to pose problems requiring solutions is created, a list of the most important problems for the state is developed (“agenda”), among which more important issues are identified and

defined, and the requirements for measuring the problem and its solution are determined.

The technologies used at this stage are applied within the following scheme of actions: analyzing the situation to find the problem; when recognizing the existence of the problem, the state chooses from 3 alternatives: 1) defining its neutral attitude towards it or defining a certain point of view without taking further actions; 2) deliberately delaying the start of the implementation process; 3) starting active work on its solution. In the latter case, the state also has several options for actions: it can take steps to solve the problem without analyzing the situation; it can start delaying certain steps to clarify the causes of the crisis in future events and then choose more beneficial ways to solve it (in this case, the state remains in the middle of the situation's development); it can try to transfer the solution of the problem to another level (for example, to civil society associations) and start taking actions to coordinate the situation in a timely manner.

Due to the continuity of forecasting, planning, and goal implementation processes in the state, this scheme for finding problems leads to the circular model of the governance cycle. It also requires parallel analysis of the situation and the “agenda.” Usually, the state considers problems at various conceptual and theoretical levels. This, in turn, allows clarifying the content of complex and large-scale tasks, taking into account the intergroup nature of state interests. If meanings and values are replaced, the problem may simply disappear from the state's scope (L. Plankett, G. Hale). Considering the problem from several conceptual perspectives allows open-minded managers to replace diagnostic losses related to ignoring certain aspects of the problem. This situation is organically linked to their personal (political) views and approaches (“mobilization approach”) based on the pretexts of “public interest.”

The analytical bodies of the state must turn certain events into problematic situations for them, which should lead to mandatory legal consequences. Especially if the situation is correctly perceived, it is necessary to define the general social causes of public contradictions and explain negative results.

In conclusion, the results of the preparation stage are as follows: recognizing the problematic situation, defining the system of its constituent issues (i.e., understanding their importance and priority based on national interests), and clearly defining the data of the problems. In short, this is the stage that limits the concept of the problem and the impressions about the ways and means of solving it. In this sense, it is extremely important for state officials to maintain a certain calmness so that the expected complexity of the task solution does not change its essence. Otherwise, responsible individuals may not accept the social problem. For the state and its citizens, such partially understood problems and vaguely (or fragmentarily) defined problems can lead to serious consequences.

Goal-setting stage. In the second stage, decision-making is carried out, and attention is focused on the process of defining clear goals of activity (their internal goals). If the state is interested in making decisions on a certain issue, it must consider various alternatives, taking into account the possibility of “topic shifting.” That is, it is necessary to shift its focus to other, potentially rapidly escalating problems. Goal selection involves aligning the overall public situation with specific, quantifiable indicators of the activities of various state structures and institutions.

In setting the goals of state policy, governance bodies analyze and compare various alternatives for solving the problem. At the same time, they model the development of events for each selected option. At least 3 alternatives are considered: maximalist, safe (neutral), and minimal probability. Each of them has its “upper” (expressing the dependence of state activity on resources, information, action time, past obligations, etc.) and “lower” (expressing the presence of factors ensuring that the problem does not disappear) boundaries. Defining them serves as an analytical task at this stage (G.Sterling).

In the field of state governance, 3 types of problematic situations and related tasks are clearly distinguished. Various alternatives for actions are considered, and decisions are made regarding them. First, these are well-structured (standard) tasks periodically performed by state bodies. For example, they are organically related to the emergence of certain conditions (say, the preparation of communal services for

winter, navigation measures, harvesting, etc.). In such situations, there are also returned algorithms of decisions reinforced by previous experience, certain deadlines, usually used tools, etc. Typically, this type of task is sufficiently quickly redefined in terms of goals and has a scattered system of reported actions, defined and ready-to-implement goals.

Tasks of one type include weakly structured tasks, and when solving them, they show results that are reliable to the extent of being guesswork. Finally, the third type of tasks are those with unstructured characteristics. When evaluating them, there are generally no objective requirements for the best, and they are difficult to understand from the perspective of goals, resource reserves, speeds, or means. The necessary components of judgment are weakly described quantitatively and only manifest based on the development of the situation. Thus, solving these tasks requires creative approaches that destroy existing stereotypes and necessitate a re-examination of previously known methods. As a result, the effectiveness of decisions related to these situations may significantly decrease.

The most important tools for solving non-standard (unstructured) tasks are various analytical methodologies that help clarify goals, specify success requirements, perceive connections between variable concepts, and characterize the situation quantitatively and qualitatively. E.Quade emphasizes that such methodologies allow reducing the complexity of the problem to manageable parts by identifying elements of the problem where sufficient information is available. Moreover, the weakest alternatives are eliminated through analysis, and action options are recommended that, while not fully satisfying all stakeholders' interests, are acceptable to them. In solving all the aforementioned types of tasks, defining internal goals is considered a method for clarifying the state's capabilities. These goals are specific, related to group and individual executors, aimed at distinguishing the state's action program, eliminating contradictions between short and long-term instructions, and laying the foundation for establishing appropriate organizational structures.

However, at the goal-setting stage, it is necessary to choose the most preferable model for future actions. This is done by comparing its main indicators with those of other models and evaluating the expected effect of the intended steps. Choosing a single alternative paves the way for expressing main goals; at the same time, it allows identifying leading factors (predictable and unpredictable, controllable and uncontrollable) that can influence the dynamics of events not only outside but also inside the country.

Along with this, state bodies are obliged to focus on the final result, hence they should set not optimal but practically achievable goals, directing them towards programs applicable in life. State leaders must not only devise rootless fantasies but also consider the real situation, strive to rationally use limited resources, and take into account the possibility of unexpected events. The main requirement of goal-setting is also to prevent additional problems and contradictions that may arise from the adopted decision. Leaders must act in such a way that a fortunate judgment in one area does not necessitate an escalation of conflicts in general areas and does not increase the burden of problems on the state's shoulders.

Achieving such goals depends to some extent on the styles that generate consensus in judgment selection. The range of methods used in state governance is vast: from intuitive to formal-rationalized, based on the use of mathematical models. Their choice and application depend on the condition of the decision-makers, the situation, strategic prospects, and a number of other conditions. For example, leaders aimed at not losing power may prefer incremental methods that require not very significant changes in problematic situations. This may lead to elites fighting for power using the “the worse, the better” principle and risky adventurous methods that increase the danger of development. At the same time, experts may limit themselves to purely technocratic approaches, contrary to intuition and political governance experience.

In general, the variety of methods used in decision-making can be divided into 6 classes:

- Intuitive, which describe the increase in hypothetical, emotional, non-reflexive thoughts of the subject;
- Precedent methods, which direct the subject to mechanically reproduce methods (and means) of previous activities in similar situations;
- Rational (scientific), mathematical methods, based on the use of “correct” (ideally explaining existence) standards of thinking for analyzing the situation. In this situation, one can talk about a wide range of price methods such as “costs and benefits”, “costs and utility”, “preliminary research”, “market and mood research”, etc.;
- Incremental methods consider minor changes in events without affecting the system and basic characteristics of the situation;
- Mixed (mixed-scanner methods) apply general theoretical approaches of social (political) analysis as a basis for detailed, empirical research of a specific problem situation;
- Experimental methods require artificial modeling of a problematic situation and its activity using appropriate methods.

Factors limiting the state's capabilities in building a system of goals in adequate situations include: lack and unreliability of information about the problematic situation; the decision-maker's values, psychological and other subjective contradictory characteristics (illegality, unwillingness to take risks or, conversely, an adventurous style of governance, etc.); situational conditions (limiting the subject's capabilities due to lack of resources or time for decision-making, unaccounted conditions, lack of obvious factors influencing the dynamics of the situation, etc.); organizational conditions (density of departmental rules, unpreparedness of organizational structures for decision-making, formal-bureaucratic attitude of the department towards set goals, etc.).

The goal implementation stage. The adopted decision is only the possibility of successfully achieving the goal, hence choosing the goal is rooted in the existence of a third stage. Its essence is formed by the state's implementation of appropriate decisions. The main distinctive feature of this stage is the expansion of the number

of participants in the governance chain by turning on feedback mechanisms and involving managers. For example, in the country, the execution of decisions is usually not carried out by the decision-makers themselves but by a wide range of citizens and structures (including opponents of these decisions) who are assigned certain responsibilities for the execution of these tasks.

At this stage, the content of state governance technologies, as a rule, is determined by the following principles: directiveness (requiring the transformation of decisions into order-recommendation form); targeting (i.e., addressing specific layers, structures, organizations, and thus prescribing appropriate forms of responsibility for them); legality; introduction of a reserve system for implementing decisions; institutionalization of control over the execution process of adopted decisions; proportionality of requirements; continuous information about the nature and results of goal implementation, etc. All this creates the possibility of quickly evaluating information based on the developed requirements for the expected victory of the state. And this process is carried out from the perspective of the interests of the state power (or organizations, departments), in general; by comparing the results and goals of its activities; by making changes to personal actions (in case of need).

The perfection of technological methods also depends on the nature of the state's counterparties. In their place, not only the entire society (the country's population) but also individual state structures, other states, and organizations can operate. The state's relationship with these governance objects can be quite diverse, hence the applied technologies must be extremely flexible, directed towards institutions that prioritize goal implementation, not allow the use of obviously dysfunctional methods, apply semi-measures, etc. In general, they can be considered using coercion (even terror), legal coordination tools, logrolling techniques (bargaining, agreements, contracts), subordination, persuasion, etc.

The variety of tasks facing the state necessitates highlighting 2 internal stages within this stage. Each of them requires the use of specific technologies: the first internal stage - preparation for goal implementation, includes steps such as analyzing the action plan, searching for resources to achieve goals, and other types of

measures. The second is the operational management of goal implementation, involving the motivation of subjects, the adoption of “secondary decisions” (i.e., decisions specified in connection with the development of the situation), the adjustment of this process, control over the behavior and use of reserves by state workers, etc.

The strengthening of directive internal systems in state governance, due to the increasing role and position of executive bodies, also increases the content of technologies that ensure legal and lawful coordination of activities. In this case, particular complexity is noted in organizing control over the use of technologies in such areas of society's life where the state has a monopoly on services provided to the population. At the same time, the structures of some ministries and departments do not allow the introduction of individual responsibility for the implementation of adopted decisions. There are also organizational conditions aimed at increasing the effectiveness of decision implementation: for a decision to be (i.e., planned steps to be executed on time), it is necessary to bring the central governance bodies as close as possible to the events, fully decentralize the governance system, simultaneously strengthening the independence of its lower structures, etc.

Seminar questions:

1. Provide information about the decision-making process in the field of state governance.
2. What technologies are used in the formation of state policy and what is the role of decision-making in them?
3. What is political forecasting and how is it carried out?
4. How many stages are decision-making divided into?

8. CONTROL TECHNOLOGY AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

1. Structure and composition of conflicts
2. Technologies for managing and controlling political conflicts
3. Stages of regulating and resolving conflicts

Structure and Composition of Conflicts. Conflicts, as previously defined, are the most widespread form and basis of political changes. They provide an opportunity to reduce competitiveness and minimize personal losses. Developing and implementing technologies to manage and control conflicts remains a primary task for every participant in political relations and governing systems.

Specifically, a conflict reflects one of the possible variants of interaction between political subjects. However, it also arises from the diversity of society, differences in perspectives, and the incompatibility of directions, leading to dissatisfaction among people regarding their conditions. Conflicts are rooted in changes in group and individual behavior, transformations in power structures, and the development of political processes.

A technologically measurable conflict involves two or more parties (groups, states, individuals) competing for power and resources. Managing and controlling the flow of political conflicts requires identifying their main components and dimensions, which can help influence them and achieve desired goals. These components structure the subject's goal-oriented activity in the political sphere, giving it a unique form and essence.

Despite certain disagreements, conflictologists typically identify the following as the main components of a conflict:

Source (subject): Reflects the essence of the disagreement between the participants.

Cause: Specific events that trigger actions aimed at defending one's interests, goals, or directions against a rival.

Parties: Direct or indirect participants in the struggle for power and resources in the political sphere.

Positions and attitudes: The goals, attitudes toward opponents, and other subjective characteristics of the parties in the conflict.

Means: Resources, methods, and tools used by the parties in their interactions.

Nature of the conflict: Describes the relationship between the parties, the stability or flexibility of their positions, changes in the subject of the dispute, and the involvement of new participants.

Identifying the main components of a conflict helps understand its procedural characteristics and the unique aspects of its development. Most researchers agree that a conflict is a competitive relationship between parties with varying degrees of intensity and development.

Conflicts go through different phases, including the latent phase, where the conflict is not openly manifested but continues through changes in the internal states of the subjects. In this phase, the conflict does not necessarily result from every imbalance of interests or perspectives.

Once the conflict enters the open phase, its nature changes. The parties engage in various actions and demonstrations to defeat the opponent. External and internal conditions may alter the composition and intensity of the conflict. For example, a dispute between two rivals may involve other political subjects, increasing the number of participants and complicating the conflict.

In the process of conflict development, various actors (arbitrators) may be involved to resolve it, which can increase the number of participants and complicate the conflict further. However, changes in the parties' positions or resource bases may also reduce the intensity of the conflict and decrease the number of participants.

To describe the development of conflicts, concepts such as "expansion" (broadening) and "escalation" (intensification) are used. Expansion refers to changes in the composition of the parties, the subject of the dispute, and the methods of competition, while escalation describes the increase in the intensity of the conflict.

The speed of a conflict increases when:

The number of rival groups grows.

The dispute affects values (ideals) and individuals.

Conflict resolution leads to similar events in society.

The conflict is perceived by participants as a “zero-sum” game (win-lose).

The subject of the dispute is unclear, making rationalization difficult.

The conflict affects other aspects of the parties' disagreements.

As competition worsens, the situation becomes more complex, and the effectiveness of managing and controlling the conflict decreases. The conflict reaches its peak, leading to a crisis. Crises can place participants in difficult and complex situations, often resulting in increased tensions, armed clashes, and the emergence of new conflicts.

In international relations, regional and internal state crises can lead to broader, even global conflicts (e.g., the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, anti-terrorist operations in Chechnya in the late 1990s, etc.).

Sources of Political Conflicts. The sources of political conflicts can be broadly categorized as non-social, social, and situational. Non-social sources include human aggression, fear, hunger, and other instincts that drive political conflicts. These factors lead to conflicts such as popular uprisings, hunger revolts, terrorist acts, and other demonstrations.

Political conflicts can also arise from temporary, situational factors, such as ecological disasters, accidents at nuclear power plants (e.g., Chernobyl), or major organizational failures (e.g., the Bhopal disaster in India in the 1980s). These large-scale conflicts not only result in disasters but also require addressing the social consequences caused by human actions (e.g., the Chernobyl disaster, where the government's delayed response increased the number of victims and complicated the situation).

However, the broader sources of conflicts lie in social factors. These determinants are related to various aspects of politics (domestic and international), the types of subjects (individual, group, mass), and other factors.

Three types of causes underlie political conflicts:

Status and roles of political subjects: Conflicts arise from the incompatibility of the statuses, roles, interests, and needs of political subjects, as well as resource scarcity. These are the objective sources of political conflicts, such as disputes between ruling and rival elites, interest groups, or states and regions.

Value and ideological differences: Conflicts arise from differences in values, political ideals, cultural traditions, and subjective perceptions of political realities. These conflicts are common in societies undergoing political system reforms or recovering from social crises.

Human needs: Conflicts arise from the unmet or restricted needs of individuals, such as the need for self-realization, economic growth, or transcendence.

In recent years, some Western theorists (e.g., J.Burton, K.Lederer, J.Davis) have proposed the “human needs theory,” which suggests that conflicts arise from the unmet needs of individuals. These needs include security, public recognition, moral improvement, and others.

Another source of conflicts is the misunderstanding or rejection of the positions and interests of others. This leads to the dehumanization of opponents, attributing only negative qualities to them, and complicating relationships.

Finally, political conflicts can arise from the process of identity formation, where individuals identify with social, ethnic, religious, or other groups and seek to defend their cultural unity or improve their status in the political system. These conflicts are common in transitional societies, where people are adapting to new norms and seeking their place in a changing world.

Technologies for Managing and Controlling Political Conflicts. In practice, various subjects involved in conflicts, either as participants or mediators, often seek to manage or control the conflict. Control over political conflicts involves a three-stage program:

Prevention: Identifying the main components of the conflict (causes, participants, positions, etc.) and monitoring the interactions and events.

Mitigation: Identifying factors that could intensify the conflict and taking measures to prevent its escalation.

Resolution: Preventing the conflict from escalating into violence or political confrontation.

Minimization: Reducing social discontent arising from political conflicts in interconnected areas of social life.

Control aims to limit the actions of the controlling subjects to prevent the conflict from turning into a crisis or tragedy.

In contrast, conflict management involves increasing the alignment of the parties' conditions with the decisions of a subject, purposefully influencing various components of the competition. Management is not only a complex form of shaping reality but also an activity that requires significant power, resources, and effort.

The effectiveness of management depends on the competition model adopted by the subject. Several models are distinguished in the literature, including:

Engineering approach: Views the conflict as a situation requiring changes in the structure or behavior of the parties.

Humanistic approach: Suggests that conflicts can be managed by bringing the parties' positions closer through continuous consultations, mediation, and arbitration.

Management model: Focuses on setting tasks for the participants that help align their goals and interests.

In practice, a combination of these models is often used to develop technologies for managing and controlling conflicts.

Strategies for Managing Conflicts. Several key strategies are used to manage conflicts:

Conflict initiation: Intensifying existing contradictions to create a situation of strong competition that can be effectively managed.

Conflict escalation: Supporting contradictions in the parties' relationships to use them for one's own interests.

Prevention: Preventing conflicts from escalating into open competition or political confrontation.

Regulation: Reducing the intensity of the conflict (partially or fully) and avoiding its negative consequences.

Resolution: Eliminating the causes of the conflict, removing the subject of the dispute, or creating conditions for peaceful relations between the parties.

Conflict displacement: Transferring responsibility for resolving the conflict to other levels of the political system (e.g., from federal to regional).

The most common strategy in politics is conflict management and resolution. These strategies aim to bring hidden conflicts into the open, reduce uncontrollable processes, and minimize the number of unforeseen tragedies.

The main principle of these strategies is gradualism, where the intensity of the competition is gradually reduced, and the system of relations between the parties is expanded to ensure their commitments are fulfilled.

R.D. emphasizes the formation of institutions that ensure the process of continuous consultation and negotiation in conflict management; the expansion of the resource (economic) potential for agreements; the strengthening of the parties' awareness of their rivals' plans; and, moreover, highlights the importance of personnel capable of conducting peaceful dialogues.

In the formation of management and control technologies, another universal requirement is to consider their origins and the internal and external factors influencing their development. Specifically, experience has shown that the factors influencing the forms and methods of conflict management by a subject include:

- The degree of openness of the political system (for example, reflecting the presence of “safety valves” that can protect governance structures from aggressive forms of political dissent);
- The level of cohesion among conflicting groups and the intensity of internal relations among their members;
- The extent of involvement of broad social strata in contentious relations;

- The emotional nature of the political behavior and attitudes of groups and citizens, and their ability to limit their aspirations for power.

When discussing conflict resolution strategies, their technologies, as a rule, involve not unilateral but bilateral actions by the parties. This implies that the agreement reached as a result of their negotiation is considered fair and correct by all participants, who accept the terms of the agreement without external pressure, the removal of the conflict from the “agenda,” and the establishment of positive relations between former rivals (K.Mitchell).

Stages of conflict regulation and resolution. For the development of conflict management and control technologies, it is important to know certain stages of their spread and development, as each of them involves solving specific tasks and achieving absolutely clear goals. Despite the value of distinguishing the stages of conflict progression and development, there is no consensus among scholars regarding their number and effective clarity. Usually, conflicts are divided into stages based on each party's position, type, and nature, taking into account the contradiction's time and other dimensions.

For example, C.Osgood links the existence of stages to unilateral initiatives aimed at reducing tension, expecting the other party to respond accordingly. Russian researcher M.Lebedeva writes about stages based on armed conflicts: “cessation of hostile actions (aimed at reducing the level of confrontation between the parties); establishment of dialogue and preparation for negotiations (directed at discussing the problem among conflict participants); the stage marked by the start of the negotiation process (allowing the parties to discuss their positions and prospects for regulation); and the stage of implementing the agreements reached.” This set of stages is characterized by a number of conditions that allow for the stabilization of the conflict and the subsequent expansion of relations and convergence of positions between the parties.

Other scholars, when examining the flow of conflict, distinguish universal stages of institutionalization, group legitimization, and simplification (A. Chumakov). The essence of the first stage is that the parties' actions are defined

within certain rules, allowing for the prediction of the conflict's development within certain boundaries. The second stage is aimed at justifying these rules before the governing regime and society. The third stage involves identifying individuals (groups) who can speak on behalf of the community in the dispute and determine the conflict's content, and consciously influencing their positions. The final stage gradually reduces the intensity of the (softened) conflict and transfers it to a lower political level.

However, while these approaches focus on important aspects of conflict management, they are still very normative for managing the actions of conflicting parties who have opposing views on the rules of action and cannot always identify a permanent representative.

Given the diversity of conflicts encountered in politics, as well as the fact that their management and control often lead to the parties' dissatisfaction (which, for example, may prevent the establishment of norms that some participants in the conflict might not accept), it is advisable to distinguish stages from the perspective of defining universal tasks. Finding solutions to these tasks gradually increases the ability to consciously influence the entire process. This makes conflict management and control technologies also specific, with each stage defined by complex tasks that take into account the goals set by the subjects. Therefore, technological models of behavior for leaders, governments, states, and other subjects are developed in science. Conflict management applies not only to all stages (for example, the “three-period model” of government activity in international crisis conditions proposed by M. Breger) but also to the internal stages of individual parties and aspects of their activities (in particular, negotiation process tactics).

From this perspective, it is possible to distinguish the stages of emergence, development, and conclusion of political conflicts. In this case, their transition stages take into account the correspondence between the subject's actions and the specific aspects of political processes, consideration of time and circumstances, cultural-historical and civilizational characteristics reflected in the development of the state

(region, subject), and the interdependence with the psychological aspects of the individuals involved.

In the emergence stage of a conflict, the political subjects' positions indicate the formation of competitive relations, the mismatch of their positions, and the existence of a certain subject of dispute, signaling a conflict environment between opposing parties. At this stage, the conflict is not yet apparent, and its future development is only predicted. At this point, the main task of the subject striving to manage or control the conflict is to reveal its true causes (and the true goals of its participants). The complexity of such analysis is determined by the fact that the parties often strive to hide the true causes of the conflict with the opponent (usually based on the use of illegal methods to achieve their interests and the public's negative reaction to revealing the cause of the dispute). While searching for the true causes of the conflict, the conflict management subject must distinguish them from the causes that serve as a trigger for the events (for example, the opposition's dissatisfaction with the government's socio-economic direction and its perception of state actions as a threat, leading to protest actions in response). Correct analysis not only reveals the source of political conflict but also prevents the conflict from “breaking away” from its primary causes and the parties' competition from turning into a closed form related to extreme social phenomena. For example, the government's failure to recognize the existence of national causes underlying economic, cultural, and other conflicts in some regions of the USSR led to a crisis in interethnic relations and deprived the state of the ability to effectively influence the development of many means and events. At this point, the clearer the subject of the dispute, the greater the conflict management subject's ability to localize it and direct the parties' competition in a beneficial direction. If governance structures act as such subjects, they must investigate the causes of the conflict and develop technologies for its regulation, supplemented by their responsibility in the further development of events.

In this sense, as French conflictologist J.Favez noted, the government can choose one of three models of action: ignoring the emergence of the conflict and

allowing it to smolder, giving it the opportunity to spread to other areas of power relations, avoiding a clear public assessment of its nature, and thus striving to “appease” various segments of the population (in which case attempts to take control of the situation are illogical); actively participating in regulating or resolving the conflict.

In this context, striving to manage the development of the conflict must be based on a clear analysis of the existing “socio-political form” in society (region), taking into account the balance of forces, the level of the parties' conflict, and the prediction of their further actions. In this sense, the management subject must develop various directions for the conflict's development, determine responses to rival actions, and identify the problem of expected negotiations and undesirable actions. The initial assessment of the situation depends on whether the direct management subject will maintain the position of the conflicting parties or take the position of one of them, reduce or increase the intensity of the conflict, and so on. However, this subject must always determine the norms and rules of certain parties' actions. At the societal level, a government striving to manage the development of a conflict must regulate the rivals' dispute within legal norms, and this helps to institutionalize the conflict, providing boundaries that allow for its management. Institutionalizing the conflict not only increases the protection of society and state security in this situation but also often creates forms that bring about the initial conditions leading to the cessation of the parties' competition.

Despite the management subject's desire to norm the actions of the conflicting parties, such determination must be broader and take into account the possibilities of various strategies of their activities, for example, one party's desire for victory, the other's lack of resistance; one party's unwillingness to act in the legal field, the other's complete disregard for the conflict, and so on.

At the level of the entire political system, the activity of the authority striving to take control of the conflict is an integral part of shaping the “social environment” of the dispute. These measures involve directing public opinion and mobilization accordingly, and this creates an environment in the state that justifies or condemns

one or both conflicting parties, narrows the field for the rivals' actions, and increases the stability of the state government.

In the process of defining the strategic and tactical goals of conflict management, the government must be “technically” prepared: it must clearly know that the experts and analysts involved, the relevant area of state management (i.e., the specific area of politics where the conflict arose - social and tax policy, science management, etc.) specialists have deep knowledge; it must check the reliability of communication and data processing centers, their material support; improve the interconnectedness of various levels and parts of the government involved in conflict management; adapt government institutions for effective monitoring of events; check the readiness of government mechanisms for the use of force. This set of measures must fully correspond to the resources under the “above-mentioned” control, as well as support the government's image, i.e., ensure the population's confidence that the government is not afraid of the conflict and keeps it under control.

In the development stage of the conflict, the circle of management subjects expands. At this stage, the forces supporting each conflicting party become clearly apparent; the subject area of the dispute is defined, expands, or narrows, the number of participants increases or decreases, the level of intensity, the need for new mediators, and so on are determined. At this point, the number of factors maintaining control over the development of competitive relations increases.

In particular, the management subject must come to an agreement on the following issues: whether the conflict flow is left to itself or whether actions to regulate it are carried out. In this case, the task of conflict management is related to uniting all parties' actions or involving mediation structures.

When making such a decision, the management subject must rely on broader information - not only about the “visible” actions of the parties but also about their hidden goals. In such situations, combating the spread of false information is of great importance, as one or the other party's misinterpretation of information about their

true goals, according to French scholars Fuste and Amiral, often invites the management subject to unconsidered actions.

By expanding the information field of control, the government, as a rule, determines the images of the conflicting parties (the dynamics of positions, the tendency to agree or reject it, the likelihood of changing goals, etc.) and previously developed personal assessments. American specialists in international relations G. Snyder and P. Dizing, at this point, distinguish changes in the “environmental” images (reflecting the assessment of the conflicting parties' basic values and goals) as well as “daily” images (changes in views on their current, prompt positions).

The management subject, striving to norm the actions of the conflicting parties, must take into account the possibilities of various strategies of their activities, for example, one party's desire for victory, the other's lack of resistance; one party's unwillingness to act in the legal field, the other's complete disregard for the conflict, and so on.

At the level of the entire political system, the activity of the authority striving to take control of the conflict is an integral part of shaping the “social environment” of the dispute. These measures involve directing public opinion and mobilization accordingly, and this creates an environment in the state that justifies or condemns one or both conflicting parties, narrows the field for the rivals' actions, and increases the stability of the state government.

In the process of defining the strategic and tactical goals of conflict management, the government must be “technically” prepared: it must clearly know that the experts and analysts involved, the relevant area of state management (i.e., the specific area of politics where the conflict arose - social and tax policy, science management, etc.) specialists have deep knowledge; it must check the reliability of communication and data processing centers, their material support; improve the interconnectedness of various levels and parts of the government involved in conflict management; adapt government institutions for effective monitoring of events; check the readiness of government mechanisms for the use of force. This set of measures must fully correspond to the resources under the “above-mentioned”

control, as well as support the government's image, i.e., ensure the population's confidence that the government is not afraid of the conflict and keeps it under control.

In the development stage of the conflict, the circle of management subjects expands. At this stage, the forces supporting each conflicting party become clearly apparent; the subject area of the dispute is defined, expands, or narrows, the number of participants increases or decreases, the level of intensity, the need for new mediators, and so on are determined. At this point, the number of factors maintaining control over the development of competitive relations increases.

In particular, the management subject must come to an agreement on the following issues: whether the conflict flow is left to itself or whether actions to regulate it are carried out. In this case, the task of conflict management is related to uniting all parties' actions or involving mediation structures.

When making such a decision, the management subject must rely on broader information - not only about the “visible” actions of the parties but also about their hidden goals. In such situations, combating the spread of false information is of great importance, as one or the other party's misinterpretation of information about their true goals, according to French scholars Fuste and Amiral, often invites the management subject to unconsidered actions.

By expanding the information field of control, the government, as a rule, determines the images of the conflicting parties (the dynamics of positions, the tendency to agree or reject it, the likelihood of changing goals, etc.) and previously developed personal assessments. American specialists in international relations G. Snyder and P. Dizing, at this point, distinguish changes in the “environmental” images (reflecting the assessment of the conflicting parties' basic values and goals) as well as “daily” images (changes in views on their current, prompt positions).

When clarifying such assessments, the management entity must compare the variable positions of the parties, understand the tactics of their actions, and identify the point of collision between the opponents. Ultimately, it is necessary to evaluate various macro and micro factors that condition the course of the conflict, providing

a clear understanding of its intensity: whether it tends to escalate or de-escalate. Based on the conclusions, the tactics of the management entity's actions should also be developed accordingly. However, while keeping in mind that mediation tools may prolong the time needed to resolve the dispute, under no circumstances should the management entity intimidate or pressure the conflicting parties. On the contrary, the management entity should bring the parties closer together based on promises and positive predictions, expanding the negotiation space between them, preventing disruptive forms of competition, and supporting the contractual method of political dialogue.

Experience has shown that during the development of a conflict, contradictions increase with the rise in the number of conflicting groups and the involvement of people in these relations. Particularly in conflicts at the level of values, and especially in disputes related to the moral judgments of the parties, pride, and self-perception, the level of conflict is high. In such cases, the parties perceive the end of the conflict as a victory or defeat and do not even consider the option of compromise, refusing to “give up their point of view.” At this stage, to direct the rapid conflict in the desired direction, the management entity must perform the following tasks:

- Apply the technological methods used in the previous stage;
- Continuously “shape the social environment” (informing the public about the developed assessments of the parties' actions, their changed positions, and perspectives on the development of the situation);
- Purposefully change the structure and methods of their actions in search of a winning tactic;
- Support unifying norms and rules in society. The balance of newly established political forces is linked to the intended actions.

Based on the actions being taken, there are two types of outcomes at the stage of conflict resolution: either the parties reach an agreement, or their inability to reach an agreement is confirmed (i.e., establishing the insolubility of the conflict). Between these poles, there are a number of variants of conflict evolution reflecting

the conflict's continuation (maintaining its previous pace), reduction, or, conversely, the intensification of mutual opposition. The conflict may remain unresolved, and in such a case, its outcome is not a “circular motion” situation but requires the management entity to review and implement its actions and operations anew. In other words, such a situation implies the search for a new strategy and tactics of control and management.

The agreement of the conflicting parties, as mentioned earlier, can be characterized by complete or partial regulation (i.e., even if the subject of the dispute is not eliminated, the behavior of the conflicting parties changes). In this case, the conflict may resolve itself without management actions (for example, the subject of the dispute loses its relevance, political actors become exhausted, resources run out, etc.). To reach an agreement, the management entity must find the necessary tools that can ensure the development of events. As previously noted by J.Fave, an agreement can be reached through a deal, compromise, submission, concession, and setting boundaries (with the past). Among the principles of regulation mentioned by E.Nordlinger, one can speak of establishing a stable alliance force and ensuring mutual veto rights. R.Dal (ignoring the deadlock in the development of events) discusses the mandatory and peaceful means of the parties' agreement.

The end of the conflict is manifested in the parties' agreement on the deal (temporary or final, complete or partial), in various forms of conflict resolution (its components), as well as in the general agreement indicating the resolution of the conflict.

Such results can be achieved through two general methods of the parties' agreement:

- Achieving a compromise while preserving the primary positions; an agreement reached through mutual equal and unequal concessions (asymmetric); the decline of resources of one or several parties; mutual respect achieved during the dispute, understanding the interests and rights of the opponent; reaching an agreement based on a newly found solution.

- An agreement based on coercion or the use of the “command method” of relations (P.Sharan), ensuring that one party does not take into account the opponent's arguments. Based on the relations absorbed by one of the participants (or by all from a third party), the superiority of one party (preserved, acquired) in strength and resources over the second party; the defeat of one party, the decline of status in accordance with the “rules of the game”; the “total annihilation of the opponent,” elimination (H.Speyer), as a result of which peace is established based on the absence of the “enemy.” The found forms of agreement vary in terms of duration and nature. An asymmetric agreement (where the interests of one party are not fully recognized) may, despite the signing of documents, not prevent the defeated party from failing to fulfill the agreed terms (this implies “regulation after regulation” - G.Raiffe), or from continuing to fight for their interests. Peace established on the basis of the complete defeat of one party may last long without recognizing the emergence of old or new conflicts.

In conflict management technologies, the most common type of reaching an agreement is negotiations. They directly or indirectly manifest the communication of the parties aimed at reconciling mutual goals and interests, leading to either the escalation or resolution of the conflict. In the process of negotiations used at the stages of development and conclusion, the parties exchange promises and ideas, which, as a rule, reduces the intensity of the conflict, helps to understand the arguments of the opposition, and to objectively assess the balance of power.

Usually, experts believe that the methods and techniques used in negotiations depend on the essence of the negotiations, the conditions, and the readiness or unreadiness of the parties to engage in dialogue. The negotiation process is often carried out within the framework of “compromise-approach” relations. They involve the use of trading technologies, considering other situations and, in accordance with their goals, preserving primary positions or reaching an agreement with the opponent or, conversely, choosing a direction that ensures unilateral opportunities without a solution, or considering the mutual satisfaction of the parties' needs. It is during negotiations that the parties have the opportunity to find the “central point” of the

conflict, which determines the essence of mutual demands and the boundaries of compromise (the possibility of negotiations not yielding results). Sometimes negotiations provide an opportunity to equalize compromises, demonstrate the openness of positions, and weaken the effectiveness of the opponent's "unacceptable methods."

In general, the use of one or another negotiation technique is related to the strategy and tactics of the parties. However, experience has shown that there are a number of universal requirements and principles for effectively concluding negotiations. In particular, American experts M.Deutsch and S.Shikman note that "the satisfaction of the parties' needs, focusing on real existing contradictions rather than the subjective interests of the people participating in the dispute, developing several variants of decisions while taking into account the objective criteria of the balance of power (not party or ideological positions) increases the effectiveness of negotiations." Compromises, attentiveness to a partner expand the possibilities of reaching an agreement. Threats, pressure on the opponent reduce the possibility of negotiations, sometimes leading to a "freeze" situation.

The positive conclusion of negotiations can be brought about by the diversification of goals, which allows the parties to consider options for solving the problem; the determination of the negotiation process, which allows the parties to choose a suitable place, time, representatives, and other measures for dialogue. As a rule, success in negotiations is also helped by relying on the principle of "distributive justice," which ensures that success is divided in proportion to the efforts and resources expended. Success can also be brought about by advertising campaigns involving a third party, or actions that "distract" opponents from the original goals of the negotiations. At the same time, the practice of many conflicts shows that involving and using the media as a mediator in negotiations can lead to the intensification of the conflict and the breakdown of communication between the conflicting parties, especially in delicate and acute issues.

Depending on the skill of the negotiators, a successful result can be achieved by "coordinating" ("packaging") the problem, i.e., considering various problems in

interconnection; “avoiding” the discussion, i.e., not paying attention to issues that do not suit one or the other side.

It is important to describe the results of negotiations at the end of the conflict in this way - compromise, agreement, force pressure (so that the population perceives them not as a defeat, humiliating peace, but accepts them impartially). In this context, actions that may cast doubt on decision-making are denied. In this sense, the management entity's use of political symbols, stereotypes, and thinking standards that reflect victory and direct people's mass activity, which are natural for public consciousness, plays an important role. For example, in military actions, the symbol of defeat is the fall of the capital or the arrest of the leader. In dialogue with citizens, only the necessary image, the symbol of agreement, and finding appropriate harmony can ensure the preservation of the results of negotiations and resist the emergence of post-conflict relations.

Mastering the technologies of the negotiation process increases the possibility of effective conflict management and allows controlling complex competitive processes in the sphere of political power division.

Seminar questions:

1. What is a conflict?
2. What are the components of the structure and composition of conflicts?
3. How can political conflicts be managed?
4. What are the technologies for controlling political conflicts?
5. Provide information on the methods of regulating conflicts.
6. What are the stages of conflict resolution?

9. THE GENESIS AND CURRENT STATE OF POLITICAL MANAGEMENT

1. Political management: its place and role in the state administration system
2. The increasing role of political management in modern conditions
3. Types of political management
4. Types of professional activities in the field of political management
5. Political management as a type of professional activity

Political management: its place and role in the state administration system. Governance is an essential and inseparable part of societal life. Governance enables the resolution of large-scale tasks related to coordinating political, economic, and social processes within society. These tasks include gaining public trust, winning elections, resolving conflict situations, and more.

To fully understand the place of political governance within the state governance system, it is appropriate to first examine its most general types. The first type of governance in politics is substantive governance. It represents objective social mechanisms or processes that encourage people to systematically incorporate elements, social structures, and functional relationships into their actions. Substantive governance ensures the integrity of the political system, preserves its uniqueness, and facilitates its reproduction and development. Key processes within the political system include political socialization, institutionalization, and legitimacy. In practice, substantive governance resembles individuals adhering to accepted norms and rules in society and being guided by cultural, including political, values.

The relational type of governance (from the French “relation” – relationship) manifests in subject-object relationships, where it is necessary to distinguish between the governing subject and the governed object, i.e., those who must comply with specific governance decisions. The existence of this type of governance distinguishes social systems from others. This is because it exists in the form of

conscious, goal-oriented activity of individuals who strive to achieve their objectives, make decisions, and influence one another.

In political science, management, as the relationship between subject and object, is divided into three main types:

a) Governance relationships between governing subjects (officials and state bodies) and the population or its specific groups. This type of governance is usually referred to as state governance, as its subject is the state, state bodies, and officials. It encompasses the entire range of administrative activities carried out by executive authorities (government, ministries, agencies, and other state institutions). The main characteristic of state governance is that it is based on the “legitimate use of force,” meaning the governing subject has the authority and resources to implement governance decisions.

b) Governance relationships formed within state and political organizations to regulate their activities and improve efficiency. These relationships are limited to specific organizations (state institutions, political parties, etc.) and resemble the management of economic organizations. Governance in state institutions and political organizations relies on the status resources of the governing subject (leadership of state institutions, party leadership) and the authority to create universally binding norms. Members of these organizations can enforce penalties for violating these norms.

c) Governance relationships where the subject (political organization, pressure group, state official) cannot rely on the “legitimate use of force” or status resources to achieve political goals. These subjects cannot create laws or decisions with mandatory force and must resort to other forms and methods of influencing the control object. This type of governance relationship is referred to as political management.

Before specifying the unique characteristics of political management, it is necessary to clarify the political goals it aims to achieve and the tasks it addresses:

1. Strengthening the position of the state or a political leader.

2. Creating favorable conditions for the activities of state institutions, political parties, or public organizations by shaping an attractive image in the public consciousness.

3. Expanding the number of supporters for a specific state or political program or project.

4. Shaping pre-election preferences among the population.

5. Forming political alliances and blocs.

6. Influencing political opposition and rivals in conflict situations.

7. Influencing decision-makers at the state level.

8. Mobilizing public political support.

The tasks listed above are of particular importance for various subjects operating within the framework of political relations. In modern society, achieving significant political results is impossible without addressing these tasks in daily practice.

The uniqueness of these tasks lies in the fact that the governing subject cannot use authority, issue decrees, create laws, or resort to coercion to achieve them. The governed object is outside the zone of status subordination to the governing subject, meaning they are not obligated (by law or status) to like or dislike a political leader. In the voting booth, they are free to act according to their will, and they cannot be forced to restrain themselves. They may join any state institution or political organization, and so on.

Thus, political management differs from state governance and governance within state institutions and political organizations in the following ways:

- First, in political management, the governing subject cannot use state coercion or penalties that state governance subjects or leaders of state institutions and political organizations can apply to their subordinates. Therefore, the methods of influence used by the political governance subject on the governed object must be very precise.

- Second, state governance and governance within political organizations are primarily based on the principle of legislative creativity.

- Third, political management addresses very specific tasks. Solving these problems helps political subjects strengthen their position in the political arena, defeat competitors, and increase their influence on the public. In other words, it is crucial for political subjects seeking to expand their influence on society and implement their plans, political programs, and projects. However, public attitudes toward them vary, shaped by personal ambitions, group interests, and biased goals, which are usually not disclosed. It is difficult to imagine a political campaign aimed at enhancing the president's reputation, boosting the prestige of a ministry, securing tax benefits for a financial-industrial corporation, or influencing political allies.

- Fourth, specific methods and tools for solving governance problems are formed within political management. These are collectively referred to as political technologies.

In the literature, there are two approaches to defining the concept of “political technologies.” Proponents of the first approach view political technologies as a universal component of any governance process in politics. Proponents of the second approach emphasize that political technologies are a type of political governance technology specific to political management.

Based on the second approach, we can define political technologies as follows: Political technologies are a set of methods that skillfully influence people's motivation, consciousness, and subconscious, encouraging them to act in line with the interests of the political subject while preserving their freedom of independent choice and the naturalness of practical activity. These methods introduce new ideas and values into public consciousness, shape new perspectives and beliefs, and are often referred to as manipulative techniques among the population.

Thus, political management is a distinct type of governance in politics, where the governing subject, striving to achieve specific political goals, cannot rely on universally accepted mandatory norms or the “legitimate use of force” and must employ special methods, tools, and various political technologies to achieve its objectives.

The Increasing Role of Political Management in Modern Conditions. The history of political management dates back to ancient times. In almost all historical societies, rulers have sought to enhance their authority and expand their influence over broader segments of the population, while competing groups and clans have always sought ways to effectively influence their leaders, kings, and emperors. However, only in modern times has political management gained a broad scope in society. This process is associated with a number of significant events that occurred in the 19th and 20th centuries.

One of these is the changing role of the masses in the political life of society.

The second process is the liberalization and democratization of mass consciousness.

The third process is the democratization of societies.

The fourth process is the introduction of universal suffrage.

The fifth process is the transformation of political parties, public organizations, and interest groups into independent structures striving to actively participate in the political arena.

The sixth process is the development of electronic mass media.

Thus, the 20th century witnessed significant changes in the lives of many societies. Processes of democratization, the limitation of officials' actions by law, the declaration of the inviolability of individual rights and freedoms, changes in societal values, the emergence of parties and their entry into the political arena, and other factors began to demand serious adjustments in the strategies of socio-political organizations to achieve political goals. The previously widespread policy of state coercion and overt violence no longer suited the new realities.

Political management provided the opportunity to resolve political issues without physical violence, and the development of electronic mass media offered additional technical capabilities in this regard.

Types of Political Management. As mentioned above, political management enables the resolution of various political issues. Initially, the same individuals handled different tasks. For example, Niccolò Machiavelli simultaneously served as

an image-maker, speechwriter, advisor, and assistant. However, the increasing importance of political management in modern political processes has led to the stratification and professionalization of this field. Specialists began to be involved in solving various political issues.

At present, the following main types of political management can be discussed:

- Political image-making;
- Political PR;
- Electoral management;
- Political branding;
- Conflict resolution in politics;
- Lobbying activities;
- Formation of political alliances and agreements.

We will briefly touch on each of these.

Types of Professional Activities in the Field of Political Management.

Currently, the division of labor within political management has led to the emergence of the following main types of activities:

- Analytical support for political campaigns;
- Political advertising;
- Media planning;
- Image-making;
- Speechwriting;
- Organization and conduct of mass political events.

The activities of political subjects can be viewed as a type of activity aimed at creating and promoting specific political goods and services in the political market. Therefore, methodologies developed in commercial marketing, such as studying consumer demand and promoting products, can also be applied in political practice. For this purpose, the concept of “political marketing” was introduced. D. Lindon defines political marketing as a set of theories and methods that political

organizations and state bodies can use to define their goals and programs while simultaneously influencing the behavior of citizens.

The concept of “political marketing” is very close in meaning to “political management.” However, it would be incorrect to equate the two. In our view, not all political campaigns can be called marketing campaigns.

Marketing campaigns are political campaigns aimed at relatively quick gains in the form of votes on election day by supporting a specific political program or draft law during a certain period of discussion. However, there are also political campaigns without strict deadlines. For example, a political campaign aimed at promoting a political brand can continue indefinitely.

Marketing campaigns aim to persuade citizens and voters to engage in a kind of exchange—votes in return for promises, support (expressed in words or actions) in return for statements about improving certain events or living conditions. However, in a political campaign aimed at shaping tolerant attitudes in public opinion, for example, even if it is prolonged, there may be no basis for exchange.

Real market relations exist only in a competitive environment. Many political campaigns are indeed conducted in a spirit of fierce struggle. This is especially true for election campaigns. However, in a democratic society, shaping citizens' positive attitudes toward state institutions does not imply competition, as there can only be one parliament, one foreign ministry, and so on in a country.

In defining the relationship between the concepts of “political management” and “political marketing,” the following methodological position underlies: “political management” is a general concept used to define a specific type of management relationship in politics. The concept of “political marketing” can only be applied to political campaigns conducted in a competitive environment.

Political Management as a Type of Professional Activity. Until the mid-20th century, election and other political campaigns were primarily conducted by party activists, friends of candidates, and sympathetic citizens who provided selfless, voluntary assistance to current politicians. Typically, their actions were driven by personal passion, the desire to ensure their candidate's victory, and the willingness

to use all available means to achieve success. Among such individuals, good organizers of political campaigns emerged, but they relied more on intuition and experience than on scientific knowledge in this field. At that time, there were no professionals in the field of political campaigns. Samuel Adams (1722–1803), one of the organizers of the liberation struggle in the English colonies and the “press agent of the American Revolution,” developed a number of principles for conducting political campaigns that remain relevant today:

1. Organizational ability to lead a campaign.
2. Use of easily recognizable emotional symbols.
3. Use of emotional symbols and memorable textual posters.
4. Staging public events that attract attention, provoke discussions, and shape public opinion.
5. Leading opponents in interpreting events.
6. The need for constant influence using available communication tools.

A specialist is an individual with specialized knowledge in a relevant field, who has undergone the necessary training, is qualified to work in this field, and can become a significant financial resource.

To turn political management into a profession, three main conditions are required:

First, the emergence of politicians and state officials who understand the importance of political management and are willing to pay for the services of specialists in this field (social need);

Second, the scientific community must have the capacity to equip potential political managers with specialized knowledge, the ability to analyze specific situations, understand the mood of real people, see the mechanisms of social influence, and provide comprehensive knowledge about methods and technologies for solving political management issues (“empirical revolution in science”);

Third, the development of an independent, competitive market for political consulting services, independent of state structures.

Thus, the professionalization of political management requires that the social need for such specialists aligns with the “empirical revolution” in the social and political sciences, while not hindering self-funded professional development.

In Uzbekistan, the demand for professional political consultants emerged in the early 2000s, when the country began to form a multi-party system. Political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists were retrained as specialists in conducting pre-election propaganda. Various seminars were held for them, with the participation of specialists from foreign countries.

The collapse of the USSR and the subsequent independence of the Republic of Uzbekistan can be considered the starting point for the development of modern political sciences. Political science as a discipline began to be taught in higher education institutions in 1993. In the process of formation and development, political sciences reflected all the difficulties, contradictions, and conflicts of independent development. The inclusion of newly born young political sciences in the list of disciplines alongside “Scientific Communism” and “History of the CPSU” is well remembered by many as having a significant impact on the development of political sciences. From the 2008–2009 academic year, the training of specialists in political science was discontinued, and these disciplines were removed from the State Classification of Disciplines. During those years, only a few educational institutions in the Republic, such as the Tashkent State Institute of Oriental Studies and the University of World Economy and Diplomacy, continued to train specialists in “International Relations” and “World Politics.”

The ten-year artificial ban, on the one hand, froze the transformation of “Scientific Communism” into political science, and on the other hand, halted the objective analysis of real political processes and the development of political institutions. Naturally, political science as a discipline lagged far behind the political sciences of other countries.

Now, a crucial and responsible time has come for political scientists in Uzbekistan, as opportunities are being created to stimulate research in line with the

requirements of the 21st century and the large-scale reforms being carried out in the country.

In this regard, the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan on measures to improve the training of personnel in the field of political sciences and increase the effectiveness of fundamental and applied research (Decree No. PQ-4139, dated January 29, 2019) became a key document. The decree established quotas for undergraduate and graduate programs in political science at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy starting from the 2019–2020 academic year.

As stated in the decree, the main task now is to study advanced international experience in training political science specialists, develop State Educational Standards based on institutional changes in political processes and modern requirements for the education system, and create educational and methodological literature for new curricula with the involvement of leading political scientists in the country.

It is known that the Strategy of Actions for the Further Development of the Republic of Uzbekistan, outlined in the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Sh.M. Mirziyoyev (Decree No. PF-4947, dated February 7, 2017), defines the improvement of the state and society construction system as a separate principle, placing a huge responsibility on the specialists in this field and requiring special attention to the training of political science personnel.

Today, new ideas, theories, research methods, and scientific schools (directions) are being developed in this field in foreign countries, and new paradigms are being created. The ongoing processes of integration and differentiation in political sciences have led not only to new methods and methodological approaches but also to the formation of new directions in the system of political sciences—political management, political marketing, political consulting, image-making, political PR, crisis management, and other practical and theoretical branches.

Political science and related disciplines are in high demand and are developing in almost all countries of the world. This is also extremely important for Uzbekistan. At the same time, research in this field should be developed not only in higher

education institutions but also at the level of “think tanks.” The role of independent “think tanks” in shaping alternative, constructive political conclusions and proposals is incomparable.

The history of human development is characterized by various, yet unique, relationships of interest, and the manifestation of different approaches to individuals, groups, strata, and events that are not repetitive in form or content. Diverse cultures and approaches contribute to the emergence of rational foundations for the development of social life and the formation of theoretical and practical criteria for the laws of development, while also leading to the manifestation of various social risks, declines, intolerance, and unique forms of irreconcilability in human and societal life.

“Today, considering the intense struggle taking place worldwide to capture the minds and hearts of the population, especially the youth, and the increasing threats of religious extremism, terrorism, drug addiction, and 'mass culture,' we must not weaken our efforts in the upbringing of our children and spiritual-educational work, but rather elevate them to a new level.”

The phenomenon of conflict situations occupies a special place in social life due to its unique characteristics and is observed at all stages of societal development. We can consider its individual, family, group, national, regional, and international manifestations. It is known that under the influence of globalization and economic and political integration processes, regions and territories are acquiring unique social landscapes. Along with the flow of goods, teachings, theories, and ideas, the worldview and practical activities of their creators are also expanding. This situation leads to the emergence of diverse relationships of interest, conflicting interests, and sometimes clashes. The formation of such attitudes among people often leads to the wrong choice of solutions, resulting in various events.

Social life is based on certain norms and principles of compliance. This situation shows that law and duty, freedom and responsibility are concepts that always operate together, in an organic connection. The higher the spiritual and educational level, knowledge, qualifications, potential, and general cultural level of

citizens, the more likely it is that conflicting relationships will be resolved through compromise, creating conditions for a free and prosperous life. The correspondence between the ideas of peace and justice in social life and the content of existing norms also stimulates the formation of practical skills in people's activities.

It is known that conflictology is a science that studies the dynamics of social conflicts in society, their causes, as well as the typology and forms of conflicts, and the theoretical and scientific foundations for resolving conflicts. For many years, due to the dominance of the former Soviet system in our country, we were unable to study conflictology and political management theory, along with many other social and humanitarian sciences. This is because Soviet society was characterized by a “conflict-free society,” although in practice, various types and forms of social conflicts could be encountered at every step. However, debates on this topic continue.

Fortunately, thanks to independence, we have gained the opportunity to think about topics that were previously “taboo.” Studying conflictology is of great importance not only theoretically but also practically. This field of science provides practical assistance to people through its real indicators in the process of studying conflicts—from small conflicts between individuals to global conflicts. It offers the possibility of resolving conflicts between individuals, social groups, and states through the use of force or peaceful negotiations and predicting their positive outcomes. Understanding the nature of conflicts is extremely important for every individual. After all, no one's life is without contradictions. This is the law of life.

Therefore, studying conflictology and political management theory is of great importance for a person, first and foremost, in deeply understanding their “human nature.” It is possible to superficially describe a conflict in society as simply this or that conflict. However, in the process of resolving or theoretically analyzing that conflict, we realize how complex it is. The multifaceted nature of conflicts naturally presents certain difficulties in their analytical study.

The main goals of modern conflictology are as follows:

1) To study all conflicts that are the object of science and to rapidly develop conflictology and political management theory;

2) To create a conflictology education system in the country and promote conflictology knowledge in society;

3) To organize a system of practical work for conflictologists in the country to predict, prevent, and reconcile conflicts.

To achieve the first goal, i.e., to develop conflictology methodology, theory, and methods, the following substantive and organizational tasks must be addressed:

1) Overcoming the fragmentation of specialized conflictological sciences;

2) Introducing conflictologists to all branches of conflictology and, on this basis, forming independent disciplines (“Conflict Resolution in International Relations,” “Political Crisis Management,” “Political Marketing and Management,” “Political PR,” etc.);

3) Conducting interdisciplinary research on conflicts;

4) Separating conflictology as a scientific specialty, initially within the framework of psychology, sociology, or political science;

5) Regularly holding scientific and scientific-practical conferences on methodological, theoretical, and methodological problems of conflictology;

6) Creating a systematic database of empirical data, including situational results of all types of real conflicts;

7) Publishing scientific articles on “Problems of Conflictology” and broadly reflecting the fundamental problems of the science in other periodicals dedicated to conflicts;

8) Expanding scientific ties with the global community of conflictologists and publishing the most important works of foreign authors in this field in Uzbekistan.

Seminar Questions:

1. The role of political management in modern conditions.

2. Types of management control.

3. Professional activities in political management.

4. Political management and political marketing: general and specific.

10. POLITICAL CAMPAIGN AND PROCESS IN POLITICAL MANAGEMENT

1. The concept of a political campaign.
2. The external environment of a political campaign.
3. The subject of management in a political campaign.
4. The management subject as a team.
5. Management Object.

The concept of a political campaign. Management is a specific sequence of actions by individuals involved in making and implementing decisions related to existing activities. Political management is no exception; it possesses all the general characteristics of the management process but also has a number of unique features. Taking these features into account, we introduce the concept of a “political campaign” to define the management process aimed at solving specific political problems (e.g., enhancing the prestige of the state or a political leader, forming electoral advantages, resolving conflict situations, etc.).

A political campaign is a management process carried out by a political leader (party, socio-political movement, interest group, etc.) using methods and tools that exclude the use of overt forms of coercion to achieve specific political goals, as well as the right to create mandatory rules and norms.

Let us discuss the unique characteristics of this concept, its content, and the differences between it and the already familiar concept of “political management.” We use the concept of “political management” to distinguish and define a specific type of management relations in politics that differ from state management and management within state and political organizations. In addition to the concept of a “political campaign,” we also refer to a specific management process in political management.

At the core of any political campaign lies the subjective will of a specific political subject—the management subject (politician, organization)—aimed at achieving a clearly defined goal. The achievement of political goals depends on and is directed toward whom we call the management object. Thus, in a political

campaign, the control object consists of individuals with their own life positions, established beliefs, and value orientations.

It is important to note that these individuals are also active, but their activity may be very different and sometimes unexpected for the management subject. For instance, individuals may passively observe or become inspired and activated by the development of a political campaign, influencing political managers and prompting them to change their strategies and tactics.

The relationship between the management subject and object in a political campaign differs from the “rigidity” and systematicity characteristic of state management in state and political organizations.

Thus, a political campaign can be viewed as subject-object management relations. However, these are a unique type of relations that lack rigidity and structure, are not perceived as control and execution relations by the participants of the political campaign, and therefore, the control object acts freely and independently without feeling bound by any obligations.

Every interaction initiated by the political management subject should bring it closer to the intended goal. However, in practice, the outcome of a political campaign is not always the desired goal. There are many reasons for the discrepancy between the goal set by the management subject and the result achieved: an incorrectly chosen persuasion strategy, lack of understanding of the unique motivational characteristics of political campaign participants, incorrect segmentation of the political market, and so on. But the main reason is that achieving the set goal depends not only on it but also on the people participating in the political campaign.

The external environment of a political campaign. Political and administrative processes do not occur in a vacuum but in a specific socio-cultural environment, in a specific place and time, which directly influences the course of the political campaign.

The external environment of a political campaign is diverse and complex, including the following:

1. The culture of society in general and political culture in particular. The influence of culture on the actions of political propagandists is multifaceted.

First, it manifests in the potential readiness of its participants to replicate generally accepted behavioral patterns (models) and cultural norms.

Second, the influence of culture lies in the fact that it prompts the subject of the political campaign to pay attention to value considerations, ideals, and important ideas that may not be shared by the majority.

Third, in modern society, the influence of culture does not lead to the unification of the activities of political campaign initiators. This is due to the complexity of cultures that include many subcultures.

2. Social structures. Any interactions in society occur in a structured social space. Structures consist of stable relationships. In general, they exist in the form of institutions, organizations, groups, and statuses. An individual living in society inevitably enters into structured relationships. They occupy certain status positions and take on specific social roles. A person forced to act in a structured social space cannot ignore institutional and group norms that impose restrictions on the ways they can achieve their goals and on their actions.

3. Factors such as the type of electoral system also significantly influence the strategy and tactics of conducting an election campaign. For example, elections under a proportional system are always intense, while the majority system, which requires an absolute majority and allows for a second round of voting, demands caution in criticizing potential allies in the second round.

4. Time and space. During a political campaign, the individuals interacting are located in a specific physical space. Their degree of physical proximity and the nature of the terrain directly influence the interaction process. A rally in a square, a meeting in a hall, or communication through mass media require different behaviors.

Time is another constraint for political campaigns. Time, or more precisely, its scarcity, forces the management subject to compress planned activities, abandoning some ideas that require significant time resources for implementation. If you misplan your actions in an election campaign, political technologists may

erase the images of candidates they have worked on for a long time from voters' memories.

1. Situational factors are formed as a set of aspirations and hopes of individuals at a specific historical stage. People's behavior and their mutual expectations are determined not only by cultural, structural, and temporal frameworks but also by today's concerns: how to provide for the family, how to spend leisure time.

2. The actions of competitors. The process of cooperation in a political campaign. Its essence is to achieve the set goal through joint efforts (subject and object), more precisely, to encourage the object to interact with the controlling subject and thereby help them implement their plans. However, many political campaigns are conducted simultaneously in society. If they are organized around the same goal, competition and even conflicts arise among their participants, and if they are viewed as potential objects of management influence by political competitors, a struggle may ensue for the same social groups.

The subject of management in a political campaign. Achieving political goals always requires collective action. Therefore, organized groups act as the subject of political management. These groups may differ in:

- 1) size;
- 2) duration of activity;
- 3) degree of independence;
- 4) presence or absence of formal relations.

The most common subjects of political campaign management are:

1. Political parties, which, for example, during an election campaign, transform into a unique election headquarters.

2. Services organized within the structure of state organizations and dealing with the image problems of the relevant state organization's leader and favorable image.

3. Special structural divisions in non-political organizations—PR services. They promote the tasks of influencing state officials to obtain certain privileges or

strengthen the economic, financial, and monetary positions of the interest groups they represent.

4. Supporters—an informal association of a group of individuals around a leader in modern society. Supporters differ from all the previously named types of political campaign management subjects by the absence of formalized relations, i.e., the absence of any normative act that enshrines mutual rights and obligations, a clear definition of functions, and the non-bureaucratic organization of internal management. The main factor uniting the group members is their value or emotional-psychological orientation toward their leader.

5. Professional organizations specializing in the field of political management. They are distinguished not only by professional skills but also by the cohesion of their workforce, allowing them to pose and solve problems in the field of political management with higher quality. At the same time, they do not set their own political goals but act as professional executors of the will of political, state figures, or organizations.

Thus, in modern society, there are various groups and organizations that can be the subject of a political campaign. Some of them, such as state institutions and political organizations, PR services organized within parties, operate on a permanent basis and have a permanent staff, while others may be organized on a temporary basis to solve a single political task. The latter includes election headquarters.

The management subject as a team. When individuals unite in a group to solve a common problem, the effectiveness of their activities is determined not only by each person's abilities and professional skills but also largely by their ability to work together. In fact, we are talking about turning a group of individuals into a team that works in the same rhythm, on the same wavelength, creating a synergistic effect. This achieves a sharp increase in labor productivity by combining the efforts of several people.

Three principles underlie the creation of an effective team: a) optimal structure, b) personal choice of participants, c) a unified team spirit. Let us examine

how these principles can be implemented using the example of forming an election headquarters.

Team structure is a set of stable formalized relationships that unite all its members. These relationships are manifested in clearly defining the functional tasks and responsibilities of each, establishing mutual control, subordination, and the rules of the team's internal hierarchy. The effectiveness of the entire team's work depends on how well the management subject's structure is thought out and how well it is adapted to solving specific political problems.

The structure is determined based on ideas about what tasks need to be solved during the political campaign, what types of activities can ensure their implementation, and what resources are available for this. For example, when forming an election headquarters, after analyzing the above factors, it may be decided to include the following groups:

- an analytical group responsible for collecting and analyzing information;
- an advertising group responsible for producing and distributing advertising materials;
- a press service;
- a group responsible for organizing the candidate's meetings with voters;
- a group of agitators;
- a group working directly with the candidate—psychologists, speechwriters;
- a legal service;
- a financial support group, accounting;
- a security service.

By selecting groups with different task-functions, we unite specialists of the same profile, enabling them to professionally and competently solve the tasks assigned to them.

However, the division of labor and its diversification can sharply increase the risk of losing control over the entire team. This problem becomes particularly acute in large-scale election campaigns, where the number of teams increases, and their members are dispersed across different cities and villages.

To ensure greater consistency in work, it is necessary to establish linear subordination, i.e., intermediate management links. Usually, this task is solved by combining groups into blocks and appointing individuals responsible not only for the work of each group but also for specific areas of work.

Thus, structuring the subject of political campaign management is the first important step toward turning it into a team, i.e., an effective organization. Structuring involves distributing functions among all team members, clearly defining technical tasks and responsibilities, as well as the nature of subordination. Ambiguity in rights and obligations can lead to serious disputes, confusion, and ultimately the failure of the political campaign.

The presence of a clear structure facilitates the control system for the execution of decisions. Each group, each direction has its own leader, who is personally responsible for the execution of the relevant work.

The second principle of effective team activity in managing a political campaign is the personal choice of its participants. For a political manager, the ideal scenario is for their team to include professionals in their field. However, in real life, you have to deal with different people, so it is important to know what criteria to follow when selecting team members:

- professional knowledge and significant work experience;
- creative abilities, i.e., the ability to generate new ideas and implement unconventional actions;
- a developed sense of responsibility, discipline, and the ability to work in a team.

The third principle of creating an effective team is turning it into a community of like-minded individuals where each person feels their involvement in the common cause, is interested in the success of the political campaign, and is ready to contribute to achieving this goal.

In conclusion, it is worth emphasizing that by the management subject, we mean a group of individuals organizing a political campaign in the process of achieving a specific political goal. The success of a political campaign is largely

determined by how effectively and professionally the existing group works. To achieve this, three principles must be considered: optimizing the structure, correctly selecting group members, and creating a comfortable environment for everyone to achieve the goal.

Management Object. The achievement of political campaign goals depends on others:

on voters, if it is an election campaign; on the population, if the task is to enhance the reputation of a state leader; on parliament members, if a certain draft law is being lobbied; on political opponents, if efforts are made to find a way out of a conflict situation. The achievement of political goals depends on whom and in relation to whom the management subject carries out specific actions, and we refer to this as the management object.

In a political campaign, the management subject selects its target of influence based on the set political goals. The object of management influence is never presented as a certain amorphous mass from which any figure can be shaped like plasticine. These are real people who have their own value orientations and interests, occupy various positions in the social and political space, possess established beliefs and privileges, and belong to various social groups.

In a political campaign, any control object can be conditionally expressed as five layers differing in the level of support for the control subject:

1. Active supporters, i.e., individuals who, for a number of reasons (value orientations, alignment of interests, high identification), are consciously and purposefully ready to cooperate with the management subject, support its actions, and even help achieve the set goals.

2. Passive supporters, i.e., individuals who sympathize with the political goals defended by the management subject but refrain from active independent actions to support them.

3. Neutral position holders, i.e., individuals who do not have a clearly defined political position, do not openly favor any political leader or party, have little

information about the goals of political subjects, and are absorbed in their personal problems.

4. Distrustful individuals, i.e., those who favor other political parties and leaders or hold a negative attitude toward all politicians, or who are disillusioned and do not believe in the ability of the state and political figures to constructively solve the people's problems in the country or region. Distrust leads them to reject any connection with the control subject in the political campaign.

5. Hostile individuals, i.e., those who have already made their political choice and have become active supporters of other political leaders and parties. The political choice made by this group's members prompts them to oppose the control subject and even engage in actions aimed at countering it.

The stratification of individuals considered as potential control objects, as outlined above, is the first serious problem that the control subject must address during the political campaign process. The subject must strive to retain the first two groups within its sphere of influence, attract the third group into the mutual interaction of management, and neutralize the actions of individuals belonging to the fourth and fifth groups as much as possible.

In addition to diversity, the potential control object has another characteristic: it is simultaneously the focus of attention of several subjects who have initiated various political campaigns.

In fact, the actions of the political campaign initiator are reduced to turning the potential object into a real participant in the management process. The main way to solve this problem is to engage people in mutual relations with the management subject, because only through direct or indirect interaction can changes in people's values, attitudes, and behaviors be achieved. Therefore, a political campaign is a whole chain of efforts carried out by the subject to engage the potential object in various types of interactions.

Model of Mutual Political Influence. Any interaction presupposes the activity of its participants. This activity can manifest in actions or occur at the level of mental, thought processes, and emotional experiences.

When constructing a model of mutual political interaction, we proceed from the following assumptions. First, individuals in mutual relations must be motivated. Only the presence of motivation prepares individuals to engage in mutual relations and respond to the actions of the counterpart. Whether they are aware of the reasons for their actions or these reasons exist as unconscious internal impulses is not important. Second, interaction is always an exchange of information, i.e., a type of communication process. It is impossible to prompt or compel a person to political action without conveying relevant information to them. Third, individuals in mutual relations in society tend to structure their relationships, i.e., to make them more reliable and predictable.

Taking the above into account, the interaction model can be expressed in its most general form as three processes that unite its participants:

1. Motivational processes – internal, mental processes that lead to the emergence of motives prompting individuals to engage in mutual relations.
2. Communication processes – the exchange of information between interaction participants, signals about their intentions, interests, and understanding of the counterpart's actions.
3. Structuring processes – the creation of relatively stable, predictable relations between the subject and the management object, the mutual acceptance of the general rules of interaction by both participants.

The processes that unite interacting individuals develop simultaneously and influence each other.

Only knowledge of the specific features of these processes can serve as a reliable basis for developing the strategy and tactics of a political campaign. This knowledge constitutes the necessary theoretical foundation of political management; without it, this is merely a set of practically tested technological methods, the effectiveness of which varies widely.

Seminar questions:

1. The concept of a political campaign.

2. The external environment of a political campaign.
3. The management subject in a political campaign.
4. The management object in a political campaign.
5. The model of political cooperation within the framework of a political campaign.

CONCLUSION

As we bring this study guide on Political Technology in International Relations to a close, it is evident that the integration of technology into political processes has fundamentally transformed the way politics is conducted in the modern world. From the rapid dissemination of information through digital platforms to the use of advanced data analytics in decision-making, political technology has become an indispensable tool for political actors at all levels – be they states, international organizations, or non-state actors.

The themes explored in this guide – ranging from political communication and information technologies to political consulting, decision-making, and public relations – highlight the multifaceted nature of political technology and its profound impact on global political processes. Each theme underscores the importance of understanding both the theoretical foundations and practical applications of political technology, as well as the ethical considerations that must guide its use.

In the realm of Political Communication, we have seen how the flow of information shapes public opinion, influences political narratives, and drives political action. The role of mass media, particularly in the digital age, has become increasingly significant, as political actors leverage these platforms to reach and engage with audiences on a global scale. However, the challenges posed by misinformation, propaganda, and the manipulation of public opinion also highlight the need for critical engagement with the sources and content of political communication.

The theme of Information Technology has revealed the transformative power of technology in the political information market. From the use of propaganda and advertising in political campaigns to the application of computer technologies in decision-making, information technology has become a key driver of political outcomes. Yet, as these technologies become more sophisticated, so too do the risks associated with their misuse, including the potential for surveillance, data breaches, and the erosion of privacy.

The concept of Political Technologies as a set of methods and tools for achieving political goals has emphasized the importance of rational, effective, and strategic approaches to political action. Whether in the context of election campaigns, governance, or crisis management, the ability to harness political technologies effectively can mean the difference between success and failure. However, the ethical implications of these technologies – particularly in terms of their impact on democracy, human rights, and social justice – must also be carefully considered.

The role of Political Analysis in understanding and solving complex political problems has highlighted the importance of evidence-based decision-making and the use of analytical tools to navigate the complexities of political phenomena. By providing a framework for analyzing political processes, political analysis enables actors to make informed decisions and develop effective strategies for achieving their objectives.

The theme of Political Consulting has underscored the growing importance of expert advice and strategic planning in political processes. In an increasingly complex and interconnected world, the ability to draw on the expertise of political consultants, analysts, and technologists has become essential for political actors seeking to navigate the challenges of governance, elections, and international relations.

Finally, the guide has explored the role of Public Relations and Political Management in shaping the relationship between political actors and the public. In an era where trust and transparency are increasingly important, the ability to communicate effectively with the public and build a cooperative environment between the state and society is critical for the success of any political endeavor.

As we look to the future, it is clear that the field of political technology will continue to evolve, driven by advances in digital technology, artificial intelligence, and data analytics. These developments will present new opportunities for political

actors to achieve their objectives, but they will also pose new challenges in terms of ethics, accountability, and the protection of democratic values.

In this context, the insights provided in this guide will remain relevant, offering a foundation for understanding and navigating the complexities of political technology in the years to come. By critically engaging with the themes and concepts explored in this guide, we can ensure that political technology is used not only to advance strategic goals but also to promote transparency, accountability, and the public good.

We hope that this guide has provided you with a deeper understanding of the role of political technology in international relations and that it will serve as a valuable resource in your academic and professional endeavors. As the field continues to evolve, we encourage you to remain engaged with the latest developments and to critically examine the ways in which political technology shapes the world around us. By doing so, we can contribute to the responsible and ethical use of political technology in the pursuit of a more just, equitable, and peaceful world.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Main references

1. Мирзиёев Ш.М. Буюк келажакимизни мард ва олижаноб халқимиз билан курашимиз.-Т.: Ўзбекистон, 2017.
2. Djumaev R.Z., Yovqochev Sh.A.. Siyosiy texnologiyalar. – T.TDShU, 2019.
3. Djumaev R.Z.Konfliktologiya (Monografiya). – T.: TDShU, 2020.
4. Jumaev R.Z., Madaminova D.I. Siyosiy menejment: o‘quv qo‘llanma. – T.TDShU, 2022.
5. Халипов Н. Коммуникативные технологии. – М: Мысль, 2000.

Books

6. Castells, Manuel. 2009. Communication Power. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Nye, Joseph S. 2011. The Future of Power. New York: PublicAffairs.
8. Arquilla, John, and David Ronfeldt. 1997. In Athena’s Camp: Preparing for Conflict in the Information Age. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
9. Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 1998. Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition. Boston: Little, Brown.
10. Morozov, Evgeny. 2011. The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom. New York: PublicAffairs.
11. Goldsmith, Jack, and Tim Wu. 2006. Who Controls the Internet? Illusions of a Borderless World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Schmidt, Eric, and Jared Cohen. 2013. The New Digital Age: Reshaping the Future of People, Nations and Business. New York: Knopf.
13. Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York: PublicAffairs.
14. Deibert, Ronald J. 2013. Black Code: Surveillance, Privacy, and the Dark Side of the Internet. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
15. Singer, P. W., and Allan Friedman. 2014. Cybersecurity and Cyberwar: What Everyone Needs to Know. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Kello, Lucas. 2017. The Virtual Weapon and International Order. New Haven: Yale University Press.
17. Rid, Thomas. 2016. Rise of the Machines: A Cybernetic History. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- 18.Choucri, Nazli. 2012. *Cyberpolitics in International Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 19.Floridi, Luciano. 2014. *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 20.Benkler, Yochai. 2006. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Journal Articles

- 21.Nye, Joseph S. 2010. "Cyber Power." Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- 22.Deibert, Ronald J., and Rafal Rohozinski. 2010. "Risking Security: Policies and Paradoxes of Cyberspace Security." *International Political Sociology* 4 (1): 15–32.
- 23.Hansen, Lene, and Helen Nissenbaum. 2009. "Digital Disaster, Cyber Security, and the Copenhagen School." *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (4): 1155–1175.
- 24.Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. 2019. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." *International Security* 44 (1): 42–79.
- 25.Mueller, Milton L. 2019. "Against Sovereignty in Cyberspace." *International Studies Review* 21 (4): 779–801.
- 26.Cavelty, Myriam Dunn. 2014. "Breaking the Cyber-Security Dilemma: Aligning Security Needs and Removing Vulnerabilities." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 20 (3): 701–715.
- 27.Eriksson, Johan, and Giampiero Giacomello. 2006. "The Information Revolution, Security, and International Relations: (IR) Relevant Theory?" *International Political Science Review* 27 (3): 221–244.
- 28.Kello, Lucas. 2013. "The Meaning of the Cyber Revolution: Perils to Theory and Statecraft." *International Security* 38 (2): 7–40.
- 29.Lindsay, Jon R. 2013. "Stuxnet and the Limits of Cyber Warfare." *Security Studies* 22 (3): 365–404.
- 30.Valeriano, Brandon, and Ryan C. Maness. 2015. "The Dynamics of Cyber Conflict Between Rival Antagonists, 2001–2011." *Journal of Peace Research* 52 (3): 347–360.

Edited Volumes and Chapters

31. Rosenau, James N., and J. P. Singh, eds. 2002. *Information Technologies and Global Politics: The Changing Scope of Power and Governance*. Albany: SUNY Press.
32. Dunn Cavelty, Myriam, and Kristian Soby Kristensen, eds. 2008. *Securing the 'Homeland': Critical Infrastructure, Risk and (In)Security*. London: Routledge.
33. DeNardis, Laura, ed. 2014. *The Global War for Internet Governance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
34. Eriksson, Johan, and Giampiero Giacomello, eds. 2007. *International Relations and Security in the Digital Age*. London: Routledge.
35. Carr, Madeline. 2016. *US Power and the Internet in International Relations: The Irony of the Information Age*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
36. Betz, David, and Tim Stevens. 2011. *Cyberspace and the State: Toward a Strategy for Cyber-Power*. London: Routledge.
37. Lawson, Sean, ed. 2018. *Cyberspace and International Relations: Theory, Prospects and Challenges*. Cham: Springer.
38. Dunn Cavelty, Myriam, and Andreas Wenger, eds. 2020. *Cyber Security Politics: Socio-Technological Transformations and Political Fragmentation*. London: Routledge.
39. Nye, Joseph S. 2017. "Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*, edited by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur, 505–524. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
40. Deibert, Ronald J. 2015. "Cyberspace and International Relations." In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, 542–560. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reports and Policy Papers

41. United Nations. 2021. *Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Advancing Responsible State Behavior in Cyberspace*. New York: United Nations.
42. NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. 2020. *Tallinn Manual 2.0 on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Operations*. Tallinn: CCDCOE.
43. World Economic Forum. 2021. *The Global Risks Report 2021*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

- 44.RAND Corporation. 2019. The Implications of Artificial Intelligence for International Security. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- 45.European Parliament. 2020. Cybersecurity: A Growing Challenge for the EU. Brussels: European Parliament.
- 46.Council on Foreign Relations. 2018. Defending an Open, Global, Secure, and Resilient Internet. New York: CFR.
- 47.Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 2017. International Cooperation on Cybersecurity. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment.
- 48.Brookings Institution. 2019. The Future of Digital Diplomacy. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- 49.Chatham House. 2020. Cyber Security and the Politics of Time. London: Chatham House.
- 50.International Telecommunication Union (ITU). 2021. Global Cybersecurity Index 2020. Geneva: ITU.

Internet Sources

- 51.The Diplomat. 2021. “The Role of AI in Modern Warfare.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.thediplomat.com/2021/12/how-does-china-aim-to-use-ai-in-warfare
- 52.Council on Foreign Relations. 2020. “What Is Cyber Warfare?” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.cfr.org/defense-and-security/cybersecurity
- 53.BBC News. 2021. “How Cyber Attacks Are Shaping Modern Conflicts.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.bbc.com/news/world-33339947
- 54.Wired. 2020. “The Rise of Cyber Mercenaries.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.wired.com/story/mercenary-hackers-playbook
- 55.The Guardian. 2021. “How Social Media is Changing Diplomacy.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/21/digital-diplomacy-how-social-media-is-transforming-global-relations
- 56.Harvard Kennedy School. 2020. “The Future of Digital Diplomacy.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.belfercenter.org/publication/digital-diplomacy-technology-and-global-affairs
- 57.Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 2021. “The Geopolitics of 5G.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.carnegieendowment.org/2020/01/15/5g-is-where-china-and-west-finally-diverge-pub-80722
- 58.Brookings Institution. 2021. “The Role of Technology in Shaping Global Power.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.brookings.edu/research/how-

[technology-shapes-power-understanding-the-international-impact-of-emerging-technologies](#)

- 59.Foreign Affairs. 2021. “The New Era of Cyber Conflict.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-06-11/age-cyberwar-here
- 60.Atlantic Council. 2020. “The Impact of AI on International Relations.” Accessed October 10, 2023. www.atlanticcouncil.org/in-depth-research-reports/report/artificial-intelligence-and-the-future-of-international-relations

Additional References

- 51.Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 52.Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Miles Kahler, and Alexander H. Montgomery. 2009. “Network Analysis for International Relations.” *International Organization* 63 (3): 559–592.
- 53.Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 54.Florini, Ann, ed. 2000. *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- 55.Howard, Philip N. 2010. *The Digital Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Information Technology and Political Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 56.Shirky, Clay. 2008. *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. New York: Penguin Press.
- 57.Sunstein, Cass R. 2017. *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 58.Pariser, Eli. 2011. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York: Penguin Press.
- 59.Tufekci, Zeynep. 2017. *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 60.MacKinnon, Rebecca. 2012. *Consent of the Networked: The Worldwide Struggle For Internet Freedom*. New York: Basic Books.
- 61.Powers, Shawn, and Michael Jablonski. 2015. *The Real Cyber War: The Political Economy of Internet Freedom*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- 62.O’Neil, Cathy. 2016. *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.
- 63.Zittrain, Jonathan. 2008. *The Future of the Internet—And How to Stop It*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

64. Sanger, David E. 2018. *The Perfect Weapon: War, Sabotage, and Fear in the Cyber Age*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.
65. Greenberg, Andy. 2019. *Sandworm: A New Era of Cyberwar and the Hunt for the Kremlin's Most Dangerous Hackers*. New York: Doubleday.