

Victor.V.Rubanov,
MA, PhD,
Associate Professor,
the V.N. Karazin National University,
Kharkiv, Ukraine

The Kharkiv University Faculty Members' Contribution to Framing up Theory and Methodology of Political Analytics

Key words: *the Kharkiv University, political arithmetics, Ukrainian school of political analysis, theory and methodology of political analytics.*

Annotation: *Based on critical reviews of scholarly works as well as theoretical and applied projects of the Kharkiv University professors, the article constitutes one of the first attempts at academic estimation of Ukrainian school of political analysis and its development back in the 19th century. The author maintains that the school, as far as academic research of politics concerns, was not inferior to the highest contemporary European standards, and was successfully developing on the national level through the efforts of scholars of Kharkiv. Thus it had clear positive impact on the global process of framing up the theory and methodology of political analytics in general.*

It is widely believed that in Western countries — the USA and Canada first and foremost — political analytics, both as an academic discipline and a branch of political management, came into existence in mid-20th century while in Ukraine and other post-Soviet countries the process of its institutionalization is just incipient (20, p.22). This is why many academics of various branches of knowledge, political science and public administration theory first of all, are so active in elaborating theoretic and methodological foundations of political analytics. In particular, they try for the first time to define political analytics as a specific phenomenon and a corresponding notion. They have also been persistently researching the problems of its genesis and subsequent evolution, though have not yet achieved any degree of uniformity in understanding the essence of the said problems, which is particularly true for the scholars belonging to different branches of scientific knowledge.

Such state of affairs, as we see it, results from a number of reasons, the major one lying in the fact that modern researchers, when working out the definition of *political analytics*, resort to oversimplified approach, terminological rather than conceptual. In the long run, too wide difference of views, imminent for such an approach, leads the researchers to quite arbitrary interpretation of the term itself as well as to categorical (and very erroneous, too) assertions that, in the 19th century, only representatives of West European political and academic elite played major and exclusive part in the formation of political analytics as professional scholarly instrument for political decision-making. E.g., S. Turonok, the author of recently issued textbook on political analysis, argues: “In the 19th c., a new generation of politically important knowledge producers was formed, making the accent on systematic acquisition and analysis of empirical data. Statistical leagues in London and Manchester, founded in the 1830s due to cooperation of scholars, bankers and industrialists, tried to modify traditional (philosophical, ethical, regulatory) ways of thinking in the field of social problems — through systematic analysis of data characterizing the processes of urbanization and industrialization, and their contradictory social aftermaths. Similar initiatives were put forward in France,

Germany, and the Netherlands.” (21, p.52) Such conclusions are defective, mainly because the author cited did not bother to evaluate the importance of think tanks, belonging to his own national academic school, in the process of framing up theory and methodology of political analytics of the time. We can explain the fact by the deficiency of studies in this field both in Ukrainian and foreign professional literature, thus requiring a much more profound scholarly researches and clarification.

The purpose of this article, quite naturally, is to show, on the basis of critical reviews of scholarly works as well as theoretical and applied projects of the Kharkiv University professors, the positive role actually played by them both in creation and development of Ukrainian school of political analytics in the 19th c. and in European and global process of framing up the theory and methodology of political analytics.

Starting to achieve the stated purpose of this research, we must note that Ukraine has never been any exception within the area of European civilization as far as the processes of genesis and evolution go in such a specific field of science of government as political analytics. Since the times the first states were formed on Ukrainian territory the national political thinking has ever developed within the general stream of global scientific tradition. (15, p. 31) Thus, in Ukraine as well as in other countries of the world, one can clearly see the same pattern of correlation and interdependence of genesis and evolutionary processes of the political analytics’ main structural elements, i.e. phenomena and conceptions: emergence of political analysis called forth forming up of political prognostication, and the latter, in its turn, gave a powerful momentum to the process of active building up of political consulting and theory of decision-making in politics, whose deepest foundations were already laid in classical antiquity. It was in antiquity that the first political analysts started to use professionally comparative analysis and simulation of ideal processes; logical methods of analytics as such and of hermeneutics; the foundations of comparative political science were gradually built up; political analysis’ first universal technique was invented that enabled scholars to watch dynamics of the development of government as well as to prognosticate the results of the process. (6, p. 56)

Of course, thinkers of the Renaissance (N. Machiavelli, J. Bodin and others) and of the Age of Enlightenment (T. Hobbes, B. Spinoza, J.J. Rousseau and others) also made rather an important contribution to the further development of problems of political analysis and prognostication, political consulting and decision-making, yet it was “the political thought of the antiquity that, according to modern political experts, was the compendium of political ideas and theories, which presented the starting point for scholars of all the following epochs.” (14, p. 35)

While always remembering a major contribution to political analytics made by the thinkers of antiquity, one should not underestimate (though, regretfully, such underestimation can be seen in a number of works in political science, especially in the works by modern Ukrainian scholars) a direct impact on its further development by British “Political Arithmetics” in the 17th c. and Ukrainian “Political Arithmetics” in the early 19th c. We mean, first of all, the works under the mentioned title written by British researchers John Graunt (1620–1674) (16, p. 188-189) and William Petty (1623—1687) (5, p. 260-268) as well as their Ukrainian followers, including Iosef M. Lang, professor extraordinary of the Emperor’s Kharkiv University. (1, p. 733) Lang and his colleagues, during the period of active scholarly activities, managed to create a special tenor in the prehistory of empirical social and political cognition. Concerning the problem, Roger Smith, a British historian of the sciences, wrote that stochastic and statistical evidence were used as instruments, which allowed the researchers to reveal the order — thus making a science possible — in the sphere of political economy and social sphere. (16, p. 187)

Speaking of the Ukrainian component in this process, it is seen best of all in the active professional activities of aforesaid I. Lang, who widely used both algebraic and arithmetical

formulae for studies and interpretations of socio-political problems in his scholarly works and teaching books. This is why modern scholars justly regard Prof. I. Lang not only as an outstanding economist of his time, but also as a founder of mathematical school in the researches of socio-political problems. (4, p. 28) The conclusion is expressively confirmed by the fact that during his work in the Emperor's Kharkiv University Prof. I. Lang published two separate works: 1. On the elementals of political economy ("Über den obersten Grundsatz der politischen Ökonomie," von Ioseph Lang. — Riga, 1807) and 2. On the elementals of political arithmetics ("Grundlinien der politischen Arithmetik." — Charkow. Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1811). Such a differentiation can be explained by his regarding political economy as a purely theoretical science, which embraces the science of national economy (*Staatswirtschaft*) as its applied part. He was deeply convinced that these two branches of science are correlated in the same way as abstract mathematics and applied mathematics. Correspondingly, Prof. I. Lang viewed "Political Arithmetics" as an integral part of political economy, and saw their purpose in studying specific features of certain phenomena in the economic turnover as e.g. quantity of the goods produced, costs of production and prices, ratio of gross return and net income — that is, the phenomena with *quantitative* dimension. (1, p. 271-272)

So, we see significance and importance of political arithmetics in framing up the theory and methodology of political analytics, first of all, in the fact that their emergence itself meant forming a specialized and independent branch of socio-political knowledge, different from previous "studies of government." While the scientific purpose of the "governmentologists" was boiled down to simple registration and description of facts (personal observations, official documents and sometimes scanty numerical data), political arithmetics, starting with the works of their founder John Graunt, put forward the purpose of finding a certain order of things and their sequences in the facts of social life. That could enable scholars to prognosticate the events, which did not yet occur and so were not yet studied. This is exactly what one can see in modern political monitoring, which is carried out today with a view of ensuring verification of methodological reliability of the instruments of political analysis, on the one hand, and of informational and analytical assistance to national and local authorities in implementing their decisions as well as planning their new political moves and projects, on the other hand.

In this way, the empiricists of both orientations achieved high effectiveness of their researches, objective and true to life, — mainly using the method of unbiased observation of natural progress and activities of society — but moreover they created and approbated the methodological instruments, necessary for achieving satisfactory results. This, in its turn, opened the way to a fundamentally new stage in the development of empiric knowledge of social phenomena, namely, a quantitative stage. Nevertheless, producing of politically significant scientific knowledge as a basis for decision-making in politics was established as an independent type of professional activities not before the Age of Enlightenment and the beginning of industrial revolution in Europe, i.e. late in the 18th century. Challenges of the epoch, closely connected with industrialization, urbanization, mass migrations of people etc., required adopting decisions in social, political and governmental spheres, more detailed and exact than it was done previously, and based on authentic economic and social information. This, in its turn, almost immediately prompted further development of empiric and statistical methods of political analysis. (3, p. 159) Quite logically, the idea that traditional political reasoning must be supported with objective empiric data became dominating. (2, p. 231) Dominating, we should add, not only among American and West European researchers, but among their Ukrainian colleagues as well. This we must especially stress, because, as we understand, their works allow us — unlike it was supposed up to now — to see and adequately evaluate both European and global process of formation and gradual development of political analytics in the aforementioned period of time. We are speaking of the direct,

significant, but regrettably forgotten and almost unstudied theoretical and practical contribution of Ukrainian scholars into framing up and advance of political analytics. One of the most dramatic examples is presented by theoretic and methodological research “Essay on the Essence, Importance, and Mission of Political Sciences” by Tykhon Fedorovych Stepanov (1795—1847), professor of political economy and diplomacy at the Emperor’s Kharkiv University (and its alumnus). The work was read in 1833, at the annual ceremonial meeting of the University’s faculty members. Speaking before his colleagues, the scholar, firstly, stressed that “only mutual agreement of theoreticians and empiricists is able to promote rapid and correct progress of Science; at the same time, it may protect fates of people and Nations from unexpected and unwanted changes.” (19, p. 31) Secondly (this is especially important), Prof. Stepanov pointed out that “nowadays, in the Civilized Countries they pay the greatest attention to statistics, a science, which embraces precious facts of the Nations’ political life.” (19, p. 33) He went on to say, “Already in the New Times of researching demography it penetrated the realm of Political Economy.” Prof. Stepanov mentioned that though Adam Smith himself paid little attention to this fact in his authoritative work, the subject, according to T. Stepanov, belongs to the sphere of a different and quite important branch of science. “In a narrow sense, this is nothing else than Politics!” (19, p. 37)

Moreover, in his speech, a very significant one for the epoch, the scholar especially stressed that “ancient Nations generally were satisfied with rather weak, insufficient ideas on Political Sciences. The Greeks and the Romans boasted of many men of learning who were famous in various branches of Knowledge; yet those learned men were hardly able to comprehend Political life of Societies.” (19, p. 22) Then Prof. T. Stepanov came to the conclusion, “Here I see the need to add that, since Societies lead two-faced life, their laws are to be studied by two separate sciences, namely Political Economy and Politics. The former discovers the Nation’s material laws of life, i.e. the laws of Wealth, while the latter deals with the laws of Morality, or general enlightenment.” (19, p. 23)

The scholar also noted at that common features, which connect the two sciences mentioned, “The purpose of both Political Economy and Politics lies in trying to decipher the major elements of dual life of people and to discover the laws common for all of them. However, these two sciences are closely interrelated and can influence one another either usefully or with a great harm for both. This same reason makes Political Economists sometimes touch the problems purely political, while students of Politics have to take into consideration certain subjects belonging to the realm of Political Economy as such.” (19, p. 39)

Scholars, Prof. Stepanov noted, “now and again, then more and more often, confused this science and Political Economy, arguing that the latter has special purpose of discovering the laws of political organism as a whole — but such a notion is utterly misleading. We have already shown that like private persons’ lives, physical and moral, have particular laws for each one, and those laws are studied by separate sciences, the same concerns the dual life of any political organism. That life is nothing else as an aggregate life of people taken together, and consequently, there must exist two separate types of laws: thus two separate sciences to study them. Comparing the one with the other, one cannot fail to take notice that the second one, Politics, is much harder to learn and much more important than Political Economy.” (19, p. 37)

This idea was supported and further elaborated in the works “A Glimpse of the History of Political Sciences in Europe” (1859) and “On the Modern State of Political Sciences in Western Europe and in Russia” (1862). Their author Dmytro Ivanovych Kachenovsky (1827—1872) was at the time a famous scholar, professor of the Emperor’s Kharkiv University and the forerunner of positive school in methodology of scientific researches of political phenomena and processes (22, p. 46) Being a champion of this school of learning, he drew special attention of academics to the fact that a new school of positive philosophy “emerged directly from demands of life, it was formed by the preceding events as a natural

and much needed instrument of social progress.” (7, p. 104) True to his beliefs, Prof. D. Kachenovsky never failed to stress in all his works, lectures and public speeches that “any science must possess objective sense, that is to examine the phenomena taking place in the realm of reality,” (8, p. 51) that any science must develop “according to the degree of accumulation of materials and ways or means of their exploration,” (8, p. 42) and that “nothing advances Science so much as freedom of thought and open-mindedness in judgment.” (9, p. 57)

According to Prof. D. Kachenovsky, these requirements embrace political sciences as well because they “cover not all actions of people but only those having impact on public interest.” (9, p. 40) Then, the scholar notes, “one can easily agree that the system of government and administration serves as the main subject of political sciences, they examine all the acts of authorities existing in a society: legislative, executive, and judicial.” (9, p. 41) Correspondingly, “political sciences, according to their purpose and the nature of their subject, cannot be purely descriptive — unlike zoology or botany.” (9, p. 55) Prof. D. Kachenovsky believed that “They must explain us in what way the idea of national unity is implemented amongst contradictory interests and aspirations of different strata as well as against the background of natural conditions (soils, climate etc.)” (9, p. 121) In this respect no other science than statistics “is an inexhaustible source of actual experience; it gives us a precious handbook to verify dominating theories and ideas, without statistics it would be practically impossible to come to reliable conclusions as to success or failure of newly adopted legal acts, measures, and reforms. Guided by the facts discovered by history and statistics, one can study the realm of politics and its parts to minutest detail.” (9, p. 49)

So, the scholar concludes, “political sciences, inferior to mathematics in exactness, still deserve, at the least, the name of reliable knowledge, and they remain good sciences for practice of administration.” (9, p. 71)

Thus, for Prof. D. Kachenovsky, «like for Montesquieu and, looking still higher, for Machiavelli and Aristotle himself, it was politics, not economics, that really played the leading part in the whole of social system and in all the transformations, taking place in the society.” (11, p. 29) That is why Prof. Kachenovsky, according to his contemporaries, in the years mentioned above “bravely starts along the headway of studying facts, examining and realizing them anew, instead of inventing utopias of administrative romanticism. Natural sciences were his guides on the way.” (22, p. 47) “Read attentively all he wrote, including his lectures at the University,” advises Maksym Kovalevsky in his memoirs of his teacher D. Kachenovsky, “and you will have a deep impression that any Prof. Kachenovsky’s statement is preceded by very thorough and probably the most complete review of well-examined facts. On those facts he then builds his empiric deduction, and after that he makes preliminary conclusions; the latter are acknowledged as proved only on condition that they fully meet the facts of modern times or of the past. What else is it but the method of inverse deduction, the one, as J.S. Mill states, which is the only guarantee of truly scientific character of any theoretical schemes in the sphere of social sciences?” (11, p. 23-42)

On top of all that, the deepest belief of D. Kachenovsky was that the hidden spring of transformations in political life is “yearning to progress, imminent in reasonable beings.” (7, p. 22) Thus, he concluded, “political sciences can be fit for their purpose only if they rely on phenomena of real life, explore this rich and ever changing material, on the basis of reason and sense of justice, then introducing the results obtained into the whirl of life to verify them and making useful for administration.” (10, p. 9)

Thus we can see the way how among the scholars of that epoch, including Ukrainian scholars, gradually conviction started to dominate that a political phenomenon differs from those in social and economic spheres. It became clear that positive results must and can be obtained through a special branch of science, namely, political science, which uses, like natural studies do, statistical and other strongly formalized methods and procedures of research, and strictly

scientific ideas and notions concerning political phenomena and processes. Starting in the mid-19th c., this conviction has been deepening and strengthening among political scholars due to active professional contacts of Ukrainian and foreign students of politics. Many Ukrainian scholars went on business trips to Europe with the purpose of exchanging views and studying the experience of specialized academic departments and chairs for training future professionals in political sciences. E.g. Prof. D. Kachenovsky stressed in his report on touring West European universities in 1858-1859, "The purpose of my journey, which started, in accordance with His Majesty's permission, in January 1858, was clearly and strictly defined from the very beginning. Having the necessities of academic lecturing in mind, I set for myself two main tasks. The first one consisted in studying modern state of things in the science of International Law, the second one, in improving my knowledge of the sciences of government in general. Very quickly, the third task was added. In March 1858 the Council of the University informed me that after my return from abroad, I will be entrusted with lecturing on public law of European countries. In order to cope with this new job I had to expand the pre-planned studies, namely, to look into political affairs and closely watch the government institutions of at least major Western powers." (10, p. 1-2) He goes on to say, "In Britain, I watched their political practice; in France, I regularly attended meetings of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences." (10, p. 23) And then, "With the start of public courses in November 1858 I used to attend lectures daily at École de droit, at Sorbonne and at Collège de France. Apart from lectures on law, I thought it my duty, while in Paris, to attend lectures on philosophy, history and even on literature." (10, p. 25)

Prof. D. Kachenovsky stressed, "Political education always was — and still is — of great value in my eyes as a preparation to acting as a public figure; I regard as progressive those nations that managed to use it for the benefit of their everyday public life. Such were the reasons for my closer study of Britain and France rather than Germany." (10, p. 42) Then he notes in another report, "My journey to France and Ireland was, as I have already mentioned, the result of the invitation from National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. In 1859 the Association elected me its Corresponding Member. In 1860 I sent a letter from Kharkiv to the Association's Secretary, substantiating, among other things, the necessity of introducing International Department under the Association. The letter was read at the congress in Glasgow. My idea was met with sympathy and gained support of many members." (12, p. 10)

So, we have all reasons to state that our national political analytics developed successfully during that period, within the general trends of global scientific tradition, and this concerns not only theoretical level but applied one as well. Apart from what has already been said, it may be also proved by the indisputable fact that as early as the beginning of the 19th c. there existed a specialized department of "Ethics and Politics, including Law" (18, p. 78) within the framework of the Emperor's Kharkiv University alongside department of medicine and chemistry and department of philology.

It is worth mentioning that in the US universities and colleges of the time, according to researches by David Ricci, political problems were discussed, like in Ukraine, within the framework of academic subjects like "moral philosophy," and a typical college professor was titled "professor of moral and mental philosophy, political economy and political literature." (17, p. 58)

Here we must say that as early as in 1812 a special Society of Sciences was founded under the Emperor's Kharkiv University, having as its purpose publication of the works of its Professors Emeriti. (23, p. 19)

The same year a draft resolution was sent to the Ministry of Public Education concerning foundation of specialized "Statistical Committee", whose members should have been professors of the University department of Ethics and Politics. It is utterly regretful that the committee planned by the University scholars was never actually founded, because of the

decisive objections of Academician (full member of St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences) Parrot, whose influence in the Ministry was great. He argued that it was “potentially dangerous for the University to institute such a committee; an institution like this directly contradicts the very sense of the university and the duties of its professors; a professor must be devoted to Science, not to waste time on a fruitless digital work that can be successfully done by any literate person.” (23, p. 19) Such treatment of innovative initiatives of academics was, at the time, regretfully common as the Emperor Nicolas I took special preventive measures against freethinking within scientific community. Particularly, between 1848 and 1856 there existed double censorship: apart from the official censorial department of Government, a special committee of five persons was established, whose task was to additionally examine all the works published at the time, including those published by universities. (13, p. 162)

In spite of those much hated circumstances, in late 1830s — early 1840s the Kharkiv University completely diverged from the obsolete tradition of encyclopedic education, introducing specialization and further differentiation of various branches of science. (13, p. 162) In 1835 a special chair of political economy was set up and economics started to be taught as a separate academic subject. The significance of that event for intensification of the process of differentiation of socio-political sciences and for framing up theoretical and methodological basis of political analytics cannot be overestimated: as a separate subject, economics was read at only four of the universities in the whole world. They were Columbia University, Oxford, Sorbonne, and the University of Naples. (4, p.17) All this vividly indicates that in the mid-19th century the Kharkiv University — to speak of training of future researchers and teachers — came very closely “to classic west European model, although it failed to achieve the true system of freedom of teaching.” (13, p. 162)

Summing the material up, we can come to the following generalized conclusions.

Some researchers’ peremptory allegations that it was only West European political and scientific elites that supposedly played in the 19th century the leading part in framing up of political analytics as a professional instrument for political decision-making and adoption of political programs are groundless. We must take into consideration the fact that *at the mentioned period of time Ukrainian school of political analysis — as far as scholarly researches of politics are concerned — was on the level with the highest European standards.* Due to professional efforts and active civic stand of the school’s best representatives, such as the Kharkiv University professors I. Lang, T. Stepanov, D. Kachenovsky and some others, Ukrainian political analytics successfully progressed on the national level, thus providing for its *positive impact on the global process of framing up the theory and methodology of political analytics in general.*

A convincing proof of this is, firstly, the fact that during the 19th century Ukrainian scholars, alongside their foreign colleagues, were active supporters of ideas of actualization political knowledge’s progress on the basis of political realism. For them, the latter meant, above all, openness of political reality and the possibility of its cognition in principle. This was an advantage for differentiation and specialization of political sciences, for the rise of their professional level, and it also had a positive impact on the general process of framing up the theory and methodology of political analytics in general.

Secondly, West European and Ukrainian scholars of the time were united by at least one common factor: all of them strived for strictly scientific definition of the line, differentiating political sciences as academic subjects as well as ways of their usage as instruments of theoretical and applied researches of public politics. This, in its turn, provided for systematic development of all the structural elements of political analytics as relatively independent academic subjects related to political management and administration.

Thirdly, all of them believed passionately that methodology of natural sciences gave the best possible means for analyzing socio-political affairs. Those methods and procedures,

reasonably adjusted, were able to help in formulating scientific laws of great cognitive as well as prognostic and creatively practical political charge, which could provide for healthy scientific mechanism of drafting and adopting political decisions and programs.

References:

1. Bahaliy DI. *A Study in the History of the Kharkiv University (after unpublished materials). Vol.1 (1802-1815). Kharkiv, 1894-1898;1204.*
2. Vaschenko KO. *Historical Genesis of Applied Political Analysis and Prognostication: Proceedings of the I.F. Kuras Institute for Political and Ethnic Researches under Ukraine's National Academy of Sciences: A collection of works. Kyiv, 2007; Iss. 35;:227-241.*
3. Degtyaryov AA. *Political Analysis as an Applied Science: Field of Subject and Trends of Development. Polis. 2004. No.1; 154-168.*
4. *The Science of Economics in the Kharkiv University: A Monograph by a team of authors: ed. by VV Hluschenko. Kharkiv, the V.N. Karazin Nat. Univ. Press, 2013; 272.*
5. *History of Theoretical Sociology. Prehistory of Sociology: Textbook for College Students. 5th edition, revised and augmented. Moscow, Gaudeamus Publ., 2010; 274.*
6. Kalnysh YuH. *Political Analytics in National Governance: Theoretical and Methodological Basis: A Monograph. Kyiv, NADU, 2006; 272.*
7. Kachenovsky DI. *A Glimpse of the History of Political Sciences in Europe. Moscow: Katkov's Printhouse, 1859; IV, 142.*
8. Kachenovsky DI. *Course of International law by Prof. D. Kachenovsky. Kharkov Univ. Printhouse. Part 1, 1863; 120.*
9. Kachenovsky DI. *On the Modern State of Political Sciences in Western Europe and in Russia. A Speech of Prof. D. Kachenovsky at the Ceremonial Meeting of the Emperor's Kharkov University, 1862. Kharkov. Univ. Printhouse, 1862; 172.*
10. Kachenovsky DI. *A Report of Prof. D. Kachenovsky's Journeys in Western Europe in 1858-1859. Kharkov. Univ. Printhouse, 1860; 48.*
11. Kovalevsky M. *Testimonial of D.I. Kachenovsky and Personal Recollections of him: In Memory of D.I. Kachenovsky. Ceremonial Meeting of Law Society under the Emperor's Kharkov University, November 22, 1903. Kharkov, N.V. Petrov's Printhouse, 1905; 23-42.*
12. *A Brief Report of the Emperor's Kharkov University Prof. D. Kachenovsky's Actions while Abroad between June and October 1861. Kharkov. Univ. Printhouse, 1862; 12.*
13. Kulish SM. *Traditions and Innovations in the Process of Scholars and Teachers Training at the Kharkiv University in the 19th and early 20th cc.: A Monograph. Kharkiv: the V.N. Karazin Nat. Univ. Press, 2013; 552.*
14. *Political Science: Textbook for College Students: IM. Koval, leading author, LA. Anufriyev, OI. Brusylowska et al. Kharkiv, Folio Publ., 2012; 414.*
15. *Political Analytics in National Governance: Textbook for College Students: ed. SO. Teleshun, YuH. Kalnysh, IV. Reyterovych, OR. Tytarenko. Kyiv, NADU, 2012; 228.*
16. Roger Smith. *The Fontana History of the Human Sciences. L.: Fontana Press, 1997. (Russian transl. ed. by D.M. Nosov. Moscow, High School of Economics Nat. Univ. Press, 2008; 392.)*
17. Ricci DM. *The Tragedy of Political Science. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1984; XIII; 395.*
18. Solovyov IM. *Russian Universities in their Statutes and Contemporaries' Memoirs. Iss. 1. Universities before 1860s. Energiya Publ. House. St. Petersburg, 1913; 208.*
19. Stepanov T. *"A Speech on the Essence, Importance, and Purpose of Political Sciences, delivered by Professor Extraordinary of Political Economy and Diplomacy Tikhon Stepanov at the Ceremonial Meeting of the Emperor's Kharkov University on the 30th of August, 1833". Kharkiv, Univ. Printhouse, 1833; 64.*

20. *Teleshun SO. Introduction to Informational and Analytical Activities in Public Administration: Textbook for College Students: ed. SO. Teleshun, OR. Tytarenko, IV. Reyterovych. Kyiv, NADU, 2009; 168.*
21. *Turonok SH. Political Analysis: A Course of Lectures. Textbook. Moscow, Delo Publ., 2005; 360.*
22. *Fateyev A. Idea of Personality in D.I. Kachenovsky's Political and Pilosophical Works: In Memory of D.I. Kachenovsky. Ceremonial Meeting of Law Society under the Emperor's Kharkov University, November 22, 1903. Kharkov, N.V. Petrov's Printhouse, 1905; 43-54.*
23. *The Kharkov University School of Law During the First Century of its Existence (1805-1905). Kharkov, Pechatnoye Delo Printhouse, 1908; 333.*