

SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES TO THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN MODERN WESTERN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Margaryta O. Hrynchak, PhD in History Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Law, Political Science and International Relations, Alfred Nobel University (Ukraine).

E-mail: mhrynchak@duan.edu.ua

DOI: 10.32342/2709-6408-2021-2-3-12

Key words: *civil disobedience, civil protest, the legal status, American Civil Rights Movement, Western political science.*

This article is devoted to the study of the concept of civil disobedience in Western political science. On the most widely accepted interpretation, civil disobedience is a public, non-violent and conscientious breach of law undertaken with the aim of bringing about a change in laws or government policies.

There is a tendency to change traditional attitudes of civil disobedience in modern western political science. Of course, this reflects the changes that are taking place in developments in political life during recent decades. There are developed and democratic nations in that citizens can take part in political life without any discrimination and other restrictions. But there are still acts of civil disobedience. Methods include coordinating protests and nonviolent civil disobedience actions, including sit-ins, lock downs and banner hangings. Sometimes it involves direct action and confrontations on the streets.

Modern scientists argue that civil disobedience is, in general, a more defensible act than the acts of private disobedience that are often referred to as 'conscientious objection'. For example, "Rosa Parks" sitting in the whites-only section of a bus was a more conscientious sort of act than a civil registrar quietly refusing to register same-sex civil partnerships. In researching explores, the ways in which the law should recognize and protect civil disobedience, and related conduct.

In modern political science argues that the legal justification for disobedience to the law caused by convictions must be recognized. This exculpatory defense is based on respect for personal autonomy and psychological integrity. Given the communicative nature of true conviction, which is not evaded, this legal justification applies to civil disobedience rather than personal disobedience. Recognizing protection would allow society to respect the links between autonomy, psychological integrity and honesty, without requiring us to give always priority to the law over our deep obligations, or always remain covert and self-censored in our efforts to distance ourselves from the laws we oppose. Many modern political scientists expand the meaning of the concept of civil disobedience in their research. This allows for serious violations of the law during rallies, and selfish motives of participants, and non-recognition of the legitimacy of the political and legal system. That means, factors those in previous ages of research excluded possibilities of these kinds of direct action. Some aspects remain unchanged. So, almost all researchers are inclined to believe that participants in civil disobedience should be clearly aware of their actions and motives, and have a principled position and serious intentions.

References

1. Brownlee, Kimberley. (2012). *Conscience and Conviction: The Case for Civil Disobedience*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Celikates, Robin. (2016). "Democratizing Civil disobedience?" *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 42 (10): 982-994.
3. Celikates, Robin, and Daniel De Zeeuw. (2016). "Botnet Politics: Algorithmic Resistance and Hacking Society," in *Hacking Habitat*, Rotterdam: nai010: 209-217.
4. Cohen, Carl. (1966). "Civil Disobedience and the Law," *Rutgers Law Review*, 21 (1): 1-17.
5. Cohen, Marshall. (1970). "Civil Disobedience in Constitutional Democracy," *Philosophic Exchange*, 1 (1): 99-110.
6. Cooke, Maeve, (2021). "Ethical dimensions of civil disobedience," in W. Scheuerman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Civil Disobedience*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 231-253.
7. Delmas, Candice. (2019). "Civil Disobedience, Punishment, and Injustice," in K. K. Ferzan and L. Alexander (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Applied Ethics and the Criminal Law*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 167-188.
8. Dworkin, Ronald. (1978). *Taking Rights Seriously*, 5th ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Lyons, David. (1998). "Moral Judgment, Historical Reality, and Civil Disobedience," in *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 27 (1): 31-49.
10. Moraro, Piero. (2019). *Civil Disobedience: A Philosophical Overview*, London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

11. Pineda, Erin. (2021). *Seeing Like an Activist: Civil Disobedience and the Civil Rights Movement*, New York: Oxford University Press.
12. Rawls, John. (1999). *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Revised edition.
13. Sharp, Gene. (2012). *Sharp's Dictionary of Power and Struggle: Language of Civil Resistance in Conflicts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Scheuerman, William E. (2015). "Recent Theories of Civil Disobedience: An Anti-Legal Turn?," *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 23 (4): 427-449.
15. Scheuerman, William E. (2020). "Can Political Institutions Commit Civil Disobedience?" *The Review of Politics*, 82 (2): 269-291.
16. Smith, William. (2011), "Civil Disobedience and the Public Sphere," *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 19 (2): 145-166.
17. Smith, William. (2013). *Civil Disobedience and Deliberative Democracy*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Одержано: 14.11.2021.