

АНАЛИЗ КОНЦЕПЦИИ КОНСТИТУЦИОННОЙ МОНАРХИИ Ш. Л. ДЕ МОНТЕСКЬЕ В НАУЧНОМ НАСЛЕДИИ Б. Н. ЧИЧЕРИНА

Зинченко Е. В.

Осуществлен сравнительный анализ изложенных французским просветителем XVIII в. Ш. Л. де Монтескье и ведущим теоретиком либерализации Российской империи XIX в. Б. Н. Чичериным концепций конституционной монархии. Основное внимание уделено изложению мыслителями сущности разделения властей, указанным Чичериным недостаткам концепции и обоснованию выдвинутых им положений по их устранению.

Ключевые слова: разделение властей, конституционная монархия.

ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT OF CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY BY SH. L. DE MONTESKIE IN SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF B. N. CHICHERIN

Zinchenko O. V.

The comparative analysis stated by the French educator XVIII century Sh. L. de Monteskie and the Russian leading theorist of liberalization of Russian empire XIX century by B. N. Chicherin of concepts of constitutional monarchy is carried out. The author gives the basic attention to a statement thinkers of essence of division of the authorities, the specified by Chicherin to lacks of Monteskie and a substantiation of the positions put forward by him on their elimination.

Key words: the division of authorities, the constitutional monarchy.



UDK 324:321.74

Jason Royce Lindsey, doctor of philosophy

REFLECTIONS ON AMERICAN POLITICAL CULTURE AFTER THE 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The paper analyzes the changes in the political culture of the population conjunction States, which appeared in the course of and following the results of the election campaign of U. S. President in 2012. A look at the author's ideological landscape of contemporary American political system.

Key words: U. S. election campaign, political culture, ideology, political system.

Topicality. The dominant question after each Presidential election is what it tells us about politics as a whole in the United States. Given the complexity of U. S. Federalism, the Presidential election represents the one office that is indeed a national vote in the United States. Elections for Congress tell us much about electoral districts and states, but we look to the Presidential election for a measure of the national political climate. Thus, after every presidential election in the United States, political commentators rush to provide analysis. Every four years there are assertions of change detected in voting patterns that are often forgotten by the midterm elections for Congress two years later.

Nonetheless, the election of 2012 appears to tell us something important about political ideology in the United States. Arguably, since the 1980's with the election of Ronald Reagan, the Republican party became increasingly identified with a conservative political ideology that has drifted further and further toward the right. This ideological coalition that propelled Reagan and subsequent Republican candidates to office consisted of a number of strands. Among the «Conservatives» of America's politics one finds the religious values voters of the Christian Right and anti abortion activists. On the other hand, one also finds a more pragmatic business block that supports a low tax agenda. Other influences include the gun rights lobbying group known as the National Rifle Association (NRA) and the more recently formed Tea Party. This latter group has become a pressure organization within the larger Republican party favoring lower taxes and smaller government.

Elaborated in the literature. Claimed problem studying the following experts: Alain Badiou, Jean Baudrillard, Campbell, David E., J. Quin Monson, Chen, Lanhee J., Andrew Reeves, David Firestone, Abrams Samuel J., Morris P. Fiorina and others.

Purpose of the paper: to analyze changes in the political culture of the United States up to the presidential elections in 2012.

The presentation of the basics. Along with these ideological groups within the Conservative camp, the right wing in American politics has developed an extensive media that supports its political views. One of the ironies of the vast range of media choice available to Americans is that many increasingly self censor the information they receive. Left leaning or right leaning citizens can access political news that fits easily with their ideological preferences. This is an important point to emphasize because the increasing fragmentation of media in the United States means that individuals can choose the «news» they prefer. In the run up to the 2012 election there was a remarkable divergence between polls reported in more conservative affiliated news outlets compared to left leaning newspapers and tv networks [1; 12].

If we step back and take an even wider perspective, then the dynamics of what is happening in U. S. political culture becomes clearer. The philosopher Alain Badiou argues that political ideology attempts to assert a preferred, orderly view of the world

over the chaos of reality. The crisis point for any political ideology arrives when the gap between the ideology's assertions and the constraints of reality become untenable [2]. From a different perspective, the philosopher Jean Baudrillard argues that when confronted with this gap a frequent cultural reaction is «hyperconformity» [3; 47–48]. That is, the ideological supporter denies this gap and instead becomes even more rigid and insistent about the ideology. This behaviour is often referred to less philosophically in current American political slang as «doubling down». In other words, increasing one's stake in a position despite its apparent weakness.

In the immediate commentary after the 2012 election this became a frequent question. Would the Republican party «double down» on its conservative positions despite its poor performance in the Presidential contest? Indeed, some Republican activists argued that the election showed that their candidate Mitt Romney was not conservative enough. On the other hand, many commentators predicted that the Republican party would now be forced to move toward the political center to improve its performance at future elections.

If this analysis seems very abstract compared to the scrum of American politics, then we can turn to more concrete trends in election behavior. For example, one can clearly show that the trend in presidential election strategies shifted profoundly in the later 1990's and 2000's. A number of political consultants advised clients to abandon appealing to the center. Instead, famous strategists like Republican Karl Rove, and Democrat David Axelrod argued that the key to winning became mobilizing one's base of ideologically driven supporters [4; 399].

In contrast, the long standing assumption of Presidential campaigns within the U. S. two party system was that one must appeal to the base during the primary elections to secure the party nomination. However, after securing the nomination of one's political party by appealing to the «hard core» Republicans or Democrats who participate in the primaries, candidates long attempted to then move to the center for the general election. The innovation attributed to Rove, Axelrod, and lesser known political consultants, was to abandon the need for this shift. Instead, they argued candidates should avoid this traditional maneuver. Rather than appeal to undecided voters, the standard Presidential election strategy became to maximize the turnout and participation of one's ideological supporters. They concluded that the best way to do this was for a candidate to remain committed to his ideological positions. Otherwise, these ideologically primed voters might come to doubt the commitment of the candidate.

The proof of this strategy's viability for many observers was President Bush's election victories in 2000 and 2004. Although the 2000 election was decided by the narrowest of margins, President Bush's 2004 victory was much more substantial. The improvement according to his strategist Karl Rove was due to the turnout of

the Republican base. What motivated this improved turnout was thought to be the harder ideological edge of the 2004 Bush campaign in comparison to his (relatively) more moderate campaign of 2000. For example, political science research shows that in 2004 the Bush campaign did especially well in states that included a ballot initiative on gay marriage. This item on the ballot allowed the Bush campaign to turn this social issue into a rallying cry for the religious voters in important states like Ohio.

However, this strategy appeared to fail the Republicans in 2012. They overwhelmingly won with their base of supporters, but decisively lost the Presidential election. The demographic trends that worked against their victory in 2012 will continue to work against the ideological home the Republicans established for themselves. Specifically, the Republicans face: an increasing ethnic diversity in the population, a surge of younger people born after 2000 (the so called millennials), and the decline of regional subcultures.

Political Science research suggests that already in 2008 this trend was apparent. An analysis of county level appearances by the candidates in the 2008 election shows that the McCain Palin campaign targeted counties with a strong Republican base in an effort to mobilize right leaning voters. In contrast, the Obama Biden campaign targeted counties that had seen recent population growth [5; 534–556]. The assumption by the latter campaign was clearly that the growth in these counties reflected the demographic trends in the U. S. that are of benefit to the Democratic party. These same trends of an increasingly diverse and younger population could be seen even more starkly in 2012.

This outcome raises an interesting question, is this recent electoral failure enough of a stimulus to force the Republican party to alter its ideological stance? Or, as some commentators asked on election night, will the trend of «hyperconformity» or «doubling down» be the reaction? The signs so far from within the party are mixed [6]. A younger and more diverse generation of Republican candidates including Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana and Senator Marco Rubio of Florida have called for change. On the other hand, many elected Republican officials have argued that a better (and more conservative) candidate than Mitt Romney would have done much better in the election.

Another clear trend from the recent Presidential election is that the political divide in the United States is increasingly between urban areas and suburban, smaller town, or countryside voters. In a number of so called «red states» (i. e. Republican leaning states) the recent election data shows that there are no red states as such. Within the states that voted for Republican candidates we find that President Obama won the vote in cities there. Thus, while states like Texas and Alabama in the deep south remain solid Republican states; voters in the Texas cities of Austin and Houston, or the Alabama cities of Birmingham and Mobile, voted for Obama.

Given the usual dominance of urban areas over a country's media, this trend points again to the challenge that right wing ideology faces in the U. S. in the years to come. There was a great deal of commentary in the U. S. after election night about the coverage of the election on the right leaning network Fox News. The famous right wing political consultant and commentator Karl Rove was extremely frustrated as the network's polling unit began calling the election for President Obama. His very public display of disbelief and anger struck many commentators as a sign of the ideological claims of the Republican party clashing with the «reality» reported by more mainstream media [7].

The other side of this strategic choice for the Republican party is linked to the current ideology found on the political left in the United States. The economic crisis in the U. S. since 2008 re energized the political left. The best example of this new energy was the Occupy Wall Street Movement. However, the Democratic party has not felt the same pressure from party activists like that of the Republican party with its Tea Party insurgents. Instead, a perverse outcome of the hardening political ideology on the right in America is that left leaning citizens, many of whom are far to the left of the more centrist Obama camp, feel they have no choice in the two party system but to support the Democrats. The further the Republican party has shifted to the right, the less pressure President Obama and the Democrats have had to move to the left. Thus, despite not passing any significant immigration reform during his first term, President Obama won the Latino vote decisively in 2012. Despite providing clear support for gay marriage only toward the end of his first term, President Obama overwhelmingly won the vote of gay citizens. The same can be said of women voters and almost any identifiable ethnic group. If the Republican party continues to insist on its rigid ideology, or even «doubles down» on it, then where can such voters go politically?

Therefore, for politically strategic reasons, the Republican party should try to adapt its ideological position to a more centrist one. Such a move would secure more votes for the party in future presidential elections and put more pressure on the Democrats to deliver tangible results to its left leaning supporters.

Yet the strategic logic of winning the nationwide Presidential election does not necessarily translate into victory in local, state, and congressional elections. Many political scientists have documented the trend in the U. S. for increasingly gerrymandered, non competitive congressional districts [8; 9]. In many so called «red states» the Republican party dominates the state offices that are responsible for drawing the boundaries of voting districts within the state. Every ten years after the census, state legislatures must revise the boundaries of voting districts. Ideally, this requirement insures that districts reflect changes in population. However, by drawing up safely conservative Congressional and State districts, Republicans at the state level heavily influence the outcome of elections.

The interesting question though for even this strategy is whether state legislatures can continue to tweak the boundaries of congressional districts at a pace that keeps up with the demographic changes of the United States. For years commentators have described the growing mobility of the U. S. workforce as its job market became a national one [10]. Thus, citizens in the U. S. move frequently and often far away. For this reason the attempt to tailor congressional districts every ten years during the redistricting process may be an increasingly failing proposition.

Overall, these trends suggest that the previously winning strategy of the political right in the United States is now out of step with the country's new political context. Past strategies of maximizing the turnout of right leaning voters, attempting to draw right leaning congressional districts, and emphasizing cultural controversies are all increasingly ineffective. Voters who match the profile of the conservative right are a shrinking part of the population. The demographic trends in the U. S. favoring greater diversity and mobility across the U. S. mitigate against the ability of gerrymandering districts every 10 years after the census. Finally, the ability of the right to emphasize cultural controversies like abortion, gay marriage, and the use of English is quickly fading too. For younger and more diverse voters, these controversies were «decided» long ago with their acceptance of a more liberal position.

The background of the economic crisis and the recession, which began in 2008, has also reduced the importance of such issues for most voters. Instead, much more attention is devoted to economic and fiscal policy than past years. Even among the most ideologically driven supporters of the left and right, we can consider Occupy Wall Street and the Tea Party respectively, the chief concerns voiced by both were over very practical questions of economic policy.

Thus, the shifting political context suggests that the Republican party needs to change its ideological commitments and consider new strategies. For the left and the Democratic party the recent election shows that its strategy of forming a diverse coalition of voters has been successful twice in national, presidential elections. The feeling of strength that the national Democratic party has after the election was reflected in the tough position President Obama took with Republicans during the «fiscal cliff» negotiations. Many commentators also attribute President Obama's boldly liberal second inaugural speech to this new found confidence on the left.

However, while successful on a national stage, this coalition of supporters is rooted in urban areas. Winning the support of the larger urban population is very important for the Presidency, but its importance is diluted by American federalism on the local and state level. This is reflected in the current House of Representatives, whose members are drawn from districts drawn within the states. In these districts, the Republican strongholds of suburban and rural voters are critically important.

In contrast, the Senate with its statewide races shows a narrow left leaning majority similar to the Democrats' national coalition.

In America's divided system of government, capturing the Presidency is not enough to guarantee that a party can implement policy. For this very important reason, the recent electoral victory of the Democratic Party shows that it has much work to do as well. How can the broad, but mostly urban coalition of Democratic party supporters break out of the cities and win support in the suburbs and countryside? The Democrats may be calculating that demographic trends will eventually solve this problem for them. However, even if that were true, the Democrats would face many years of White House and Senate control, but Republican opposition everywhere else.

If voters in these areas are culturally different than the Democratic coalition of urban, young, and ethnically diverse citizens, then how can the Democrats expand in these areas? Arguably success here would require delivering on economic and social policies. However, the polarization of American politics since the 2000's meant that little accountability was felt by either side as voters had nowhere else to go in the two party system. The Democratic party now needs to shift its strategy to one of delivering on tangible benefits to the citizenry if it hopes to break through in these Republican areas. Continuing to appeal to left leaning voters on highly charged social issues like abortion threatens to leave the Democrats locked in their urban strongholds, just as such appeals on the right leave Republicans locked out of urban areas.

Optimistically, these political facts on the ground could drive both parties toward more traditional, centrist strategies. That sort of behaviour has been the norm for most of the U. S. political system's existence. In the past, the two parties routinely compromised with each other in Washington and across the Federal system to produce centrist policies. The signal that this could be happening again will be in 2016. If we see the return of the old presidential election strategy (of shifting to the center after the primaries), then we may look forward to a more policy driven, centrist politics.

On the other hand, both parties have short term incentives to continue their present behavior. The Republican party could continue its tactic of gerrymandering. This tried and true tactic could continue to insure control of the House in Washington and many local and state offices. Recently proposed changes to the procedures for the Electoral College in a number of Republican controlled states suggest that some members of the party are still committed to such short term, procedural tactics [11]. The changes some Republican dominated state legislatures have proposed for selecting their Electoral College votes after the 2012 election would magnify the influence of non urban counties and districts in their states. Thus, the response from

at least some members of the Republican party to their recent loss is to attempt something like gerrymandering for the Presidential election, rather than change their message to voters.

There are similar short term incentives for the left as well. Appeals to voters based on highly charged cultural issues are politically easier than delivering legislation and practical policy benefits to constituents. There is undoubtedly a temptation for incumbent Democratic officials to continue this easier political tactic. This is especially the case while the Republican party continues to control many of the other branches of government in the United States. Incumbent Democratic officials can blame their failure to produce more concrete results on the intransigence of the opposition.

Conclusion. Both parties can claim success at different levels of the American political system. However, the challenge both sides now face is appealing to voters across the cultural divide into the other party's territory. In the short term, Republicans can continue to count on local and state level success with their current, conservative ideological formula. Similarly, the Democrats have recently enjoyed success at the national level with their liberal ideological appeals. Nonetheless, the longer term demographic and cultural changes underway in American society guarantee to make their current orientations obsolete. The Republican party faces a rapidly changing electorate from the one it has known in the past. The Democratic party faces a stalemate in the broader political system if it cannot expand its appeal to voters from outside its current left leaning coalition.

Of course there is another unpredictable element to the current political situation in the United States. Politicians in democratic systems base their strategies on winning votes. For this basic reason, the future tactics of both parties will rest in large part upon their perceptions of what American voters want and will support. The midterm elections in 2014 will be watched closely by both parties for further evidence of where they are succeeding and failing on this score.

REFERENCES

1. Nate Silver. In National Polling, Its Gallup vs. the Rest // The New York Times, October 20, 2012, p. A12.
2. Alain Badiou. Ethics: an Essay on Understanding Evil (New York: Verso, 2001).
3. Jean Baudrillard. In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities. New York: Semiotext(e), 1983: 47–48.
4. Campbell David E., and J. Quin Monson. The Religion Card Gay Marriage and the 2004 Presidential Election. Public Opinion Quarterly 72, no. 3 (2008): 399–419.
5. Chen Lanhee J., and Andrew Reeves. Turning out the base or appealing to the periphery? An analysis of county-level candidate appearances in the 2008 presidential campaign. American Politics Research 39, no. 3 (2011): 534–556.

6. Molly Ball. What Should the Republican Party Stand For? *The Atlantic Monthly*, January 26, 2013. Available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/01/what-should-the-republican-party-stand-for/272561/>.
7. David Firestone. The Republican Bubble. *The New York Times*, November 9, 2012. Available at: <http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/09/the-republican-bubble/>.
8. Bill Bishop's. *The big sort: Why the clustering of like-minded American is tearing us apart.* (New York: Mariner Books, 2009).
9. Abrams Samuel J., and Morris P. Fiorina. The Big Sort. *That Wasn't: A Skeptical Reexamination.* *PS Political Science and Politics* 45, no. 2 (2012): 203–210.
10. Kambourov Gueorgui, and Iouri Manovskii. Rising Occupational and Industry Mobility in the United States: 1968–97, *International Economic Review* 49, no. 1 (2008): 41–79.
11. Nia-Malika Henderson and Errin Haines. Republicans in Virginia, other states seeking electoral college changes. *The Washington Post*, January 24, 2013. Available at: http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-24/politics/36528394_1_electoral-votes-votes-by-congressional-district-electoral-college/2.

РОЗДУМИ ЩОДО АМЕРИКАНСЬКОЇ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ПІСЛЯ ПРЕЗИДЕНТСЬКИХ ВИБОРІВ 2012 р.

Ліндсі Джейсон Ройс

Проаналізовано зміни у політичній культурі населення Сполучених Штатів Америки, які виявилися в ході проведення та за підсумками виборчої кампанії Президента США у 2012 р. Запропоновано авторський погляд на ідеологічний ландшафт сучасної американської політичної системи.

Ключові слова: *США, виборча кампанія, політична культура, ідеології, політична система.*

РАЗМЫШЛЕНИЯ ОБ АМЕРИКАНСКОЙ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЕ ПОСЛЕ ПРЕЗИДЕНТСКИХ ВЫБОРОВ 2012 г.

Линдси Джейсон Ройс

Проанализированы изменения в политической культуре населения Соединенных Штатов Америки, которые проявились в ходе проведения и по итогам избирательной кампании Президента США в 2012 г. Предложен авторский взгляд на идеологический ландшафт современной американской политической системы.

Ключевые слова: *США, избирательная кампания, политическая культура, идеологии, политическая система.*