

MORAL IN POLICY

Actuality of theme. The problem of moral is the focus of the modern political world. It plays a significant role in government process. And scientists can't make a consensus about this issue. It is difficult for scientist to determine when the government can use amoral methods? Can they use these methods at all?

The research aim is to investigate this problem and to understand is it necessary to forget about moral in the process of managing the country and how to use this ability in appropriate way.

Results and discussion. Let's determine a definition of moral. It actually has a lot of description and a lot of scientists, such as Sergei Rubinstein, Immanuel Kant , Oleksandr Titarenko tried to describe this term as accurately as possible, but we will use only one that psychology provides. [2, c. 125], Moral is the part of psychological structure of personality that gives us an estimate of things in unconscious way. Moral is the set of reflexes that are formed owing to the fact that we are afraid of social court. So it is the set of performatives that were established in the past.

And we can find out some other definitions of moral, that was given by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, like moral is the way how to reach happiness. And now I will back to the notion of policy. There is one ideology, that the essential part of which is to reach happiness for country in whole and for every citizen (national). It is Juche ideology that exist in nowadays in North Korea. The main goal for government is to achieve economic and political freedom, to be independent from other countries. That's incredible to be a free man, to be a free country. But we can't actually call the way and methods they want to reach it a moral way.

As we noticed before, moral is a type of freedom, type of independence. Political philosophy gives us two types of freedom: negative that was pointed by liberalists and negative freedom that was described by adherents of the republicanism theory. What about negative freedom. You are free when no one compels you, no one force you to do something. Positive freedom is described as a freedom of development, when you can develop yourself without any obstacles. It can be extrapolated on the relationships between slave and master. Imagine that the master has good mood today and he doesn't disturb you, doesn't offend you, just doesn't touch you. By liberalists you are free but you are still a slave. But for republicans you are not free. Freedom cannot depend on the mood of master. Freedom is constant, it is the way of development, the way to overcome obstacles.

We want to point out about one philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli. A lot of people make a huge mistake saying that Niccolò thought that policy has to be amoral. But that's not true. Machiavelli didn't claim that police has to be amoral but he considered that it is amoral unfortunately. In his famous book "The Prince" Niccolò Machiavelli noticed that every good prince should have the ability to refuse his kindness at all. Because you can't manage the county well leaning only on the moral side. [1, c. 75],

Conclusion. In our humble opinion you can't as a sovereign use only moral side. Because, as Aristotle said, nation is a reflection of a ruler, and ruler is a reflection of

nation. So if regent do terrible thing for nation that means that nation did it before for a prince.

And we want to suggest that if you want to build a new country and to manage this country using only moral methods you have to create a new society with new moral principles.

REFERENCES

1. [Niccolò Machiavelli](#). The Prince / [Machiavelli Niccolò – Italy, 1532. – 110 p.](#)
2. Л. В. Лохвицька. Аналіз теорії моралі у філософських і психологічних концепціях / Лохвицька Л. В. // Матеріали Міжнародного наукового форуму: психологія, філософія, соціологія / 2015. – С. 115-129