TO THE ESSENCE OF MODELS OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE ERA OF POSTMODERNISM: DECISIONAL ASPECT

Abstract. The article analyzes the models of local self-government in the postmodern era. It is determined that during the long history of mankind many specific models of territorial organization of power in the countries in general have been formed, which are analyzed in detail by, for example, Ukrainian scientists V. Solovykh and E. Solovykh. They emphasize that the territorial organization of power is determined by such basic factors as: a) the administrative-territorial structure of the country (unitary and federal states); b) directly by models of self-government (community (Anglo-Saxon) (Anglo-American), state (continental (French) and mixed model.

It is proved that the separation of powers is an event of a single state power (it remains indivisible) between its main branches in the state, and the distribution of power is the distribution of such powers between central and local executive bodies.

It is noted that conceptually (according to different models) local self-government as a complex social phenomenon has been and remains unchanged, as it is: a) the right to internal management of people's local affairs; b) the right to decide
matters of internal administration under its own laws within the national territory; c) autonomy. Even more accurate and successful is the definition of “local government”: it is “a type of social governance in which the subject and the object of governance coincide, that is, the people themselves manage their affairs, make decisions together and act to implement them”.

It is substantiated that in its conceptual, basic meaning the basic principles of its self-government were and remain unchanged in the models of local self-government, which are enriched, acquire all significance adequate to the needs of time and social practice of organizing human communities.
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К СУТИ МОДЕЛЕЙ МЕСТНОГО САМОУПРАВЛЕНИЯ В ЭПОХУ ПОСТМОДЕРНИЗМА: ПОСТАНОВЧНЫЙ АСПЕКТ

Аннотация. Осуществлен анализ моделей местного самоуправления в эпоху постмодернизма. Определено, что за многовековую историю человечества сформировалось много специфических моделей территориальной организации власти в странах в целом, которые достаточно подробно анализируются, например, украинские ученые В. Соловых и Е. Соловых. Они делают акцент на том, что территориальная организация власти обусловливается такими основными факторами, как: а) административно-территориальное устройство страны (государства унитарные и федеративные) б) непосредственно моделями самоуправления (общественная (англосаксонская, англо-американская), государственная (континентальная (французская) и смешанная модель).

Доказано, что разделение властей — это событие единой государственной власти (она остается неделимой) между основными ее ветвями в государстве, а распределение властных полномочий — это распределение таких полномочий между центральными и местными органами исполнительной власти.

Отмечено, что концептуально (при различных моделях) местное самоуправление как сложный общественный феномен был и остается неизменным, поскольку это: а) право на внутреннее управление людьми местными делами; б) право решать дела внутреннего управления по собственным законам в рамках национальной территории; в) автономия. Еще более точным и удачным есть следующее определение понятия “местное самоуправление”: это “тип социального управления, при котором субъект и объект управления совпадают, то есть сами люди управляют своими делами, совместно принимают решения и действуют с целью их реализации”.

Обосновано, что в своем концептуальном, базовом значении неизменными в моделях местного самоуправления были и остаются основополагающие принципы его осуществления, которые обогащаются, приобретают значимости адекватной потребностям времени и социальной практики упорядочения жизни человеческих общностей.
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Problem statement. Local self-government the complex, multidimensional social phenomenon, has a long history and is constantly undergoing changes and transformations, since countries and societies are radically transformed, people’s ways of life are becoming more complex and improving, relations between states and societies, state power and civil society are fundamentally changing.

The change, transformation and formation of qualitatively new models (systems) of local self-government in the postmodern era (transition to the state of information societies) is due to
a number of objective, fundamental circumstances, among which we single out three, in our opinion, the most significant: 1) radical transformation of the political systems of countries; 2) separation of powers and distribution of powers and the formation of fundamentally new models of public administration; 3) the growing role and importance of the direct participation of citizens in state administrative processes.

**Analysis of the recent research and publication.** Among the large number of special foreign and domestic publications on this subject, we first of all single out the works of such scientists V. Averianov, N. Arzamaskin, A. Bata nov, V. Bordeniuk, A. Galus, D. Dann, E. Diuran, B. Kalynovskyi, V. Kui bida, V. McNeal, V. Malynovskyi, M. Naim, N. Nizhnik, T. Panchenko, V. Pantyukhin, E. Pere guda, V. Pogorilko, M. Pukhtinsky, V. Seregin, A. Skripnyuk, V. Tertichka, N. Urbani ty, V. Fedorenko, F. Fukuiama, V. Khali pov, A. Chernezenko, V. Chirkin, Y. Shemshuchenko, V. crowd, A. Yan chuk and many others.

Since the scientific problematics in this regard are too multifaceted and broad, it is important to focus on its key aspects.

**The aim of the article** is to analyze the models of local self-government in the postmodern era.

According to the centuries-old history of mankind, many specific models of the territorial organization of power in the countries of whole have been formed, which are analyzed in sufficient detail, for example, by the Ukrainian scientists V. Solovykh and E. Solovykh [2, art. 214–215]. They emphasize that the territorial organization of power is determined by the following main factors as: a) the administrative-territorial structure the country (unitary and federal states) b) directly by the models of self-government (community (Anglo-Saxon (Anglo-American), state (continental (French) and of mixed model.

Since the scientific problematics in this regard are too multifaceted and broad, it is important to focus on its key aspects.

New models of the territorial organization of power determine the transformation of local self-government, which to a large extent depends primarily on the process and state of separation and distribution of powers. In any state, this process is regulated by constitutions, other normative legal acts. In Ukraine, these are: a) the Constitution of Ukraine, which consolidates the political system of Ukraine; the status and powers of the President of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the judicial branch of government and local executive authorities [3]. Among the laws of Ukraine, the separation of powers and the distribution of powers are primarily determined by the Laws of Ukraine “On the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine”, “On local administrations”, “On the formation of local authorities and self-government” and others. This regulatory framework includes individual Decrees of the President of Ukraine, Decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and decisions of local authorities in terms of state policy and its practical implementation.

Let us emphasize that the fundamental nature of the peculiarity, the distribution of power and the separation of powers are not one, but, in fact,
two closely related processes that are carried out on the basis of decentralization of state power on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity. The same time, several means and mechanisms are used, the central (fundamental) of which are: a) decentralization of power; b) the use of the principle of subsidiarity in the process of division and functioning of power; c) introduction and use of the mechanism of checks and balances; d) democratization of power and expansion of powers of local self-government; e) development and strengthening of the influence of civil society on power. Other principles and mechanisms are largely derived from those mentioned [1, art. 24].

The division of powers is an event of a single state power (it remains indivisible) between its main branches in the state, and the distribution of powers is the distribution of such powers between central and local executive bodies. Let us emphasize, — this is emphasized by the Ukrainian political scientist T. Panchenko, — that the ideal option for using the principle of subsidiarity in the division of power and the distribution of powers is when: a) the region receives powers that can be better implemented by them; b) the factor of the so-called “subsidiary liability” [4] operates.

A significant factor influencing a radical change in the models of local self-government is, in addition to the decentralization of state power, the democratization of public life, in general and its significant result, the growth of the potential of civil society. By and large, there is a process (and problem) of the relationship between democracy and governance. The remarks of the Ukrainian manager A. Fedorenko are very accurate in this regard, who, in particular, writes: “The relationship between democracy and governance is viewed through the prism of the categories of form and content. The form is determined by the democratic institutions of society, the content of those in power and administrative activities. Their interdependence is determined: power is a functional feature and is implemented through social management; institutions of democracy is a form of organization and exercise of power and management” [7, art. 10].

It should be noted that conceptually (under various models) local self-government of complex social phenomenon has been and remains unchanged, since it is: a) the right to the internal management of people in local affairs; b) the right to decide matters of internal government according to their own laws within the national territory; c) autonomy [6]. The following definition of the concept of “local self-government” is even more accurate and successful: it is “a type of social management in which the subject and the object of management coincide, that is, people themselves manage their affairs, jointly make decisions and act to implement them” [5, art. 590].

There are components of local self-government, and today, in the context of its transformation, they remain unchanged. First, we are talking about the fundamental principles of such management. First, it is the principle of democracy. Thus, the Constitution of Ukraine (Article 5) says: “The people are the bearers of sovereignty and the only source of power in Ukraine. The people exercise power directly and
through government bodies and local government bodies [3, 4]. We add that this provision has received a certain development in the Law of Ukraine “On Local Self-Government in Ukraine” by the definition of a territorial community—residents of a village or a voluntary association into a rural community of residents of several villages, settlements, cities — as the primary subject of local self-government, the main carrier of its functions and powers ...

The legality in the implementation of local self-government remained unchanged for all the democratization processes in any country. We are talking about the mandatory compliance of those normative legal acts adopted by local authorities with the existing norms in the country of legislation.

The principle of publicity received a similar character. It is ensured by the fact that local self-government bodies should work as openly and transparently as possible, and the territorial community had every opportunity to know as much as possible about what decisions are made and why, how they are implemented, how it affects the lives of citizens, and the like.

It is not easy enough to be implemented, but the principle of collegiality has always existed and exists in local self-government: various collegial (collective) governing bodies (councils, groups, committees, etc.) should be and actively operate in the local self-government system.

It is not easy, but the principle of combining local and state interests has to be realized. This is especially true for the interests and activities of all business entities. Solutions to local problems are the practice of the state strategy for the development of country, ensuring its integrity and sovereignty under any political system of the state - unitary, federal, confederal, etc.

Separately, we can characterize the action of such rather complex principles as: the principle of legal, organized and material and financial independence of territorial community; the principle of state support and guarantees of local self-government; the principle of judicial protection of rights of local self-government.

The principles of local self-government in Ukraine, which are justified by the Constitution (1996) and the corresponding laws of Ukraine, are characterized and are basic for the functioning and improvement of local self-government.

Main conclusions on the topic of the article are:
• the change and transformation of models of local self-government in the postmodern era (transition from post-industrial to information societies) is a natural, objective process, due to radical changes in countries and societies, the increasing role and importance of civil societies in public administration;
• the real improvement of local self-government is carried out in the process of decentralization of power and wide democratization of public relations, as an important component of state social policy;
• in its conceptual, basic meaning, the fundamental principles of its implementation have been and remain unchanged in the models of local self-government, which are enriched, acquire all significance in accordance with the needs of the time and social practice of ordering the life of human communities.
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