

UDC: 35.077

Bielska Tetiana Valentynivna,

Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Department of Management and Administration, O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, Ukraine, 61002, Kharkiv, 17, Str. Marshal Bazhanov, tel.: (066) 450 62 12, e-mail: tanya_belska@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2792-4700

Бельська Тетяна Валентинівна,

доктор наук з державного управління, доцент кафедри менеджменту і адміністрування, Харківський національний університет міського господарства ім. О. М. Бекетова, Україна, 61002, м. Харків, вул. Маршала Бажанова, 17, тел.: (066) 450 62 12, e-mail: tanya_belska@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2792-4700

Бельская Татьяна Валентиновна,

доктор наук по государственному управлению, доцент кафедры менеджмента и администрирования, Харьковский национальный университет городского хозяйства им. А. Н. Бекетова, Украина, 61002, г. Харьков, ул. Маршала Бажанова, 17, тел.: (066) 450 62 12, e-mail: tanya_belska@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2792-4700



PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN THE CONDITIONS OF GLOBALIZATION CHALLENGES

Abstract. The article states that globalization changes understanding of the concept of “governance”, territorial membership is no more the epicenter of politics because symmetry between the territorial borders and the political power collapses; it is indicated that the driving forces of the modernization of the global governance process are the large private business represented by multinational corporations and global civil society; it is argued that cultural values and identities play an increasingly important role in the modern world; the population that lives in a certain territory is a permanent community, united on a territorial basis, and defines the public, private, and social spheres of life; the emphasis is placed on the fact that the public policy of territorial associations should be aimed to ensure the order in the society, coordination and realization of various social interests and achievement of public consent; it is

creating a strategy that defines the main goals of the community to improve the quality of public policy.

Keywords: public administration, public policy, globalization, global civil society, transnational corporations, values, “good governance,” “anticipatory governance”.

ПУБЛІЧНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ В УМОВАХ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЙНИХ ВИКЛИКІВ

Анотація. Визначено, що глобалізація змінює розуміння поняття “управління”, епіцентри політики не мають більше територіальної належності, оскільки симетрія між територіальними кордонами та політичною владою руйнується; доведено, що рушійними силами модернізації глобально-управлінського процесу виступають великий приватний бізнес в особі транснаціональних корпорацій і глобальне громадянське суспільство. Аргументовано, що здебільшого роль у сучасному світі відіграють культурні цінності та ідентичності; населення, що проживає на певній території становить постійне співтовариство, об’єднане за територіальною ознакою, й визначає публічну, приватну, соціальну сфери життя. Акцентовано увагу на тому, що публічна політика територіальних об’єднань має бути спрямована на забезпечення порядку в суспільстві, узгодження й реалізацію різноманітних соціальних інтересів і досягнення громадської злагоди; для підвищення якості публічної політики створюється стратегія, що визначає головні цілі спільноти.

Ключові слова: публічне управління, публічна політика, глобалізація, глобальне громадянське суспільство, транснаціональні корпорації, цінності, “гарне управління”, “передбачуване врядування”.

ПУБЛИЧНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИОННЫХ ВЫЗОВОВ

Аннотация. Определено, что глобализация меняет понимание понятия “управление”, эпицентры политики не имеют больше территориальной принадлежности, поскольку симметрия между территориальными границами и политической властью разрушается; доказано, что движущими силами модернизации глобально-управленческого процесса выступают большей частью частный бизнес в лице транснациональных корпораций и глобальное гражданское общество; аргументировано, все большую роль в современном мире играют культурные ценности и идентичности; население, проживающее на определенной территории, представляет собой постоянное сообщество, объединенное по территориальному признаку, оно определяет публичную, частную, социальную сферы жизни. Акцентируется внимание на том, что публичная политика территориальных объединений должна быть направлена на обеспечение порядка в обществе, согласование и реализацию различных социальных интересов и достижение общественного согласия; для повышения качества публичной политики создается стратегия, определяющая главные цели сообщества.

Ключевые слова: публичное управление, публичная политика, глобализация, глобальное гражданское общество, транснациональные корпорации, ценности, “хорошее управление”, “прогнозирующее управление”.

Target setting. Governance in today's world is facing the challenges of globalization, among scientists and politicians there are doubts about the viability of management structures that were characteristic of previous historical periods of human development. The major driving forces of changes of the global governance process are the large private business that is represented by multinational corporations and global civil society. These circumstances lead to the transformation of the world order — it is not already built around politico-ideological blocs of states, as it was in the twentieth century, but around world civilizations.

Analysis of the recent research and publications. The most famous scientific intelligence about the existence of world civilizations is “Dimension of Europe” by O. Shpengler, “Understanding the History” by A. Toynbee [1] and “Collision of Civilizations and the Restructuring of the World Order” by S. Huntington [2]. Systematizing history, A. Toynbee convincingly proved that history of humanity is developing not as a direct line of gradual progress, but as a cyclic-wave coexistence of individual civilizations — closed societies, based on religion and the forms of its realization. The problem of global modernization, the transformation of society and the prospects of social development is studied by scholars such as H. Bull [3], E. Giddens [4], J.

Kin [5], J. Rozenau [6], E. Toffler [7], M. Edwards [8], and others. However, it is necessary more clearly to define the theoretical foundations of the research problem — the peculiarities of public administration in the context of global challenges.

The purpose of the article — is the consideration of the theoretical foundations of public administration in the context of global challenges that can be the basis for decision making at the global and regional levels.

The statement of basic materials. Guy Peters and Jon Pierr in the book “Governance, Politics and the State” define that governance — is how society functions now, will operate in an increasingly complex world where states must interact more and influence other actors and institutions to achieve results.

To paraphrase Susan Strange's argument about the collapse of the state, the authors talk about “upward movement,” “downward movement” and “outward movement” within the governance process, in order to visualize challenges to national states, respectively, from transnational forces, subnational governments, non-governmental organizations and other components of civil society [9, p. 83–87].

They note that thinking in the concepts of binary positions “state-society” or “public-private” is archaic and constitutes a barrier for governance. Guy

Peters and Jon Pierre distinguish four governance structures: governance as a hierarchy, as a market, both as a network and as a community. Based primarily on literature on political economy and public policy, they argue that management through hierarchy, which is state administration, is giving way to other management structures in response to a series of different pressures. The arguments in favor of the new management point to a series of elements that lead to a shift from the states towards markets and, to a lesser extent, to networks. These elements include the “crisis” of public finances in most industrialized countries in the 1990’s, the collapse of attempts at state intervention in response to population expectations, globalization and social changes. Eliminating the distinction between public and private, the state and markets, the national level, and other levels of political institutions are simply presented as the effects of processes that seem to live their own lives [Ibid.].

According to G. Pocheptsov, “the complexity of the objects with which management is concerned is taking place. Today, we have complex objects for management, but we do not have adequate tools to work with them” [10].

P. Hirst describes the types of management, from the management of economic development, corporate governance and international regimes to the kind that he calls “social management through negotiations” [11, p. 18]. What distinguishes these different embodiments of managerial types from each other is the desire to manage without politics in the form in which it was determined in the modern era, namely without the struggle for power, medi-

ated, formalized or permitted by the political power of the state. What distinguishes these different embodiments of managerial types from each other is the desire to manage without politics in the form in which it was determined in the modern era, namely, without the struggle for power, mediated, formalized or permitted by the political power of the state.

R. Falk is building his model of human management on the achievements of the business sector in the international arena. In his view, business forums contribute to the growth of the number of leading world economic institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization, which provide an “arena for discussion and recommendations for the shaping of global politics” [12, p. 215]. The R. Falk’s model is based on cooperation between the public and business sectors in the form of world assemblies that could solve various global problems by ignoring the rhetoric of illegitimacy.

A brave proposal, of course, is subject to criticism. The following arguments are put forward against it: 1) the business sector is a rational agent, who seeks to maximize its profits in a competitive market, while public organizations, trade unions and other associations are more inclined to “political sentiment”, 2) business sector — a private part in the state, separated from it, but in our state it is highly politicized and selective today. In addition, the election of global charges (as an example, the model of the European Parliament) entails enormous consequences: even if this assembly is truly reliable and represents the elite of the society,

this does not automatically mean that it will be flawless [13].

According to D. Achibugi, in today's world, global meetings should only serve as an advisory role on the world arena, but not a function of legislative power, because this excludes the possibility of abuse of power. In addition, the meeting will focus only on the most important or urgent issues, such as climate change, poverty, hunger, health, trafficking, labor migration, trade rules, humanitarian assistance, etc.

However, taking in to account only a few issues that seem the most relevant means to leave people ignorant of certain issues and give into the mercy of oppressive regime in terms of human rights protection. "Disadvantaged", as D. Achibugi calls them, migrants and all other groups should benefit the novelty for the global civil society, because these people remained outside the system only because their problems are not global in nature [14, p. 11]. Thus, a global civil society must appear in any form as an inhomogeneous organism, which is a composition of the set of mini-organisms that are forming as a global world of ideas, beliefs, ideas, ideals and thoughts of citizens. This is a promising plan of world order. But the global civil society is not a plan itself; it is a part of a major restructuring of the international system and the world order.

The population that lives in a certain territory is a permanent community that is territorially defined and provides some form of public and private spheres that are dominant over vast areas of social life. The relevant community is constantly changing, and individuals are not limited to the

only form of membership. Rather, "networks", which form the basis for many management-related arguments, are volatile, flexible and mobile [15, p. 139]. There is also the idea that individuals belong to many different communities that are quite possible to come into conflict with each other.

Modern civilization theories convince that in the modern world vanquish classical ideologies, and economic, ideological contradictions gradually lose meaning and influence on public policy. Cultural values and identities play an increasingly important role in the modern world. Actually, human history itself does not start from the birth of man as a biological being, but from the moment of man's sense of time, immersing it into the world of common-value basis of life, in the very life of man and whole civilizations in time-values.

This constant focus on self-improvement, self-reliance, self-affirmation becomes the meaning of life in general. Each civilization, according to A. Toynbee, passes the stages of genesis, growth, fragmentation and decomposition, the emergence and fall of universal states, world churches. The main conclusions of the theory of A. Toynbee should be recognized: firstly, the genesis of civilizations requires the efforts of more than one race; secondly, the state is always an element of a larger system — a society and arises only after the appearance of society

That is why the limits of civilization are always wider both in space and in time, than any national states, state-cities or political unions; thirdly, no civilization covers the whole of humanity and the entire Earth; fourthly, none

of the civilizations is “the best one”, and although they are forced to interact with each other, their full merger into the “unity of civilizations” is impossible [16].

Under these conditions, according to Z. Bzezinsky, “the possibility of global anarchy is inevitable and real” [17, p. 195]. The theory of civilizations of political development was obtained in studies by S. Huntington. The American political scientist argues that in the modern world, the main criterion for differences between people is their cultural affiliation with a particular civilization, or identity, consisting of linguistic, ethnic, historical, religious, institutional elements.

The scientist also questions the widespread belief that trade, investment, communication, etc., create the preconditions for the formation of a single civilization. On the contrary, he argues that “people define their identity with what they are not”, namely, than people know the world more, than more they feel their own uniqueness and try to protect it [18].

Three centuries later, the influence of Western civilization in world politics, according to S. Huntington, led to erroneous conclusions about the universality and exclusive “correctness” of Western values for all mankind. Attempts to impose on humanity the culture of Western civilization and the way of organization of society led in some countries to confront civilizations, to reject another culture of civilization and self isolation; in others, there is a Westernization or assimilation process according to the western, European model in some countries before modernization, namely, the modernization of the

values of the country while preserving own national and cultural uniqueness.

They went in the nineteenth century by the way of rejection. China and Japan, self-isolation was characteristic of the twentieth century for the USSR. Now it is clear that such way in the conditions of globalization is false and leads to a lag in all life indicators. Westernization implies the abandonment of entire strata of local culture that are incompatible with democratic values. Turkey has precisely used this way since 1920, based on the initiative of K. Ataturk, radical cultural reforms were carried out up to the abandonment of the classical Arabic alphabet.

On the way to unconditional Westernization there is a threat of structural breakdown crises and disintegration, which show the countries of Latin America and Africa, “where decades and centuries of European principles and standards of lifestyle were unviable, and where there was a need to revive the usual social institutions and norms to ensure the viability of societies” [19, p. 26]. Analysis of changes of the structural elements of consciousness in the process of socio-historical development allowed determining their influence on the civil society and socio-power relations at the modern global stage of development of the civilization.

Modernization (or trying to combine fundamental values, achievement of own culture with Western technologies and practices) is the most successful development strategy of the 21st century. Implementation of the modernization in Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia and other countries has allowed not only to rapidly narrow the economic gap (for Japan — even to

become one of the world's economic leaders), but also to shift the military-political and demographic balance in its favor.

The Civilization theory explains the peculiarities of political processes in independent Ukraine, which initially proclaimed the course for modernization. After all, in Ukraine (S. Huntington in his work devotes considerable attention to Ukraine as a "split country"), the breakdown of civilizations, which was initiated by the Brest Union in 1596. About four centuries, the Right Bank of Ukraine existed as a member of European states, absorbed the state-management traditions of Western civilization based on Catholic and Protestant religious values. At the same time, the state-management traditions of the Left-Bank Ukraine adopted the principles of the collectivist ethics of the Orthodox civilization. This difference in civilizations did not manifest itself during the period of Stalin totalitarianism and Brezhnev's authoritarianism, but it naturally appeared during the time of an independent democratic Ukraine.

However, it would be very simplistic to explain the split of Ukrainian society with only unscrupulous politicians and the "black piar" of political technologists. The root of the problem is much deeper. It has been understood by Western philosophers and analysts long time ago, but it still does not want to be seen by the majority of the political elite [20].

The modern world space, trends in its development and management, largely determined by the growing role of global civil society and the world community in the adoption of important national and international deci-

sions. These trends are gaining particular relevance in Ukraine that is located "at the epicenter of the planetary economic crisis, under the progressive press the national crisis is getting deeper" [21, p. 3].

Authorities, in the process of historical development, used various resources and methods of influence on people. Today, the fundamental issues in science acquire the fundamental questions of human nature, in particular the study of psychological differences, the study of archetypal structural elements of consciousness, the direction of consciousness development, the manipulation of consciousness and the formation of value systems for use in political science, sociology, psychology and public administration.

An objective political process that led to the destruction of the foundations of civil society was the approval of a biopolitical paradigm. As a result of this, in the political discourse the notion of "people" was ostracized by the notion of "population". The phenomenon of biopolitics is closely linked with the present situation of man. Philosophers and anthropologists increasingly pay attention to the fact that biotechnology interferes in human nature and change it radically.

In modern philosophy and political science, they are often referred to the understanding of biopolitics that we encounter in the works of M. Foucault. According to him, biopolitics is a combination of political means of influence on the biological origin of man and control of him/her in order to realize certain political and social interests. Biopolitics reaches the essence of sovereign power that has important

privileges such as the right of life and death.

In the work “Will for Truth” M. Foucault pays attention to the fact that power is the power over life. “Never the wars have been as bloody as now since the XIX century, and never before, on other equal terms, the ruling regimes did not produce such mass massacres in relation to their own peoples” [22, p. 240].

“The wars are not conducted anymore in the name of the sovereign, which must be protected, they are now conducted in the name of all; whole peoples are trampling with each other, they kill each other in the name of the need to live. The fighters have become vital. Many regimes succeeded in launching of so many wars, forcing them to kill many people based on the role of controlling life and survival, bodies and descendants” [ibid., p. 240–241]. The power becomes the biopower, when it begins to manage health, fertility, hygiene, sexuality, etc. [23, p. 13].

The question of hidden mechanisms of manipulation of consciousness is widely discussed during the political, ideological, methodological and legal discussions that take place in the context of the revival of eugenics – the science of controlling human heredity [24].

Attempts to influence the person by genetic engineering were made during the “Cold War”, in the 1960s of the twentieth century, when the USSR and USA have developed a genetic or ethnic weapon. The problem of biotechnology has recently been interested for the American political scientist F. Fukuyama and the German philosopher and sociologist Y. Habermas, who talk

about the need for a “liberal eugenics” that can only be developed in a society of liberal democracy.

Archetypes, discovered by K. Jung, are the key to understand the socio-cultural values and peculiarities of people. The important science topic is the study of archetypal structural elements of consciousness and the formation of value systems for use in public administration. Since archetypal images in modern conditions are means of managing people, the curiosity about the issue of archetypes among scientists in the field of public administration and society is increasing.

The archetypal structural elements of consciousness are a concentrated expression of various parameters of the social life of people for millennia. Thus, the Spanish scientist H. Ortega-Gasset believed that “power means domination of thoughts and views” [25, p. 117]. At the same time, it is interpreted as the ability of agents of power to embody or impose certain political decisions through dominance.

Among contemporary scholars appeared the idea that the nature of power is a mystery of real, not stylized self-confidence that is capable of creating a special aura, plunging into which one decisively governs (rule), and others selflessly obey, following any orders [26, p. 4], or “the ability and opportunity to exercise their will, to have a decisive influence on the activities, behavior of people” [27, p. 87]. Namely, dominance and subjugation are rooted in the human nature, in archetypal structural elements of human consciousness.

There is developing of new technologies of power and transformation of power-management relations. “The

political field, — notes L. Herasin, — suddenly lost energy, which provided the opportunity to rule and willingness to obedience”. An unusual situation of semantic vacuum has developed in the power relations [28, p. 4]. That is, in a global society, political power is not the embodiment of the highest necessity.

L. Furth puts forward the theory of “Presumed government” and proposes a way of fighting it the two-component phenomenon — acceleration and complication, which together creates a threat to coordinated governance. The various departments of the Cabinet of Ministers, in particular the Ministry of Defense, have internal planning systems that are close to the intended management. Such systems are not available at the national level.

As a result of this, the government is increasingly limited to resolving large-scale crises and loses its ability to shape a policy that allows for future planning. At the national level, there is no mechanism to bring predictability and policy closer to effective relations [29, p. 31]. Lack of systematic worsens the ability of the government to think and act strategically and threatens national security.

The changes are conditioned by the globalization of society, led to the creation of a new theory of public administration that involves expanding of the circle of decision-makers. “Governance” and “Good governance” are understood as “institutions through which citizens and groups express their interests, exercise legitimate rights, perform duties, and balance between differences” [30, p. 54].

Modernity is characterized by the will of the society to be virtual, with

virtualization not only of the society, but also a generated personality in this society. The Internet serves as a mean to transform and manage the individual, the society, in general. Management in the systems of virtual mass communication in the information society goes to the level of democratic relations; therefore the Internet is often called the “vector of democratization” and even the “zone of anarchy”.

With the help of new forms of social-power interactions, citizens can express their position on various issues, including issues of management and self-organization. The network can become a “virtual parliament”. Communication in the net equates the participants and it is its democratic nature.

The availability of information, of course, makes our civic responsibilities more meaningful and revives democracy [31]. The main function of “democracy” in the context of globalization — the alienation of society from the state, its expansion to “global civil society” and the advancement of the global governance.

D. Achibuti sets out his arguments in favor of global citizenship leadership, despite the lack of democracy. The deficit of democracy is understood as the lack of legitimacy due to the low turnout in the elections. The European Union (EU) presented its model at the global level as an example for replication, but the lack of legitimacy in the perception of citizens creates serious obstacles to the institutional development of this international entity.

The global civil society is a reality because of four reasons: 1) it is, for J. Scholte, “supraterritorial” [32, p. 8] — interterritorial organization of citizens,

based on universal moral principles; 2) acts on the basis of the principle of equality at the supranational level, this is the main rule in the international arena and does not apply to domestic policy; 3) it allows expanding of the social geography [ibid., p. 9], without violating the territorial boundaries of national states; 4) it is based on the philosophy of cosmopolitanism, accepts the fact that human diversity that exists within and between communities, which extends the boundaries, ultimately is accessible to a wide circle of mankind [33].

O. Matei convinces that the idea of the global civil society is based on the combination of two basic elements of cosmopolitanism — moral universalism and institutional building. So, the global civil society is the result of cosmopolitan philosophical thought. Today, it can be created without reorganizing the current international system, preserving its cosmopolitan character. More precisely, according to O. Matei, a universal civil society is an ideal system of civic participation and governance.

An important element of the evolution of liberal democracy in the Modern era was the process by which a citizen began to be defined as a constituent part of the political community with appropriate definitions of rights and duties related to citizenship. This process can be defined as constitutionalism. The development of the state is the integral part in this period.

The classic work about constitutionalism is the work of M. D. C. Weil, “Constitutionalism and the separation of powers”, which formulates a fundamental goals, the search of ways in

which the power is placed in a certain place in order to be under control and citizens would have the access to it [34].

However, management-related examples obviously cannot meet the order, the problem of constitutionalization of management lies in the fact that it is completely unclear in what form it will or can be organized at the supra-state level.

The purpose of a global civil society is not to restrict the role of the state, but to increase the responsibility of political institutions. It is a democratic alternative to globalization “from the bottom” as a response to globalization “from above”. Like society, it is unthinkable without a relationship with the state [35, p. 55].

Together with the expansion of the sphere of influence of civil society and strengthening of its status as the main subject of institutionalization of changes in the modern society at the stage of its transition to postmodernity, there is globalization of the processes of institutionalization [36, p. 93].

According to E. Giddens, on the basis of mass symbolic interaction and general information culture, a global social system arises, while the predominant national state goes back to the past [37].

Indeed, many modern theorists have opinion that global civil society is a democratic alternative to globalization “from the bottom” as a response to globalization “from above”. At the same time, V. Stepanenko points out that “it is impossible not to notice the peculiar projection of the traditional disposition of civil society — a state that would be transferred to the world level in the relationship the global society (global

polity) — global governance. Thus, the global civil society is seen as a normative ideal of justice and democratic participation” [38, p. 162].

Conclusions. The foregoing serves as a sufficient basis for the conclusion that globalization changes the understanding of the concept of “governance”, the epicenter of politics has no more territorial affiliation, because of symmetry between territorial borders and political power collapses.

The driving forces of the modernization of the global governance process are the large private business represented by transnational corporations and the global civil society. Cultural values and identities play an increasingly important role in the modern world.

The population that lives in a certain territory presents a permanent community, united based on territory, and defines the public, private, social spheres of life. Therefore, the public policy of territorial associations should be aimed at ensuring the order in the society, harmonization and implementation of various social interests and the achievement of public consent. To improve the quality of public policy is developing strategy that defines the main goals of the community.

REFERENCES

1. *Toynbee A.* (2008). *Postyzhenyestoryy: yzbrannoe; pod redaktsyey V. Y. Ukolovoy, D. É. Kharytonovycha; perevod s anhlyyskoho E. D. Zharkova* [A Study of history: the chosen one]. — Moskva, Russian: Ayrys-Press. — P. 521. [in Russian].
2. *Huntington S.* (2003). *Stolknovenye tsyvylyzatsyy?* [Clash of Civilizations?]. — Moskva, Russian: OOO Yzdatel'stvo AST. — P. 605. [in Russian].
3. *Bull H.* (1966). *International Theory: The Case of a Classical Approach // World Politics.* — Volume 18 (3). — P. 361–377. [in English].
4. *Giddens A.* (2005). *Ustroenye obshchestva: ocherk teoryy strukturatsyy* [The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration]. — Moskva, Russian: Akademicheskyy Proekt. — P. 528. [in Russian].
5. *Keane J.* (2001). *Demokratyya y hrazhdanskoe obshchestvo; perevod s anhlyyskoho, posleslovye M. A. Abramova.* [Democracy & Civil Society]. — Moskva, Russian: Prohress-Tradysyya. — P. 400. [in Russian].
6. *Rosenau James N. and Czempiel Ernst-Otto.* (1992). *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics.* — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. — P. 311. [in English].
7. *Toffler A.* (1992). *Problemy vlasti na poroge 21 veka* [Metamorphoses of the power: Knowledge, wealth and force on a threshold of the 21st century] // *Svobodnaya mysl'.* — Volume 2. — P. 113–120. [in Russian].
8. *Edwards M.* (2001, Summer). *The rise and rise of civil society,* *DfID Developments Magazine,* Retrieved from : <http://www.futurepositive.org/edwards.php> [in English].
9. *Pierre J. and Guy Peters B.* (2000). *Governance, Politics, and the State.* — New York, N.Y.: St. Martin's. — P. 231. [in English].
10. *Pocheptsov G.* (2017, July, 22). *Dalekoye budushcheye, kotoroye vidyat voyennyye, pravitel'stva i korporatsii, Khvilya,* Retrieved from: <http://hvylya.net/analytics/society/dalekoe-budushhee-kotoroe-vidyat-voennyie-pravitelstva-i-korporatsii.html> [in Russian].

11. *Hirst P.* (2000). Democracy and Governance, Debating Governance. Authority, Steering, and Democracy. Ed. by Jon Pierre. — Oxford: Oxford University Press. — P. 138–164. [in English].
12. *Falk R.* (2001). Toward Global Parliament, Foreign Affairs. — Volume 80 (1). — P. 212–220, Retrieved from: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2001-01-01/toward-global-parliament> [in English].
13. *Matei A.* (2011, October, 1). Making It Happen: A Global Civil Society, E-international relations students, Retrieved from: <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/10/01/making-it-happen-a-global-civil-society/> [in English].
14. *Archibugi D.* and *Held D.* (2011, March, 16–19). Cosmopolitan Democracy: Paths and Agents, ISA Annual Convention “Global governance: political authority in transition”, Panel Cosmopolitan Global Governance and the Role of the State: Rethinking Sites of Legitimate Authority. — Montreal, Quebec, Canada. — P. 1–20. Retrieved from: http://www.danielearchibugi.org/downloads/papers/Archibugi_and_Held_Paths_and_Ways.pdf [in English].
15. *Kooiman J.* (2000). Societal governance: Levels, models and orders of social-political interaction. In J. Pierre (Ed.), Debating governance. Authority, steering and democracy. — Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. — P. 138–166. [in English].
16. *Toynbee A.* (2008). Postyzhneyestoryy: yzbrannoe; pod redaktsyey V. Y. Ukolovoy, D. É. Kharytonovycha; perevod s anhlyyskoho E. D. Zharkova [A Study of history: the chosen one]. — Moskva, Russian: Ayrys-Press. — P. 521. [in Russian].
17. *Brzezinski Z.* (2000). Vibir. Velika shakhivnitsya [The Grand Chessboard]. — Lviv, Ívano-Frankivs'k, Ukraine: Lileya-NV. — P. 236. [in Ukrainian].
18. *Huntington S.* (2003). Tret'ya volna. Demokratizatsiya v kontse 20 veka [The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century]. — Moskva, Russian: Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya (ROSSPEN). — P. 368. [in Russian].
19. *Ukrayina v suchasnomu heopolitychnomu prostori: teoretychnyy i prykladnyy aspekty* (2002). [Ukraine in the modern geopolitical space: theoretical and applied aspects]: kolektyvna monohrafiya; za redaktsiyeyu F. Rudycha. — Kyiv, Ukrayina: MAUP. — P. 488. [in Ukrainian].
20. *Radchenko O. V., Savchenko I. H.* (2008). Tsinnisnyy vymir sotsial'noyi vidpovidal'nosti v demokratychniy derzhavi : monohrafiya [Valuable Dimension of Social Responsibility in a Democratic State]. — Kharkiv, Ukrayina: Vydavnytstvo KHNUVS. — P. 200. [in Ukrainian].
21. *Korniychuk V. P.* (2005). Stratehichnyy transformatsiynnyy menedzhment [Strategic transformation management]. — Kyiv, Ukrayina: Deneb. — P. 40. [in Ukrainian].
22. *Foucault M.* (1996). Volya k ystyni: po tu storonu znanyya, vlasty y seksual'nosti. Raboty raznykh let; perevod s frantsuzskoho [The will for Truth, on the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality. Works of different years]. — Moskva, Russian: Kastal'. — P. 448. [in Russian].
23. *Rozvytok hromadyans'koho suspil'stva v Ukrayini: mynule, suchasnist', perspektyvy* [The development of civil society in Ukraine: past, present, prospects] (2014); kolektyvna monohrafiya za redaktsiyeyu O. M. Rudenko, S. V. Shturkhet's'koho, seriya “Hromadyans'ke suspil'stvo”, Vyp. 7. — Ostroh, Ukrayina: IHSU, Vydavnytstvo Natsional'noho universytetu

- “Ostroz’ka akademiya”. — P. 328. [in Russian].
24. *Belets Zh. A.* (2016) Partytsypatorne byudzhetuвання як innovatsiynny demokratychnyy instrument uchasti hromadyan v upravlinni spravamy terytorial’nykh hromad [Participative Budgeting as an Innovative Democratic Instrument for Citizen Participation in the Management of Territorial Communities] // *Teoriya ta praktyka derzhavnogo upravlinnya i mistsevo-ho samovryaduvannya*. — Volume 1. Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Ttpdu_2016_1_21 [in Ukrainian].
 25. *Ortega y Gasset J.* (1989). Vosstanye mass [The Revolt of the Masses] // *Voprosy fylosofyy*. — Volume 4. — P. 114–155. [in Ukrainian].
 26. *Herasina L. M.* (2011). Instytut publichnoyi vlady u modernomu ta post-modernomu naukovomu vymiri [Institute of Public Power in the Modern and Postmodern Scientific Dimension] // *Derzhavne budivnytstvo*. — Volume 1. Retrieved from: <http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2011-1/doc/1/07.pdf> [in Ukrainian]
 27. *Politolohichnyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk* [Political Encyclopedic Dictionary] (2004); ukladach V. L. Horbatenko; redaktor YU. S. Shemshuchenko ta in. — Kyiv, Ukraine: Heneza. — P. 735. [in Ukrainian].
 28. *Herasina L. M.* (2011). Instytut publichnoyi vlady u modernomu ta post-modernomu naukovomu vymiri [Institute of Public Power in the Modern and Postmodern Scientific Dimension] // *Derzhavne budivnytstvo*. — Vol. 1. Retrieved from: <http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2011-1/doc/1/07.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
 29. *Fuerth L.* Operationalizing anticipatore governance, Center for Complex Operations, Retrieved from: cco.ndu.edu/Portals/96/Documents/prism/prism_2-4/Prism_31-46_Fuerth.pdf [in English].
 30. *Smorhunov L. V.* (2003). Sravnytel’nyy analiz polytyko-admynystratyvnykh reform ot novoho hosudarstvennoho menedzhmenta k kontseptsyy “Governance” [Comparative analysis of political and administrative reforms from the new state management to the concept of “Governance”], *Polys*, Volume 4. — P. 54–60. [in Russian].
 31. *Zoderkvyst Y. A. y Bard A.* (2005). Netokratyya. Novaya pravyashchaya élyta y zhyzn’ posle kapytalyzma [Netocracy. New ruling elite and life after capitalism]; perevod so shvedskoho. Sankt-Peterburh, Russian: Stokhol’mskaya shkola ékonomyky v Sankt-Peterburhe. — P. 211. [in Russian].
 32. *Scholte J.* (2001, January). A. Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance; Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick, CSGR Working Paper, № 65/01. Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b695/541fbd9a2dd9ffe0213d8090c02275efc6c7.pdf>
 33. *Matei A.* (2011, October, 1). Making It Happen: A Global Civil Society, E-international relations students, Retrieved from: <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/10/01/making-it-happen-a-global-civil-society/> [in English]
 34. *Vile M. J. C.* (1998). Constitutionalism and the Separation of Power, Vile M. J. C. Indianapolis : Liberty Fund. Retrieved from: <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/677> [in English].
 35. *Nerubashchenko I.* (2015). Hlobal’ne hromadyans’ke suspil’stvo, Suchasna politychna leksyka : navchal’nyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk-dovidnyk [Global Civil Society, Contemporary Political Vocabulary: An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Languages]; za redaktsiyeyu Khomy N. M. — L’viv, Ukraine: Novyy Svit-2000. — P. 395. [in Ukrainian].

36. *Sydorenko S. V.* (2012) Teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady piznannya hlobal'noho hromadyans'koho suspil'stva [Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Cognition of Global Civil Society] // *Humanitarnyy visnyk ZDIA*. — Volume 51. — P. 87–100. Retrieved from: http://www.zgia.zp.ua/gazeta/visnyk_51_87.pdf [in Ukrainian].
37. *Giddens A.* (2004). Uskol'zayushchyy myr: kak hlobalyzatsyya menyaet nashu zhyzn'; perevod s anhlyyskoho [Escalating world: How Globalization Affects Our Life?]. — Moskva, Russian: Ves' Myr. — P. 120. [in Russian].
38. *Stepanenko V.* (2005). Hlobal'noe hrazhdanskoe obshchestvo: kontseptualyzatsyya y postkommunystycheskiye varyatsyy [Global Civil Society: Conceptualization and Post-Communist Variations] // *Sotsyolohyya: teoryya, metody, marketynh*. — Volume 2. — P. 156–175. Retrieved from: http://i-soc.com.ua/journal/08_Stepanenko.pdf [in Russian].