UDC: 316.728

Sudakov Volodymyr Ivanovich,
Professor, Doctor of Sociological Science, Head of the Theory and History of Sociology dpt., Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 01601, Kyiv, Str. Volodymyrska, 58, tel.: +38 (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

Судаков Володимир Іванович,
доктор соціологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедрою теорії та історії соціології факультету соціології Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, 01601, м. Київ, вул. Володимирська, 58, тел.: +38 (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

Судаков Владимир Иванович,
доктор социологических наук, профессор, заведующий каферы теории и истории социлологии факультета социологии Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко, 01601, г. Киев, ул. Владимирская, 58, тел.: +38 (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093
DOI https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.122

THE LABOR DIVISION AS THE ARCHETYPAL SOURCE OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION, SOCIAL CONFLICTS AND SOCIAL TENSIONS IN THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC SPACE

Abstract. The article presents analytical sociological approach that is oriented to the scientific research of the division of labor as the archetypal source of social integration, social conflicts and social tensions the European public space. Devoted that the division of labor archetype is the fundamental transcultural stimulus for the resource development in the contemporary societies and is the important determinative factor for supporting and strengthening integrative foundations of public space in these societies. The specialized conceptions of social and public space, which have been elaborated in the European sociology for explanation the conflict-and the risk manifestations of the division of labor in the individual and collective labor practices were analysed by the author. Argued that in the globalized multicultural public space of the contemporary European societies take

place the constant reproduction of the different intercultural conflicts which are the functional manifestations of the of division of labor between individual and collective actors of social life. Substantiated that the social foundation of these intercultural conflicts are the different forms of social tension which reflect the concrete circumstances of social inequality, violence, social exclusion, deprivation, protest behavior in the system of the labor practices and also in the different models of employment of the working population. Proved the necessity of further development of the fundamental and applied scientific researchers of the new intercultural conflicts and the forms of social tensions in the labor activities that are reproduce in the multicultural European public space. Such scientific researchers would be the important stimulus for the development of the theory and methodology of the public management.

Keywords: globalization, labor, division of labor archetype, social integration, social solidarity, social conflict, social tension, European public space.

РОЗПОДІЛ ПРАЦІ ЯК АРХЕТИПНЕ ДЖЕРЕЛО СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ, СОЦІАЛЬНИХ КОНФЛІКТІВ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ НАПРУЖЕНОСТІ У ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОМУ ПУБЛІЧНОМУ ПРОСТОРІ

Анотація. Представлено розробку аналітичного соціологічного підходу, спрямованого на наукове дослідження розподілу праці як архетипного джерела соціальної інтеграції, соціальних конфліктів та соціальної напруженості у європейському публічному просторі. Аргументована значущість розуміння архетипу розподілу праці як визначального транскультурного стимулу ресурсного розвитку сучасних суспільств і важливого чинника підтримки та посилення інтегративних засад їх публічного простору. Здійснено аналіз спеціалізованих концепцій соціального та публічного простору, які були розроблені у європейській соціології для пояснення специфіки конфліктних та ризикових проявів архетипу розподілу праці в індивідуальних та колективних трудових практиках. Аргументовано, що в публічному мультикультурному просторі сучасних європейських суспільств стабільно відтворюються різноманітні міжкультурні конфлікти, які реально є суперечливими функціональними проявами архетипу розподілу праці між індивідуальними колективними суб'єктами суспільного життя. Підкреслено, що соціальною основою цих міжкультурних конфліктів є різні форми соціальної напруженості, які відображають конкретні обставини соціальної нерівності, насильства, соціального відторгнення, депривації, протестної поведінки в системі трудових практик, а також в різних моделях зайнятості працездатного населення. Доведена необхідність подальшого розвитку фундаментальних та прикладних наукових досліджень нових міжкультурних конфліктів та форм соціальної напруженості в індивідуальних та колективних трудових практиках, які специфічним чином відтворюються та виразно проявляються у полікультурному європейському публічному просторі. Саме такі дослідження можуть стати важливими стимулами розвитку теорії та методології соціального менеджменту.

РАЗДЕЛЕНИЕ ТРУДА КАК АРХЕТИПНЫЙ ИСТОЧНИК СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ, СОЦИАЛЬНЫХ КОНФЛИКТОВ И СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ НАПРЯЖЕННОСТИ В ЕВРОПЕЙСКОМ ПУБЛИЧНОМ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ

Аннотация. Представлена разработка аналитического социологического подхода, который направлен на научное исследование разделения труда как архетипного источника социальной интеграции, социальных конфликтов и социальной напряженности в европейском публичном пространстве. Аргументирована значимость понимания архетипа разделения труда как определяющего транскультурного стимула ресурсного развития современных обществ и важного фактора поддержки и усиления интеграционных принципов их публичного пространства. Осуществлен анализ специализированных концепций социального и публичного пространства, которые были разработаны в европейской социологии для объяснения специфики конфликтных и рискогенных проявлений архетипа разделения труда в индивидуальных и коллективных трудовых практиках. Аргументировано, что в публичном мультикультрном пространстве современных европейських обществ происходит стабильное воспроизводство различных интеркультурных конфликтов, которые реально являются противоречивыми функциональными проявлеными архетипа разделения труда между индивидуальными и коллективными субъектами общественной жизни. Подчеркнуто, что социальной основой этих интеркультурных конфликтов являются различные формы социальной напряженности, которые отражают конкретные социальные обстоятельства социального неравенства, насилия, социальной эксклюзии, депривации, протестного поведения в системе трудовых практик, а также в различных моделях занятости трудоспособного населения. Доказана необходимость дальнейшего развития фундаментальных и прикладных научных исследований новых интеркультурных конфликтов и форм социальной напряженности в индивидуальных и коллективных трудовых практиках, которые специфическим образом воспроизводятся и проявятся в поликультурном европейском публичном пространстве. Именно такие исследования могут стать важными стимулами развития теории и методологии социального менеджмента.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, труд, архетип разделения труда, социальная интеграция, социальная солидарность, социальный конфликт, социальная напряженность, европейское публичное пространство.

Formulation of the problem. It is known that intensification of globalization processes constitutes the new forms of activities in economic, political and cultural spheres of human life. The contemporary labor practices are

connected with the trend of deepening global social drama, which reflects the new controversial realities of the new social differentiation of human civilization into post-industrial center, industrial semi-periphery and agrarian periphery. Obviously, this differentiation has the specific consequences which actually lead to lower quality and living standards of the working population, increasing unemployment and to mass international migration. The current crisis of the global and regional labor markets reflects the situations of radical changes of the international labor division in the European public space. But these changes have some positive and negative dimensions. It is important to understand that the division of labor was traditionally analyzed by scholars as the main resource foundation of the human being and as the progressive transcultural archetype of social integration in different forms of social solidarity. The negative dimension of this process was connected with argumentation that labor in its different collective forms is the main source of social inequalities, violence, exploitation, social exclusion, social tensions and social conflicts. It is important to underline that the new waves of global technological modernization are also the specific factor of dehumanization of social life. This is a serious and important scientific problem for scholars who study contemporary institutional crisis of employment in the European labor market.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In recent some decades scientists have paid much attention to the problems on the labor practices in European countries. The situations of the "crisis and destruction of the labor societies", the "end of work" and of the "destandardization of employment" were investigated by Z. Bauman, J. Baudrillard, U. Beck, R. Dahrendorf, A. Giddens, D. North, G. Ritzer, L. Sklair, J. Stiglitz, Ch. Tilly, A. Toffler. These investigations create positive cognitive stimulus for further advanced studies of the contemporary labor relations. But it will be reasonable to stress that the process of division of labor practices in European societies constitutes the multicultural European public space with the specific forms of social integration, social conflicts and social tensions. In resent publications by A. Assman, M. Archer, A. Atkinson, P. Bourdieu, D. Bouget, J. Habermas, B. Latour, K. Sorrells, Gr. Crow, O. Widegreen, Ph. Brown, A. Heskeith have been proposed some perspective ideas, which could stimulate innovative researches of the division of labor problem under the context of contemporary intercultural communications.

The purpose of the article. The main purpose of this article is to characterize the division of labor as the archetypal source of social integration, social conflicts and social tension in the European public space.

The statement of basic materials. First of all, it is important to take into account that the concept of public space has become widespread in the contempotrary social sciences. In spite of that this scientific notion has broad conceptual volume, this notion, as A. Assman believes, reflects some specific features of the general "spatial turn" in social and cultural studies [1, p. 149–166]. Obviously, it is important to take into account the important real fact of the

global integration of social life in over the world. Therefore the contemporary European societies, in spite of different levels of their socio-economic development, form common integrated public space, which functionally reproduces the specific determinants of economic, political and socio-cultural interactions and communications between individuals, social communities and social institutions.

It should be noted that the main contradictions of this public space sociologists for a long time have been explained by existing social inequalities, which were interpreted as consequences of the direct influence of the international division of labor and the unequal distribution of scarce material resourses in different societies. It is worth recalling that P. Sorokin at the beginning of the 20th century in his theory of social space defined the phenomena of wealth, power and profession as th basic factors of organization and reproduction of the social order and culture in any type of society [2, p. 39–40]. P. Sorokin tried to prove that the systemic connection between these phenomena is determined by the process of division of social labor, which forms the status positions of certain individual and collective actors in the system of social interactions of the two large "cumulative" groups — the previleged social group of mental labor and the subjugated social group of physical labor.

At the beginning of the 21th century, the French sociologist P. Bourdieu attempted to develop the post-structuralist theory of social space, emphasizing the importance of identification the status dispositions of social actors from the point of view of the analysis of the real possibilities by these actors to use the different types of capital — economic, political, social, cultural, symbolic. The the processes of free use and mutual conversion of capitals in the public space of the developed European societies have become autonomous and do not have a direct dependence on the existing national division of labor. According to Bourdieu, this situation requires a new theoretical understanding of the basic resource determinants of social integration in Europen societies societies, taking into account the circumstance that organization of social relations between people in these societies is increasingly influenced by the globalized sphere of consumption. He points out in his book "Social Structures of the Economy" [3] that the process of economic globalization radically politicizes the division of labor in the contemporary European nation-states due to the pseudo-humanist requirements by transnational institutions to provide people with the necessary goods of consumption on the basis of the free movement of people, commodities and capitals. He claims that "so-called "global market" is a *political* creation, the product of a more or less consciously concerted policy" [3, p. 225].

The famous scholars of the neomarxist Frankfurt school (T. Adorno, E. Fromm, G. Markuze, J. Habermas) argued that in western "consumer societies" division of labor is no longer detetermines a class structure and social behavior. J. Habermas in two-volume fundamental research "The Theory of Communicative Action" indicates to the importance of overcoming simplified views on the division of labor as the institutional framework of industrial

cooperation and social integration. He argues that in the class capitalist societies the division of labor is the source of emergence and development of different social conflicts and social tensions. Therefore the important consequence of the capitalist division of labor is the formation of the specific stimulus and the specilized mechanisms of social self-organization and of civil activity by social actors who in the "open public sphere" demonsrate the potential of their "life-world". In monographs "Structural Tranfomations of the Pubic Sphere [4, p. 124–129] and "The Divided West" [5, p. 179–185] J. Habemas writes that in the public sphere human individuals identify themselves as citizens through the legal social mechanisms of self-organization and have real chance to establish appropriate system of collective human rights as the basic regulative legal norms of the peaceful intercultural communications and of the non-violent social order. He considers that the public sphere in multicultural societies is the specific public space of the intercultural communications which constantly reproduces itself by different forms of civil activity, mass collective actions and public discussions.

Obviously, one should agree with J. Habermas's position that public space is reproduced through expression and harmonization of the private and collective interests on the basis of social self-organization. However, as I believe, it is also important to take into account the fact that the processes of reproduction of the public space stimulate the formation of new trends in the distribution of social labor, which in general reflect the social demands for professional management and administrative activity, which have to strengthen the integrative foundations of social order and the process of social solidarity in the contemporary modern multicultural European societies.

It should be noted that in sociology the concept of "solidarity" reflects the realities of the certain social unity of individuals and social groups as the integral result of the human peaceful coexistence based on common needs, interests, ideals, values. Of course, the descriptions and characteristics of the solidarity of the various communities in the contemporary multicultural societies now are widely presented through the principles of liberal ideology that proposed to understand solidarity as the basic social value and desirable goal of social progress. Therefore in the different democratic political programs of organization of the peaceful and non-violent social order the concept of solidarity scholars often use for emphasizing the general integrative foundation of social life.

Now in the scientific literature the different definitions of the term "solidarity" are given. G. Crow in his works [6; 7] analyzes different semantic meanings of this term, which have historically formed according to the scientific or ideological positions of scientists. He underlines that A. Conte and his follower E. Durkheim believed that solidarity is a "natural" state of society, which is based on the division of social labor, when people objectively need each other. The Marxist position offered to understand "solidarity" as the unity of a particular social community, which arises on the basis of objectively existing interests and becomes a mobilization force of collective action.

Marx used the notion of "solidarity" to determine the state of collective unity, the unity of the proletariat. In modern theories of rational choice, the concept of "solidarity" refers to the phenomenon of group consciousness and group action, based on the identification of individuals with "own" group/community, when the individual deliberately delegates part of his rights in exchange for the collective defense of their interests [6, p. 4–29; 7, p. 52].

Obviously, in the public consciousness, solidarity has a morally positive connotation as a symbol and a sign of mutual understanding among members of society, as a factor in ensuring non-conflict coexistence, as an indicator of the common need of people to live together. Therefore I agree with O. Widegreen who investigates solidarity as the specific strategy of the social exchange. He argues that solidarity in its basic ontological dimensions is, firstly, a feeling of the specific exchange with other members of the group, a feeling of "we", that is, a sense of unity; and secondly, solidarity is the state of people's consent to certain joint actions for the goal of affirming their own interests. "In general, solidarity is the unity of beliefs and actions, mutual assistance and support for members of a social group based on common interests and the need to achieve common group goals; joint responsibility, as well as active sympathy and support for any actions or thoughts" [8, p. 775].

Taking into account the analyzed conceptual positions, I would like to emphasize that under conditions of the newest globalization changes the new two types of solidarity in the multicultural societies are emerged.

I believe that the new "*neoliberal type of solidarity*" in its ontological manifestations is the specific form of social integration through the social tensions, protests, conflict behavior and also through the specific human struggle for the priorities of certain cultural values and ideals, for belonging to a more "high", more "qualitative" culture. Another — the "*innovative type of solidarity*" — is based on the positive effect of preserving a cultural diversity and of an enrichment of existing cultures through innovative and creative activities by actors who produce unique technical, technological, artistic and spiritual products.

It is important to conclude that the public space of modern multicultural societies is not an ideal arena for non-violent reconciliation of public interests. That is why one should agree with A. Giddens and other scholars (Z. Bauman, U. Beck, D. North) who draw attention to the importance of researching the risks of "unintentional social consequences of individual and collective activity", which leads to the appearance the various intercultural conflicts.

In the advanced research programs by M. Archer [9] and A. Atkinson [10] have been emphasized that the modern intercultural conflicts are the specific controversial manifestations of the division of labor among different social communities. And the specific social results of these manifestations consist of the tensions between human equality and social inequalities which reflect and represent the phenomena of social exclusion, poverty and unemployment.

K. Sorrells in her book [11] tries to analyse different forms of the intercul-

tural communications as the sources of conflict interactions in the public space and as the problem of social policy. She understands intercultural conflict as "the real or perceived incomparibility of values, norms, expectations or outcomes between two or more individuals or groups from different cultures" [11, p. 260]. K. Sorrells argues that intercultural conflicts have flexible structure and very often demonstrate the contradictory realities of the "crossing cultural and social borders" actions and are the most evident indicators of social injustice. Therefore the search for appropriate ways in order to solve and overcome intercultural conflicts now is the serious complex problem for public management. That is why so many scholars now pay attention upon the study of the phenomenon of social tension as a specific stage, preceding the actualization of intercultural conflicts in the public space.

In the recent publication [12] I tried to prove that the different forms of social tensions in the contemporary globalized world are the specific contradictory consequences of the international division of labor and are the essential determinants which constitute *inclusive and exclusive models of employment* [12, p. 338–342]. I consider that the existing system of social tensions is the important ontological base for identification of the new pre-conflict and conflict realities in the contemporary labor practices as the specific type of the globalized multicultural communications. The essential characteristics of the "social tension" concept, as Western scholars believe, reflect the certain system of the typical causal ontological factors as sources of actualization: 1) violence;

2) social exclusion; 3) social inequalities; 4) protest behavior; 5) social conflicts; 6) global and local risk situations as the specific ontological modifications of the individual and collective activities [13–19]. These scholars have proposed the new scientific conceptualizations of the theme of social tension under the context of certain innovative ideas. In this connection, it is reasonable to underline the content of the three such important ideas.

First, it is the idea of the epistemological development of the contemporary social sciences "beyond societies" (J. Urry [15], U. Beck [16]). The conceptual expression of this idea lies in the argumentation of the research position that under the influence of the globalization process all contemporary societies as nation-states lose their "organic" nature, and the features of functional autonomy and self-sufficiency. That is why the sociological analysis, which is limited to the study of separate societies, is becoming obsolete. It is easy to understand that according of this research position, *social tensions are the attributive consequences of the contemporary globalization process and of the "new mobilities"*.

Secondly, it is the idea of "reassembling the social" (B. Latour [17]). This idea reflects the need of radical rethinking of the ontological characteristics of sociality under the context of the intensive development of social networks, which form the new interactive models of social interactions and intercultural communications. It is also important to take into account the fact that the processes of virtualization of public life positively stimulate the potential of the agency of individual and collective so-

cial actors and expand the possibilities of their involvement (inclusion) into the existing field of global, regional and local labor and social practices. However, such involvement, as believes J. Baudrillard [18], is often simulative and really transforms into the forms of social alienation and social exclusion. So the desire and actions of the migrant or refugee, who are aimed at achieving the goal of becoming a member of an advanced society are really faced with the mechanisms of social exclusion as a functional system of economic, political, legal, and sociocultural constraints. The controversial combination of these desires and actions and functional mechanisms of social exclusion, as we consider, are the important source of social tensions. From the standpoint of such conceptual understanding, *social tension is an ontological manifestation of contradictions between inclusive and exclusive types of identity of individual and collective actors*.

Thirdly, it is also important to point out the conceptual significance of the idea of radical strengthening of the tendency of individualization of social life. The concept of "individualized society" which has been proposed by Z. Bauman, expresses the essential characteristics is this idea [19, p. 2–14]. This concept targets the scientific search: 1) to the study of the dominant influence of personal (individualized) social practices in the processes of organizing the social order in the contemporary societies; 2) to the research the establishment of the a meritocratic profile of social structure as the results of individual choices which are based on accumulation of the cultural capital and its "life meanings". It is important to take into ac-

count that the increase of the influence of personified social practices actually leads to the violation and destruction of the existing traditional modes of social integration due to the formation of the new individualized channels of social mobility. Obviously, a certain system of such "violations and destructions" is also a specific source of social tensions, which can turn into different latent and explicit forms of social conflicts and protest behavior. Thus, *social tension is the specific consequence of the radical strengthening of the tendency of individualization of social life*.

Conclusions.

1. The scientific researches of the newest tendencies of the division of labor are the important stimulus further its analysis as the archetypal source of social integration, social conflicts and social tensions. These tendencies determine the qualitative differences between the social systems of different types which in the globalized social space of contemporary civilization lead to its differentiation into to the post-industrial centre, the industrial semi-periphery and the agrarian periphery. As a universal transcultural archetype the division of labor is a fundamental stimulus for the resource development in the contemporary societies and is an important determinative factor for supporting and strengthening the integrative foundations of public space in these societies.

2. In the European sociology have been elaborated the specialized conceptions of social and public space for scientific explanation of the contradictory nature the manifestations of the division of labor in the European public space. In particular, the special atten-

tion by scholars was paid upon identification of the conflict-and the risk-factors in the individual and collective labor practices that are reproduced in the globalized multicultural public space of modern European societies.

3. The scientific search for the development of the optimal strategies for effective managerial influence towards the intercultural conflicts in the system of labor practices is an important problem of the theory of social management. It is important to take into account that the origin and development of the intercultural conflicts are conditioned by the influence of the different forms of social tension, which really are the contradictory manifestations of the archetype of the division of labor in the inclusive and exclusive models of employment of the working population.

REFERENCES ————

1. *Assman A.* Introduction to cultural studies. Topic, Concepts, Issues / A. Assman. — Berlin: Erich Smidt Verlag, 2012 — 248 p.

2. *Johnson B. V.* Pitirim A. Sorokin on Order, Change and the Recostruction of Society / Barry Johnson // Comparative Civilizartion Review. — 1999. — № 41. — P. 25–41.

3. *Bourdieu P.* The Social Structures of the Economy / P. Bourdieu. — Cambrige: Polity Press, 2005. — 240 p.

4. *Habermas J.* The Structural Transformations of the Pubic Sphere / J. Habermas. — Cambrige (Mass): The MIT Press, 1991. — 301 p.

5. *Habermas J.* The Divided West / J. Habermas. — Cambrige; Polity press, 2006. — 224 p.

6. *Crow Gr.* Social solidarities; theories, identities, and social change / Gr. Crow. — Buckingham; Open univ. press, 2002. — 152 p.

7. *Crow Gr.* Social solidarities / Gr. Crow // Sociological Compass. — 2010. — Vol. 4 (1). — P. 52–60.

8. *Widegreen O.* Social Solidarity and Social Exchange / O. Widegreen // Sociology. — 1997. — Vol. 31, issue 4. — London; Sage publ. — P. 755–771.

9. *Archer M.* The sociological approach to the tension between equality and social inequality / M. Archer // The Study of the Tension between Human Equality and Social Inequalities. From the Perspectives of the Various Social Sciences. — Vatican city: Academy of Political Sciences, 1996. — Acta 1. — P. 81–99.

10. *Atkinson A. B.* Social exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment / A. Atkinson // Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity / A. B Atkinson and J. Hills eds. — London: school of Economic and Political Science, 1998. — P. 1–20.

11. *Sorrells K. S.* Intercultural Communication, Globalization and Social Justice. (2nd ed.) / K. Sorrells. — Los Angeles: Sage publ., 2016. — 331 p.

12. *Sudakov V. I.* The global detrminats of the conflict intractions in the contemporary models of employment / V. Sudakov // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 335–342.

13. *Bouget D.* Social Tension: some general elements / D. Bouget. — Oslo: The Peace Institute, 2008. — 35 p.

14. *North D. C., Wallisd J. J., Waingast B. B.* Violence and Social Orders. A conceptrual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. C. North, J. J. Wallisd, B. B. Waingast. — N.-Y.: Cambrige univ. press, 2013. — 320 p.

15. *Urry J.* Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century / J. Urry. — London: Routledge, 2000. — 266 p.

16. *Beck U.* World at Risk / U. Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226 p.

17. *Latour B.* Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory/ Brouno Latour. — N.-Y.: Oxford: univ press, 2005. — 303 p.

18. *Baudrillard J.* Symbolic Exchange and Death / J. Baudrillard. — 2nd ed. — London: SAGE Publ., 2017. — 280 p.

19. *Bauman Z.* Individulized Sosiety / Z. Baunan. — Cambrige: Polity press, 2008. — 272 p.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Assman A.* Introduction to cultural studies. Topic, Concepts, Issues / A. Assman. — Berlin: Erich Smidt Verlag, 2012. — 248 p.

2. *Johnson B. V.* Pitirim A. Sorokin on Order, Change and the Recostruction of Society / B. Johnson // Comparative Civilizartion Review. — 1999. — № 41. — P. 25–41.

3. *Bourdieu P.* The Social Structures of the Economy / P. Bourdieu. — Cambrige: Polity Press, 2005. — 240 p.

4. *Habermas J.* The Structural Transformations of the Pubic Sphere / J. Habermas. — Cambrige (Mass): The MIT Press, 1991. — 301 p.

5. *Habermas J.* The Divided West / J. Habermas. — Cambrige; Polity press, 2006. — 224 p.

6. *Crow Gr.* Social solidarities; theories, identities, and social change / Gr. Crow. — Buckingham; Open univ. press, 2002. — 152 p.

7. *Crow Gr.* Social solidarities / Gr. Crow // Sociological Compass. — 2010. — Vol. 4 (1). — P. 52–60.

8. *Widegreen O.* Social Solidarity and Social Exchange / O. Widegreen // Sociology. — 1997. — Vol. 31, issue 4. — London; Sage publ. — P. 755–771.

9. *Archer M.* The sociological approach to the tension between equality and social inequality / M. Archer // The Study of the Tension between Human Equality and Social Inequalities. From the Perspectives of the Various Social Sciences. — Vatican city: Academy of Political Sciences, 1996. — Acta 1. — P. 81–99.

10. *Atkinson A. B.* Social exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment / A. Atkinson // Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity / A. B. Atkinson and J. Hills eds. — London: school of Economic and Political Science, 1998. — P. 1–20.

11. *Sorrells K. S.* Intercultural Communication, Globalization and Social Justice (2nd ed.) / K. Sorrells. — Los Angeles: Sage publ., 2016. — 331 p.

12. *Sudakov V. I.* The global detrminats of the conflict intractions in the contemporary models of employment / V. Sudakov // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 335–342.

13. *Bouget D.* Social Tension: some general elements / D. Bouget. — Oslo: The Peace Institute, 2008. — 35 p.

14. *North D. C., Wallisd J. J., Waingast B. B.* Violence and Social Orders. A conceptrual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. C. North, J. J. Wallisd, B. B. Waingast. — N.-Y.: Cambrige univ. press, 2013. — 320 p.

15. *Urry J.* Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century / J. Urry. — London: Routledge, 2000. — 266 p.

16. *Beck U.* World at Risk / U. Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226 p.

17. *Latour B.* Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory / B. Latour. — N.-Y.: Oxford: univ press, 2005. — 303 p.

18. *Baudrillard J.* Symbolic Exchange and Death / J. Baudrillard. — 2nd ed. — London: SAGE Publ., 2017. — 280 p.

19. *Bauman Z.* Individulized Sosiety / Z. Baunan. — Cambrige: Polity press, 2008. — 272 p.