



Mykola Holovaty

D.Sc. (Political Science), Professor,
Vice-Rector for Research and Pedagogic Work,
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, Ukraine
2 Frometivska Str., Kyiv, 03039, Ukraine
m.f.holovaty@ukr.net

The state and society: the conceptual foundations and social interaction in the context of formation and functioning of states

Abstract. Scientifically and practically speaking, the state and society have much in common and yet have even more specific features each, which is due to their mission and specific character of their functions. The individual, citizen severely «suffers» in case of biased understanding and performance of such functions since: a) their rights and freedoms are not secured; b) the primary human right to manage and control all government and social processes is not exercised; c) civil society remains undeveloped and undemocratized. The author believes and tries to prove that the said problems should be defined in political and legal, social and organizational, spiritual and moral, and other terms, as well as by identifying objective factors and creating proper conditions for ensuring close cooperation of the state and society for the sake of maximum self-actualization of citizens and ensuring their stable untroubled life.

Keywords: State; Society; Social Interaction; Functions of State and Society; Social Development and Progress; Citizen
JEL Classification: Z18, Z19

Головатий М. Ф.

доктор політичних наук, професор, проректор із наукової та виховної роботи,
Міжрегіональна академія управління персоналом, Київ, Україна

Держава і суспільство: концептуальні засади та соціальна взаємодія в сучасних умовах формування й функціонування держав

Анотація. В науковому й практичному планах держава і суспільство мають багато спільного, але ще більше особливого, що обумовлено їх призначенням та специфікою функцій. У випадку необ'єктивного розуміння й реалізації таких функцій суттєво страждає людина, громадянин, оскільки: а) не забезпечуються громадянські права і свободи; б) не реалізується найперше право людини на управління всіма державними та суспільними процесами; в) нерозвинутим і недемократизованим залишається громадянське суспільство. Автор вважає і намагається довести, що визначення вказаних проблем має здійснюватися в політико-правовому, соціально-організаційному, духовно-моральному та інших аспектах, а також шляхом виокремлення об'єктивних факторів і створення належних умов для забезпечення тісної співпраці держави і суспільства для максимальної самореалізації громадян, забезпечення їхнього стабільного добротного життя.

Ключові слова: держава; суспільство; соціальна взаємодія; функції держави та суспільства; соціальний розвиток і прогрес; громадянин.

Головатый Н. Ф.

доктор политических наук, профессор, проректор по научной и воспитательной работе,
Межрегиональная академия управления персоналом, Киев, Украина

Государство и общество: концептуальные основы и социальное взаимодействие в современных условиях формирования и функционирования государств

Аннотация. В научном и практическом планах государство и общество имеют много общего и еще больше особенно, что обусловлено их назначением и спецификой функций. В случае необъективного понимания и реализации таких функций существенно страдает человек, гражданин, поскольку: а) не обеспечиваются гражданские права и свободы; б) не реализуется в первую очередь право человека на управление всеми государственными и общественными процессами; в) неразвитым и недемократизованным остается гражданское общество. Автор считает и пытается доказать, что определение указанных проблем должно осуществляться в политико-правовом, социально-организационном, духовно-нравственном и других аспектах, а также путем выделения объективных факторов и создания условий для обеспечения тесного сотрудничества государства и общества для максимальной самореализации граждан, обеспечения их стабильной добротной жизни.

Ключевые слова: государство; общество; социальное взаимодействие; функции государства и общества; социальное развитие и прогресс; гражданин.

1. Introduction

The problem of the state-society interaction at the present historical stage of existence of human communities can be to a significant extent objectively defined and explained subject to: a) a clear understanding of the essential nature and features of such phenomena as society and state (common and specific); b) understanding of the dialectic of mutual relations and mutual influence of the state and society; c) consideration of the status of socio-political transformations and modernization of, in particular, Ukrainian society in the context of the world integration and globalization processes. We have already addressed this topic in some of our publications [4].

There is much in common between the state and society while they differ in many matters of detail. What such notions

of different orders as «society» and «state» have in common is that they are determined in time and necessarily situationally conditioned; they are associated with the individual (personality) and large human communities (social media), and they are interdependent and constructively determine social progress on the whole.

At the same time, there is a principal difference between society and the state as phenomena, which fundamentally differentiates them in terms of the essence, nature, functional purpose, way of functioning, effect on human life, etc.

Society in the widest, simplified and generalized form represents a large population of people who unite to live together and satisfy certain needs and interests, and in a broader, philosophical sense it is «a relatively stable system of social

ties and relations among people based on joint activities that has developed in the course of historical evolution and is aimed to reproduce material conditions of existence and to satisfy needs» [5, 433].

Just as the notion of society, the notion of state also has many definitions with experts considering it in substantial, attributive, institutional and international senses. In the attributive sense (explanation) it is, in particular, «an arrangement of certain social relations, an official order of a certain society, its formalization» [15, 185]. More exactly: a state is «sovereign, political and territorial organization of power of a certain portion of the population in a socially heterogeneous society that has a special administrative and enforcement machinery, as well as exercises administration of society-wide affairs» [Ibid.].

Meanwhile, there are many specific features of the state as a holistic, living organism, which are, unfortunately, often disregarded when considering the essence of contemporary states. Already philosophers of antiquity noticed and tried to substantiate them. «State, – according to the definition of, in particular, Aristotle, – is not a common place, established for the prevention of mutual crime and for the sake of exchange... Such a community can only be established when there is intercourse for the sake of a perfect and self-sufficing life» [2, 461-462]. And Cicero explained the emergence of the state by the propensity of people to live together and the need to solve, through joint efforts, the problems that they are unable to solve without assistance. This is a somewhat simple but still extremely apt explanation.

2. Brief Literature Review

At the time, such noted philosophers, historians, sociologists as N. A. Berdyaev, N. V. Ustryalov, P. B. Struve, P. A. Florensky, P. A. Sorokin, P. I. Novgorodtsev, N. S. Timashev, S. I. Gessen, M. M. Alekseev and others pointed out that the state «has its own life and its own logico-philosophical laws that should provide the basis for its building and development» [3, p. 8]. Such Ukrainian and Russian scholars as H. V. Atamanchuk, E. A. Afonin, V. D. Bakumenko, O. L. Vavlevskiy, B. A. Hayevskiy, M. F. Holovaty, V. M. Kniyazev, O. O. Kucherenko, M. M. Lohunova, V. Y. Malynovskiy, I. F. Nadolnyi, O. Y. Obolenskiy, V. A. Rebkalo, V. E. Romanova, V. L. Romanova, Y. P. Surmin, V. V. Tertychka, V. A. Shakhov and others also comprehensively analyze the same issues but in the context of the current status of statehood. Ukrainian scholar I. S. Bakhov writes about them in many of his publications [22].

3. Purpose.

To present author approach towards conceptual foundations and social determination of state and society counteraction on modern stage for the benefit of citizens.

4. Results

It is common knowledge that in the course of studying the theoretical foundations of the state two basic approaches are applied to examination of it, of its status and purpose: the artificial (axiomatic) approach – when the concept of the state is based on a given axiom, and the natural approach – when the state is regarded just as a form of existence of man and society. It is clear that the natural approach should certainly be used in the context of the society – state relationship problem (Aristotle, Plato, G. W. F. Hegel, I. Kant and others).

It is important to keep in mind that under the natural approach to consideration of the phenomenon of the state the ethical principle of the emergence and functioning of the state takes center stage anyway (rather than simply its form, for ethical principles have been and remain the natural basis for living together, relationship of people in the state. T. O. Butyrskaya notes that the state and morality «serve as the sole form of regulation of relations among people» [3].

In this particular case, when the focus is on the ethical aspect of the state, organization of the semantic form of the state comes to the forefront rather than simply its fairly simplified identification, let's say, with a political regime, political system, authorities or economic organization.

Speaking of the natural approach to the essence of the state we also pay special attention to the fact that, according to O. O. Dzhuraeva, it is also a case of statics and dynamics of the state's being. We always resort to statics just when we describe the state as a society organized in a state (the machinery of the state, its qualitative characteristics, political system, territory, etc.), while we refer to dynamics all that imparts a vision, an understanding of how exactly the state acts, changes, develops, and serves its social purpose [7, 4].

Crucially, the state as a form of society organization should consolidate society, resolve the contradictions it faces, get over crisis situations, use efforts to satisfy citizens' needs, and ensure their social and other protection. Alongside this, especially in recent times, individual states have played in fact a destructive role, when they predominate over society, try to, if not, governmentalize society, penetrate into all its spheres, which quite often leads to certain destruction of the social organism on the whole.

In this day and age, the state on the way toward maximum democratization of life and social relations is destined to be not only the leader or the manager of innovative changes but also to be concerned about maximum reduction of pressure on all social, political and economic processes. That is to say, the state's ability to transform itself is of greater importance. Such scholars as R. V. Balaban, I. F. Kuras, F. M. Rudych, S. H. Ryabov and many other experts have recently put increasing emphasis on it in Ukraine.

For study and analysis purposes, the structural and dynamic approaches assume greater and substantive significance compared with the state. In the former case, society represents and is regarded as a complex structured «organic unity», while in the latter the social environment is marked by diversity of social processes. In other words, society is a more dynamic and mobile essence. This refers to that «social dynamics», which is determined by the value system, culture, and spirituality.

But for all that the phenomenon of «society» is ambiguous and even rather controversial. Theories that became the most popular already in the 20th century were those explaining society as «mass consumption society» (W. Rostow), «service society» (J. Fourastie), «third wave civilization» (A. Toffler), «technetronic society» (Z. Brzezinski), «post-industrial capitalism» (R. Helbrunner), «information society» (Y. Masuda, D. Bell), «welfare society» (W. Beveridge), «adequate standard of living society» (D. Peters, J. Bergman), «information and high technology society» (J. Naisbitt) and others [6].

Since the state and society are interdependent and inter-influential, the following is noteworthy. Given certain fluctuation in culture types in human history (according to P. A. Sorokin), the following types of states can be distinguished:

- a) those, whose policy is dominated by sensual culture (sensory perception);
- b) societies dominated by idealized culture (rational thinking);
- c) societies dominated by ideological culture (intuitive way of thinking).

One way or another, but the key determinant is that at any time the functions of the state and society are fundamentally different although they are maximally specified after all: legislative (rule-making), executive (management activity in all spheres), judicial (administration of justice), and control and oversight (of crime). When it comes to the functions of society, they are broader (functionally fuzzy), less subjectified and regulatory: society is based on a convention, contract, the same (there is never such a thing as the ideal option, after all) orientation of interests. Oftentimes, society means an area that lies between the individual and the state. It should be pointed out in passing that the collapse of the former USSR, Yugoslavia, etc. in the late 20th century was associated, according to many experts in political science, social philosophy, history, exactly with the lack of cardinal delineation of the functions of the state and society, while more specific reasons for such a breakup turned out to be:

a) in the sphere of economy, economic management – the preponderance of political, command management methods over market methods, marked disproportions in economic development among individual regions, totalitarian «dominance» of state-owned property;

b) in the realm of politics – excessive development of the one-party system;

c) in the social sphere – critical alienation of the people from property and power;

d) in the field of international politics and international relations – participation in the «cold war», policy of isolation and seclusion from the entire capitalist world. Such a point of view appears worthy of support.

Consequently, the state acts with respect to society as a sort of controlling system that is able, according to its purpose and functions, to influence all most important processes occurring within society. Such functions, such influence are often termed not otherwise than paternalistic, and a sort of the overall function of the state is just considered as social development «management» [See I. S. Bakhov, 23].

We also emphasize the fact that mutual relations, relations of the state and society sometimes develop in such a way (for example, in the former USSR) that the state's concern for people, citizens assume a character of state paternalism which, finally, gives also rise to direct or indirect state coercion.

Society and the state, therefore, fundamentally differ in their natural purposes, functions, modes of functioning with respect, primarily to the individual (personality), and specifics of human life determination.

Society is a sphere of man's life, existence, that of his personal fulfillment. The state represents a «tool» for organizing life of the individual and large social groups. It is a truism that society emerges long before the state and for a long time largely does without it. The need for the state arises as the society's internal structure becomes more complex, in the course of its social differentiation, stratification of classes, marked differentiation of social interests, and growth of anti-social elements and so on.

Further, let us consider more extensively the issue of the state-society relations in the context of contemporary Ukraine, of which the author is a citizen.

The Constitution of Ukraine (1996) enshrined the underlying, initial principles of the state-society relations having entrenched at the same time the following principles of building and developing of Ukraine: sovereignty, independence, democratism, social state, law-governed state, priority of universal human values, and division of powers. At that the Constitution points out that Ukraine is a state where the people is the only source of power exercising it directly and through bodies of state power. Objectively speaking, the state concedes a portion of its powers in the state and managerial areas to civil society in the context of pluralistic democracy.

The second fundamental fact concerning the state-society relations is that within the context of vigorous development of integration, globalization processes peculiar to the present-day world, there are quite a lot of international and internal life actors, which have a significant impact on restriction of state sovereignty in many countries, and by virtue whereof states voluntarily and to different extents concede a portion of their sovereignty. Such actors include international institutions and organizations, transnational economic associations, sub-state regional entities (federal lands, regions, cantons, republics within federations and so on), numerous nongovernmental organizations, state-private-social groups, etc. That is to say, globalization fundamentally changes the managerial decision-making mechanisms: the principle of subsidiarity operates, that is, issues are mainly decided at the level, which enables to ensure their most meaningful, effective implementation. And yet, even in the age of globalization the national level of nationwide decision-making and implementation has been and remains the most important (within a given state). The reason for this is that each nation always regards the following as its top priorities: national security,

provision of appropriate social services to its citizens, regulation of economic (market) relations, control over extraction and utilization of natural resources, regulation of migration processes, solution of interethnic problems, etc.

The third fundamental fact that determines the essential nature of the relations of the state and Ukrainian society in modern Ukraine is related to the fact that most formed and legitimized civil society institutions are in the state of concurrently introvert and extravert existence. In other words, they, on the one hand, develop and go through the phase of self-establishment and self-actualization and on the other hand – strengthen their influence on social development and state-building processes. This is the case of both basic, nationwide and local, regional political processes.

Overall, the problem of civil society is rather well-grounded in contemporary political philosophical sciences.

Civil society emerges when horizontal relations initiated by enshrinement of legal equality of people supplant vertical feudal institutions and relations. Although civil society is not based on law, the actual existence of such society is, however, associated with an equal and universally binding law, with a law-governed state. Even considering that there is formal and informal equality of people, legal recognition of the equality of people is a great accomplishment of mankind.

There are many signs by which one can establish availability and the degree of maturity and efficiency of civil society. They are as follows:

a) delineation of competences of the state and society, independence of the civil society institutions from the state within the scope of their own competence;

b) democracy and pluralism in the political sphere;

c) market economy, the mainstay of which is formed by non-state-owned enterprises;

d) availability of the middle class;

e) a law-governed state with precedence of the rights and liberties of an individual over the state's rights;

f) ideological and political pluralism;

g) freedom of speech and of the mass media.

If one tries to answer the question to what extent civil society is formed in present-day Ukraine, a positive conclusion can hardly be admitted. Indeed, Ukraine has proclaimed democratic principles of building and developing statehood; market relations are forming in the sphere of economy and economic management; there are many non-governmental organizations, associations, interest groups, however, their influence on the state and social development of the Ukrainian public at large is too small and ineffective.

It is held that the actual existence of civil society was initiated by Bills of Rights (the USA, England), Declarations of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (France), various constitutions of individual states and other regulatory documents, which pointed out that the right is not an «order of authorities» but a general rule regardless of wealth, social and other inequalities. The horizontal social ties that actually form the mainstay of the civil society model began to form based on the listed documents.

Among the main factors of an objective nature that fundamentally change the Ukrainian state-society relations, mention should be made of the five of them:

1) radical change of the political system;

2) transition of the state from autocracy (totalitarianism) to democracy;

3) transition from the centrally planned distributive system of management to the market system;

4) formation of a new value system;

5) formation and development of civil society.

In the meantime, the said processes develop ambiguously, oftentimes inconsistently and, most importantly, under the influence of both the world practice, modernization processes, and mainly of Ukraine's own history, traditions, culture, and state-building experience.

In addition, the fact that quite a number of citizens lack really high-toned, highly spiritual values that would serve as the major consolidating factor is one of the really crucial

problems, which substantially slow down the truly democratic transformations of Ukrainian society. For example, it was found, based on the data from the sociological monitoring performed in 2003 by the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, that the cult of money is the most active among the moral values and standards of the western way of life that come into the Ukrainian's life (44.9%); almost half of the polled regard wealth as the key sign of man's success in our country (47.0%). For 67.4% of respondents, money serves as the primary prerequisite for success in life. At the same time, most respondents consider these days as a time of thieves (51.7%) with bribery and corruption (55.3%) being its most characteristic signs (55.3%) [9, 125].

Let us emphasize that the essence and status of non-governmental organizations, which is the central connecting link between the state and the citizens, assume fundamental importance in the state-society relations. We place among such organizations trade-union, professional, human rights, cultural-religious, educational, ethnic, ecological, women's, youth and other organizations, various charitable organizations and foundations and so on. In terms of their (social and regulatory) status, non-governmental organizations represent «a totality of objective, voluntary, socially useful, long-repeated, stable social ties and relations consciously coordinated in order to achieve a common goal of social ties and relations among individuals who voluntarily join together for the purpose of joint satisfaction of their own specific needs and interests, act within the same legal framework as the central connecting link between the state and society» [11, 12].

In such a way, close, mutual interest-driven interaction and cooperation of the state and society is material for all individuals, citizens.

Joint and equal interaction of the state and society in such a case is actually possible only subject to establishment of an appropriate social dialog as the most civilized and democratic mechanism for resolution of current conflicts and problems. In our opinion, such a dialog seems to be likely only if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. Historical experience, traditions and practices of self-organization of people (citizens, population) in order to realize their own and collective interests.
2. Appropriate traditions and rules of the state-society interaction.
3. A proper organizational structure level, maturity, legal status of representative organizations of the society's main social groups.
4. Availability of appropriate political culture (a type of such culture) among citizens, etc.

The enumerated conditions can be supplemented with another one that Ukrainian political scientist V. V. Davydenko substantiates, namely «dependence of the state's role in regulation of socio-political processes on the political conjuncture, in particular, on such subjective factors as the political will of the leader of state or leader of a nongovernmental association, a certain group of individuals» [6, 5]. When it comes to the state-building practices in modern Ukraine, this condition seems too important and, what is more, too complex.

We single out the following problems among the major challenges that slow down the necessary societal, social dialog between the state and society under the current Ukrainian conditions:

- diversity and disparity in rates of modernization of the Ukrainian society institutional subsystem against the civil society values;
- severe lack of democratic political culture in people (population);
- inadequacy of division of power and distribution of powers of authority among the branches of government and other participants in the social, political processes;
- lack of civilized participation in the social dialog of a number of effective civil society institutions (trade unions, employers' associations, foundations and so on);

- shortcomings in development and strengthening of the public image of independent, democratic mass media, etc.

The said circumstances obviously demonstrate why instead of an effective and efficient social dialog between the state and society, authorities and citizens in present-day Ukraine there comes about a rather complicated and ambiguous situation, when: a) there is noticeable strengthening of the formal government institutions and social entities; the role and influence of bureaucracy grow; b) the individual rights and freedoms are downplayed; personalized forms of life become worthless; c) there is unjustified intrusion of formal entities and institutions into the sphere of inter-human relations. The grave crises of 2013-2014 bear witness of our opinion.

In the socially and economically volatile environment of Ukraine, common accord, tolerance, compromise, consensus, socio-political and societal partnership, which, if combined, are able to ensure constructiveness in building and development of a democratic Ukrainian society, are realistic ways toward a constructive social dialog.

A social, societal dialog is a history-tested rule of communication that takes place not only in a volatile environment, amid crunch periods of people life but also in situations when, one would think, there is not a great need for it. As J.-J. Rousseau put it in his far-famed treatise «Of the Social Contract», a social contract has also place, when «... men can't create new forces; they can only bring together ones that already exist, and steer them. So their only way to preserve themselves is to unite a number of forces so that they are jointly powerful enough to deal with the obstacles. They have to bring these forces into play in such a way that they act together in a single thrust» [17, 160].

5. Conclusion.

Though for discussion purposes, one may state, however, that in modern Ukraine interest groups, pressure groups, which use far from civilized, public forms and methods of influence on making and implementing oftentimes landmark decisions of authorities rather than an individual (citizen) or actual civil society components are the main participants in the political and, therefore, societal processes. Thus, corporate rather than public (those of individual large social groups) interests dominate rendering the societal dialog distorted and ineffective.

Consequently, searching for ways and establishment in modern Ukraine of more productive mechanisms of the state-society relations serving the interests of man and society appears as the most burning problem of civilizational, democratic progress of Ukraine, its establishment as an independent, sovereign, and law-governed state.

References

1. Alexander, J. C. (1999). *The Paradoxes of Civil Society. Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh (Sociology: Theory, Methods, and Marketing)*, 1, 113-126 (in Ukr.).
2. Aristotle. (1983). *Politics*. Moscow: Mysl (in Russ.).
3. Butyrska, T. O. (2009). *The Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for State-Building in Ukraine: an abstract of the thesis for a doctor's degree in public administration: specialty 25.00.01 «History and Theory of Public Administration»*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
4. Holovaty, M. F. (2014). Multiculturalism as a Means to Achieve Interethnic Unity of Peoples and Nations. *Ekonomiczny Chasopys-XXI (Economic Annals-XXI)*, 11-12, 15-18 (in Ukr.).
5. Holovaty, M. F., & Panasjuk, M. B. (2005). *Social Policy and Social Work: A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts*. Kyiv: MAUP (in Ukr.).
6. Davydenko, V. V. (2008). *Social Dialog in the Context of Interaction of Civil Society and the State: an abstract of the thesis for a doctor's degree in political science: specialty «Political Institutions and Processes»*. Lviv (in Ukr.).
7. Dzhuraeva, O. O. (2006). *The Functions of a Modern State: an abstract of the thesis for a PhD degree in Law: specialty 12.00.01 «Theory and History of State and Law; History of Political and Legal Doctrines»*. Odessa (in Ukr.).
8. Dontsova, O. V. (2009). *The Political-Legal Factors of Formation of the Party System in Ukraine of the Late 20th Century: an abstract of the thesis for a doctor's degree in political science*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
9. Yefremenko, T. (2004). *An Average Ukrainian: homo economicus or homo socius? Ukrainian Society 1994-2004: Monitoring of Social Changes*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).

10. The Constitution of Ukraine: adopted at the fifth session of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on June 28, 1996: as amended in conformity with the Law of Ukraine of December 8, 2004 № 2222-IV (2005, February). *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy*, 2 (in Ukr.).
11. Kravchuk, V. M. (2008). *Relationship of Nongovernmental Organizations and the State in the Context of Civil Society Formation in Ukraine (Theoretical and Legal Aspects): an abstract of the thesis for a PhD degree in Law: specialty 12.00.01 «Theory and History of State and Law; History of Political and Legal Doctrines»*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
12. Leschenko, V. M. (2010). *A Political Party in the Contexts of Interaction of the Social and Political Systems of Cotemporary Ukrainian Society: an abstract of the thesis for a PhD degree in political science: specialty 23.00.02 «Political Institutions and Processes»*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
13. Moiseeva, A. S. (2009). *The Organizational Criteria for Functioning of Political Parties in Present-Day Ukraine: an abstract of the thesis for a PhD degree in political science: specialty 23.00.02 «Political Institutions and Processes»*. Luhansk (in Ukr.).
14. Shemshuchenko, Y. S., Babkin, S. D., Horbatenko, V. P. (2004). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Political Science*. Kyiv: Gheneza (in Ukr.).
15. Holovaty, M. F., & Antoniuk, O. V. (2005). *Political Science Dictionary: a Manual for Tertiary Students*. Kyiv: MAUP (in Ukr.).
16. Prymush, M. V. (2002). *Political Parties: the Mechanisms for Institutionalization and Structural Transformation: an abstract of the thesis for a doctor's degree in political science: specialty 23.00.02 «Political Institutions and Processes»*. Lviv (in Ukr.).
17. Rousseau, J.-J. (1969). *Of the Social Contract, or Principles of Political Right. Treatises*. Moscow: Nauka (in Russ.).
18. Severnyuk, V. M. (2010). *Political Behavior as a Phenomenon of Social Life: Theoretical and Methodological Problems: an abstract of the thesis for a doctor's degree in political science: specialty 23.00.01 «Theory and History of Political Science»*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
19. Skrypnyk, O. V. (2005). *Social, Law-Governed State in Ukraine: Problems of Theory and Practice*. Kyiv (in Ukr.).
20. Kopechukov, V. V., & Lysenkov, S. L. (2002). *Theory of State and Law*. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter (in Ukr.).
21. Yakubovskiy, O. P. (2006, March). State Power and Civil Society: An Interactive System. *Aktualni Problemy Derzhavnoho Upravlinnia: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, 3(27), 67-75.
22. Bakhov, I. S. (2013). Government multicultural policy in Canada in the period of 1970-2000s. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(10), 1450-1454.
24. Bakhov, I. S. (2014). Dialogue of Culture in Multicultural Education. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 29(1), 106-109.
6. Давиденко В. В. Соціальний діалог в контексті взаємодії громадянського суспільства і держави : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступ. доктора політ. наук : спеціальність «Політичні інститути та процеси» / В. В. Давиденко. – Львів, 2008. – 35 с.
7. Джураєва О. О. Функції сучасної держави: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступ. канд. юрид. наук : спец. 12.00.01 «Теорія та історія держави і права; історія політичних і правових учень» / О. О. Джураєва. – Одеса, 2006. – 20 с.
8. Донцова О. В. Політико-правові чинники формування партійної системи в Україні кінця ХХ століття : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступ. док. філософії в галузі політології / О. В. Донцова. – К., 2009. – 19 с.
9. Єфременко Т. Пересічний українець: homo еconomicus чи homo socius? // Українське суспільство 1994–2004 : Моніторинг соціальних змін. – К., 2004. – 321 с.
10. Конституція України: прийнята на п'ятій сесії Верховної Ради України 28 червня 1996 р. : Зі змінами, внесеними згідно із законом України від 8 грудня 2004 р. №2222-IV // Відомості Верховної Ради України. – 2005. – № 2. – 38 с.
11. Кравчук В. М. Взаємовідносини громадських організацій і держави в умовах формування громадянського суспільства в Україні (теоретико-правові аспекти) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступ. канд. юрид. наук : спец. 12.00.01 «Теорія та історія держави і права; історія політичних і правових учень» / В. М. Кравчук. – К., 2008. – 20 с.
12. Лещенко В. М. Політична партія у контекстах взаємодії соціальної та політичної систем сучасного українського суспільства : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. політ. наук : спец. 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути та процеси» / В. М. Лещенко. – К., 2010. – 20 с.
13. Моїсеєва А. С. Організаційні критерії функціонування політичних партій в сучасній Україні: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. політ. наук : спец. 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути та процеси» / А. С. Моїсеєва. – Луганськ, 2009. – 19 с.
14. Політологічний енциклопедичний словник / Упорядник В. П. Горбатенко; За ред. Ю. С. Шемшученка, С. Д. Бабкіна, В. П. Горбатенка. / 2-ге вид., доп. і перероб. – К. : Генеза, 2004. – 736 с.
15. Політологічний словник: Навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. / За ред. М. Ф. Головатого та О. В. Антонока. – К. : МАУП, 2005. – 792 с.
16. Примуш М. В. Політичні партії: механізми інституалізації і структурної трансформації : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора політ. наук : спец. 23.00.02 «Політичні інститути та процеси» / В. М. Примуш. – Львів, 2002. – 32 с.
17. Руссо Ж.-Ж. Об общественном договоре, или принципы политического права / Ж.-Ж. Руссо // Тракаты. – М. : Наука, 1969. – С. 151–303. – 704 с.
18. Северинюк В. М. Політична поведінка як феномен суспільного життя: теоретико-методологічні проблеми : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора політ. наук : спец. 23.00.01 «Теорія та історія політичної науки» / В. М. Северинюк. – К., 2010. – 20 с.
19. Скрипник О. В. Соціальна, правова держава в Україні: проблеми теорії і практики. – К., 2005. – 600 с.
20. Теорія держави і права / За ред. В. В. Копейчикова, С. Л. Лисенкова. – К. : Юрінком Інтер, 2002. – 481 с.
21. Якубовський О. П. Державна влада і громадянське суспільство: система взаємодії / О. П. Якубовський // Актуальні проблеми державного управління: зб. наук. пр. – О. : ОРІДУ НАДУ, 2006. – №3(27). – С. 67–75.
22. Bakhov I. S. Government multicultural policy in Canada in the period of 1970-2000s / I. S. Bakhov // Middle East Journal of Scientific Research. – 2013. – No. 15(10). – P. 1450–1454.
23. Bakhov I. S. Dialogue of Culture in Multicultural Education / I. S. Bakhov // World Applied Sciences Journal. – 2014. – No. 29(1). – P. 106–109.

Received 30.09.2015

References (in language original)

1. Александр Д. С. Парадоксы гражданского общества / Д. С. Александр // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. – 1999. – №1 – С. 113–126.
2. Аристотель. Политика / Аристотель. – Соч. в 4 т. – Т. 4. – М. : Мысль, 1983. – 491 с.
3. Бутирська Т. О. Теоретико-методологічні засади державотворення в Україні : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня док. Наук з державного управління : спец. 25.00.01 «Теорія та історія державного управління» / Т. О. Бутирська. – К., 2009. – 36 с.
4. Головатий М. Ф. Мультикультуралізм як засіб досягнення міжнародної єдності народів і країн (англійською мовою) / М. Ф. Головатий // Економічний часопис – XXI. – 2014 – № 11–12. – С. 15–18.
5. Головатий М. Ф. Соціальна політика і соціальна робота: Термінол.-понятійн. слов. / М. Ф. Головатий, М. Б. Панасюк. – К. : МАУП, 2005. – 560 с.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.09.2015

About The Economic Annals–XXI Journal

Institute of Society Transformation is a publisher of the leading Ukrainian Research Journal **Economic Annals–XXI** starting from the 1996 (<http://soskin.info/en/material/1/about-journal.html>). The Editorial Board of the Journal consists of 23 Doctors of Sciences who represent different affluent Research centres in Ukraine and other European countries (Latvia, Poland, Slovak Republic). In the Journal, articles of not only Ukrainian, but also foreign authors from Poland, Slovakia, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, Czech Republic, Russia, Kazakhstan and other countries are published.

The Economic Annals–XXI Journal is included into seven international indexation databases:

- 1) Scopus, The Netherlands (**SJR 2014: 0.186**)
- 2) EBSCOhost, The USA
- 3) Index Copernicus, Poland
- 4) Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, Great Britain, The USA
- 5) Central and Eastern European Online Library (C.E.E.O.L.), Germany
- 6) InfoBase Index, India
- 7) Russian Index of Science Citation (RISC), Russia
- 8) **ERIH PLUS Index (Norway) new!**