

УДК 323.39(477)

Dmytro Serhatyuk PhD student, Vasyl Sukhomlynskyi Mykolayiv National University

POLITICAL ELITE: KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA UNDER DEMOCRACY

The author of the article states that, though in modern scientific literature different evaluation criteria for effectiveness level of political elite in democratic states are stipulated, however, in conclusion their essence comprises their ability to satisfy core interests of the society and states, i.e. detailed consideration and interpretation of some basic activities of social and state development.

The article is focused on the idea that effectiveness of the political elite under democratic political systems is increasingly determined by level of elitism than under authoritarian forms of governing. The author submits a proposition that the indispensable condition for elitism of the political elite, its proto-criterion is the elitism of politicians' personalities, who belong to it;

Generally, the system of criteria to evaluate the elitism of modern democratic political elite was stipulated, its basic constituents are comprised in such features as availability of organic connectivity with profession, availability of certain psychological characteristics, national and state patriotism, global thinking; feeling of national mission, leadership qualities, charismatic features, political proficiency, tolerance and political correctness.

Keywords: *modern political elite, evaluation criteria, effectiveness of the activity, political elitism, democracy.*

Сергатиук Д. А. Політична еліта: ключові критерії оцінення за демократії

В статті розглядаються критерії оцінювання ефективності (результативності) та елітарності сучасної політичної еліти за демократії.

Ключові слова: *сучасна політична еліта, критерії оцінювання, ефективність (результативність) діяльності, політична елітарність, демократія.*

Сергатиук Д. А. Политическая элита: ключевые критерии оценивания при демократии

В статье рассматриваются критерии оценивания эффективности (результативности) и элитарности современной политической элиты при демократии.

Ключевые слова: *современная политическая элита, критерии оценивания, эффективность (результативность) деятельности, политическая элитарность, демократия.*

Modern world experience in building democracies shows that one of the most important components of this process is the willingness of the political elite to establish democratic norms in social and political life.

Indeed, during the establishment of democratic institutions, the formation of democratic procedures, the development of social and political culture, democratization depends on the activity of the political elite which turns into the main channel of democratic changes. The key question is the quality of elite that challenges the survey of its criteria evaluation under democracy.

The purpose of writing this article is to analyze the existing criteria for evaluating modern elite in the conditions of democracy. This research is highly applicable for societies in transition because the process of democratization depends, to a great extent, on the quality of ruling elite and its desire to bring democratic norms into life.

We should start with the fact that the powers of each country can be objectively assessed with regard to whether they correspond to the strategic long-term national interests, whether its creative potential and competitiveness are mobilized and increased [1, c. 58] as was mentioned by the renowned Ukrainian researcher Alexander Dergachov.

Obviously, the main criterion for the effectiveness of any political elite activity is the level of its ability to meet the fundamental interests of society and the state. The main manifestations are, in general, the need for social and political stability, high standard of living, security and prestige of the state. However, these criteria are not sufficient to determine the success of modern, democratic political elite. The effectiveness of its activity is also characterized by the degree of scientific progress, the level of democracy, legal and social state, and civil society, the degree of media freedom, government transparency and optimality of openness level.

Different criteria of evaluating efficiency of modern political elite are distinguished in modern scientific literature, but eventually their essence is to work out in detail and interpret these basic indicators of social and national development. Thus, according to A. Kryukov, the efficiency of political governance should be understood as the ability of the system to implement the core mission of the society, to realize and protect the interests of all society citizens, to regulate social relationships, to create and embody optimal forms of organization and promotion of people, to protect national interests and ensure national security [2].

According to another Ukrainian scientist A. Kovalenko the efficiency of the government, and therefore the ruling political elite, first of all, depends on how well it manages to realize the fundamental objectives enshrined on the constitutional and legal level, as well as to meet the demands posed by the society to the state system and the political system as a whole, adequately. Although, of course, says the scientist, the effectiveness of the government is to be "measured" both by the nature of the relationship between the specific results obtained in the course of political and legal activities, and the amount of costs aimed at achieving the desired goal. In this sense, maintains Kovalenko, several state performance criteria may be offered.

They are focused on such factors as: the dynamics of labor productivity, the adequacy and accuracy of planning, the level of real national product per capita, the expansion and extension of democracy, the rights and freedoms of citizens, their implementation in practice, the most precise correspondence between management line and public interest, etc. [3, p. 86].

According to the Ukrainian researcher S. Chemekova, the most important criteria of social and political stability, as already noted above, has been one of the basic political elite performance indices. These are such factors as financial and legal position of citizens, their attitude to the ruling elite and the level of trust to it [4]. At the same time, American political scientists E. Duffy and J. Makkamant justify such criteria of social and political stability as: domination of social benefits over social mobilization, rapid economic development, equal distribution of income, primarily due to the ability of government to collect taxes, availability of political opportunities' reserves, dissemination of institutionalized political parties which ensure broad involvement of citizens in political life [5, p. 152-153].

In their turn, Ukrainian scientists V. Horbatenko and I. Horbatenko argue that the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the political elite activity in modern terms is determined by its positive contribution to the management of political events or the damage done to the society by incorrect decisions and actions. The researchers point out that the inefficiency of individuals can be both assessed by results and predicted, by analogy, by quantity-related calculations, brainpower of a certain politician, the quality of political forces which put him forward, and so on. [6, p. 100].

It should be noted that the effectiveness of the political elite, is to a large extent determined by the level of its elitism, and under democratic political systems the link between political elitism and its efficiency is stronger than under authoritarian forms of government. Thus, after the fall of democracy in Italy, Germany and Spain, S. de Madariaga said: "Contrary to external appearances, liberal democracies depend on leadership even to greater extent than other more authoritarian forms of government, because ... their natural tendency to weaken the springs of political power must be balanced by the higher level of politicians" [7]. V.O. Key in this regard stated that: "The crucial element which determines the unscathed state of democratic order, consists of beliefs, norms (standards) and the competence of those, who within this procedure is the media influence opinion leaders, political activists" [8].

This fact particularly actualizes the need for research and systematization of the political elitism criteria peculiar to modern democratic representatives of the political elite. These criteria are still scattered in the scientific literature. Although it should be noted that in the history of political thought, the attention of many thinkers was aimed at understanding the problems of the political elitism. They singled out a variety of options and systematized them differently, to some extent due to historical and national elite type which a particular researcher was oriented at.

There are plenty of criteria for evaluating the quality of the political elite, each of which covers a specific aspect of its elitism, and therefore, to some extent, defines the overall effectiveness of the elite. However, we can assume that the prerequisite of political elite is the elitism of politicians' personalities. The Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset in his book "Revolt of masses" formulated the signs of such elitism, the chief of which, in the opinion of the thinker, is the spiritual superiority of the elect,

or elite people, over the masses of the people, by which the scientist understands average people that equip life without effort, without trying to correct or perfect themselves, the type of which, in his view, can be found in all classes and strata of the population. The spiritual superiority of the elect the philosopher saw in their following the rules forming the basis of culture. The signs of the selectness, according to the thinker, also include more self-discipline, the ability to overcome the stereotypes of the majority of people, that is in other words independent thinking, the ability to oppose personal intellectual responsibility and moral discipline, and ingenuity by which he understands prominence above all, different from ordinariness of people-mass, to self-barbarianism [9].

However, we can highlight other important aspects of individual elitism. Thus, the Professor of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts K.Stetsenko indicates that “elitism is the desire to be and its implementation” [10], it must be noted that according to the teachings of the famous philosopher Erich Fromm, the direction of the vector “to be” , the opposite direction of “to have” [11]. In the sphere of political philosophy such an outlook takes the form of a focus on values rather than interests, which is a real sign of political elitism.

The detailed description of the criteria of the political elite elitism, and thus, its performance potential, can be started with any criterion of the quality of the political elite, but the most appropriate way is to start with the basic one for any activity, that is imagined by the possibility of achieving elite status in the realm of any profession namely, - the presence of the organic connection between people and profession, which manifests itself in the form of their ability and interest in it. This criterion attracted the attention of many thinkers, in the history of philosophical thought it was broadcast in different interpretations. For example, the prominent Ukrainian philosopher G.Skovoroda underlined to the need for affinity of labor [12], but according to J. Ortega y Gasset, if an influential politician is not in organic connection with the received position, he is a threat to society [9].

Other important criteria for evaluating elitism should include general cultural and intellectual level. Thus, the well-known French politician Charles de Gaulle stated that: “The true school, which gives the ability to command, it is common culture” [13, p. 306]. Obviously, high general cultural and intellectual level of a politician is an indisputable sign of his personality elitism, which is a necessary prereq-

uisite for the potential of a politician to the highest professional work samples.

An important feature of elitism for a politician is the presence of personal objectives and political will to implement them. A politician who does not possess his own goal, or for whatever reason realizes a borrowed one, which by its deep nature differs from his own, can never be elite. The Russian researcher A. Haman-Holutvina emphasizes that a necessary condition for the transformation of the political actor (official auth.) to the political subject (political figure auth.) is firstly, the existence of its own strategic (or at least tactical) project of its own (not foreign) interests and goals realization, and secondly, existence of the political will to implement this project [14, p. 94-95].

A necessary feature of elitism is also high level of morality due to which a politician in his activity comes primarily not from short-term considerations, but from significant social and public needs, and reasoning public categories, he confronts his actions to moral values and norms. In this context it should be noted that an important indicator of morality of a modern politician is his non-use of dirty political technologies between and during elections.

Let us pay attention to such a feature of elitism as national patriotism, where the nationality is understood not as ethnic kinship but rootedness in the national soil, national life and culture with their historically conditioned problems, existential and ethical imperatives [15, p. 75], and patriotism is interpreted as love to country, sense of responsibility for its destiny, willingness and ability to serve its interests faithfully and to contribute to its success in the domestic life and in the international arena, respecting other nations and peoples [16, p. 477].

The national elite, that is nationally conscious, independent, acts as major nation-leading power and social group that defines the strategy and direction of social development [17, p. 176-177]. It consolidates around national and indigenous social values and is able to unite the nation to solve major problems. Therefore, this elite must necessarily be national, global scale of thinking, be able to generate and implement national interests, placing them above personal, ethnic, cultural, class, corporate or regional goals and willing to take unpopular decisions.

In addition, as the Ukrainian scholar L. Kochubej states, the political elite should not only be able to form the basic values of the people, but also convert them to their values instruction. Therefore, according to the scientist's point of view, it must

meet the following requirements: be able to assess the current situation in the country as a whole and in terms of basic values and historical perspective, able to determine the long-term objectives of the country, be national, equip the life in the native country [18, p. . 30].

From the point of view of the director of the Ukrainian Institute of Global Strategies V. Kara-syev, the presence of national mission is one of the main criteria of elitism [19]. The sense of national mission is based on national patriotism and the political sense and political accumulation, i.e. the ability to understand the needs of society, the state, other countries, leading forces and players of domestic and foreign political arena, their environment, and the ability to accumulate and adequately express the interests of specific mass groups in the activity. In this context, it is appropriate to note that an essential feature of politician's political instinct is his ability and willingness to understand some other, different from his own way of thinking.

Possession of leadership skills, i.e. the ability of individuals to gain and maintain the confidence of people, to make effective social impact on their own environment, on the public, regardless of whether it has the authority, or other administrative instruments or not, also belongs to the important criteria for evaluating political elitism. A well-known Ukrainian scientist M. Mihalchenko argues that elite includes primarily leaders who can be a status and moral example for citizens to provoke respect to their work and to themselves [20, p. 24]. Thus, in his view, a politician becomes a political leader only when he understands the national state-idea clearly and can make people follow him to implement it [21, p. 24].

The author also fully agrees with the opinion of the Ukrainian researcher B. Vasyutinskii, who states that the presence of leadership abilities for a politician means that the government is for him not an end in itself, but a means of realizing ideas. (In-deed, as A. Adler claimed, a weak individual seeks to compensate for their weaknesses by achieving power over people, serving as a goal in itself [22, p. 245]).

"Instead, the researcher notes, for a person not self-confident, psychologically weak, incapable of adequate achievements, getting the dominant position, possession of power is very attractive." Due to it, she protects from the comprehension of her little value [23, p. 43-44].

Most modern scholars distinguish the following basic features of political leaders: possession

of their own political program understandable to everybody, that meets the interests of the majority of society, personal qualities (commitment, dedication, persistence), profound knowledge, allowing the leader to implement his program, popularity, ability to gain the mood of the masses, the ability to create effective political leadership [6, p. 102]. From our point of view, to such inalienable signs of a political leader should be added his charisma, which includes the confidence of people in some extraordinary abilities of this individual. The criteria of charisma are: credibility, and its highest form - arbiterness, influence on the outlook of people, speaking skills, psychological magnetism, ability to inspire large numbers of people and guide them along.

An important criterion for evaluating elitism is also tolerance, which is a formed principle of political orientation at the respect for fundamental freedoms and human rights vitally important for democratic system, respect for the otherness of the Other, solidarity in the highest goals and interests, conscious compromises [24, p. 328] and political correctness, which requires accuracy and precision of inter-subject communications in politics.

The culture of tolerance for a politician guarantees his tolerance, civilized behavior as for dissent, and therefore facilitates the effectiveness of performance. Also, tolerance is a prerequisite for political correctness, which according to the Ukrainian researcher B. Hanstatynov, provides the political discourse with such external forms of expression in which any necessary maintenance is identified as corresponding to what is appropriate to all components of the act of communication, and therefore provides the accurate meaning. It reduces the risk of misunderstanding significantly, the threat of not perceiving the "other" as an equal partner in dialogue, intolerance to him, and irreconcilability to his views. Mastering the rules of political correctness, says the scientist, acts as a prerequisite of professionalism in politics, and is one of the significant indicators of social responsibility of different subjects. After all, political correctness itself, says V. Hanstatynov, is an essential feature of the political culture, an indicator of readiness for dialogue and compromise, evidence of prudent political position [25, p. 35 – 36].

Speaking about such a criterion of elitism as competence, such well-known Ukrainian scholars as V. Zhuravskiy, O. Kucherenko and M. Mikhalchenko claim that: "First of all, the elite must be competent. If it is not such, and is not able to fulfill

the work efficiently, but imitates productive work, it is a sign of pseudo elite”, which, as these scholars noted :” ... may even seek to perform useful work, or at least simulate it. However, due to the incompetence, this work is done by trial and error, has random and completely untrustworthy character.

... with the incompetence ... undermines the natural state of things and destroys the national body, even if it is wrong is done unconsciously “[26, p. 156-157].

In general, the concept of competence in scientific literature is defined as the ability to carry out activities efficiently, to perform a task or work using the required set of knowledge, skills and attitudes that permit the individual to operate effectively and perform certain functions to achieve certain standards in the professional field, or activity. For a politician, competence looks like his full readiness to work in the sphere of politics. This quality is acquired within the period of continuous learning, self-education and self-improvement.

Let us draw attention to such criteria of elitism as innovation, which includes the ability to create constantly, disseminate and apply new ideas to solve problems, which were solved differently in the previous time; the ability to produce relevant, meaningful tumors arising from various initiatives and innovations that are promising for the evolution of society [27, p. 45-46] and for the state. Thus, the essence of this criterion is expressed in the ability to discover optimal solutions, including non-standard ones, and to implement them persistently, to produce constructive ideas, including their personal concepts.

On the basis of political competence, innovation and excellence in the field of interpersonal relations another criterion of political efficiency is based, and therefore of elitism - political professionalism, which primarily expresses itself in the ability of a politician: to respond to changing circumstances and needs of the citizens promptly and effectively for immediate solution of these problems, to identify the goal which you want the society and the state to seek, to make the right decision for its achievement and to monitor their implementation.

The author fully shares the opinion of the Ukrainian researcher M. Pyrene, that the professional responsibility is also an important criterion for evaluating modern political elite in the conditions of democracy. As the components of the concept of “responsibility”, says the researcher, serves a whole range of skills and personal qualities such

as honesty, fairness, integrity, willingness to be responsible for the consequences of the actions. The scientist notes that professional responsibility of political power elite - is not only its public reputation but also understanding the responsibility to the society, and the capacity to fulfill the promises that meet public expectations and are within the scope of power and jurisdiction of a particular type of elite [28, p. 31].

A specific criterion for evaluating political elite is avoidance of excessive transparency. This, at first sight, paradoxical elitism criterion improves the efficiency of operation substantially. The well-known Italian and American political scientist G. Sartori reveals the essence of the paradox in the following way: “Undoubtedly, democracy seems to require transparency to make government house a house of glass. Rational, unlike the moral foundation of this position is that high transparency enables better control ... But the medal has its reverse side. As we well know from personal experience, that same individual behaves very differently, going from opaque to highly transparent contexts, and it indicates that the transparency can both enhance and distort behavior. For example, transparency distorts when it throws on “selling the image” at the expense of “responsible behavior.” In addition, transparency can create if not then deepen conflicts, and to the extent that escape from transparency is the most common and most practical way to reduce stress “[29, p. 747].

The above mentioned criteria of elitism enable us to analyze the degree of perfection of the ruling elite at a rather high level, but it is at the same time impossible to assess the elitism level of the opposition elite, because the level of compliance with the given requirements can fully occur only through manipulating powers of government. However, there are some criteria for evaluation of opposition elitism , which allow somehow to compensate for partial or complete inability of its manifestation as a bearer of powers of government judging by the above mentioned evaluation criteria of the political elite. First of all, these are:

The authenticity of the opposition, which manifests itself in two dimensions as matching the name “opposition” with its content, the antithesis of genuine opposition in this respect is the Fronde, and as oppositional views, moral authority, and not just the basic desire to reverse roles with the government in power;

Constructibility of political position and criticism of the government. From the point of view

of the Ukrainian scholar N. Vinnychuk, the main features of such behavior is the opposition of moderation and pragmatism, not resorting to unrealistic claims and promises [30, p. 53]. Also, constructive opposition, as justly noted the famous Ukrainian scientist F. Rudych, should be an alternative, non-antagonistic to politics, strategies and tactics of the ruling power elite (except for extreme cases, auth.) [31, p. 6].

The responsibility of opposition that also shows itself in the maximum use of abilities to influence the political process, and the antithesis of this aspect is the shortage of persistence in realizing political positions. Hence, a significant sign of elitism of the opposition is the intensity and stability of its operation in the period between elections.

As a conclusion it should be noted that as the grounds of the basic system parameters of efficiency and elitism of modern democratic political elite are such criteria as:

1. The ability of the political elite to meet primary needs of the modern society and the state,

the main manifestations of which are the need for social and political stability, high standard of living, security and prestige of the state, as well as in scientific advancement, high level of democracy, legal and social state, civil society;

C. High spiritual and moral, intellectual and general cultural level of a politician, his possessing organic connection with his profession, which manifests as the ability and interest to it, national patriotism and the state, global scope of thinking, the sense of national mission, which is based on national patriotism and on the political sense and political accumulateness;

C. The presence of leadership abilities, which suggests that the government advocates for a politician not as an end in itself but a tool of realizing ideas, and hence the ability to gain and maintain the confidence of people, popularity, charisma and political professionalism, based on competency of the politician, his innovativeness and excellence in the sphere of interpersonal relationships.

References

1. Dergachov O. Ukrainskiy dosvid transformatsii vlady ta evropeyski standarty (Ukrainian experience in transforming government and European standards) in Suchasna ekrainska politika. Polityky i politylogy pro nei. (Modern Ukrainian politics. Politicians and political scientists about it). - Issue. - 17. - 2009. - PP. 53 - 62.
Kryukov A. Effektivnoe politicheskoe upravlenie i kachestvennaya elita fantastika ili realnost' (Effective political management and qualitative elite: fiction or reality?) in Zerkalo nedeli (Zerkalo nedeli). 2009. - 30 April.
Kovalenko A. Chym vymiryaty efektyvnist vlady? (How to measure the effectiveness of government?) in Veche (Veche). - 2001. - № 1 (106). - PP. 85-94
Chemakova S. Pravyashchaya elita Ukrainy: sushchnost, osobennosti I protivorechiya formirovani-ya i funktsionirovaniya (The ruling elite of Ukraine: essence, features and generating contradictions and functioning). Abstract. Thesis for the scientific degree of candidate in political sciences: speciality 23.00.02 "Political Institutions and Processes" / S. Chemakova. - Odessa, 2002.
Makarychev A. Stabilitnost i nestabilitnost pri demokratii: metodologicheskie podkhody i otsenki (Stability and instability under democracy: methodological approaches and comments) in Polis (Polis). - 1998. - № 1. - PP. 149 - 156.
Horbatenko W. Osnovni napryamy uspishnoi diyalnosti elity v umovakh perekhidnogo suspilno-derzhavnogo rozvytku (Main directions of the success of the elite in the transition of social and national development) (Elites and civilizational processes of formation of nations). - Volume 2. - K.: OOO UPVK "Ex Ob", 2006. - PP. 95 - 107
Madariaga S., de. Anarchie ou Hierarchie / S. Madariaga - Paris: Galliamrd, 1936. - 56 p.
Key V. The Responsible Electorate. - In: Public Opinion and American Democracy / V. Key - Cambridge, Mass., 1966, p. 558
Ortega i Gasset H. Vosstanie mass (Revolt of masses) Voprosy filosofii (Problems of Philosophy). 1989. - № 3. - PP. 120 - 145.
Stetsenko K. Formula elit (Formula of elite): <http://dialogs.org.ua/ru/dialog/page4-131.html>
E. Fromm. Imet ili byt (To have or to be). Moscow: Progress, 1990. - 336 p.
Gorski B. Istoriya ukrainskoi filosofii (History of Ukrainian philosophy). - Kyiv: Naukova Dum-ka, 1996. - 286 p.

13. N. Molchanov Generak de Goll (General de Gaulle). Moscow: International relations, 1972. - 496 p.
14. Haman-Holutvina O. Problema sub'ekta modernizatsii v Rosii: istoriko-kontseptualnie aspekty i sovremennoe sostoyanie (The problem of modernization subject in Russia: historical and conceptual aspects and modern state) Authorities and elite in the Russian transformation: Scientific articles collection. / Edited by. A. Duka. - St. Petersburg.: Intersocis, 2005. - PP. 94 - 109.
15. Bezv T. Kontsept politychnoi elity u dyskursi suchasnogo politychnogo protsesu. Zbirka "Elita I tsivilizatsiyni protsesy formuvannya natsiy" (The concept of the political elite in the discourse of contem-porary political process. Collection "Elite and civilizational processes of formation of nations") in Elites and civilizational processes of formation of nations. - Volume 2. - K.: Open UPVK "Ex Ob", 2006. - PP. 69 - 80.
16. Politologichniy entsiklopedichnyi slovnik (Political Encyclopedic Dictionary) . Ed. Shem-shuchenko Y, Babkin V., Horbatenko V. - 2nd ed., Ext. and revised. - K.: Genesis, 2004. - 736 p.
17. Tancher V. Elity Ukrainy: chy mozhlivy consensus? (Elites of Ukraine: is consensus possible?) in Elites and civilizational processes of formation of nations. - Volume 2. - K.: Open UPVK "Ex Ob", 2006. - PP. 175 - 183.
18. Kochubej L. "Politychna elita" i "politychnyi klas": klasychni ta suchasni pidkhody do vyznachen-nya ponyat ("Political elite" and "political class": classical and modern approaches to definitions) in Politi-cal Management. - 2008. - Special Issue. - PP. 24 - 31.
19. Karasev V. Elita v Ukraine est, no ona ne sushchestvuet (There is elite in Ukraine but it does not exist) <http://dialogs.org.ua/ru/dialog/page4-118.html>
20. Mikhalchenko M. Ukrainska elita yak spetsifichniy fenomen (Ukrainian elite as a specific phenomenon) in Elites and civilizational processes of formation of nations. - Volume 2. - K.: Open UPVK "Ex Ob", 2006. - PP. 17 - 30.
21. Mikhalchenko M. Ukrainska natsionalna ideya: pidkaz dlya politychnykh lideriv (Ukrainian na-tional idea: tricks for political leaders) in Political Management. - 2007. - Special Issue. - PP. 24 - 35.
22. Piren M. Politychna elita ta problemy politychnoi elitaryzatsii ukrainskogo suspilstva (Political elite and the problems of political elitism-development in Ukrainian society) in Bulletin of the Ukrainian Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine. - 2001 - № 1. - PP. 242 - 249.
23. Vasyutinskii V. Dominuvannya I pidporyadkuvannya na terezakh intersub'ektnoi vzaemodii (Dominance and submission in the balance of inter-subject interaction) in Social Psychology. - 2003. - № 1. - PP. 40 - 50.
24. Hanstantynov V. Politychniy vymir tolerantnosti: idei ta problem (Political Dimension of toler-ance: ideas and problems). Nikolaev: Published by: Petro Mohyla Black Sea University, 2011. - 336 p.
25. Hanstantynov V. Politykorektnist u politytsi (Political Correctness in politics) in Scientific Papers: Scientific-methodical journal. - T.65. - Issue. 52. Political Science. - Nikolaev: MSHU. Peter Graves, 2007. - PP. 34 - 37.
26. Zhuravskiy V. Politychna elita Ukrainy: teoriya i praktyka transformatsii (The political elite of Ukraine: Theory and Practice of Transformation). - Kyiv: Logos, 1999. - 283 p.
27. Polityka v osobakh. Politychne liderstvo na postsotsialistychnomu prostori (Politics in persons. The political leadership in the post-socialist space: national and regional contexts). Monograph / General editor Rudich F. - K.: Parliamentary Publishers, 2008. - 352 p.
28. Piren M. Problemy profesiynoy vidpovidalnosti polityko-vladnoi elity v Ukraini (Problems of Professional Responsibility of the ruling political elite in Ukraine) in Social Psychology. - 2007. - № 3. - PP. 29 - 35.
29. Sartori G. Teoriya ukhvalennya rishen za demokratii (The theory of decision-making in democ-racy) Democracy. Anthology / Compilation. A. Prochenko. - Kyiv. Torch. - 2005. - PP. 715 - 750.
30. Vinnychuk N. Typologiya politychnoi opozytzii (Typology of political opposition) in Political Management. - 2007. - № 3. - PP. 51 - 59.
31. Rudych F. Politychnyi rezhym v Ukraini: sprobna politologichnogo analizu (Political regime in Ukraine: an attempt of political analysis) in Political Management. - 2011. - № 2. - PP. 3 - 13.

