

UDC: 32.2:328.16](4)

Lyaschenko Oksana Alekseevna,
*post-graduate student of the Department of
Parliamentarism and Political Management,
National Academy of Public Administration
under the President of Ukraine, 03057, Kyiv,
Str. Eugene Potier, 20, tel.: (067) 254 00 02,
e-mail: Ksena_l@inbox.ru*

ORCID: 0000-0003-0319-1394

Лященко Оксана Олексіївна,
*аспірант кафедри парламентаризму та
політичного менеджменту, Національна
академія державного управління при Пре-
зидентові України, 03057, м. Київ, вул. Еже-
на Пот'є, 20, тел.: (067) 254 00 02, e-mail:
Ksena_l@inbox.ru*

ORCID: 0000-0003-0319-1394

Лященко Оксана Алексеевна,
*аспирант кафедры парламентаризма и
политического менеджмента, Националь-
ная академия государственного управ-
ления при Президенте Украины, 03057,
г. Киев, ул. Эжена Потье, 20, тел.: (067) 254 00 02, e-mail: Ksena_l@inbox.ru*

ORCID: 0000-0003-0319-1394



EXPERIENCE OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ON INTERACTION OF CIVIL SOCIETY AND AUTHORITIES IN THE CONDITIONS OF POLITICAL CRISIS

Abstract. This article analyzes the experience of European countries for interaction between civil society and government in a political crisis. It analyzes and summarizes the features of the interaction in modern conditions between civil society and government in Europe. The attention is focused on the potential national “round” tables as tools for overcoming the political crisis, the results of which were recorded in the relevant regulations. Overview of basic principles and factors on which the interaction between civil society and government are built and focus on the role of civil society as a partner in government.

Keywords: public administration, international experience, interaction between civil society and government, the political crisis, the national “round” table.

ДОСВІД ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИХ КРАЇН ЩОДО ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ГРОМАДЯНСЬКОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА І ВЛАДИ В УМОВАХ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ КРИЗИ

Анотація. Проаналізовано досвід європейських країн щодо взаємодії громадянського суспільства і влади в умовах політичної кризи. Проаналізовано та узагальнено особливості процесу взаємодії в сучасних умовах між громадянським суспільством і владою в європейських країнах. Акцентовано увагу на можливостях національних “круглих” столів як одного з інструментів виходу з політичної кризи, результати яких було зафіксовано у відповідних нормативно-правових актах. Узагальнено основні принципи і фактори, на яких будується взаємодія громадянського суспільства і влади та звернено увагу щодо ролі громадянського суспільства як партнера влади.

Ключові слова: державне управління, зарубіжний досвід, взаємодія громадянського суспільства і влади, політична криза, національний “круглий” стіл.

ОПЫТ ЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ СТРАН ПО ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЮ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА И ВЛАСТИ В УСЛОВИЯХ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО КРИЗИСА

Аннотация. Проанализирован опыт европейских стран по взаимодействию гражданского общества и власти в условиях политического кризиса. Проанализированы и обобщены особенности процесса взаимодействия в современных условиях между гражданским обществом и властью в европейских странах. Акцентируется внимание на возможностях национальных “круглых” столов как одного из инструментов выхода из политического кризиса, результаты которых были зафиксированы в соответствующих нормативно-правовых актах. Обобщены основные принципы и факторы, на которых строится взаимодействие гражданского общества и власти и обращено внимание на роль гражданского общества как партнера власти.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, зарубежный опыт, взаимодействие гражданского общества и власти, политический кризис, национальный “круглый” стол.

Target setting. The defining feature of modern Europe is represented by integration processes that ensure the development of Western Europe, became a model for other countries. The formation of the European Union (hereinafter – EU) was a complex, multistage process in which participating coun-

tries had to solve severe economic, social, political and legal problems, to find adequate answers to the challenges of time. And this process continues, faces new challenges – the global economic crisis, the exit of the UK and the EU, “the crisis of migrants”, war in Ukraine and the attitude of the political forces

in the EU, all developments create a new history of old Europe.

Today, Ukrainian state also is facing challenges that require new approaches and understanding of what is happening. The political crisis is one of those challenges that reduces the effectiveness of the public administration and rise uncontrollability of the processes in society, which in turn affects the country's economic life, social protection of citizens and national security.

Ukraine has chosen the European way of confirming the signing of the Association Agreement with the European Union. The course of European integration, adaptation of national legislation to European standards, positioning Ukraine as a European country at the international level requires a clear understanding of the process of interaction between civil society and government in the EU, especially in a political crisis and the need for further study of these processes. Solving these problems allows Ukraine to use the positive experience of the EU and to avoid the mistakes that were made in European countries.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In Ukraine, the analysis of problems of interaction between civil society and government was held by T. Belska, S. Dorogyh, A. Kolodiy, A. Paliyuk, O. Sosnin, A. Myhnenko, V. Yablonsky, A. Onishchenko and others. Study of theoretical and practical aspects of the political crisis is covered in the works of Yu. Matsiyevskiy, I. Zabelina, A. Kolodiy and others.

Cooperation between civil society and the state in the European context was discussed in the writings of such scholars as J. Buchanan, Z. Katz, I. Ko-

karev, P. Conroy, G. Lovenberh, E. Pain, S. Peregudov, Yu. Rubinskyi, S. Schoenberg and others.

The purpose of the article is analyzing and summarizing the experience of European countries regarding the interaction between civil society and government in a political crisis.

The statement of basic materials. Late twentieth and beginning of XXI century were marked by a number of qualitative changes in the political life of many European countries. The main factors of these changes were as following: 1) the collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist model of social development, which for a considerable period after the Second World War, significantly influenced the socio-political processes not only in Europe but throughout the world; 2) qualitative changes in social and economic structures of developed countries, which led to significant changes in the social and political spheres; 3) integration processes in Europe and the European Union as an independent institution constantly expands and deepens the level of its own competence and self-sufficiency. [1]

European countries differ in terms of economic development, stability of political systems, national characteristics. And despite the unification into a single political and economic space, all EU countries seeking to escape political and economic crises are at certain stages of stabilization and destabilization of public administration. According to Jean Monnet, this situation is the best way to "ever closer union". He insists that "Europe will be created in crisis, it will be the sum of the decisions taken to address these crises" [2].

Almost every EU country has its own experience of building process of interaction between civil society and government and how to overcome the political crisis. However, you can isolate the common principles of building a democratic society, which formed the basis for the unification of European space based on European values. The founders of a united Europe were guided by the belief that only democracy, based on freedom, guaranteeing end of day conflicts and wars in the Old World. Integration primarily promoted market liberalization and further open borders. The foundation of the United Europe rests on the four freedoms (free movement of people, goods, capital and services) [3].

The main criteria of life of European countries is the development of democracy, civil society, social and legal state. European vector of Ukraine determines the need for movement towards the European model of civilization, securing European criteria. Progress in all areas of society and the state is possible only in case of the operation and development of an active civil society.

According to the social contract, European countries give a part of their authority structures of civil society, and to replace these structures they involve citizens in solving social, political and economic issues. [4].

Civil society is an integral part of public, social, political, spiritual and cultural life of the EU. The importance of development and the principles governing cooperation with EU institutions and Member States associations were recognized and defined in 50s years of the 20th century. Thus, the Council of Europe in 1951 recognized

the importance of CO and citizens' right to assembly and association is guaranteed with a number of conventions. An important step in recognizing the role of civil society was the adoption by the Council of Europe of the "Guidelines for the development and strengthening of CO in Europe" in 1998 and "Fundamental Principles of the status of CO in Europe" 2002. [5].

In particular, the Treaty of Rome dates 1957 the European Economic and Social Committee (hereinafter – EESC) was created in order to involve economic and social interest groups in the process of formation of the common market. EESC members represent various segments of civil society of EU countries – employers, trade unions and representatives of public organizations dealing with environmental protection, consumer rights, small and medium enterprises and others. In practice, it is the participation and, indeed, the EESC initiative, that builds the bilateral EU platform of civil society and third parties. EESC enables representatives of economic, social, social-professional, civic organizations to be an integral part of policy and decision-making at EU level [6].

Civil society in the EU operates in a complex multi-level management system of supranational representative bodies. It can be defined as one that has two ways: vertical, which has a national and European level and horizontal, which includes network and stakeholders [5].

For example, the Belgian state has framework agreements with institutions of civil society (non-state organizations) and these agreements set goals and ways off implementation of their

initiatives. Belgium recognizes those non-state organizations that provide all the necessary guarantees that subsidies provided by the state will be used properly and effectively. The interaction of state bodies of the Republic of Austria with civil society and public involvement in the formulation and implementation of public policy is governed by a number of federal and land laws. In the UK, the scope of civil society is governed primarily by regulations. Like other western democracies, the political system of Denmark is a representative democracy in which joint decisions are made by Parliament, which is usually every four years elected by popular vote. According to the Constitution of Denmark (revised in 1953), that elections are a reliable mechanism to ensure accountability of parliament and the government to the citizens of Denmark. In Spain since 2005 there are plans to create and implement the project "Open Government", which should facilitate interaction between state and civil society institutions at all levels [7].

Functionally European system of cooperation between government and civil society is quite flexible and consists of the following ways of interacting as specific advice on the various social and political issues, regular and special meetings (on the development of biotechnology, environment, etc.) and public online consultations with the publication of the relevant public materials in Internet, allowing civil society and its representatives involved in the process of public decision-making to agree on issues that appear in European review [5].

However, despite these progressive, democratic approach to the process of

interaction between civil society and government, today the EU is experiencing perhaps the most serious political crisis. It consists of the following factors, according to some researchers [2].

The first — an internal policy in the member states, which is formed on the background of popularity national governments and their voters in EU. More specifically, it is the elections that this and next year will take place in several key EU countries and ratings of populist parties: those calling for withdrawal from the community, solving supranational issues through referendums against the regime of economy by closing borders etc.

The second factor is the migration, or "migration" crisis that affects the configuration of political forces in the national governments and encourages civil society in these countries to organize in order to protect their interests against the public policy and the possibility of coming to power of ultra-right forces (for instance, Germany, France Poland and others) [2].

These factors stimulate the search for new ways of interaction between civil society and government to end the political crisis. Each EU country has its own tradition of interaction between civil society and government in a political crisis and its own vision out of such crises.

So-called national "round tables" became the tools to overcome the political crisis in the EU.

National "round table" as a tool for solving the acute political crisis appeared in world political practice in the last quarter of the twentieth century. The idea of the national "round table" as

a means of politics is to solve the political crisis through dialogue, through the search for solutions, in a way acceptable to all parties to the conflict [8].

The first textbook successful example of national “round table” were the negotiations between the government and all parliamentary political forces in Spain in 1977, which ended with the signing of several agreements, called “Moncloa Pact” (Los Pastos de la Moncloa in Spanish). These agreements provided for a number of measures to reform various spheres of social life [8].

So you can see how the process of self-development of society, civil society also play a kind of stabilizing role. The civic are structures designed to define rules that can overcome the destructive potency of various fighting forces and channel the interaction of civil society and government into a positive, creative direction [9].

The following examples of successful national “round tables” were provided by the era of “velvet revolutions” in Central and Eastern Europe in 1989 (Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany). In these countries, “round tables” played the role of an effective instrument of democratic reform of the political system and pluralistic government, although the role and importance of these measures for the political development of countries was different [8].

We agree with [10], that the common features of the mentioned above national “round tables” are as follows:

- in all of these countries national “round tables” took place in the transition period from authoritarianism to democracy; it is obvious that the specific problems of democratic transition

led to the emergence of a new form of political settlement of conflicts;

- these national “round tables” had a broad agenda (the strategic priorities of country’s fundamental political and economic reforms, etc.);

- the results of national “round tables” were implemented to specific regulations embodied in a future life.

These national “round” tables at one time became a peaceful alternative to address complex policy issues and their decisions became law for European countries.

Conclusions. Thus, analyzing the European experience regarding the interaction between civil society and government in the political crisis, we can conclude that social activity is essential for a democratic society, namely the initiative and voluntary participation of people in policy making at different levels. Recognizing the role of civil society partnership in cooperation with the authorities, European countries systematically involve citizens and their associations in developing and implementing of public policies in all areas. With this approach to resolve the political crisis in the EU we can highlight the basic principles of interaction between civil society and government, such as transparency, participation and accountability, which is the basis of modern “Good government”.

Summarizing the experience of European countries regarding the interaction between civil society and government in a political crisis we can highlight key factors such interaction, namely social activity, partnership, openness and responsibility of all participants in the interaction, political independence. A civil society is a fun-

damental value of the European Union and is seen as one of the key principles of democracy.

However, given the dynamic changes in the political life of both the European Union and Ukraine, there is a need for further studies of the interaction between civil society and government in a political crisis.

REFERENCES

1. *Romaniuk A.* (2007). Porivnialnyi analiz politychnykh instytutiv krain Zakhidnoi Yevropy: Monohrafiia. [Comparative analysis of the political institutions of Western Europe: Monograph]. Publishing center of Ivan Franko LNU, p. 391 [in Ukrainian].
2. *Peet J.* (2017). The future of the European Union. Special report of The Economist. Retrieved from: <http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21719188-it-marks-its-60th-birthday-european-union-poor-shape-it-needs-more> [in Ukrainian].
3. *Buras P.* (2017). Try novi paradyhmy intehratsii YeS. Yak nynishni vyklyky zminiuiut zasady Yevrosoiuzu i transatlantychnoi spilnoty. [Three new paradigm of EU integration. How to change the current challenges EU principles and the transatlantic community]. Inform. Edition Ukrainian week. № 16 (492). Retrieved from: <http://tyzhden.ua/World/190506> [in Ukrainian].
4. *Daudova G. V.* (2014). Vzaiemodiia hromadianskoho suspilstva i vlady: yevropeyskyi dosvid. [Engagement of civil society and government: European experience]. — [E-Reader version]. — Retrieved from: <http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2014-1/doc/4/01.pdf>. [in Ukrainian].
5. *Tkachenko I.* (2015). Hromadianske suspilstvo i Yevropeyskyi Soiuz: funktsionuvannia y spivpratsia. [Civil society and the European Union, functioning and cooperation] // Journal Parliament “Veche”. — № 2. Retrieved from: <http://www.viche.info/journal/4544> [in Ukrainian].
6. *Matiazh S. V.* (2014). Yevropeyskyi dosvid rozvytku ta funktsionuvannia instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva [European experience in the development and functioning of civil society]. — Retrieved from: <http://mk-eu.at.ua/material/naukpratsi/matjaz.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
7. *Dosvid vzaiemodii derzhavnykh orhaniv krain svitu z instytutamy hromadskoho suspilstva, zaluchennia hromadskosti do formuvannia ta realizatsii derzhavnoi polityky, protydii koruptsii, zabezpechennia elektronnoho uraduvannia* [Experience of interaction of state bodies of the world with institutions of civil society, public involvement in the formulation and implementation of public policy, combating corruption, providing e-government]. (2013). Retrieved from: http://ogp.gov.ua/sites/default/files/library/Dosvid_OGP-MFA.pdf [in Ukrainian].
8. *Dosvid provedennia natsionalnykh “kruhlykh stoliv” v Ukraini ta sviti. Pidsumky pryiniattia universalu natsionalnoi yednosti* [The experience of national “roundtables” in Ukraine and abroad. Results of the adoption of national unity]. (2009). NISS. Retrieved from: <http://old.niss.gov.ua/monitor/Marrch/09.htm> [in Ukrainian].
9. *Nepop L.* (2014). Polityka Yevropeiskoho Soiuzu shchodo rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva [EU policy for the development of civil society]. Scientific № 2(70). Retrieved from: http://www.ipiend.gov.ua/uploads/nz/nz_70/nepop_polityka.pdf [in Ukrainian].

10. *Haletskyi A. V.* (2012). Zarubizhnyi dosvid spriannya rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva. [Foreign experience to promote the development of civil society]. Public administration, improvement and development. – № 11. Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Duur_2012_11_12 [in Ukrainian].