

UDC 351.851:005.332.3

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-383-393>

Semenets-Orlova Inna Andriivna,

Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration, Associate Professor of the Department of Political Science and Sociology, National Aviation University, 03058, Kyiv, Str. Komarova, 1, tel: (044) 406-71-53, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426

Семенець-Орлова Інна Андріївна,

доктор наук з державного управління, доцент кафедри соціології та політології, Національний авіаційний університет, 03058, м. Київ, вул. Комарова, 1, тел/факс: (044) 406-71-53, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426

Семенец-Орлова Інна Андріївна,

доктор наук по государственному управлению, доцент кафедры социологии и политологии, Национальный авиационный университет, 03058, г. Киев, ул. Комарова, 1, тел/факс: (044) 406-71-53, e-mail: innaorlova@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9227-7426



VALUABLE CONCEPT OF PEACE-BUILDING IN UKRAINE

Abstract. The conducted study concluded that the most integrative potential for the successful completion of democratic transit in Ukraine could be a model of patriotism built on the basis of a high level of civil competency of individuals and called the “citizenship patriotism” model.

Citizenship patriotism requires a critical amount of patriots trained to constructive interaction in a complex society and oriented towards securing public interest. As the results of the survey showed, the level of citizenship competencies of children and youth is not high enough in Ukraine at the moment. However, if the same tendency is maintained for the actualization of the issue of civil education in public discourse, in few years the model of citizenship patriotism can become an effective model of patriotism for the majority of Ukrainians, which will be effective in the unstable context of socio-political development and play a key factor in the successful completion of democratic transit in Ukraine.

The article compares the content of the definitions of “nationalism” and “patriotism”, comparing the characteristics of sentimental and constructive types of

patriotism. It is emphasized that citizenship, like patriotism, involves care for public interest. The main component of citizenship is the active participation of the individual in the life of society for the public good.

At the heart of the civic culture is the focus on civil responsibility. It is proved that civil patriotism is an ideal model for a complex society, which is reflected in the commitment of the person to the interest of the country (public and public interest), an active position on its protection and fulfillment of civil obligations, along with a substantiated (and affective, and rational) positive assessment general national realities of flexible format. The concept of citizenship from the point of view of strategy approach is analyzed. The further development of the study of “pedagogy of peace” was obtained. The special educational potential of the culture of civic citizenship in the Ukrainian society is emphasized.

Keywords: citizenship, peace-building, value concept, archetype approach, sustainable development.

ЦІНІСНИЙ КОНЦЕПТ МИРОБУДІВНИЦТВА В УКРАЇНІ

Анотація. Проаналізовано інтегративний потенціал моделі громадянського патріотизму для успішного завершення демократичного транзиту в сучасній Україні.

Зазначено, що громадянський патріотизм вимагає критичної кількості патріотів, які мають освітню підготовку до конструктивної взаємодії у складному суспільстві та орієнтовані на забезпечення суспільних інтересів. Наголошено, що рівень громадянської компетентності дітей та молоді на сьогодні в Україні недостатньо високий. Проте, якщо тенденція актуалізації питання громадянської освіти в публічному дискурсі зберігається, то за кілька років модель громадянського патріотизму може стати ефективною для більшості українців. Ця модель виявлятиме особливу дієвість у нестабільному контексті.

У роботі порівняно зміст дефініцій “націоналізм” та “патріотизм”, зіставлено характеристики сентиментального та конструктивного видів патріотизму. Наголошено, що громадянськість, як і патріотизм, передбачає турботу про суспільний інтерес. Основною складовою громадянства є активна участь особистості в житті суспільства для суспільного блага.

Основою культури громадянськості є орієнтація на громадянську відповідальність. Доведено, що громадянський патріотизм — ідеальна модель для складного суспільства, відображається в прихильності особи до інтересу країни (суспільного, публічного інтересу), активній позиції щодо його захисту та виконання громадянських обов’язків поряд з обґрунтованою (і афективною, і раціональною) позитивною оцінкою загальнокраїнових реалій гнучкого формату. Проаналізовано поняття громадянськості з точки зору підходу стратегемності. Дістало подальшого розвитку дослідження “педагогіки миру”. Приділено увагу особливому інструментальному потенціалу освіти для розвитку культури громадянськості в українському суспільстві.

Ключові слова: громадянськість, миробудівництво, ціннісний концепт, архетипний підхід, сталий розвиток.

ЦЕННОСТНЫЙ КОНЦЕПТ МИРОСТРОИТЕЛЬСТВА В УКРАИНЕ

Аннотация. Проанализирован интегративный потенциал модели гражданского патриотизма для успешного завершения демократического транзита в современной Украине.

Отмечено, что гражданский патриотизм требует критического количества патриотов, которые имеют образовательную подготовку к конструктивному взаимодействию в сложном обществе и ориентированы на обеспечение общественных интересов. Указано, что уровень гражданской компетентности детей и молодежи в настоящее время в Украине недостаточно высок. Однако, если тенденция актуализации вопроса гражданского образования в публичном дискурсе будет сохраняться, через несколько лет модель гражданского патриотизма может стать эффективной для большинства украинцев. Эта модель проявит особую эффективность в нестабильном контексте.

В работе проведено сравнение содержания дефиниций “национализм” и “патриотизм”, сопоставлены характеристики сентиментального и конструктивного видов патриотизма. Отмечено, что гражданственность, как и патриотизм, предполагает заботу об общественном интересе. Основной составляющей гражданства является активное участие личности в жизни общества для общественного блага.

Основой культуры гражданственности является ориентация на гражданскую ответственность. Доказано, что гражданский патриотизм — идеальная модель для сложного общества, отражается в приверженности личности к интересу страны (общественного, публичного интереса), активной позиции по его защите и выполнения гражданских обязанностей наряду с обоснованной (и аффективной, и рациональной) положительной оценкой реалий страны. Проанализированы понятия гражданственности с точки зрения подхода стратегемности. Получило дальнейшее развитие исследование “педагогика мира”. Отмечено особый инструментальный потенциал образования для развития культуры гражданственности в украинском обществе.

Ключевые слова: гражданственность, миростроительство, ценностный концепт, архетипический подход, устойчивое развитие.

Problem settings. In modern Ukraine, the question of peace-building remains open for discussion during 5 years. Recently, the appeal of scientists to this problem has also become more frequent. A well-known Ukrainian theoretician S. Klepko analyzes an

educational paradigm called “pedagogy of peace”, based on the concepts of globally expanded responsibility, empathy, and trust [1, p. 21]. The task of the pedagogy of peace — to create peace of mind in the education subjects in whole without taking into account numerous

factors. However, the scientist emphasizes that the war does not start from the effectiveness of education, rather, they are initiated by educated rulers, so for the purposes of education important philosophical knowledge of the nature of modern wars [1, p. 21]. M. Barber's speech "Short reflections on education and the causes of wars" is valuable in this debate. The British scientist determines the significant potential of education to eliminate the causes of wars and calls for lifelong learning [2].

Reflecting on the role of cultural factors in the process of educational change, scientists often analyze a case of "soft power" (for example, as an approach to modern successful modernization of China). The theory of "soft power" was first developed by American political scientist J. Nye who emphasized the importance of a way to achieve success on the world stage, in addition to economic and military might, cultural and political values of the country [3]. Many Chinese scholars based on this theory substantiate the approach of building China's political power on the basis of growing attention to culture (this is reflected in the enhancement of cultural exchanges, promotion of the attractiveness of the Chinese model of development, peaceful foreign policy and the belief in their responsibility). On this basis, the theorists characterize the so-called strategic thinking of the Chinese, consisting in extraordinary methods of achieving the goal by peaceful means, based on gradual, pragmatic, flexible, objective, spiritual freedom, humanity, and integrity. The prerequisites for such a phenomenon were the philosophical schools of Ancient China: Taoism, Legislation,

Confucianism. Therefore, strategy is to promote national interests through a special approach to the translation of cultural values, support for social harmony, understanding based on the sociocultural features of each country, as well as verification of the effectiveness of ideas and concepts in practice. We have repeatedly referred to the approach of practical significance of certain ideas in our publications, substantiating the practical social and political participation of children and young people as an integral part of the process of forming their civic beliefs and attitudes [4].

The analysis of recent publications on the issues. The problem of world-building and the role of education in this process became the subject of works by foreigners (G. Almond, M. Barber, S. Verba, M. Heidegger, L. Richardson, S. Huntington, etc.), and ukrainian scientists (S. Klepko, G. Rodyk, L. Skorokhod, and others). An archetypal paradigm is represented in the Ukrainian scientific thought by the works of scientists of the Ukrainian school of archetype – E. Afonin, O. Sushiy, O. Bandurka, A. Martynov and others. In this paper, the problem of world-building will be considered in the aspect of analyzing the instrumental potential of citizenship education and citizenship education.

The purpose of the article is to study the value concept of world-building in Ukraine on the basis of analysis of the educational potential of society.

Presentation of the main research material. Political transit determines two main prerequisites for a successful transition to democracy: the presence of an appropriate level of national unity,

political will for a democratic transition and a real struggle for democracy [5, p. 667]. The rethinking of various ways of solving the problem of ensuring national unity after the civil protest actions in Ukraine entitled “Revolution of Dignity” was reflected in many scientific publications and public discourses. At the stage of the surge in civil activity from the first half of 2014 and so far, scholars have increasingly begun to call patriotism a factor that can ensure sustainable civil participation, as well as effective work of the state apparatus in the context of the problems of political development (annexation of the Crimea, the beginning of military aggression on the East of Ukraine). This was reflected even in the fact that in the first version of the draft Law of Ukraine “On Civil Service” among the list of principles of civil service “patriotism” was put in the first place. After about two years of public discussion, in the final version of the Law of Ukraine “On Civil Service”, adopted by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on December 10, 2015, patriotism (defined as “devotion and faithful service to the Ukrainian people”) was placed on the fourth position in the above-mentioned list (article 4, paragraph 1, subparagraph 4). In the previous Law “On Civil Service” dated December 16, 1993 [6], the notion of “patriotism” was not mentioned at all. Of course, in a situation of cases of treason by certain public officials of Ukraine’s national interests in the Crimea and in some territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, the relevance of patriotism sounded in a new way.

In order to solve internal problems, Ukrainian society, having its own intel-

lectual reserves, has long been forced to import someone else’s experience. It was a situation of manifestation of the archetype of “distortive experience” [7] and in some way influenced the fact that the political culture of Ukrainians is controversial, eclectic, marked by the lack of a clear orientation of political development and the priorities of domestic politics, the growth of social pessimism and the presence of a syndrome of wonder, weakening political will of a person. However, during the last 4 years, cordocentrism that is mentally peculiar to Ukrainians has become more or less transformed [8] — Ukrainian society is beginning to lessen trust in promises of politicians, loses its illusion, begins to think more and more rationally.

The Stanford Philosophical Encyclopaedia gives the standard definition of “patriotism” as follows: it is love for one’s country [9]. Other scholars point out that patriotism must be understood as a commitment and a sense of belonging to one’s country [10]. Its meaning is usually related to its role in supporting national cohesion on behalf of the state to the extent that the state encourages members of society to respect their civil responsibilities. The consideration of this question varies greatly from one context to another, so theorists suggest talking about “patriotism” in plural, stating the diversity of its manifestations [10].

Patriotism can be defined as a system of views (cultural, consciousness attitudes) that reflect the inflexible attachment of a person to a particular country, characterized by an indisputable positive assessment of that country, persistent loyalty and intolerance

to critics. In Western political philosophy, there is a debate about the type of patriotism that can provide an effective alternative to nationalism, as a meta idea for a stable statehood [9]. The theorist S. Nathanson defines patriotism as the identification of a person as a member of his/her country, manifested in a special love for it, a sense of pride in achievement of his/her country and shame for its loss, anxiety about the well-being of its people, willingness to sacrifice for the happiness of its future [11, p. 34–35]. Hence, the rationale for patriotism as an affective phenomenon, the content of which is strong symbolic (sentimental) interpretations, is valuable.

The theorist H. Kelman suggested two basic types of patriotism – sentimental and instrumental [12, p. 174]. Sentimental patriotism implies “perceiving the group for personal identity”, instrumental – “perceptions of the group to meet one’s personal needs and interests”. Hence, individuals who perceive the country to form their personal identity will be hostile to criticism of the country. Individual carriers of instrumental patriotism are likely to criticize the country if it does not manage to reach the expected level of national welfare. Consequently, sentimental patriotism is characterised by an unquestionable positive assessment, country’s loyalty and intolerance to its critics. Instrumental (or constructive) patriotism is characterised by critical loyalty to the country, due to the desire for positive change. Both orientations demonstrate positive identification based on a sense of affective commitment to the country. However, the sentimental (sometimes called – “blind”)

patriot considers the nation's critique dissent, which is contrary to the long-term national interests [12, p. 183].

Famous researchers G. Almond and S. Verba in the work “Civil Culture: Political Relations and Democracy in 5 Nations” [13] highlighted the following signs of civil culture: a sense of pride in their nation, an expectation of a fair attitude to the society on the part of the authorities, a tolerant attitude to the opposition parties, active participation of the community in local self-government, confidence in one’s ability to participate in politics, civil cooperation and trust, citizens’ membership in autonomous associations.

G. Orwell contrasted “patriotism” and “nationalism” from the following point of view. In his view, the apologists of nationalist ideas immerse their individuality in the collective aspirations of their people, seek to get as much power and prestige as possible for their country. Patriots, unlike nationalists, consider their people to be better, but they do not want to impose their own way of life on others [14, p. 362]. Therefore, from the point of view of G. Orwell, patriotism is more full of ideas of tolerance and pluralism, and hence of democracy. Agreeing with G. Orwell, the theorist M. Billing argues: when love and special care about one’s country becomes “unbridled” and causes to think about a bad attitude towards others, then such traits characterize nationalism [15, p. 55–59].

Methodologically valuable is the vision of the discrepancy between the notions of “nationalism” and “patriotism” by the theorist L. Acton: patriotism, unlike nationalism, is the awareness, first of all, of our moral responsibilities

to the socio-political community [16, p. 163]. We will rely on this definition in our work further. In this position, a meaningful assessment of morality as a universal regulator of the world of the future is important, which, in particular, the author of the theory of “The Black Swan” N. Taleb substantiated [17].

According to recent studies, the near future will be characterized by the proliferation of collective identities, as well as emotionally volitional meanings of social communities [18]. After all, with the further development of democracy, analysis and development of policy require more and more complicity among citizens, and the attitude of patriotism, which can act as a motive for such complicity, is most widespread in the form of its symbolic (sentimental) type (the sentimental type is approximately 40 % more common in modern democratic societies, than the constructive type of patriotism [19]).

S. Nathanson reflected on the type of patriotism that is more closely associated with morality, therefore, can be defined as the optimal model, based on the discussion above. The scientist suggested to call it “moderate patriotism” [20]. The meaning of “moderate patriotism” is illustrated by the attempts to combine the attitudes of the achievement of good for one’s compatriots and the idea of caring for all humanity. S. Nathanson rejects the cosmopolitan approach of A. MacIntyre [21] and emphasizes the importance of moral thinking in defining the main meaningful components of patriotism [22].

Patriotism is defined as love for one’s country, identification with it, special care for its well-being, and also about compatriots, which can also be

characterized with concern for “public interest” [23, p. 81]. Public interest is a generalized variant of individual and group interests legitimized in public opinion. French theorists emphasize a different meaning of patriotism as a recognition of responsibilities to each other as citizens, requiring collaboration, cooperation, tolerance and disinterestedness [10]. In this approach, in general, one can identify the meaning of the concepts of “patriotism” and “citizenship”. However, we do not agree with its authors, although we recognize some meaningful synonymy of the concept of “citizenship” and “moderate patriotism”. In our opinion, in the system of categories adjacent to the issue, the citizenship is more meaningful to the notion of “state patriotism” as an active and responsible patriotism. The logic is: “I love my people, a strong statehood creates opportunities for its unity and being, so I will help the state in the realization of its functions, caring for public interest”.

By the notion of “citizenship”, Ukrainian researchers point to a certain moral and spiritual state of the people, which implies a feeling of one’s own freedom and, at the same time, responsibility, and a belief in social values [24, p. 42]. According to another scientist I. Ilyin, to be a real citizen is to “feel an indissoluble identity between the interest of the state and one’s own interest. And that is why, as one’s own interest, each spiritually correct interest of their fellow citizens is to be recognized” [25, p. 271]. Citizenship reflects the desire and will to live together. Consequently, citizenship, like patriotism, contain meaningful concerns about the interest of fellow citizens.

A well-known philosopher J. Habermas, in his work "Between Facts and Norms", argues that the normative meaning of democratic citizenship can be determined without the formation of an individual in the context of a "national state" [26]. This approach is somewhat inconsistent with our desire to combine "patriotism" and "citizenship" for their interconnection, but also takes place in scientific discourse. A theorist H. Starkey has a similar position, he claims that the concept of "citizenship" in its meaning always has a political and legal dimension. Although citizenship is in some way linked to a national concept, it is an autonomous and independent theory. In this context, H. Starkey observes that in the new concepts, citizenship exists also at supranational levels [27, p. 7]. Unlike H. Starkey, the Irish researcher M. Craith argues that although the basis of modern citizenship is the focus on civil responsibility, it is the cultural forces (the value attitude of the individual to the state, the country and its citizens) that implicitly fasten components of modern citizenship [28]. Our position correlates with the Irish researcher's point of view.

Citizenship patriotism is an ideal model for a complex society, which is reflected in the commitment of the individual to the interest of the country (public interest).

Conclusions. Citizenship patriotism is endowed with the potential to promote sustainable development of society, national unity and the development of local and nationwide democracy in Ukraine. Citizenship patriotism is a necessary prerequisite for a sustainable democratic transit. Its relevance is

greatly enhanced in the context of the decentralization of power in Ukraine.

Proceeding from the historical traditions of the Ukrainian people, and taking into account sensitivity as an indispensable characteristic of his mentality, we consider citizenship as a valuable basis for peace-building in modern Ukraine. In the Ukrainian context, citizenship is a peculiar strategy, endowed with enormous potential for the objective reflection of the socio-cultural features of Ukrainian society. The role of education in the process of formation and development of the culture of citizenship, and, on the basis of civil patriotism, is enormous. And although education as an instrument of social change is characterized by significant time consuming, in addition, the purposeful educational process characterizes stable results, long-term and value significance for both a particular person and for the whole society. Consequently, world-building in modern Ukraine depends to a large extent on the effectiveness of methods and technologies of domestic education, including civic education as its component.

REFERENCES

1. *Klepko S.* (2016). *Pedagogika my'ru i filosofiya vijny': poshuk isty'ny'* [Pedagogy of Peace and the Philosophy of War: Finding Truth], *Postmetody'ka*, 2(125), 21–23 [in Ukrainian].
2. *Бабюк М.* *Kratky'e razmishleny'e ob obrazovany'y' y' pry'chy'nax vojn* [A brief reflection on education and the causes of wars]. Retrieved from <http://www.msses.ru/> [in Russian].
3. *Nye, J.* (2004). *The Means to Success in World Politics*. N.-Y.: Public Affairs [in English].

4. *Semenets-Orlova I.* (2019). Suspil'ne zamovlennya na gromadyans'ku osvitu [Public order for citizenship education]. Retrieved from <http://education-ua.org/ua/articles/1327-suspilne-zamovlennya-na-gromadyansku-osvitu-abo-yak-virostiti-anglijskij-gazon-v-ukrajini> [in Ukrainian].
5. Tranzы'tu polity'chnogo (polity'chnogo perexodu) teoriya [Political Transition Theory]. V. Gorbatenko (Eds), Political Encyclopedic Dictionary (p. 666–667), Kyiv: Osnova [in Ukrainian].
6. Zakon Ukrainy Pro derzhavnu sluzhbu [On civil service]. (n.d.). zakon.rada.gov.ua. Retrieved from <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/889-19> [in Ukrainian].
7. *Donchenko O. & Romanenko Yu.* (2001). Arxety'py' social'nogo zhy'ttya i polity'ka [Archetypes of social life and politics]. Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].
8. *Brick T.* (2018). Krovotecha: diagnoz bez analizu [Bleeding: Diagnosis Without An Analysis]. Retrieved from <https://voxukraine.org/uk/krovotecha-diagnoz-bez-analizu-retsenziya-sotsiologa-na-rezonansnu-stattyu-dzherkala-tizhny/> [in Ukrainian].
9. *Primoratz I.* (2017). Patriotism. N. Zalta (Eds.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/patriotism/> [in English].
10. *Françoise D.* (2013). Les diversités du patriotisme contemporain, Critique internationale, 1 (58), 9–17, doi:10.3917/crii.058.0009 [in French].
11. *Nathanson S.* (1993). Patriotism, Morality, and Peace, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield [in English].
12. *Kelman H.* (1997). Nationalism, patriotism, and national identity: Social-psychological dimensions. D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), Patriotism In the Life of Individuals and Nations (p. 165–189). Chicago: Nelson-Hall [in English].
13. *Almond G. & Verba S.* (1989). The civic culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, Sage Publications, Inc. [in English].
14. *Orwell G.* (1968). Notes on Nationalism. S. Orwell & I. Angus (Eds.) Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters. (p. 361–80). London: Secker & Warburg [in English].
15. *Billig M.* (1995). Banal Nationalism, London: Sage Publications [in English].
16. *Acton L.* (1972). Nationality, Essays on Freedom and Power, Gloucestershire: Gloucester [in English].
17. *Taleb N.* (2018). Anty'kry'xkist' [Antimalice], Kyiv: Nash format [in Ukrainian].
18. *Semenets-Orlova I. & Kyselova Y.* (2018). Multidimensional management contemporary: generation of social meanings for a new collective identities, Public management, 4 (14), 264–269, doi:10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.118 [in English].
19. *Schatz R., Staub E. & Lavine H.* (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. Political Psychology, 20(1), 151–174 [in English].
20. *Nathanson S.* (1989). In Defense of 'Moderate Patriotism, Ethics, 99, 535–52 [in English].
21. *MacIntyre A.* (1984). Is Patriotism a Virtue? (The Lindley Lecture). Lawrence: University of Kansas [in English].
22. *Nathanson S.* (2009). Patriotism and the Value of Citizenship, Acta Analytica, 24, 63–67 [in English].
23. *Semenets-Orlova I.* (2016). Osvita dlya demokraty'chnogo gromadyanstva / osvita z prav lyudy'ny' yak zasib formuvannya kul'tury' gromadyans'kosti [Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education as a means of forming of the culture of citi-

- zenship]. N. Protasova, (Eds.), Civic competences in vocational education of civil servants and local government officials (p. 66–87). Kyiv: Osнова [in Ukrainian].
24. *Ryabov S., Zhadan I.* (2004). Polity'chna kultura ta problemy' gromadyans'koyi osvity' v Ukraini [Political culture and problems of civic education in Ukraine], Kyiv: Tandem [in Ukrainian].
 25. *Ilyin I.* (1994). Sochy'neny'ya [Compositions], Moscow: Medium [in Russian].
 26. *Habermas J.* (1996). Between Facts And Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press [in English].
 27. *Starkey H.* (2002). Democratic citizenship, languages, diversity and human rights. Guide for the development of Language Education Policies in Europe. From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education. Language Policy Division Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education, Strasbourg: Council of Europe [in English].
 28. *Craith Nic M.* (2004). Culture and citizenship in Europe. Questions for anthropologist, 3, 289–300. Retrieved from <http://europe.praguesummer-schools.org/files/europe/6euc.pdf> [in English].
 3. *Nye J.* The Means to Success in World Politics / J. Nye. — N.-Y. : Public Affairs, 2004.
 4. *Семенець-Орлова І.* Суспільне замовлення на громадянську освіту [Електронний ресурс] / І. Семенець-Орлова. — Режим доступу : <http://education-ua.org/ua/articles/1327-suspilne-zamovlennya-na-gromadyansku-osvitu-abo-yak-virostiti-anglijskij-gazon-v-ukrajini>
 5. Транзиту політичного (політичного переходу) теорія // Політичний енциклопедичний словник [Текст] / упорядник В. Горбатенко; за ред. Ю. Шемшученка, В. Бабкіна, В. Горбатенка. — 2-ге вид., доп. і перероб. — К.: Генеза, 2004. — С. 666–667.
 6. Про державну службу. Закон України від 10.12.2015 [Електронний ресурс] / Офіційний веб-портал Верховна Рада України. — Режим доступу : <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/889-19>
 7. *Донченко О.* Архетипи соціального життя і політика (Глибинні регулятиви психополітичного повсякдення): монографія / О. Донченко, Ю. Романенко. — К.: Либідь, 2001. — 334 с.
 8. *Брік Т.* Кровотеча: діагноз без аналізу [Електронний ресурс] / Т. Брік // Рецензія соціолога на резонансну статтю у “Дзеркало тижня”. — Режим доступу : <https://voxukraine.org/uk/krovotecha-diagnoz-bez-analizu-retsenziya-sotsiologa-na-rezonansnu-stattyu-dzerkala-tizhnya/>
 9. *Primoratz I.* “Patriotism” / The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/patriotism/>
 10. *Françoise D.* Les diversités du patriotisme contemporain / D. Françoise // Critique international. — 2013. — Vol. 58. — P. 9–17.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Клепко С.* Педагогіка миру і філософія війни: пошук істини / С. Клепко // Постметодика. — 2016. — № 2 (125). — С. 21–23.
2. *Барбер М.* Краткие размышления об образовании и причинах войн [Электронный ресурс] / М. Барбер // 2.04.2009. — Режим доступа: <http://www.msses.ru>

11. *Nathanson S.* Patriotism, Morality, and Peace / S. Nathanson. — Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1993.
12. *Kelman H.* Nationalism, patriotism, and national identity: Social-psychological dimensions / H. Kelman // In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), Patriotism In the Life of Individuals and Nations. — Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1997. — P. 165–189.
13. *Almond G.* The civic culture : Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations / G. Almond, S. Verba. — Sage Publications, Inc, 1989. — 392 pgs.
14. *Orwell G.* Notes on Nationalism / G. Orwell // Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters, Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.). — London: Secker & Warburg, 1968. — Vol. 3. — P. 361–80.
15. *Billig M.* Banal Nationalism / M. Billig. — London : Sage Publications.
16. *Acton L.* “Nationality”. Essays on Freedom and Power. — Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1972. — P. 141–70.
17. *Талеб Н.* Антикрихкість. Про (не) вразливе у реальному житті / Н. Талеб. — К. : Наш формат, 2018. — 408 с.
18. *Semenets-Orlova I.* Multidimensional management contemporary: generation of social meanings for a new collective identities / I. Semenets-Orlova, Y. Kyselova // Public management. — June 2018 (Special edition). — № 4 (14). — P. 264–269, <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.118>
19. *Schatz R.* On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism / R. Schatz, E. Staub & H. Lavine // Political Psychology. — 1999. — Vol. 20 (1). — P. 151–174.
20. *Nathanson S.* In Defense of “Moderate Patriotism” / S. Nathanson // Ethics. — 2002. — Vol. 99. — P. 535–52.
21. *MacIntyre A.* Is Patriotism a Virtue? (TheLindleyLecture) / A. MacIntyre. — Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2002.
22. *Nathanson S.* Patriotism and the Value of Citizenship / S. Nathanson // Acta Analytica. — 2009. — Vol. 24. — P. 63–67.
23. *Семенець-Орлова І.* Освіта для демократичного громадянства / освіта з прав людини як засіб формування культури громадянськості [Електронний ресурс] / І. Семенець-Орлова // Громадянські компетентності у професійній освіті державних службовців та посадових осіб місцевого самоврядування // Зб. метод. матеріалів для системи підготовки, перепідготовки та підвищення кваліфікації держ. службовців і посадових осіб місцевого самоврядування. — К., 2016. — С. 66–87. — Режим доступу : https://docu.in.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Gromadanski-kompetentnosti_.pdf
24. *Жадан І.* Політична культура та проблеми громадянської освіти в Україні: метод. посіб. / І. Жадан, С. Кисельов, О. Кисельова, С. Рябов. — К.: Тандем, 2004.
25. *Ильин И. А.* Сочинения : в 2 т. / И. А. Ильин. — М. : Медиум, 1994. — Т. 2. : Религиозная филос. — 576 с.
26. *Habermas J.* Between Facts And Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy / J. Habermas. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.
27. *Starkey H.* Democratic citizenship, languages, diversity and human rights [Text] / Guide for the development of Language Education Policies in Europe. From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education // Language Policy Division Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education. — Strasbourg : Council of Europe, 2002. — 33 p.
28. *Craith Nic M.* Culture and citizenship in Europe. Questions for anthropologists [Internet resource] / M. Nic Craith // Social Anthropology. — 2004. — № 3. — P. 289–300. — Mode to access : <http://europe.praguesummerschools.org/files/europe/6euic.pdf>