

**UDC: 316.012**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-417-427>

**Sudakov Volodymyr Ivanovich,**

*Professor academic rank, Doctor of Sociological Science, Head of the Theory and History of Sociology dpt., Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 01601, Kyiv, Volodymyrska Str., 64/13, tel.: +38 067 5028648, e-mail: vl\_sudakov@ukr.net*

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

**Судаков Володимир Іванович,**

*доктор соціологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедрую теорії та історії соціології факультету соціології Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Україна, 01601, м. Київ, вул. Володимирська, 64/1, тел.: +38 067 5028648, e-mail: vl\_sudakov@ukr.net*

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

**Судаков Владимир Иванович,**

*доктор социологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедры теории и истории социологии факультета социологии Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченка. Украина, 01601, г. Киев, ул. Владимирская, 64/13, тел.: +38 067 5028648, e-mail: vl\_sudakov@ukr.net*

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093



---

## **ARCHETYPE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND IDEOLOGICAL CONFRONTATION OF THE CONTEMPORARY MODELS OF SOCIAL POLICY**

**Abstract.** The analysis of the essential characteristics of the social justices archetype as the integrative transcultural basis of peaceful human coexistence and as the specific foundation of the conflict type that determinate reproduction of the different forms of ideological confrontations among of the protective, liberal and intersocietal (global) technological models of social policy in the contemporary class-stratified societies is presented in the article. Argued that the modern processes of economic, political and cultural globalization are the important factors which determinate the need to elaborate the new theory of social justices that should be the valid cognitive instruments for explanation the contradictions of the global social stratifications and of the global social inequalities among agrarian, industrial and postindustrial societies and also it should be the conceptual

base for modernization of existing models of social policy. The author supports the scholars who try to use the new ideas of “distributive justice” in order to develop the specific social themes on justice under the contradictory context of the contemporary globalized intercultural relations and communications. Substantiated that the urgent research task is concretization cognitive content of the concept “social policy”. Proved that it is important to understand that under conditions of globalization the content of this concept includes the specific elements, which reflect the specific dimensions of the global, supranational and national character. It is concluded that the identification of the conceptual basis of the protective, liberal and intersocietal technological models of social policy one can regard as the scientific proven fact that these models have common intension to justification of the archetypal status of social justices. Emphasized that, as the instruments of social management, these models have strong populist orientation and manipulative influence and this circumstance is a factor that restricts their practical efficiency as the means for democratization the mechanisms of social control.

**Keywords:** social justice, archetype of social justice, social policy, technological models of social policy, ideological contradictions among the models of social policy.

## АРХЕТИП СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ СПРАВЕДЛИВОСТІ ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЧНА КОНФРОНТАЦІЯ СУЧАСНИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

**Анотація.** Проаналізовано сутнісні характеристики архетипу соціальної справедливості як інтегративного транскультурного базису мирного співіснування людей та як специфічної конфліктогенної основи, яка зумовлює відтворення різних форм ідеологічної конфронтації між протекціоністською, ліберальною та інтерсоціетальною (глобальною) технологічними моделями соціальної політики в сучасних класово-стратифікованих суспільствах. Аргументовано, що процеси економічної, політичної та культурної глобалізації є важливими чинниками, які зумовлюють потреби наукової розробки нової теорії соціальної справедливості як пізнавального інструменту пояснення суперечностей глобальної стратифікації та глобальних соціальних нерівностей між аграрними, індустріальними та постіндустріальними суспільствами, а також як категоріальної основи модернізації існуючих технологій соціальної політики. Автором підтримується позиція вчених, які намагаються використати нові ідеї “дистрибутивної справедливості” з метою розвитку спеціалізованих соціальних тем стосовно справедливості в суперечливому контексті сучасних глобалізованих міжкультурних взаємодій та комунікацій. У статті звернуто увагу на значущість конкретизації поняття “соціальна політика”, зміст якого визначається специфічними вимірами глобального, наднаціонального та національного характеру. Здійснено ідентифікацію категоріальної основи протекціоністської, ліберальної та інтерсоціетальної технологічних моделей соціальної політики та доведено, що цим моделям притаманна спільна інтенція обґрунтування архетипного статусу соціальної

справедливості. Водночас констатовано, що ці моделі, як інструменти соціального менеджменту, мають виразну популістську орієнтацію, що обмежує їх практичну значущість при вирішенні завдань демократизації соціального контролю.

**Ключові слова:** соціальна справедливість, архетип соціальної справедливості, соціальна політика, технологічні моделі соціальної політики, ідеологічні суперечності моделей соціальної політики, глобалізація.

## **АРХЕТИП СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ СПРАВЕДЛИВОСТИ И ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ КОНФРОНТАЦИЯ СОВРЕМЕННЫХ МОДЕЛЕЙ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ**

**Аннотация.** Осуществлен анализ сущностных характеристик архетипа социальной справедливости как интегративного транскультурного базиса мирного сосуществования людей, а также как специфической конфликтной основы, которая обуславливает воспроизводство различных форм идеологической кофронтации между протекционистской, либеральной и интерсоциетальной (глобальной) технологических моделей социальной политики в современных классово-стратифицированных обществах. Аргументировано, что процессы экономической, политической и культурной глобализации являются важными факторами, которые обуславливают потребности в научной разработке новой теории социальной справедливости как познавательного инструмента объяснения противоречий глобальной стратификации и глобальных социальных неравенств между аграрными, индустриальными и постиндустриальными обществами, а также как категориальной основы модернизации существующих технологий социальной политики. Автором поддерживается позиция ученых, которые пытаются использовать новые идеи “дистрибутивной справедливости” с целью развития специализированных социальных тем относительно справедливости в противоречивом контексте современных глобализированных межкультурных взаимодействий и коммуникаций. В статье обращено внимание на значимость конкретизации понятия “социальная политика”, содержание которого включает специфические измерения глобального, наднационального и национального характера. Осуществлена идентификация категориальной основы протекционистской, либеральной и интерсоциетальной технологических моделей социальной политики и доказано, что этим моделям присуща общая интенция обоснования архетипного статуса социальной справедливости. В то же время констатировано, что эти модели, как инструменты социального менеджмента, имеют четкую популистскую ориентацию, которая ограничивает их практическую значимость при решении задач демократизации социального контроля.

**Ключевые слова:** социальная справедливость, архетип социальной справедливости, социальная политика, технологические модели социальной политики, идеологические противоречия моделей социальной политики, глобализация.

**Target setting.** At first glance, the conceptual problem that reflects interconnection between the principles of social justice and social policy is rather simple due to the self-evident of its content. Taking into account the pragmatic aspect of this problem, it is easy to assume that theoretical interpretations of the principle of social justice not just as an abstract social ideal of achieving democratic social order and social consensus, but as a regulative principle of social relations, underline the archetypal status of social justice. Therefore, in most cases, scholars and policy-makers define social justice as the fundamental stimulus for the self-realization by personal and collective social actors and also define this archetype as the value transcultural basis of human life.

As a significant constitutive element of the “practical meaning” of the peaceful human coexistence, social justice is the specific ideological archetypal foundation, which encourages people to realize their human potential in the society where they live. That is why people constantly actively fight for the establishment of social justice, making various claims to specialized power institutions, which propose, constitute and provide different models of social policy. But today contradictions of the global social stratifications and of the global social inequalities among agrarian, industrial and postindustrial societies determine different forms of ideological confrontations of the existing contemporary models of social policy. Such ideological confrontations reflect some theoretical and practical difficulties of effective solving the basic problems of the human coexistence and sustainable development: education;

health protection; social insurance, social security, guarantees of labor rights, regulation of market relations, distribution of social wealth and benefits, gender equality etc.

**Analysis of the recent publications on the issue.** First of all it should be noted that the general content of the contemporary researches of the social justice problematics reflects the situation of necessity to create the new fundamental theory of justice. The liberal, socialist and conservative theories of justice now present the system of conceptual argumentation and statements about social justice as a desired state of social equality in the aspects of enhancing democratization and humanization of public life. In spite of that in fundamental researches by J. Rawls [1], F. Hayek [2], M. Walzer [3], R. Nozick [4] have been proposed and substantiated the new ideas of “distributive justice”, many scholars try to develop the specific social themes on justice under the contradictory context of the contemporary globalized intercultural relations and communications [5–8]. K. Sorrels in her book “Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice” [7] presents innovative analytical study of the contemporary transcultural nature of social justice. M. Sandel also underlines the need to investigate in modern liberal societies the communicative foundations of social justice taking into account the priority human rights and liberties over common goods [9, p. 185–218].

In fundamental research by D. North, J. Wallis and B. Waingast “Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history” [10] the social jus-

tice archetype is presented as the global problem of two different patterns of social order – the “closed social order” and “open social order”. According to the authors’ point of view, the social contradictions between these patterns are the basic sources of violence, which one must overcome by introducing effective social policy.

It is well-known that social policy is an important institutional mechanism of social integration and social solidarity [15]. As technological instrument of social management and public administration, social policy has the specific goal-orientation, which people usually understand as practical establishing the progressive forms of social inclusion by the common adopted norms of social justice. But it is reasonable to agree with the scientists who believe that in the contemporary class-stratified societies different technological models of social policy functionally support the conflict processes of social exclusion and social inequalities [11–14]. This circumstance is important for scholars who try to study the ideological contradictions among the protective, liberal and intersocietal technological models of social policy [15–19].

**The purpose of the article.** The main purpose of this article is the analysis of essential characteristics of the social justice archetype as the integrative basis of peaceful human coexistence and as the specific conflict foundation that determines the different forms of ideological confrontations among the protective, liberal and intersocietal technological models of social policy in the contemporary class-stratified societies.

**The statement of basic materials.** First of all it is important to emphasize

that the most influenced basic statements concerning scientific understanding the archetypal status of social justice have weak conceptual argumentation. But in spite of this circumstance these statements one should regard as an important cognitive intentions of the scientific and theoretical consciousness by many scholars, who try to overcome the simplicity of traditional scientific discourse, about social justice as a desired state of social solidarity in the aspects of enhancing equality of citizens, democratization and humanization of public life. It is obvious that overcoming the obsolete stereotypical ideas about social justice is a difficult task, because now one can easily notice the lack of a generally recognized fundamental theory of justice.

Today the scientific elaboration and development of the new theory of justice is an innovative research task. The scientific search in this direction, of course, is connected with the formulation of the basic conceptual coordinates of the theoretical work. “What is the theory of justice?” “What is the conceptual core of this theory?” In the fundamental research “A theory of justice” John Rawls proves that this theory is the specialized cognitive instrument for explanation the specific principles of regulating the activities of institutions as the “basic structures” of society. He writes: “Justice is the first virtue of social institutions as truth is of system of thought. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well arranged must be reformed if they are unjust” [1, p. 3].

I believe that such abstract understanding of the cognitive status of a theory of justice is disputable. For example, F. Hayek argues, that today existing theory of justice does not have objective epistemological standards. Therefore it rather is a “mirage of social justice”, because the meaning of the abstract managerial institutional rules of justice really ignores the system of “private interests which are unknown” [2, p. 11]. G. Esping-Andersen also proves a position according to which the need for a theory of justice simply does not exist – one can easily organize scientific study without it, focusing research interest on the empirical investigation of the specific, historically changing “motivations”, “interests” and “elements” of social justice [14, p. 75–78].

The reasons for these nihilistic positions, from my point of view I can explain by the empirical fact that the implemented programs of social policy in different countries are recognized by scientists as ineffective because in these programs usually undermine both the paternalistic and liberal foundations of social justice. As a result of this situation are, indicated by R. Dahrendorf [11, p. 141–165] and U. Beck [12] the “new social conflicts” and the new “world of risk”, because “we are becoming of a global community of threats” [12, p. 4]. Obviously, that the economic, political and cultural trends of globalization determinate the main factors which cause the need to elaborate innovative theory of social policy beyond of the state-territorial localities of the contemporary social life.

That is why for scholars today is the important task to propose the constructive solution of the problem of expand-

ing the conceptual boundaries of the modern theory of social policy as the specialized cognitive tool of scientific understanding of the relationship between the principles of social justice and social responsibility. Therefore I agree with J. Rawls who proves that social policy must be “fair, honest and responsible”, because without this value conditions the social policy will not become the basis of the consensus integration in the aspects of ensuring the equal freedoms of citizens and maintaining a certain level of social inequalities and power relations among them “only as a result of compensation for the benefits for everyone” [1, p. 14–15].

As I believe from this formulation of the problem the two difficult disputable questions arise: 1) *can social policy always be socially responsible*; 2) *to what extent does it serve as a justification for social justice?*

From my point of view it will be reasonable to underline the importance of the three circumstances. Firstly, the global economic competition between countries may encourage them to reduce the total amount of budget funds allocated to social protection in order to increase the competitiveness of national economies. Secondly, the migration of the economically active population objectively creates precedents for the spontaneous redistribution of income between states, which limits the economic opportunities for separate countries to implement an effective social security policy for the citizens. Thirdly, the global labor and capital markets lead to the emergence of supranational power structures, whose activities may threaten the social rights of citizens at the national level.



These circumstances, as I consider, also try to research B. Deacon and P. Stubbs who argue that today the concept of “social policy” has at least three conceptual dimensions: 1) global 2) supranational, and 3) national (regional) [16].

Unfortunately, the authors do not fully clarify the cognitive sense of the terms “global”, “supranational” and “national” which they used for identification of the different types of social policy paying attention upon the problem” how a particular policy fields become globalized” [16, p. 6]. At the same time, it is possible to agree with such approach if we take into account that the main subjects (actors) of any types of social policy are the global, supranational and national power institutions and organizations. Certainly, these institutions and organizations in some ways want to establish and to develop different communications among them. But when we try to research and to evaluate the resource base of social policy that realize the global, supranational, and national power institutions one can easily identify the situations of the clash and ideological confrontations of the three contemporary technological models of social policy.

It is important to stress that each of this model has the specific cognitive and ideological foundations. So paying attention upon this statement I believe that it will be useful to characterize these models.

1. *Protective model of social policy.* It should be noted that many modern theorists believe that the conceptual field of the scientific theory of social policy should be distanced from the social drama of market realities of the in-

dividual and collective life. Therefore the various fields of theoretical work are related to the concepts of “*equality*”, “*social justice*”, “*limited resources*”, “*non-market distribution of benefits*”, “*institutional systems of social services*”, “*social security*”, “*welfare state*”. So, the general technological orientation of the protective model of social policy should be the expression of the non-market segment of people’s lives as citizens of certain states. This specific segment of social life, as M. Walzer believes, is functionally autonomous and reproduces itself outside the fluctuations of the free markets of commodities, labor and capital. He advises to identify and to research the different “spheres of justice” as the main object-field of social policy because “justice is a human construction and its doubtful that it can be made in only one way” [3, p. 6].

2. *The liberal (active) model of social policy.* In its possible humanistic form, this technological model today is most clearly represented in the theory of human development. The basic axiom of this theory is that “development” must create and empower people in such way that they can choose their own way of life and by own affords to create the base of self-protection because “instead of goods, a person has been put [2; 4, p. 6]”. In such a conceptual perspective, the basic categories of the liberal model of social policy are: 1) “*productivity*” – the ability of people to constantly increase their incomes, economic growth and to work for a monetary reward; 2) “*equality*” – the absence of restrictions related to gender, race, nationality, class affiliation, origin, place of residence, level of well-being, etc., imped-

ing the acquisition of opportunities for full participation in economic and political life; 3) “*sustainability*” – an expression of the principle of “universalism of human rights”, according to which access to resources and a fair distribution of benefits should be provided not only to present but also to future generations; 4) *empowerment* – creating stimulus for the full participation of people in the decision-making process and all other processes that improve their well-being; 5) “*private and public expenditures*” – the resource base for implementation the necessary programs of the individualized social policy.

3. *Intersocietal (global) model of social policy*. In its basic conceptual coordinates this technological model is focused on taking into account the influence of the specific social challenges which caused by economic, political and cultural globalization. Therefore I agree with B. Deacon and P. Stubbs who argue that this model is based on “multylateralism complex” that reflects “terrain of emergent global governance, multiplicity of actors and process come together rather in unpredictable ways” [16, p. 8]. I also would like to support the general research positions which formulates P. Kennet [17] who emphasizes that the scientific basis for the new global “integrated theory of social policy” should be based on the comparative cross-national analysis. Such type of analysis will allow us to make the new understanding of the contemporary value principles of the neoliberal ideology of “social well-being”, “distributive justice”, and “welfare state”. The conceptual structure of the intersocietal technological model of social policy that based on cross-national analysis, as

P. Kennet believes, should consist of 5 fundamental categories: 1) “*inequality*” – the process that reflects different social consequences of social stratification; 2) “*polarization*” – the specific process of fixing the extreme characteristics of existing inequalities; 3) “*poverty*” – an institutionally defined minimum norms of the level of consumption, below which it is impossible to maintain livelihoods; 4) “*social exclusion*” – the process of socially limited autonomy of various social subjects: i.e., the process of systematically restriction of resource limiting opportunities for individuals and groups to improve their well-being; 5) “*perverse integration*” – a complex of social consequences of the development of the globalized criminal economy of information capitalism, which increase the illegal distribution of incomes between the members of the rich and poor groups, who, the opportunities and chances of globalization, use in various ways [17, p. 8–9].

Taking into account the peculiarities of conceptual foundations of the three technological models of social policy, I can conclude that each of these models have the specific ideological orientation which consist of different intentions to be well-grounded justification of the archetype of social justice. But, in the contemporary class-stratified societies these models, as V. Lapina proves, really protect the strategy of the elite over-consumption [6, p. 164–165]. Therefore, existing technological models of social policy have strong populist orientation and manipulative influence as instruments of social management. And that is why “there is a failure that social policy can be the instrument of social control” [15, p. 4].



## Conclusions.

1. The analytical approach, which is presented in the article, demonstrates the necessity of the new scientific researches of the essential characteristics of the social justice archetype as the integrative transcultural basis of peaceful human coexistence and as the specific foundation of the conflict type that determinate reproduction of the different forms of ideological confrontations among the protective, liberal and intersocietal technological models of social policy in the contemporary class-stratified societies.

2. Contemporary processes of economic, political and cultural globalization are the important factors, which determinate the need to elaborate the new theory of social justice that should be the cognitive instrument for explanation the contradictions of the global social stratifications and of the global social inequalities among agrarian, industrial and postindustrial societies and also the conceptual base for modernization of existing models of social policy.

3. The urgent research task is concretization cognitive content of the concept "social policy". It is important to understand that under conditions of globalization the content of this concept includes the specific elements, which reflect the specific dimensions of the global, supranational and national character.

4. Proposed by the author the identification of the categorical basis of the protective, liberal and intersocietal technological models of social policy one can regard as scientific proven fact that these models have common intention to justification of the archetypal

status of social justice. But, as the instruments of social management, these models have strong populist orientation and manipulative influence and this circumstance is the factor that restricts their practical efficiency as the means for democratization the mechanisms of social control.

## REFERENCES

---

1. *Rawls J.* A Theory of Justice / John Rawls. — New York; Oxford univ. press, 1973. — 607 p.
2. *Hayek F. A.* Law, Legislation and Liberty. — Vol. II: The Mirage of Social Justice / Friedrich August. A. Hayek. — Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago press, 1976. — 210 p.
3. *Walzer M.* Spheres of Justice. A Defense of Pluralism and Equality / Michael Walzer. — New York: Basic books, 1983. — 345 p.
4. *Nozick R.* Anarchy, State and Utopia / Robert Nozick. — Padstone, Corwill: Blacwell Publ., 2003. — 367 p.
5. Theorizing of intercultural communication / W. Gudykunst (ed). — Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ., 2005. — 480 p.
6. *Afonin E. A., Martynov A. Y.* Archetypes of the sociocultural conflicts: from modern to postmodern / A. E. Afonin, A. Y. Martynov // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 17–32.
7. *Sorrels K.* Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice / Katryn Sorrels. — Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ., 2013. — 290 p.
8. *Lapina V. V.* Over-consumption archetype globalization as a new source of social conflicts and social tension / V. Lapina // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 158–166.
9. *Sandel M. J.* Liberals and Limitations of Social Justice. — 2-nd ed. / Michael Sandel. — Cambridge: Cambridge univ. press, 1998. — 234 p.

10. *North D. C., Wallisd J. J., Waingast B. B.* Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. C. North, J. J. Wallisd, B. B. Waingast. — New York: Cambridge univ. press, 2013. — 320 p.
11. *Dahrendorf R.* The Modern Social Conflict. The Politics of Liberty // Ralf Dahrendorf. — Berkley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California press, 1990. — 219 p,
12. *Beck U.* World at Risk / Ulrich Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226 p.
13. *Habermas J.* The Divided West / Jurgen Habermas. — Cambridge ; Polity press, 2006. — 224 p.
14. *Esping-Andersen G.* Two societies, one sociology and no theory / Gosta Esping-Andersen // The British Journal of Sociology. — Vol. 51, issue 1. — January/March 2000. — P. 58–78.
15. *Social Policy: Theories, Concepts and Issues / ed. by M. Lavette and A. Prat* — 3<sup>ed</sup>. — London.: Sage, 2006. — 325 p.
16. *Deakon B.* Stubbs P. Global social policy studies /Bob Deakon, Paul Stubbs. // Global social policy. — 2013. — № 1 (13). — P. 5–23.
17. *Kennett P.* Comparative Social Policy: Theory and Research / Patricia Kennett. — Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open univ. press, 2001. — 189 p.
18. *Archer M.* The sociological approach to the tension between equality and social inequality / Margaret Archer. // The Study of the Tension between Human Equality and Social Inequalities. From the Perspectives of the Various Social Sciences. — Vatican city: Academy of Political Sciences, 1996. — Acta 1. — P. 81–99.
19. *Atkinson A. B.* Social exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment / Anthony Atkinson. // Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity / A. B. Atkinson and J. Hills eds. — London: School of Economic and Political Science, 1998. — P. 1–20.

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

---

1. *Rawls J.* A Theory of Justice / John Rawls. — New York; Oxford univ. press, 1973. — 607 p.
2. *Hayek F. A.* Law, Legislation and Liberty. — Vol. II: The Mirage of Social Justice / Friedrich August. A. Hayek. — Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago press, 1976. — 210 p.
3. *Walzer M.* Spheres of Justice. A Defense of Pluralism and Equality / Michael Walzer. — New York: Basic books, 1983. — 345 p.
4. *Nozick R.* Anarchy, State and Utopia / Robert Nozick. — Padstone, Corwill: Blacwell Publ., 2003. — 367 p.
5. *Theorizing of intercultural communication / W. Gudykunst (ed).* — Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ., 2005. — 480 p.
6. *Afonin E. A., Martynov A. Y.* Archetypes of the sociocultural conflicts: from modern to postmodern / A. E. Afonin, A. Y. Martynov // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 17–32.
7. *Sorrels K.* Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice / Katryn Sorrels. — Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ., 2013. — 290 p.
8. *Lapina V. V.* Over-conumption archetype globalization as a new source of social conflicts and social tension / V. Lapina // Public management. — 2017. — № 3 (8). — P. 158–166.
9. *Sandel M. J.* Liberals and Limitations of Social Justice. — 2-nd ed. / Michael Sandel. — Cambridge: Cambridge univ. press, 1998. — 234 p.
10. *North D. C., Wallisd J. J., Waingast B. B.* Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. C. North, J. J. Wallisd, B. B. Waingast. — New

- York: Cambridge univ. press, 2013. — 320 p.
11. *Dahrendorf R.* The Modern Social Conflict. The Politics of Liberty // Ralf Dahrendorf. — Berkley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California press, 1990. — 219 p,
  12. *Beck U.* World at Risk / Ulrich Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226 p.
  13. *Habermas J.* The Divided West / Jurgen Habermas. — Cambrige ; Polity press, 2006. — 224 p.
  14. *Esping-Andersen G.* Two societies, one sociology and no theory / Gosta Esping-Andersen // The British Journal of Sociology. — Vol. 51, issue 1. — January/March 2000. — P. 58–78.
  15. Social Policy: Theories, Concepts and Issues / ed. by M. Lavette, A.Pratt — 3<sup>ed</sup>. — London. : Sage, 2006. — 325 p.
  16. *Deakon B.* Stubbs P. Global social policy studies /Bob Deakon, Paul Stubbs. // Global social policy. — 2013. — № 1 (13). — P. 5–23.
  17. *Kennett P.* Comparative Social Policy: Theory and Research / Patricia Kennett. — Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open univ. press, 2001. — 189 p.
  18. *Archer M.* The sociological approach to the tension between equality and social inequality / Margaret Archer. // The Study of the Tension between Human Equality and Social Inequalities. From the Perspectives of the Various Social Sciences. — Vatican city: Academy of Political Sciences, 1996. — Acta 1. — P. 81–99.
  19. *Atkinson A. B.* Social exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment / Anthony Atkinson. // Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity / A. B. Atkinson and J. Hills eds. — London: School of Economic and Political Science, 1998. — P. 1–20.