

DOI: 10.52363/2414-5866-2021-2-32

УДК 351: 342.9. 625.1. 656.2

*Mykhaylov D., PhD-Student of Zaporizhzhia National University,
Zaporizhzhia, ORCID: 0000-0002-5512-441X,*

*Pravosud O., PhD-Student of Dnipropetrovsk State University
of Internal Affairs, Dnipro*

*Михайлов Д., здобувач ЗНУ, м. Запоріжжя,
Правосуд О., аспірант, ДДУВС, м. Дніпро*

**DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE FIELD
OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN UKRAINE IN THE CONTEXT OF EN-
SURING THE TRUST OF ITS POPULATION**

**РОЗВИТОК ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ У СФЕРІ МІСЦЕВО-
ГО САМОВРЯДУВАННЯ УКРАЇНИ В КОНТЕКСТІ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ
ДОВІРИ ЇЇ НАСЕЛЕННЯ**

У статті аналізуються актуальні проблеми забезпечення розвитку публічного управління у сфері місцевого самоврядування України з позиції підтримки заходів довіри. У цьому контексті відбувається звернення до філософських модифікацій системи безпеки, які мають своєю основою соціально-етичні елементи громадянської довіри та злагоди.

***Ключові слова:** публічного управління, безпека, довіра населення, налагодження комунікації.*

The article analyzes the current problems of ensuring of the development of public administration in the field of local government from the standpoint of maintaining confidence-building measures. In this context, there is an appeal to the philosophical modifications of the security system, which are based on the socio-ethical elements of civil trust and consent.

***Key words:** public administration, security, trust of population, establishing communication.*

« אבן השת — евен а-штія — «наріжний камінь» [4]

Problem setting. Man is not only the main object of protection, but also an active subject (actor) of the reliable functioning of the national security system. According to some scholars, a citizen deserves respect and trust, under these conditions he is the cornerstone of statehood, its strong foundation as a carrier of sustainability, and not vice versa, an apple of discord. Rejecting absolute freedom, some philosophers emphasize that a free-acting person is a "terrible creature", communication with which excludes any trust, any upbringing, any law and order [2]. According to the socio-ethical interpretation, trust performs a "unifying function". Strictly speaking, it contributes to the establishment of the integrity of relations, civic solidarity on the basis of mutual care and responsibility and, as a consequence, the creation of a new person in political, spiritual and life-practical relations. It is no coincidence that in the modern sense of security "trust" is seen as a factor in geocultural development, in particular, as a special state of human worldview, constructive communication between people, actors and institutions, man and power to reach agreement and compromise in the global world. Therefore, it is important to determine the directions of development of the security system and the place of man, as well as his confidence in ensuring such development.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The works of many domestic and foreign scientists D. Hrytsyshen, S. Dombrovska, V. Yevdokimov, O. Karpenko, S. Maistra, G. Ortina, G. Sytnyk and others are devoted to the study of security system issues. At the same time, we emphasize that in domestic science the topic of public confidence in the field of public administration, legal regulation and ethics is gaining importance. Evidence of this is the work of M. Weber, E. Giddens, E. Durkheim, N. Luhmann, G. Rose, V. Streltsov, A. Seligman, F. Fukuyama, J. K. Herpfer, P. Stompka, and others. [1; 3; 6; 9]. Given the urgency of this problem, there is a need to deepen research on the above issues.

Paper objective. The purpose of the research is to determine the directions of development of public administration in the field of local government in Ukraine in the context of ensuring the trust of its population in the context of ensuring the trust of its population.

Paper main body. In the historical context, R. Polborn noted certain patterns of the relationship "trust-distrust", including contradictory ratio of honesty and deception. In conditions of undemocratic power, there is a rapid immersion in distrust ("no one can be trusted"), an atmosphere of suspicion of any information [6]. It is no accident that this leads to the "loneliness of power." As a result, a "spiral of distrust" is formed, which excludes even the possibility of challenging the actual distrust of the government. Distrust always begins with cau-

tion and doubt ("it turns out not everything is so simple", "is it possible to believe it") and is the result of overconfidence based on the usual diagnosis of the relationship in anticipation of deception.

The regularities mentioned by R. Polborn [6] are illustrated by examples of the Soviet period. The slogan of "boundless devotion to the cause of the party and the state" was not only accompanied by manic suspicion and mass repression, but was also interrupted by the exposure of senior statesmen. It is important to understand that trust relations, otherwise it is a purely political fact, so the traditional understanding of the "Thaw" of the 1960s should be associated not only with the sprouts of freedom, but also with the advent of a truly new phase of trust as a goal of social development, and it is in Officially recognized unanimity of the people after the period of stagnation of the 1970s is replaced by a phase of "romantic trust" in the goals of perestroika in the mid-80's, which turns into full confidence in the new national leaders of democratic change in the late 1980s - in the early 1990s.

The political stability of the modern Ukrainian state is explained by the high level of trust in its leaders. In N. Luhmann's communicative theory of power [3], The everyday civil life of society presupposes "normalized power." The quality of the choice of "for" or "against" in relation to government actions forms a "facade of power", which depends on the accuracy of the schemes of the desired actions. We can talk about the positivity of government decisions if they are aimed at the open space of the future. This principle is followed by Euro-optimists - supporters of the European Union as a home of public good and well-being. At the same time, true socio-political behavior is "dialectized" in such manifestations as deception, maneuvering, lobbying of private interests, and so on.

In the scientific work "Social Systems" scientist N. Luhmann analyzes trust as a fundamental basis of action [ibid.]. Security and reliability are the result of appropriate government action on "trust", which is manifested in the reduction of dangers, threats and negative risks, as well as anticipated (forecasting) and taking into account all possible accidents. It is these measures that determine the procedure for maintaining trust.

The transition from distrust to trust in relation to the authorities is carried out procedurally, evolutionarily, including with fragments of the costs of the former distrust based on the growing importance of public and public administration, as well as the law as a driver of public order. As N. Luhmann emphasizes [ibid.], Trust must be granted within the limits of equal homogeneity, ie voluntarily. Trust cannot be equated with life optimism or situations of fear of

unhappiness - it is a sequence of development of social relations that begin with mutual risks.

Trust is easier to guarantee if it is needed on both sides. It is this aspect that N. Luhmann draws attention to, emphasizing that "the trust of one actor (government or citizens) must find support in another" [ibid.]. The scientist also rightly insists on the "circular nature" of trust, which is the basis for the development of complex systems. It provides not only cyclicity, but an updated modernization of these systems, which are developing in a spiral. As a result, trust is a universal social and political fact necessary to create a strategy of reliability, to determine its reserves, although in the presence of elements of mutual risk.

The understanding of trust as a political-power strategy with a significant range can be considered from the position advocated by E. Giddens [1]. The author, in particular, defines "basic trust against distrust" [ibid.]. The formation of a sense of trust is interrelated with the awareness of specific activities, including to preserve a holistic personality and continuous reproduction of the social system. The scientist E. Giddens believes that "uniformity is vital for the functioning of psychological mechanisms by which the need for reliability or ontological security is met during daily activities" [ibid.].

The use of the concept of "ontological security" focuses on understanding security in terms of ensuring the protection of the individual, overcoming its ontological instability. In fact, we are talking about confidentiality or trust, "which represents the natural and social worlds, including the basic existential parameters of" self- "and social identity" [ibid.]. Some researchers also believe that "the ontological security of the individual implies a sense of trust and a sense of authenticity, loyalty to his "I" " [8].

According to V. Kemerovo, the ontological view of man creates a kind of "picture" of the positions and orientations of "private" (internal) activities [8]. It thus builds on philosophical understanding, but at the same time helps to more clearly identify the outlines of socio-historical and socio-cultural conditions of human life. Ontological schemes are the interdependent existence of people, the identification of driving forces and structures of social processes [ibid.]. In this context, remark [7] is correct, that a person who is not able to take responsibility for what he has done and admit his mistake, "does not trust himself, and therefore he should not be trusted." This means that measures and means of ensuring the security system (including state, public and personal) require precisely the "ontological approach", which performs the integrative function of reality and the place of correlation of public meanings, goals, values. Strictly speaking, the

ontological approach determines what actually happens in the security system, as well as a person's place in it.

In continuation, we note that in a broad sense, the security system is seen as existential security, which involves the protection of the very existence of society and man. Thus, the daily oncoming flows of people in the metro, from the point of view of existentialism, mean involuntary, mostly nonverbal communication of people. However, such an event as a terrorist act demonstrates the absence of "rupture" of relationships between people in a tragic space. In fact, it is about the mood of anger, neutrality or mobility in the first situation of "changing meetings in the subway", as well as the emergence of civil imperatives not to neglect social and humanistic responsibilities, care, sympathize with others in difficult situations (for example, in the case of a theoretical act). People feel the existence of a common human destiny (just like existence). Working together to understand and experience turns events into facts of personal biography (one's own life), which creates resistance forces within a person, although it also creates conditions for the manifestation of different human characters. Such a behavioral attitude ("manufacturing") creates a socio-moral foundation for the prevention of dangers not only in a rational way, but also on the basis of a new worldview, the refusal to justify the former indifference and inability of direct personal action. Within it, a person makes "his choice", determines "his events", "his participation". True interaction means not only vigilance, but also the ability to rediscover oneself. As a result, the sensitivity of the existential approach outlines a new type of trust as the presence of "progressive" relationships that may involve a change and adjustment of activities, compared to past circumstances, the usual course of events.

By analogy, trust can be a sufficient basis for the allocation of other philosophical modifications of the security system, namely:

- phenomenological security as an action in the "reciprocity of prospects", when the limits of interoperability are reduced (security acts as a synonym for trust);

- anthropological security in conditions of lack of trust, attention is paid to the integrity of the individual, the formation of a specific experience of "human in man" (this means the ability to rise above personal images, narrowly selfish private interests);

- personalized security as a special subjective connecting unity, the experience of "other" life as a value, the spirit of responsibility to "be part of the whole".

It should be noted that the National Security Strategy of Ukraine until 2030 [5] Provides for increasing the level of state and public security, including through the development of democracy and civil society, guaranteeing personal security and high standards of living. It should be noted that the current Strategy in the field of national security of Ukraine, unlike all previous ones (starting with the first strategy adopted in 2008), contains in the title an indication "Human security - national security". This actualizes the consideration of the category of "security" in a multifaceted sense, the defining place in which is the anthropocentric approach. We believe that it is necessary to ensure the socio-humanistic and sustainable development of the state and society, with its level of trust in it. At the same time, the security system from the standpoint of isolated approaches requires a separate detailed consideration in the framework of further research, in particular, the study of levels of trust as a factor in this security - national, regional and local.

Conclusions of the research. Thus, in basic science today there is considerable experience in studying various aspects of trust as a social factor. However, there is a shortage of scientific papers on the analysis of strengthening public confidence as a security factor. Trying to solve this problem, the desire to find reasons and ways to build trust requires the definition of such a problematic field of study as the formation of public confidence at all levels of government, especially at the regional level. In addition, it is important to substantiate trust as an indicator of the security system within the National Security Strategy of Ukraine.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Гидденс Э. Устройство общества: Очерк теории структуризации. 2-е изд. М. : Академический проект, 2005, 499 с.
2. Кузнецов В.Н. Социология безопасности. М. : КДУ, 2009.
3. Луман Н. Социальные системы. Очерк общей теории / пер. с нем. СПб. : Наука, 2007, 184 с.
4. Наріжний камінь. URL: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%9A%D0%B0%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%8C_%D0%9E%D1%81%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%8F.
5. Офіційний веб портал Верховної Ради України. URL: <https://www.rada.gov.ua/>.
6. Полборн Р. Воля и власть. М. : Московский психолого-социальный институт, 2006, 654 с.

7. Помаза-Пономаренко А. Л. Соціальний розвиток і безпека регіонів: державноуправлінські аспекти: Монографія. Харків: НУЦЗ України, 2017. 270 с.

8. Социальная философия : словарь / сост. и ред. В.Е. Кемеров, Т.Х. Керимов. М. : Академический проект, 2003, с. 290, 291.

9. Pomaza-Ponomarenko A., Hren M., Durman O., Bondarchuk N., Vorobets V. Management mechanisms in the context of digitalization of all spheres of society // *Revista San Gregorio*. SPECIAL EDITION-2020. Núm. 42. URL: <http://revista.sangregorio.edu.ec/index.php/REVISTASANGREGORIO/issue/view/RSAN42/showToc>.

References:

1. Giddens E. Organization of society: Essay on the theory of structuration [Ustroyeniye obshchestva: Ocherk teorii strukturatsii]. 2nd ed. M.: Academic project, 2005, 499 p.

2. Kuznetsov V.N. Sociology of security [Sotsiologiya bezopasnosti]. M.: KDU, 2009.

3. Luhmann N. Social systems. Essay on the general theory [Sotsialnyye sistemy. Ocherk obshchey teorii] / per. with him. SPb. : Nauka, 2007, 184 p.

4. Cornerstone [Narizhnyy kamin]. URL: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%9A%D0%B0%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%8C_%D0%9E%D1%81%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%8F.

5. Official web portal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. URL: <https://www.rada.gov.ua/>.

6. Paulborne R. Will and Power [Volya i vlast]. M.: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute, 2006, 654 p.

7. Pomaza-Ponomarenko A. Social development and security of regions: public administration aspects [Sotsialnyy rozvytok i bezpeka rehioniv: derzhavnoupravlinski aspekty]: Monograph. Kharkiv: NUTSZ of Ukraine, 2017. 270 p.

8. Social philosophy: dictionary [Sotsialnaya filosofiya] / comp. and ed. V.E. Kemerov, T.Kh. Kerimov. M.: Academic project, 2003, p. 290, 291.

9. Pomaza-Ponomarenko A., Hren M., Durman O., Bondarchuk N., Vorobets V. "Management mechanisms in the context of digitalization of all spheres of society". *Revista San Gregorio*. SPECIAL EDITION-2020. (2020): 42. URL: <http://revista.sangregorio.edu.ec/index.php/REVISTASANGREGORIO/issue/view/RSAN42/showToc>.