

<https://doi.org/10.31861/mediaforum.2019.7.305-317>

УДК: 328.18(477)

© Анастасія Репецька¹

ПОЛІТИЧНА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ ЗАКОНОДАВЧОЇ ТА ВИКОНАВЧОЇ ВЛАДИ В УКРАЇНІ: СУЧАСНІ РЕАЛІЇ

Структура законодавчої та виконавчої влади в системі політичної комунікації України, незважаючи на всебічний інформаційний ресурс її інституцій на щаблі соціальної артикуляції суспільних проблем, поступається в резонансній дієвості політичної риторики, суб'єктами якої виступають Верховна Рада, Кабінет Міністрів та Президент України. Посилання на функціональну особливість уряду доволі поширене пояснення процесу тоді, коли зміст поняття «виконавча влада» передбачає прагматичність дій. Адже природа технологічних операцій професіоналів у сферах державного управління моделює певні умови для зародження політичного дискурсу. В країнах розвиненої демократії, включаючи й Україну, для досягнення максимальної відкритості та прозорості діяльності законодавчої і виконавчої влади прогнозовані й дієво функціонують механізми: політичні, нормативно-правові, організаційні, інституційні, інформаційні та освітні. Через те прозорість влади повинна належним чином забезпечуватись функціонуванням діалогу із громадськістю на всіх етапах прийняття рішень, повинен бути постійний доступ до повної, об'єктивної, точної, зрозумілої інформації про дії органів державної влади та її посадових осіб. Ефективність дій публічної адміністрації залежить від рівня відкритості влади та якості повідомлень громадськості про роботу її органів у будь-якій демократичній державі.

305

Ключові слова: політична комунікація, інформаційні процеси, взаємодія, медіатизація політики, законодавча та виконавча влада.

¹ Аспірантка кафедри політології та державного управління, Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича, Україна та кафедри історії, Сучавського університету Стефана чел Маре, Румунія. E-mail: nastasia_queen94@ukr.net; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6922-5054>

Political Communication of Legislative and Executive Branches of Power in Ukraine: Modern Realities

The structure of Legislative and Executive branches in the system of political communication in Ukraine, despite the comprehensive information resource of its institutions, is still lacking in its resonance of political rhetoric effectiveness at the stage of social articulation of social problems. The subjects of this structure are the Verkhovna Rada, the Cabinet of Ministers and the President of Ukraine. The reference to the functional feature of the government is a fairly common explanation of the process when the content of the concept of "Executive power" implies pragmatic actions. After all, the nature of technological operations of professionals in the fields of public administration models certain conditions for the emergence of political discourse. In the developed democracies, including Ukraine, to achieve maximum openness and transparency in the activities of the Legislative and Executive branches, predictable and effective mechanisms are functioning: political, regulatory, organizational, institutional, information and educational. Thus the transparency of the government must be properly ensured by the operation of the public dialogue at all of the decision-making stages, there should be a regular access to full, fair, accurate, understandable information about the actions of public authorities and its officials. In any democratic state, the effectiveness of public administration depends on the level of transparency and the quality of communication to the public on the work of its organs.

Keywords: *political communication, information processes, interaction, mediatization of politics, Legislative and Executive branches.*

Introduction. The modern concept of political communication originated in the late 40s – early 50s of the XX century, when with the development of technical mass communication media we began to feel the phenomenon of mediatization of politics.

Modern science understands political communication as a means of reaching agreement between individuals, political actors, "those who rule" and "those who are ruled" (Schwarzenberg, 1992, 175), as the entire range of informal communication processes in society (Pai, 1987, 442), as a set of information processes, etc. The "communicative" interpretation of the political sphere was developed by H. Arendt and K. Deutsch in the 50s-60s. In their opinion, politics is a system of communications and information flows (Arendt, 1998, 131-141; Deutsch, 1993). Also, the political sphere as

the world of communications and communicative actions is considered by the theoretical constructions of J. Habermas (Habermas, 2001, 424).

Analysis of recent research and publications. Managing a modern democratic society is impossible without an extensive system of political communication. A message from the communicator to the audience and vice versa is transmitted through various forms and means of this system, namely: events are reported, facts, changes in life, certain points of view, etc. So it is not possible to carry on without mass communication theory and its methods, which in general aspects were developed by such scholars as: T. Adorno, B. Berelson, G. Barthes, Z. Bauman, D. Bell, J. Beniger, Y. Budantsev, P. Bourdieu, N. Wiener, M. Horkheimer, B. Gunter, T. Van Dijk, G. Deleuze, J. Derrida, J. Carey, J. Lull, P. Lazarsfeld, G. Lasswell, W. Lippmann, D. McQuail, M. McLuhan, T. Peterson, T. Roszak, F. Siebert, J. Trenaman, A. Toffler, M. Herrmann, W. Schramm, and others.

Coverage of various theoretical and practical aspects of political communication in modern conditions is carried out in the publications of V. Badrak, A. Baronin, D. Bell, H. Blumer, Y. Bondar, N. Wiener, Y. Ganzhurov, A. Zernitsky, V. Ivanov, S. Kvit, A. Kuznetsov, E. Mamontov, V. Moskalenko, T. Parsons, I. Pidlusko, G. Pocheptsov, N. Skulenko, I. Slisarenko, A. Toffler, A. Chernetska, A. Shvidunov, K. Shannon, V. Shklyar, Y. Finkler. In recent decades, the theory of political communication and its individual aspects have been studied by Russian scientists O. Gritsenko, S. Demchenko, M. Karashchuk, V. Kovalevsky, A. Kostyrev, O. Romashko, T. Shulga, D. Yakovlev, and others. At the same time, a number of problems that require further analysis remain without the attention of researchers.

307

Presentation of the main material. In the political processes of modern Ukraine, in the conditions of transition to the information society, the role and importance of political communication is increasing. At the same time, the system of political communication is becoming more complex: its quality, level and transparency are changing, and the subjects of politics are being transformed into subjects of the communication process. Therefore, ensuring the democratization of relations between government authorities is one of the main purposes of political communication, which makes it an object of study of political science.

Today the issue of political communication and information transparency of state authorities of Ukraine is regulated by a considerable number of domestic and international laws. The main document in this area

is the Constitution of Ukraine. However, first of all, information on this issue can be found in various legislative acts, which, of course, prevents a complete understanding of this criterion for the activities of the authorities. And, secondly, there is no clear and specific definition of information openness of authorities, standards and norms of information that is open to public access of citizens. They can be developed based on world practice, the principles of democracy, constitutions and legislative acts of developed democratic states. "In General, information openness is providing the ability to search for, receive, and distribute information" (Liuta, 2002, 47: 5).

308 — Since the government in Ukraine often becomes a hostage of the parliamentary-presidential struggle, it always enriches the communication network of the political system through this information competition. The Executive branch, on the one hand, has acquired the experience of initiating political compromises, and on the other – has formed a motley but yet active elite of "temporary" officials. If we take into account the actualization of the problem tangible in the authoritarian reflections of the President L. Kuchma, it becomes clear that the tendentious and opportunistic motivation for strengthening the independence of the Executive power comes first and foremost from the only legislative body of the state, when the neglect of interinstitutional ties of these subjects of political communication has acquired dangerous features of a conflict nature (Ganzhurov 2006, 4, 98-107).

For this reason, the analysis of forms of political communication that contribute to the democratization of state relations is relevant. Among them we can find such forms of information submission as, for example, news, debates, political talk shows, interviews, as well as polls and referendums, collecting signatures, citizens' appeals to the media, alternative elections with secret voting, participation in the activities of Legislative and Executive authorities, peaceful assemblies, pickets, rallies, marches and demonstrations, protest actions, etc. Therefore, such forms of political communication as: party conferences and congresses, a politician's speech to an audience, meetings with voters, "going to the people", the appearance of a political figure in public places, and street communication are favorable for the democratization of power relations.

We believe that to form of a positive image for the actions of certain subjects of power relations it is necessary to consider three factors: degree factor of confidence in the information source, the factor of audience characteristics and the factor of the region characteristics. Therefore, the choice

of channels of influence is determined by the possibilities of group and interpersonal communication and the peculiar features of the media (the press, radio, television), that cover a wide range of issues: issues of public administration, issues of political rights, issues of public opinion, issues of pacts, exchanges, issues of party conferences, gatherings and meetings, etc.

N. K. Dniprenko believes that “it is extremely important to develop the principles, main goal and specific directions for the changes. Determining the content basis for the formation of new approaches to the organization of information exchange in the field of public administration, that is the philosophical basis, should become a priority in the activities of state authorities. The very definition of the key paradigm – the specification of ways to move from one model of development to a fundamentally different one – should play a crucial role in addressing the quality of further social development and the compliance of this process with the democratic needs of our time” (Dniprenko, 2008, 17-136).

The importance of the regulatory components of transparency is due to the fact that it is only possible to radically solve the problem of transparency of the government by creating an appropriate legislative mechanism. This is especially important for a society that lacks a strong tradition of democracy. Under these conditions, there is an urgent need to normalize the behavior of both government institutions and government representatives, as well as the general public (Grigorian, 2016). For example, Ukraine has already created a legal framework for implementing the principle of transparency in political communication between the Legislative and Executive branches, and between the entire state administrations. But the process of creating regulatory components of transparency is still ongoing.

309

At the same time, there is a number of problems that hinder the implementation of successful political communication between the Legislative and Executive branches in Ukraine: lack of political will to continue the started initiatives and to consistently implement them; lack of coherence and cooperation among agencies, which contradicts to the achievement of its goals; fragmentation of resources to some piecemeal actions instead of working on targeted integrated programs; lack of one focal point – inter-institutional system; focus on the information distribution, not its formation; insufficient and various views on the need for political communication by the leaders of various government bodies.

Thus, the main direction of political communication between the Legislative and Executive branches in Ukraine should be considered primarily

in the constitutional format, which is based on essential areas of public life that need collective actions and positions of the Legislative and Executive branches of state power, according to the Constitution of Ukraine. They are as follows:

- legislative and budgetary process;
- parliamentary control, including observing human rights and freedoms;
- personnel policy; defining the main directions of domestic and foreign policy;
- introduction of a state of war or emergency, etc.

At the same time, it is also important to take into account the processes of information support for the preparation of solutions. It should be based on certain feedback carriers, which follows the requirements of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada, regarding the organization of consideration of issues in particular (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2014, 29-34). At the same time, behind the scenes of a significant documentary basis for solving issues, the mode of processing government information has a noticeable tendency to distance effective decisions from the basic communicators, which are the reports of government members in the Parliament. The low efficiency of such discourse is explained by evidence of the dominance of oligarchic motivations in political communication between the Legislative and Executive powers.

310

—

As F. Rudich notes, “the criminal and semi-criminal bourgeoisie persistently and brazenly climbs (and not without success) into power structures... The intelligentsia, workmen, rural workers, and other segments of the population were humiliated. This reduces citizens’ trust in the authorities” (Rudich, 2009, 64). This opinion is followed by Y. Ganzhurov: “Without clearing the political discourse of parliamentary-government communication, that mainly circulates outside the social channels of its explanation, without popularization and dissemination, it is difficult to count on the effectiveness of pension, medical, educational and other reforms that the government declares” (Ganzhurov, 2017, 239-252).

This social-scientific examination of political communication of the Legislative and Executive power has to determine, preferably in the public sphere, the following aspects: communicative mechanisms of parliamentary responsibility of the government in the comparative mapping; information framework of cooperation between the Legislative and Executive branches of government; the parliamentary responsibility of the govern-

ment in the system of checks and balances within the separation of state power; problem of inefficient regulatory the existing mechanism of the parliamentary responsibility of the government in Ukraine (Ganzhurov, 2017, 239-252).

According to Y. Ganzhurov, “the actualization of the outlined issues, in many ways, is explained by the serious resistance of the sole rule supporters, when the parliamentary responsibility of the government is disavowed by the presidential guardianship of the Executive branch of power” (Ganzhurov, 2017, 239-252).

In our opinion, it is also possible to require forming of an alternative model for solving the functional problems of political communication between the Legislative and Executive branches with the participation of the presidential levers of its adjustment. However, the possibility of varying interpretations of the inevitable transformational links between the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine through the model of formation of a coalition Government by the Parliament seems uncertain.

According to Y. Ganzhurov, “the President will adjust parliamentary-government relations, namely: in the legal field as a subject of legislative initiative; with the help of constitutional levers of a nominative nature both in relation to the Government and the Verkhovna Rada; through informal communication channels, the effectiveness of which, given the tradition of solving a wide range of problems, especially in terms of private interests, remains very high” (Ganzhurov, 2017, 239-252).

It is predicted that the struggle for leadership in the pro-power triangle is not only personalized, but also financially motivated, with political communication between the authorities as its facade. Therefore, when thinking about this issue, O. Moroz writes that “changing the property relations to privatization as a means of obtaining revenue for improving property management – this is what the Executive power most of all hindered” (Moroz, 2016, 559).

This can be explained if we consider this thesis: “there is another serious problem that everyone is talking about – the lack of legislative obligation for cooperation between the Government and the Parliament, since today all contacts are built only on the desire or unwillingness of a particular person. There is no legislative foundation that should be based on the laws on the Cabinet, the opposition, the parliamentary majority, and the President...” (Voropaev, 2005, 27). It is probably difficult to deny the role

of the personal factor in contacts between the Legislative and Executive authorities in Ukraine, as well as the destructive factor of the lack of these laws. However, in this case, the increase in quantitative indicators does not form a qualitatively different format for this political communication, since the problem is not in the number of laws, but in the mechanism of their legal communication (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2002, 120-122).

We believe that openness, transparency and accessibility of government power should serve the people for their spiritual and material enrichment. Also, openness, transparency and accessibility should be bilateral, meaning that the information should go from the government to the people and from the people to the government.

Therefore, in the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) enshrines the right of citizens to participate in public affairs (article 141), equal access of citizens to public service, service in the local self-government bodies (article 38), freedom of information (article 34), on individual and collective appeals to the authorities and officials (article 40) (Constitution of Ukraine, 1996).

312

— It is also necessary to pay attention to the Law of Ukraine “On Citizens’ Appeals” (1996), which provides the Ukrainian citizens with opportunities to participate in the management of state and public affairs through the mechanism of official appeals. In the context of transparency of state power, we should recall the Law of Ukraine “On Information” issued in 1992, which supports the constitutional right of citizens to access information related to them personally (art. 8, 9), the Law of Ukraine “On the Procedure for Covering the Activities of Public Authorities and Local Self-Government Bodies in Ukraine by the Media” (1997), the Decree of the President of Ukraine “On Measures to Develop the National Component of the Global Internet Information Network and Ensure Wide Access to this Network in Ukraine” (2000). The latter facilitated the creation of conditions for the public structures to transparently exercise their powers, obliging them to establish a certain procedure for electronic coverage of information about their activities and to create web pages for authorities at all levels and for leading scientific and educational institutions (Melnychenko, 2007).

In 2001 the Decree of the President of Ukraine “On the Preparation of Proposals for Ensuring Publicity and Openness of the Activities of Public Authorities” was enacted, according to which a working group was established to develop legislation, aimed at developing adequate legal frame-

work to ensure the transparency and openness of activities of public authorities.

In addition to the above-mentioned normative documents, some aspects of public administration transparency are enshrined in the Laws of Ukraine “On the Basic Principles of Information Society Development in Ukraine for 2007-2015” (2007), “On the Basics of State Regulatory Policy in the Sphere of Economic Activity” (2004) and others.

In January 2010, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine issued a decree “On Approving the Concept of the Draft of the Law of Ukraine “On the Basic Principles of the State Communication Policy”. The concept notes that there is now a need to improve the mechanism for regulating the process of information exchange, to introduce the principle of partnership, in particular, which involves not only informing the population, but also establishing effective feedback, conducting appropriate explanatory work, and establishing public control over the activities of state authorities and local self-government bodies. Therefore, the analysis of the legislative framework in terms of legal regulation of relations between the Legislative and Executive branches of power at the level of requirements of current laws allows us to conclude that there is a sufficient basis for proper communication between the Parliament and the Government of Ukraine (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2002, 120-122).

313

Conclusions. Therefore, it can be argued that in general, political communication becomes an area where all political actors function. It forms the agenda, articulates the interests of various participants in the political process, analyzes political situations, organizes discussion of issues of current importance, and is also an expert in the tactics of the activities of public authorities.

Thus, the discourse of political communication between the Legislative and Executive branches of power, in our opinion, should progress towards the public sphere, due to the fact that traditional forms of secrecy of adopted and planned decisions become risky for the state power. This is what the revolution of Dignity in Ukraine has convincingly shown.

Джерела та література:

1. Арендт, Х., 1998. «Ситуация человека». Вопр. Философии 11: 131-141.
2. Верховна Рада України. 1992. Закон України «Про інформацію». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2657-12>

3. Верховна Рада України. 1996. Закон України «Про звернення громадян». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/393/96-%D0%B2%D1%80>
4. Верховна Рада України. 1996. Конституція України. 5 сесія, Червень 28. zakon.rada.gov.ua
5. Верховна Рада України. 1997. Закон України «Про порядок висвітлення діяльності органів державної влади та органів місцевого самоврядування в Україні засобами масової інформації». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/539/97-%D0%B2%D1%80>
6. Верховна Рада України. 2002. Інформ. Довідник 2: 120-122.
7. Верховна Рада України. 2004. Закон України «Про засади державної регуляторної політики у сфері господарської діяльності». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1160-15>
8. Верховна Рада України. 2007. Закон України «Про Основні засади розвитку інформаційного суспільства в Україні на 2007-2015 рр.». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/537-16>
- 314 — 9. Верховна Рада України. 2014. Регламент Верховної Ради України. Парламентське вид-во, 246.
10. Воропаєв С., 2005. «Бажане за дійсне». Народний депутат 11: 27.
11. Габермас Ю., 2001. Філософський дискурс Модерну. Четверта хвиля, 424 с.
12. Ганжуров Ю., 2006. «Комунікативний ресурс парламентсько-урядових зв'язків: проблеми еволюції». Політичний менеджмент 4: 98-107.
13. Ганжуров Ю., 2017. «Парламентсько-урядова комунікація як модель політичного дискурсу». Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України 3: 239-252.
14. Григорян О., 2016. «Світовий і вітчизняний досвід забезпечення прозорості та відкритості органів державної влади в реалізації публічної політики (інформаційний аспект)». <http://academy.gov.ua/ej/ej15/txts/12 GOOPIA>.
15. Дніпрошенко Н. К., 2008. «Комунікація: демократичні стандарти в роботі органів державної влади». Вістка, 17-136.
16. Дойч, Карл., 1993. Нервы управления: модели политической коммуникации и контроля. Нью-Йорк.
17. Кабінет Міністрів України. 2010. Розпорядження Кабінету

Міністрів України «Про схвалення Концепції проекту Закону України «Про основні засади державної комунікативної політики». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/85-2010-%D1%80>

18. Люта Г., 2002. «Ми могли б служити в розвідці...». Дзеркало Тижня 47 (422). <http://www.dt.ua/2000/2200/36988/>

19. Мельниченко В. І., 2007. «Прозорість і відкритість публічного управління як об'єкт законодавчого регулювання». <http://www.academy.gov.ua/ej5/txts/07mviozr.htm>

20. Мороз О., 2016. «Для чого потрібна влада (Згадуючи Валентину Семенюк)». Парламентське вид-во, 592.

21. Президент України. 2000. Указ Президента України «Про заходи щодо розвитку національної складової глобальної інформаційної мережі Інтернет та забезпечення широкого доступу до цієї мережі в Україні». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/928/2000>

22. Президент України. 2001. Указ Президента України «Про підготовку пропозицій щодо забезпечення гласності та відкритості діяльності органів державної влади». <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3252001>

23. Рудич Ф.М., 2009. «Много ли власти нужно власти? Украина в контексте трансформации политических систем в странах СНГ, Балтии и Восточной Европы». Наукова думка.

24. Шварценберг Р.-Ж., 1992. Политическая социология. М., 175 с.

25. Pye L., 1987. Political Communication. The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Institutions. Oxford: NY, 442.

References:

1. Arendt Kh., 1998. «Sytuatsiya cheloveka». Vopr. Fylosofyy 11: 131-141.

2. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy 1992. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro informatsiiu». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2657-12>

3. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 1996. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro zvernennia hromadian». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/393/96-%D0%B2%D1%80>

4. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 1996. Konstytutsiia Ukrainy. 5 sesiia, Cherven 28. zakon.rada.gov.ua

5. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 1997. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro poriadok vysvitlennia diialnosti orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady ta orhaniv mistsevoho

samovriaduvannia v Ukraini zasobamy masovoi informatsii». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/539/97-%D0%B2%D1%80>

6. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 2002. Inform. Dovidnyk 2: 120-122.

7. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 2004. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro zasady derzhavnoi rehuliatornoj polityky u sferi hospodarskoj diialnosti». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1160-15>

8. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 2007. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro Osnovni zasady rozvytku informatsiinoho suspilstva v Ukraini na 2007-2015 rr.». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/537-16>

9. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. 2014. Rehlement Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy. Parlamentske vyd-vo, 246.

10. Voropaiev S., 2005. «Bazhane za diisne». Narodnyi deputat 11: 27.

11. Habermas Yu., 2001. Filosofskiyi dyskurs Modernu. Chetverta khvyliia, 424 p.

12. Hanzhurov Yu., 2006. «Komunikatyvnyi resurs parlamentsko-uriovodovykh zviazkiv: problemy evoliutsii». Politychnyi menedzhment 4: 98-107.

316

—

13. Hanzhurov Yu., 2017. «Parlamentsko-uriovodova komunikatsiia yak model politychnoho dyskursu». Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy 3: 239-252.

14. Hryhorian O.O., 2016. «Svitovyi i vitchyzniani dosvid zabezpechennia prozorosti ta vidkrytosti orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady v realizatsii publichnoi polityky (informatsiinyi aspekt) ». <http://academy.gov.ua/ej/ej15/txts/12GOOPIA.pdf>

15. Dniprenko N. K., 2008. «Komunikatsiia: demokratychni standarty v roboti orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady». Vistka, 17-136.

16. Doich K., 1993. Nervy upravleniia: modely polytycheskoj kommunykatsyy y kontroliia. Niu-York.

17. Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. 2010. Rozporiadzhennia Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy «Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii proektu Zakonu Ukrainy «Pro osnovni zasady derzhavnoi komunikatyvnoi polityky». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/85-2010-%D1%80>

18. Liuta H., 2002. «My mohly b sluzhyty v rozvidtsi...». Dzerkalo Tyzhnia 47 (422). <http://www.dt.ua/2000/2200/36988/>

19. Melnychenko V.I., 2007. «Prozorist i vidkrytist publichnoho upravlinnia yak obiekt zakonodavchoho rehuliuivannia». <http://www.academy.gov.ua/ej5/txts/07mviozr.htm>

20. Moroz O., 2016. «Dlia choho potribna vlada (Zghadiuchy Valentynu Semeniuk)». Parlamentske vyd-vo.

21. Prezydent Ukrainy. 2000. Ukaz Prezidenta Ukrainy «Pro zakhody shchodo rozvytku natsionalnoi skladovoi hlobalnoi informatsiinoi merezhi Internet ta zabezpechennia shyrokoho dostupu do tsiiei merezhi v Ukraini». <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/928/2000>

22. Prezydent Ukrainy. 2001. Ukaz Prezidenta Ukrainy «Pro pidhotovku propozytsii shchodo zabezpechennia hlasnosti ta vidkrytosti diialnosti orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady». <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3252001>

23. Rudych F.M., 2009. «Mnoho ly vlasty nuzhno vlasty? Ukrayna v kontekste transformatsyy polytycheskykh system v stranakh SNH, Baltyy y Vostochnoi Yevropy». Naukova dumka.

24. Shvartsenberh R.-Zh., 1992. Polytycheskaia sotsyolohyia. M., 175 s.

25. Rue L., 1987. Political Communication. The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Institutions. Oxford: NY.