

UDC: 351.9(457)

Haharinov Olexii Valerevich,

post-graduate student of the Department of Public Administration, Public Administration and Regional Economics, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Ukraine, 61166, Kharkiv, Nauky avenue, 9-A, tel.: (063) 262 52 73, e-mail: gagarinovl09@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-3886-8388

Гагарінов Олексій Валерійович,

аспірант кафедри державного управління, публічного адміністрування та регіональної економіки, Харківський національний економічний університет ім. Семена Кузнеця, Україна, 61000, Харків, пр. Науки, 9А, тел.: (063) 262 52 73, e-mail: gagarinovl09@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-3886-8388

Гагаринов Алексей Валерьевич,

аспирант кафедры государственного управления, публичного администрирования и региональной экономики, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. Семена Кузнеця, Украина, 61000, Харьков, пр. Науки, 9А, тел.: (063) 262 52 73, e-mail: gagarinovl09@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-3886-8388



THE STRATEGY OF TRANSFORMATION OF THE POST-SOVIET STATE SYSTEM OF UKRAINE AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS (ARCHETYPAL APPROACH)

Abstract. The article is devoted to the scientific problem of the transformation strategy of post-Soviet state system of Ukraine as a necessary condition for the resolution and prevention of social conflicts. The author developed conceptual provisions concerning the essence of the transformation strategy of the post-Soviet state system as a necessary condition for the resolution and prevention of social conflicts. It's based primarily on the principals of the archetypal approach, system theory and public management. According to the author the transformation strategy of the post-Soviet state system should be based on: the

state of the governmental system and the character of the culture as a “way of life” which support each other’s state by forming the reinforcing feedback.

Keywords: transformation strategy, post-Soviet state system of Ukraine, social conflict, archetypal approach, culture as a “way of life”, systemic crisis.

СТРАТЕГИЯ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ ПОСТРАДЯНСЬКОЇ СИСТЕМИ ДЕРЖАВНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ УКРАЇНИ ЯК НЕОБХІДНА УМОВА ВИРІШЕННЯ ТА ЗАПОБІГАННЯ СОЦІАЛЬНИХ КОНФЛІКТІВ (АРХЕТИПНИЙ ПІДХІД)

Анотація. Статтю присвячено науковій проблемі — стратегії трансформації пострадянської системи державного управління України як необхідної умови вирішення та запобігання соціальних конфліктів. Базуючись насамперед на принципових положеннях архетипного підходу, теорії систем та публічного управління, автором були розроблені концептуальні положення щодо змісту стратегії трансформації пострадянської системи державного управління як необхідної умови вирішення та запобігання соціальних конфліктів. В основу стратегії трансформації пострадянської системи державного управління, на думку автора, повинні лягти: стан системи державного управління та характер культури як “спосіб життєдіяльності”, які, формуючи петлю посилюючого зворотного зв’язку, підтримують стан один одного.

Ключові слова: стратегія трансформації, пострадянська система державного управління України, соціальний конфлікт, архетиповий підхід, культура як “спосіб життєдіяльності”, системна криза.

СТРАТЕГИЯ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ ПОСТСОВЕТСКОЙ СИСТЕМЫ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ УКРАИНЫ КАК НЕОБХОДИМОЕ УСЛОВИЕ РЕШЕНИЯ И ПРЕДУПРЕЖДЕНИЯ СОЦИАЛЬНЫХ КОНФЛИКТОВ (АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД)

Аннотация. Статья посвящена научной проблеме — стратегии трансформации постсоветской системы государственного управления Украины как необходимого условия решения и предотвращения социальных конфликтов. Основываясь в первую очередь на принципиальных положениях архетипного подхода, теории систем и публичного управления, автором были разработаны концептуальные положения относительно содержания стратегии трансформации постсоветской системы государственного управления как необходимого условия решения и предотвращения социальных конфликтов. В основу стратегии трансформации постсоветской системы государственного управления, по мнению автора, должны лечь: состояние системы государственного управления и характер культуры как “образ жизнедеятельности”, которые, формируя петлю усиливающей обратной связи, поддерживают состояние друг друга.

Ключевые слова: стратегия трансформации, постсоветская система государственного управления Украины, социальный конфликт, архетипический подход, культура как “образ жизнедеятельности”, системный кризис.

Target setting. The world, in which mankind are living now, is interesting from a scientific point of view, and hyper turbulent in terms of dynamics and character of changes. N. I. Hrazhevska defines this period as the Age of Bifurcations and N. Talieb — as the Age of Unpredictable Events, which he calls ‘the black swans’. In turn, the state, in which the humanity is today with all global system of international interaction, was very aptly reflected by the well known Ukrainian scientist and activist Ya. I. Grytsak. ‘There will not be any confidence in the world. It is probably the most honest prediction that can be made over the next 15, 25 and even 100 years,’ he wrote in his article in one of the Ukrainian media.

World order of transformation beginning fell to the events in Ukraine, which became its catalyst. The social conflict, occurred in Ukraine, had resulted in the Revolution of Dignity of 2013–2014. It have launched a comprehensive process of structural change as the average country as in the world geopolitical arena. Intra-state conflict escalated into inter-state and led to direct military operations on the territory of Ukraine and annexation of its territory by the Russian Federation.

Today the transformation process taking place in Ukraine in public administration and reform of key public spheres of life of the Ukrainian people are not systematic and do not have a clear strategic direction. This situation is dangerous in terms of availability of highly destructive factors both internally and in its external environment. Social pressure, which is currently formed primarily based

on moral fatigue and low purchasing power in most sections of the population and underdevelopment of the Ukrainian economy, becomes a powerful challenge to the system of governance Ukraine.

There are only two ways: build systematically developed state, including widely applying the tools of public management and achievements of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes, or loss of statehood and subsequent factorisation of the system state, its stagnation and degradation from the perspective of modern challenges. Therefore you need to choose between the path of order and chaos.

A constructive solution of these problems is impossible without the transformation of post-Soviet system of state management of Ukraine into a state of progressive systematization on the basis of systems theory, public administration, and on the basis of the archetypical methodology. This synthesis will provide an opportunity not only to solve but also to prevent large-scale social conflicts, including with tragic consequences.

Understanding the systemic causes of today’s conditions through the prism of historicity and archetypes will give the opportunity to form a strategy of transformation, which can lead to constructive systemic changes in the social and political sphere of Ukraine when it is embodied. ‘What can and should we do to keep the Ukraine and with it the whole world from the worst?’ Ya. I. Hrytsak said.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The described problem is not new to domestic science and practice however; the relevance of its

solution is difficult to overestimate. The complexity of the problem needs to focus efforts of various schools and methodological developments outstanding scientists and practitioners for its solution. Scientific and practical problem of transformation of post-Soviet public administration system of Ukraine is multifactorial and interdisciplinary, and therefore is a system. According to the author, it requires the use of a systematic approach to its solution, applying all constructive interdisciplinary scientific and practical tools.

Many works of domestic and foreign scientists are devoted the problems of public administration and resolving social conflicts. Our national scientists, namely: B. D. Havrylyshyn [1], L. Yu. Gordienko [2], N. I. Hrazhevskya [3], P. M. Kobziev [4] and others devoted their works of transformations aspects of social and economic systems, including in public administration. Public administration in the light of the theory and practice of public administration is disclosed in the following works of: O. Yu. Obolenskyi [5], O. A. Dehtiar [6], O. I. Hrytsiak [7], O. Moroz [8] and others. In turn, the public administration through the prism of the archetypical approach is considered in the works of O. Yu. Amosova and N. L. Havkalova [9; 10]. The methodological provisions of Archetypes, in the context of the described problems, are considered by the following scientists and researchers: E. A. Afonin and A. Martynov [11; 12], M. Lashkin [13], V. Haniak [14] and others. The problem nature of social conflict and the origin of the notion 'social conflict' are dedicated in

the works of the following scientists and researchers: I. I. Kopaihora [15], O. Kuchabskyi, I. Parabchak [16], I. Yasna [17], V. Kotyhorenko [18] and others.

Of course, the described problems are not confined by the above mentioned works of researchers and scientists, we probably also need to remember the following names: C. G. Jung, T. Parsons, R. Darendorf, Yu. P. Surmin, Yu. Romanenko and others.

However, despite the wide range of publications and researches, the problem of transformation of the post-Soviet system of public administration of Ukraine, as a necessary condition of solution and preventing social conflicts, requires further research and constructive of theoretical and practical developments in this area in order to guarantee the transition of Ukraine to the path of system development and orderliness in all aspects of life on which efforts of the author of this work are aimed.

So, **the purpose of the work**, in the context of the mentioned above study, is to enhance scientific and theoretical foundations of post-Soviet transformation strategy of public administration of Ukraine as a necessary condition of resolving and preventing social conflicts on the basis of the archetypical approach.

The statement of basic materials. Human, an individual are on the one hand the basis of entire hierarchy of subjects of social and economic relations from the individual to the mega level. On the other hand, people act as designers and create social and economic systems, such as for example, the state. On the other hand, they are

functionaries and performers in systems that are created by them. This feedback loop or causal relationships has great potential of varied both in terms of laying the foundations for the generation of social conflicts and resolve them and prevent acquiring into force of opportunities in practice balancing or reinforcing nature.

Conflictology as an area of research has not received their recognition for a long time. Therefore it was unable to develop. First and foremost, this situation was connected due to the fact that 'theory of conflict absence' was totally dominated in the Soviet times.

Modern Ukrainian Conflictology, like Conflictology of all post-Soviet states, was formed and developed under the influence of the heritage of the Soviet social science and the concepts that have emerged in the West. In particular, the negatives of the Soviet era, its late compared with the foreign science, appeal to social conflict still affects [17, p. 138].

Now, we can conclude that there are two major schools of Conflictology that are based on the works [14–17]. This conclusion was made by Robert Pretorius back in 1960. He noted that conflictologists divided into 'the consensus school' and 'the school of conflict' in the US.

For example, T. Parsons believed that conflict is a social anomaly, abnormal phenomenon, which points to certain deviations in the course of normal development of a society that happens due to a gain in it of social differentiation in its structural-functional theory. And if this differentiation is bigger, the deeper becomes the distinction between people according to

their social statuses and roles, income, educational level, etc. [17, p. 140].

In turn, a bright representative of the opposite position is G. Dahrendorf with his 'the functional theory of conflict'. The central element of conflict model of society, built by this researcher, is a recognition tight interdependency between 'conflict' and 'system': the second does not exist without the first, but without the second does not exist the first [17, p. 141]. Proponents' views of social conflict as a positive phenomenon in social development are also G. Simmel, L. Coser, V. Speranskyi and others.

The notion 'social conflict', according to [14, p. 79], is regarded as the confrontation between two or more entities, due to the opposite (incompatibility) their interests, needs and value systems. Typically, confrontation is based on certain social norms.

Therefore, the social conflict is one of the characteristic phenomena of the society development that embraces a diverse range of contradictory reality, and that is the peak expression of inability to solution of various contradictions.

Despite the fact, through the prism of this theory to consider the social conflict in any case it has negative consequences in the form of aggression, war, direct confrontation, human casualties, etc. In fact social conflicts are the tools of revolutionary development of social and economic systems. In turn, the well known fact that the best properties of the system are formed from the perspective of evolutionary development, and therefore more conducive to scientific and prac-

tical point of view is conflict-free way of life, based on a gradual evolution.

It should also be understood that absence of conflicts are based on evolutionary development. It requires building sophisticated social and economic system of the 'state' on the one hand and a high level of consciousness among the population (active elements) on the other hand. From the position that, if we are talking about social conflicts, the public administration system of a country is a primary tool for their resolution and prevention.

The notion 'public administration' is a multidimensional and complex. It combines a composition of all entities of public administration, such as: executive bodies, which carrying out the management process, interact with each other and the environment, forming a unified whole. According to law of required diversity by William R. Ashby, the future of the object management, primarily in terms of conflict or conflict-free way of development depends on from the quality of public administration and its ability to produce management impacts.

Talking about the state of public administration system of Ukraine, we should note that it is in a state of systemic crisis. We will provide a more detailed analysis, based on systematic and historical approach.

In 1991 the state mega system of the USSR was held anthropogenic system crash, by which it should be understood: the result of uncontrolled process of increase of entropy in an artificial organizational system that causes its collapse (self-destruction) due to failure to control subsystem

transform organizational system from the initial chaotic situation in the target system condition, that is, one in which negentropy is produced [18, p. 9].

In turn anthropogenic system crash, occurred with the USSR, had led to a rapid and unsystematic creation of independent state systems, including the public administration system of Ukraine. As a result, the systemic crisis has emerged, begun to increase. It has continued for now.

Systemic crisis are both state and behaviour of established in violation of system principles and organized to function with deviations from systemic patterns of organizational and economic system. External and internal exposures to these can cause the mode of generation of the problems and unstable condition in internal environment of crisis [4, p. 14].

Thus the need for post-Soviet transformation of public administration system of Ukraine is caused due, first of all, ineffective functioning at earlier stages of transformation, from the time when Ukraine gained independence, and became a democratic state with developed market economy. On the one hand, in turn the main reason for its inefficiency is the systemic crisis. These crisis have not resolved until now. It forms a large destructive potential for the occurrence and exacerbation of new social conflicts.

On the other hand, it should be understood that a long period of social and economic system of the USSR as part of the USSR has formed a culture as 'the way of life activity' of the active elements (people). It significantly differs from the active elements of the

Western society according to the basic characteristics.

Culture as ‘the way of life activity’ is a system of values, norms, attitudes, customs and traditions which developed in the course of historical development of a particular group of active elements, and which affects all aspects of their individual and group behaviour [19, p. 9; 20].

Comparative characteristics of the active elements of the socialist and capitalist systems, as alternative hierarchies that emerged in the 20th century, are presented in [21, p. 26]. Consider them for convenience in tabular form.

Based on Table, we can conclude that according to the classification of culture as ‘the way of life activity’ presented in the work [19, p. 9–10], on the basis of the nature of the impact on the functioning and development of state systems and territories; based on the position of the correct market conditions and democratic system,

the powerful destructive forces in the form of culture as ‘the way life activity’ was formed.

Thus we should take into account the impact of culture as ‘the way life activity’ from the position of managing by transformation processes in addition to systemic crisis in the post-Soviet system of public administration of Ukraine. Its destructive nature was dominant in the most active elements, acting as creators of a new system of public administration as its functionaries. Founded fundamental contradictions as a consequence had led to two revolutionary events of 2004 and 2013–2014. The events of 2013–2014 with tragic consequences had caused the military action on the territory of Ukraine. The military actions have also gone for today.

Thus it can be argued that the certain archetypes influenced the creation of a new state system of independent Ukraine. It had been formed

Comparative characteristics of active elements (people) of capitalist and socialist alternative hierarchies

The active element	The capitalist system	The socialist system
HUMAN	Progressive dominant of hereditary characteristics; market mentality; private owner; entrepreneur; carrier of high moral and human values; quality priority of products and services produced; creator of their own destiny; focus on success; faith in God; law-abiding; market, economic, financial and political literacy; correctness of external business and external validity of formal and informal human relations; high quality of life; self-discipline; culture and self-organization; priority of the interests of the super system over the individual; desire for financial independence; a high level of openness; presence of systemic and strategic thinking	Dominant recessive hereditary traits; non-market mentality (Soviet); conditional co-owner of state property; the carrier of collective values; atheist; priority of public interests over personal; fate and human well-being in the hands of the state; a low level of economic, financial and political literacy; lack of purposefulness; poor quality of life; lack of entrepreneurship; low self-discipline, culture and self-organization; the low level of openness; financial dependence; low quality of products and produced services; lack of systemic and strategic thinking

during the period of Ukraine was the part of the USSR. These events have also affected to the course of transformation processes and defined its results in general for now.

The archetype is the collective memory of humanity inherent in each person a priori. Archetypes affect to all of social constructs. These are sphere of everyday life, habits, traditions and norms of social control. These are also social organization, relevant social institutions, political organization of society. These are public perceptions of themselves and the surrounding world. These are also motivation, social and interactive process of structuring [12, p. 15].

Thus it is the post-Soviet transformation strategy of public administration in the state of progressive organizing, where there will not be any place for social conflicts, and will be implemented the evolutionary process of development. It should be based on the principles of systems theory, public administration and archetypical methodology.

One of the alternative interpretation of the notion 'strategy' that is suitable for use, in the context of social and economic systems of the 'state' according to [22], is a plan, guide, landmark or direction of development, the path from the present to the future. In turn, based on [3, p. 95], the transformation is broadly understood as the process of transformation that combines both evolutionary and revolutionary form of economic system. The moment of transition to the new system development trajectory is interpreted as the sphere of revolutionary changes (revolutionary transforma-

tion), and the process of adaptation to the new system trajectories and the accumulation of factors that will lead to future crisis and disasters. It is also determined by a process of evolutionary development (evolutionary transformation).

Thus, in a broad sense 'the transformation strategy' is the plan, guide, landmark or direction of development, the path from the present to the future through evolutionary or revolutionary change in the context of social and economic system of the 'state'.

According to the research, conducted by the author, the results presented above two key factors in the development of transformation strategy of the post-Soviet system of public administration, should be the same: the state of public administration and the nature of culture as 'the way of life activity'. It supports the status of each other, forming a reinforcing feedback loop.

This is a known fact that public systems are created to meet the needs of all the people living on its territory, regardless of nationality in democratic countries. These needs are to create the favourable conditions for harmonious development life activity and people, ensuring their personal rights and freedoms, protection of property and territory, as well as participation in government. These basic provisions should act just the guidance and direction that the post-Soviet system of public administration should include. Realizing this appointment, it automatically minimizes the likelihood of social conflicts appearance.

Tools of the system improvement of public administration of Ukraine

should become the models of public administration in the context of the strategy of transformation as the necessary condition of solving and preventing social conflicts.

According to [9, p. 7], a public administration can be defined as the interaction of management subject and bearer of power in social processes and relationships accordingly to socially significant functions and powers. In the narrow sense, public administration is connected with the executive branch of government and is seen as the following:

1) Professional activities of state employees, which cover all activities, are aimed at the implementation of government decisions;

2) Research, development and implementation of state policy. In a broad sense, a public administration understands management system provided by administrative institutions within the adopted structures of power.

Today there are three models of public administration that have improved and developed, including the archetypal paradigm [9, p. 9]:

- **Old Public Management** is the classic bureaucratic form of organization, described by Max Weber as an ideal type of rational form of government that due to the principle of legal state indicated a high level of predictability for politicians and citizens.

- **New Public Management** is a composition of administrative and political reform strategy, which is based on interpretations mostly administrative activities in the light of the private economy.

- **'Good Governance'** fills the concept of public administration social

and humanitarian components, creates a new approach to understanding the necessary self-government, which now has not only to meet the requirements of efficiency, but also be open, accessible, accountable, controlled and sensitive to the demands of citizens, their needs and requests.

The author agrees with the position of the authors [9] about the fact that there is the existence of models of the Old Public Management and the New Public Management in Ukraine. The author also offers as benchmarks in the strategy of transformation to consider steady transition to the model of the New Public Management on the first stage, and to consider steady transition to the models of public administration as the 'Good Governance' on the second stage.

In turn, as a benchmark for the management of culture as 'the image of life activity' need take the character of its manifestation in progressive societies as a landmark, according to the model given in [19, p. 12]. According to this model, a culture as an image of 'the life activity'. It is divided into the five estimated parameters, namely:

1. The ideology state level of active elements.

2. The virtues values state level of active elements.

3. The social behaviour state level of active elements

4. The economic behaviour state level of active elements.

5. The environmental behaviour state level of active elements.

Each of these five groups, representing the first level of the model, is divided into subgroups within their group and during conduction expert

research and evaluation, and building the resulting graphic profile. It makes it possible to turn out the system solutions in from the point of view of the formation of a strategic change plan for this unit within the post-Soviet transformation strategy of public administration in Ukraine.

Benchmarks should become a culture as 'the way of life activity' for this block of the transformation strategy. It is characterized by a neutral, not destructive in terms of promoting the states and territories development, and by the transformational changes as constructive on the second stage.

Conclusions. The post-Soviet system of public administration of Ukraine is in the state of systemic crisis. It is dangerous from the perspective of appearance and exacerbation of social conflicts and the possibility of its further existence as a whole in a situation of non-system transformations and the lack of a clear strategic direction, including taking into account the challenges of the modern world.

Therefore, the social conflict is one of the characteristic phenomena of the society development that embraces a diverse range of contradictory reality, and that is the peak expression of inability to solution of various contradictions. It is the system of governance of the country. It plays one of the most important roles in solving and preventing social conflict.

The anthropogenic system disaster, occurred with the Soviet Union in 1991 in addition to the occurrence of a systemic crisis in the new established system of state governance of Ukraine, led to the fact that certain archetypes, formed during the stay in

the USSR, have been moved. They had the impact on creation of a new state system of independent Ukraine. They also have continued for now, affecting the course of the transformation process and identifying results overall. The destructive culture as 'a way of life activity' was moved to it from the democracy perspective development and building of a developed market economy.

Based on the principle of system theory, public administration and methodology of Archetypes were developed the conceptual provisions due to the content of post-Soviet transformation strategy of public administration as a necessary condition of solution and prevention of social conflicts.

So the transformation strategy of the post-Soviet system of public administration is based on both the state of public administration and the nature of culture as 'the way of life activity', which support the state of each other, forming a reinforcing feedback loop.

We proposed to consider the steady transition to model of the New Public Management on the first stage, and to consider steady transition to models of public administration as the 'Good Governance' on the second stage as benchmarks in the transformation strategy. The benchmark in the block 'Culture' as 'the way of life activity' in the transformation strategy should be the move to neutral in the first stage, rather than destructive, and the transformational changes as constructive on the second stage.

The author's further researches will be focused on deepening theoretical and practical provisions for the development of system transformation

of constructive tools of the social and economic system of the 'state', based on the principles of systems theory, public administration and methodology of Archetypics.

REFERENCES

1. *Havrylyshyn B.* To the efficient societies: pointers to the future : supplemented by the Rome Club / B. Havrylyshyn; compiler V. Rubtsov. — ed. 4, unchanged. — K.: University Publishing House 'THE PULSARY', 2013. — 248 p.
2. *Gordiienko L. Yu.* Management of Organizational Transformation: theoretical and methodological principles and management tools: monograph / L. Yu. Gordiienko. — Kharkiv: The Publishing House of KHNEU, 2011. — 440 p.
3. *Hrazhevska N. I.* Evolution of modern economies : textbook / N. I. Hrazhevska. — K: The Knowledge, 2011. — 286 p.
4. *Kobziev P. M.* Systemic approach for the Improvement of the state management and local government / P. M. Kobziev // Management Development. — KHNEU. — 2005. — № 2. — P. 13–16.
5. *Obolenskyi O. Yu.* Development of society and public administration / O. Yu. Obolenskyi // Bulletin NAPA. — 2013. — P. 27–33.
6. *Dehtiar O. A.* The role of public administration in the social sphere of society / O. A. Dehtiar // Public Governance. — 2016. — P. 89–94.
7. *Hrytsiak I. A.* Public administration in Ukraine: establishment of the European standards / I. A. Hrytsiak // Bulletin of the Academy of the Customs Service of Ukraine. Series: Public administration. — 2010. — № 2. — P. 5–11.
8. *Moroz O.* Public Administration in Ukraine: problems of establishment and effectiveness / O. Moroz // Collection of scientific works 'THE EFFICIENCY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION'. — 2013. Edition 34. — P. 41–47.
9. *Amosov O. Yu.* Models of public administration (archetypical paradigm) / O. Yu. Amosov, N. L. Havkalova // Public Management: theory and practice. — 2013. — Special Edition. — P. 6–13.
10. *Amosov O. Yu.* Conceptual principles of public administration: archetypical approach / O. Yu. Amosov, N. V. Havkalova // Public Management: theory and practice. — 2015. — Special Edition. — P. 8–12.
11. *Afonin E.* Universal and unique in the process of social transformation / E. Afonin, A. Martynov // Public Management: theory and practice. — Ed. 3–4. — Kharkiv, 2010. — P. 250–263.
12. *Afonin E.* Theoretical and methodological aspects of the development of the Ukrainian School of Archetypics / E. Afonin, A. Martynov // Public Management: theory and practice. — 2015. — Special Edition. — P. 13–18.
13. *Lashkina M.* Chaos, self-organization and cooperation as archetypes of statehood for Ukraine / M. Lashkina // Public Administration: theory and practice. — 2015. — Edition 1 (Special edition). — P. 162–167.
14. *Kopaihora I. I.* Historical background of the notion 'social conflict' / I. I. Kopaihora // Forum of law. — 2007. — № 2. — P. 82–79.
15. *Kuchubskyyi O.* Features of social conflict as a relevant factor in state regulation of public relations / O. Kuchubskyyi, I. Parubchak // Collection of scientific works 'EFFICIENCY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION'. — 2012. — Ed. 32. — P. 13–19.

16. *Yasna I.* Postmodern social conflicts: attempts of conceptualization / I. Yasna // Philosophical thought. – 2015. – № 4. – P. 104–117.
17. *Kotyhorenko V.* Knowledge about social conflict: the absolute or relative? / V. Kotyhorenko // Political management. – 2003. – № 2. – P. 137–155.
18. *Haharinov A. V.* Anthropogenic systemic catastrophe of the 20th century: essence, causes, consequences / A. V. Haharinov, P. M. Kobziev, A. A. Kotliar // The Business Inform. – 2015. – № 5. – P. 8–15.
19. *Haharinov A. V.* The cultural phenomenon and its role in the transformation of the post-Soviet state system of governance of Ukraine: the main archetypes of sustainable development // Archetypes and public administration: challenges and risks of social transformation [Text]: Collection of scientific works of the winners and the best authors of the Fourth International Competition of young scientists; May 28, 2016, Kyiv, Ukraine / Scientifically edited by E. A. Afonin, H. L. Riabtseva. – Kiev; Tbilisi : The Psycheia, 2016. – P. 7–16.
20. *Haharinov O.* Cultural Phenomenon as the basic factor of systemic competitiveness of organizations or new paradigm of humanity development / O. Haharinov, P. Kobziev, A. Kotliar. – The LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. – 2014. – 66 p.
21. *Kobziev P. M.* System analysis of the created alternative hierarchies of organizational and economic systems / P. M. Kobziev // Economics of development. – KHNEU. – 2009. – № 4 (52). – P. 24–29.
22. *Mintzberg H.* Schools of policies / H. Mintzberg, B. Alstrend, D. Lempel. – St. Petersburg: The Peter, 2000. – 336 p.