

УДК 321.7

## THE DILEMMAS OF MODERN DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

### ДИЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОГО РОЗВИТКУ ДЕМОКРАТІЇ: ТЕОРІЯ ТА ПРАКТИКА

### ДИЛЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОГО РАЗВИТИЯ ДЕМОКРАТИИ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

#### **Pogorska I. I.**

Doctor of Political Sciences, Senior Researcher, Senior Researcher of the Institute of International Relations of Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University. E-mail: irinapogorska@yahoo.com

#### **Погорська І. І.**

Доктор політичних наук, старший науковий співробітник старший, старший науковий співробітник Інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. E-mail: irinapogorska@yahoo.com

#### **Погорская И. И.**

Доктор политических наук, старший научный сотрудник, старший научный сотрудник Института международных отношений Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко. E-mail: irinapogorska@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** *The manageability of modern global and regional processes is directly dependent on the success of multilateral interaction, the search for collective mutually acceptable solutions. Therefore, the foreign policy of modern states is essentially aimed at creating a more stable, predictable and secure international environment on the democracy model basis, where an effective balance has been found between the national and collective interests of political actors. The current stage is the subject of serious scientific discussions. It is argued that situational measures can not fundamentally change the model of democratic development on world space because that does not entail a change in the conceptual basis of the system of multilateral cooperation. Modern research stands out fundamental works, which presents systematized integration features, combining economic, historical, political, cultural and psychological aspects of the analysis of democratic development formats.*

**Key words:** *democracy, theory, model, global development.*

**Анотація.** *Керованість сучасних глобальних і регіональних процесів безпосередньо залежить від успіху багатосторонньої взаємодії, пошуку колективних взаємоприйнятних рішень. Тому зовнішня політика сучасних держав в основному спрямована на створення більш стабільної, передбачуваного і безпечної міжнародної обстановки на основі розвитку моделі демократії, де було досягнуто ефективний баланс між національними і колективними інтересами політичних акторів. Нинішній етап є предметом серйозних наукових дискусій. Стверджується, що ситуаційні заходи не можуть кардинально змінити модель демократичного розвитку на світовому просторі, оскільки це не тягне за собою зміни концептуальної основи системи багатостороннього співробітництва. Сучасні дослідження виділяють фундаментальні роботи, в яких представлені системати-*

зовани інтеграційні функції, що поєднують економічні, історичні, політичні, культурні та психологічні аспекти аналізу форматів демократичного розвитку.

**Ключові слова:** демократія, теорія, модель, глобальний розвиток.

**Аннотация.** *Управляемость современных глобальных и региональных процессов напрямую зависит от успеха многостороннего взаимодействия, поиска коллективных взаимоприемлемых решений. Поэтому внешняя политика современных государств в основном направлена на создание более стабильной, предсказуемой и безопасной международной обстановки на основе развития модели демократии, где был достигнут эффективный баланс между национальными и коллективными интересами политических акторов. Нынешний этап является предметом серьезных научных дискуссий. Утверждается, что ситуационные меры не могут кардинально изменить модель демократического развития на мировом пространстве, поскольку это не влечет за собой изменения концептуальной основы системы многостороннего сотрудничества. Современные исследования выделяют фундаментальные работы, в которых представлены систематизированные интеграционные функции, сочетающие экономические, исторические, политические, культурные и психологические аспекты анализа форматов демократического развития.*

**Ключевые слова:** демократия, теория, модель, глобальное развитие.

**The current problem.** One of the major consequences of the transformation processes late XX – early XXI century was the establishment of democracy as a basic model of global socio-political system. In today's world, this process is becoming more global. Almost all more or less developed countries are now democracies or chose a strategy of democratization, which is based on national circumstances and traditions. Thus, in the 1950s the number of democratic and authoritarian regimes practically coincided, and since 1980, there has been steady growth in the number of democracies. In general it can be stated that the main trend of world development is moving toward democracy as the optimal form of social organization.

**The aim of the article** is to analyze of the dilemmas of the democracy development at the present stage of the global world evolution in combining theoretical and practical aspects.

**The important research results.** Problems of historical development and the prospects of democracy can be seen in a different theoretical context, often based on civilization paradigms and stages of world development. That is, the reflection of the fact that democracy is the product of a definite (Western) civilization or step required historical and political evolution of any society. While the attention of researchers focused on the trend to global spread of democratic institutions and the difficulty of their rooting in non-Western societies.

The establishment of democratic institutions was a relatively late stage of the development of Western civilization – in the era of so-called modern, i.e. democracy, understood as a set of representative government, free elections, ideological and political pluralism and turnover subjects of power by the will of the citizens, is the phenomenon of stages in framework of the present civilization. Analyzing the problems of modern democracy in this context, a renowned expert in the given area Ulrich Beck rightly sees the way to solve them in dedogmatisation and desecration of permanent the principles of democracy [Beck, 1997: 40–46]. This means that the simple reproduction of its foundations giving way to critical analysis and experiments of a constant in all spheres of social action. Search for new forms of democracy becomes a feature of modern public opinion and different dimensions of social practice. First of all, we are talking about the formation of new forms of sociality, designed to replace traditional forms of group socio-cultural community by more mobile, emerging on a voluntary basis on changing specific problems and situations. Searching “new communitarism” where sociality, determined “outside” is re-

placed by sociality voluntary, expressing the desire of individuals without sacrificing their autonomy, to overcome mutual estrangement on the basis of finding common values and aspirations [Etzioni, 1999: 7–9].

Today it is really hard to say which changes in democratic institutions can lead this search to. However, the leading tendency is to increase the role of civil society and its impact on the development of the state, which apparently requires expanding the scope and enrich the forms of its activity, its penetration on the level of management, decision support systems, which are the domain of professional policy, technocracy and bureaucratic structures.

Arguably, it is here rather the need for development of a new stage of democracy than its evolution only within its civilization, i.e. the western area. Feature prospects for democracy as a global phenomenon, by stages, is the relationship of democratization and globalization, the evolution of democracy in the context of global historical process. Because none of the currently existing local civilizations, except Western, not made in its development of democratic values and institutions, we can assume that this prospect is real only in the event of a new global civilization that graft these values and institutions on the traditional foundations of other civilized areas.

The main factor in the democratization of globalization is often considered the impact of the modernization of economic and social structures: economic development based on modern technology leads to an increase in wealth, and the latter opens the way to democracy. Since by S. Huntington, “the relationship between the welfare of the nation and its democratization is strong enough” and S. M. Lipset, exploring the relationship between the level of economic development of countries and their political systems, found that democratization depends on many factors, but the level of socio-economic development is its “basic and essential” (74% of the countries with the lowest levels of economic development are authoritarian, 24% “semi” and only one country – India – the democratic regime. Among the countries with the level below and above average democracies are respectively 11 and 39%, but this category includes all countries with developed market economies) [Huntington, 1984: 193–218].

However, the dependence of the democratization on the economic factor is hardly immediate. Socio-economic condition of representative democracy is not a Western-style market economy and level of economic development as such, but due to these factors numerical superiority in the social structure of the so-called middle class. This social community is united by living standard, which provides access to a set of basic consumer goods, supplied with modern mass production, and interest in the socio-political stability and is internally split by specific diversity of group status and sources of income, which are formed by market relations. This combination of consensus and pluralism of interests makes the middle class the support of representative democracy that allows its different groups to identify, protect and accommodate their interests without disturbing at the same time, institutional bases of their economic and social status. Clearly, the role of the middle class in a democratic political system appears not in all historical situations, and some may even turn into its opposite. In particular, in the case when the society is in socio-economic processes that threaten the position of some of the middle class, they are quite capable by its socio-political behavior to destabilize the institutions of representative democracy, and even act as force support authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. However, if the middle class is not always a pillar of democracy, its significant share in the social structure of business and civil society is a prerequisite for sustainable democratic development.

If the welfare of major groups is not provided by their market situation but on the other basis, such as through state paternalism, the pluralism of interest does not appear, and even a very high level of welfare does not create social conditions of democratization. With all these warnings doubt that poor societies in which large segments of the population live in poverty and mar-

ginalized socially, do not constitute a favorable environment for the development of democracy and civil society.

In terms of socio-economic factor, the prospects of global democratization sometimes look quite optimistic. The current phase of globalization is accompanied by a deepening economic differentiation between the most developed countries and the other majority of countries. This trend continues we should not expect a quick and uniform economic and social progress, a radical increase in living standards and, therefore, the formation of social preconditions for real participatory democracy. In many of those countries, where formal democratic institutions were abolished the democratic progress remains fragile and, in critical condition, it may even act as an additional factor of social and political instability of the political transformation processes.

A major obstacle to global democratization, at least it does not have clear alternatives to the Western model yet, is the cultural originality of non-Western societies, which is not able to dilute any Westernization. Thus, in the cultural context of some non-Western societies individual value, which is fundamental to Western culture and spiritual prerequisite of democratization is perceived as a foreign element. Although the process of individuation is developing in such societies, it is poorly violates inherent dissolution of the individual in the group. This does not preclude democratization at least in formal electoral level, but makes it unreal in those forms, which are developed in Western societies.

The analysis of the contemporary interdisciplinary discourse on globalization influences in socio-economic terms proves that members of the social sciences show division between those who consider globalization and post-industrialism potential from the standpoint of destruction, and those who see globalization in action a positive force [Bobbio, 1987: 12–17]. The main problem in many countries is poverty that in today's world there are regions where the poor are not able to solve the problem of survival. In this situation, poverty is a source that produces only itself. Since these areas are not talking about any notion of development, there is deactualization of such important areas of international aid as security of physical, human and natural capital. When it comes only about a survival, it is too risky to invest in the future. Not surprisingly, the poor countries have low or negative ratings of economic growth, their governments can not effectively take advantage of the physical geography, national fiscal resources, the investments in infrastructure, on which the economic development depends. Moreover, in such habitats of poverty governmental system often riddled with corruption that adversely affects the identification and funding of high-priority projects and organizations the necessary mechanisms of management, taking into account the structure of the existing local cultural barriers and social norms which are provided with the advantages by different social groups. Demography is also a deterrent factor – large family denies individual opportunities to invest money in its development. Lack of innovation in all spheres of life creates a significant gap in the trends of rich and poor countries. As individuals and whole groups in societies with low scores may be poor or impoverished, having lost hope for social progress of their societies. In such a situation, rich world puts a logical question about the effectiveness of its own care.

Economic mechanisms of poverty reduction can be divided into two main categories: increasing resources through redistribution and enhance the effectiveness of the economic environment. Leading by supporting poor nations are often redistribution resources through targeting particularly important ones for the growth of national productivity industries – such as investing in agriculture, health, education, transport and communication. Investing in this manner is aimed at helping the poorest groups at least to get in the way of development. This approach has a logical solution to the problem of increasing national growth figures, because it is necessary to understand the growth in value of resources that belong to the nation. Of particular importance

here is the question of the effectiveness of government efforts to regulate private economic activity, including the activity of foreign companies. The experience of developed European countries and the United States showed that strong economic growth depends less on direct government investment, but on the creation of an institutional structure of the government, when there is an effective transformation of income from private investment in both physical and human capital. In the case of poor countries, there is another option to advance economic growth. There are various reasons that their national space is not attractive to private investors, including the implementation of projects related to poverty reduction. Besides corruption in poor countries, there is frequent instability of governmental institutions, causing a high degree of risk and no guarantees, subsidizing unprofitable projects and tax profitable, the presence of ideological opposition to market processes. All this reduces the efficiency of such a mechanism, as investing in development. Thus, the primary attention of leaders of the international community is aimed at mechanisms of direct allocation of resources in poor areas of the world. They are as follows: through the central international organization the World Bank, through bilateral government aid, through the international activities of individual citizens. Significantly, in the context of the implementation of active government support to invest in human capital, educational programs become particularly valuable. According to Western experts and functionaries, the successful combination of three levels of implementation of aid to poor countries will lead to a steady reduction in global poverty. In turn, a permanent reduction in global poverty would allow poor nations to find the necessary resources to conduct effective and systematic institutional reform.

Taking into consideration the duality of the effects of globalization, we consider it appropriate to note that not all relationships have to be firm – perhaps some of these effects of globalization can be very positive, but the nature of them may help to overcome high poverty and to increase it also. Redistribution of resources from the rich to the poor raises the question of support for investment and the level of economic growth. Therefore, it is important to use the potential of globalization in terms of investments in higher standards of living. Developing countries need not only transfers, but also creation of conditions under which it is possible to overcome the circumstances of poverty through trade, security, maintenance and investment. In this context, growth is often understood as a tool for poverty reduction and associated with the introduction of minimum standards of living in some temporal dimension. It is clearly, that poverty reduction and economic growth especially in the low-income countries are correlated. Empirical studies show: real progress in living standards makes it necessary to increase the national wealth. For example, India in the sense of rapid growth as the main tool for poverty reduction shows a significant positive contribution to the development. The positive association between poverty reduction and growth can be noted in the following countries with high levels of poverty, such as China, Indonesia, Philippines [4]. It is clear this growth contributes to inject into the society of such long-awaited positives functioning as improving law and fiscal discipline. However, it is not the fact that the very existence of democratic institutions has a systemic impact on tackling poverty. In the context of globalization influences governments often show reluctance to quality combination of national programs of short-and long-term interests which at the same time have to consider the interests of other countries. Practice of industrialized countries to protect vulnerable markets can be regarded as a sign of difficulty of dramatic changes. There is no denying the fact that the risks of globalization are particularly significant for fragile economies of developing countries. The negative side of globalization is evident during the global economic and financial crises. On the other hand, it is undeniable that globalization has the potential in terms of poverty reduction, including the developing countries, first of all, by cre-

ating an environment conducive to faster economic growth and rapid transfer of knowledge. Proper use of structural factors and channels of national economic policy in the world economy makes it possible to confirm the benefits of globalization. Progress in reducing global poverty exists primarily due to Asian countries that have chosen the path of intensive development [Priest, 2005: 4–7].

From this perspective, it makes sense to note the meaning of channels that connect the modern globalization with poverty. The most important mechanism is defined: growth-inequality-poverty. The link, which brings together globalization and the growth, is opening the market primarily due to liberalization of trade and movement of capitals. The way from openness to poverty is determined by the relationship between growth and inequality. Here, poverty reduction will depend on how you will profit sharing. If growth is aimed at increasing inequality in income, the last link combines the effect of the growth and impact of income inequality on poverty, at the same time, a high level of GDP growth is good for its reduction. Therefore, government officials often focus their efforts on the structure of growth more than on a level of growth as such. That is a significant reduction in poverty is a combination of high growth and a more “social” distribution of profits out of it. Opening global competition can promote the reduction of working places and deterritorialization under conditions of employment and labor. So, in any case, integration into the global economy could help the poor, but does not replace a strategy to fight with poverty.

In such a situation it becomes important the relationship between global technological diffusion, which in global terms is uneven, and the level of training. High qualified personnel does not migrate to poor countries, on the contrary, the reverse tendency is observed. The confirmation of this is the active migration of medical personnel from African and Asian countries to the United States and the EU. Unqualified staff especially, is not in a position to support the programs of intensive internal development, and part of it again migrates to wealthier countries. Quite important becomes the role of multinational corporations which move the process of production to the areas where there is cheap labor. Despite criticism regarding the exploitation of the local population, the activities of corporations contribute significantly to the growth of incomes in the location, and also stimulate people to get qualified, and local companies to introduce new technologies and efficient management. So the positive from the operation of TNC in terms of improving individual social status depends largely on the attractiveness of the internal environment of the country [Smith, 2002: 15]. It is clear that from the standpoint of the use of the positive aspects of globalization to reduce poverty, governments and businesses need to realize social and collective capabilities. The latter point includes: investments in health, the institutions that are responsible for the observance of basic legal norms, collective investments in social insurance. In the absence of such elements globalization process only creates difficulties for those who due to it might take better living attitudes. These institutions, acting as a kind of filter, which intensifies the positive and negative effects of the relationship between globalization and poverty, should help to reduce the global socio-economic heterogeneity.

Positive results of the impact of progress on the global space of international relations have a very specific context. For getting positives from the effects of globalization forces, developing countries have to make strategic moves of correlation for the long term. Officials must define and implement an active strategy not only to benefit from globalization, but also to counter its negative effects. In this regard, it is appropriate the combination of movement through strategic integration into the global world market and conducting active internal policy of development aimed at poverty reduction and based on the use of scientific and technological opportunities of progress. That is what will improve living standards in poorer regions of the world and thus give their members more opportunities to self-realization.

Lack of adequate resources in countries of the South only increases the gap between the levels of rich and poor worlds that needs attention first of all of the countries of the Great Eight. However, in terms of the complexity of determining the most useful single regulatory system, the most practical efficiency is revealed by coalitions “ad hoc”. Support for crisis centers is of strategic importance particularly for regional determining norms of collective action, because the latter requires a consensus in the implementation of specific assistance programs. At the same time the need for a global strategy becomes obvious.

At present the strategy of international organizations demonstrates a certain consensus on the inclusion of the poorest countries in the world economy. It is based on three components: the actual politics of development of these countries, the benefits of opening external exchange, the increasing foreign aid [Dunning, 1993: 18–29]. Largely profit becomes dependent on policy of a country and management quality of its institutions by the accumulation of capital in the creation of industries that will participate in the global economic exchange [Nissanke, 2007: 1–4]. This regulation rhythms and general modality of commercial liberalization is not less important than the help itself for the adapting by the new players in the market the most transparent mode does not automatically solve the problem of poverty. Therefore, this policy provides for the integration of the total population in the development process, i.e. the preservation of such important budget priorities as education and health, quality of social capital investment. And it already reflects the level of political decisions and political investment in the overall development.

The prospect of global democratization is considerably complicated by the existing structure of international relations, the asymmetry of democratization processes in different regions of the world. If Western society solves the problem of overcoming the dysfunctions of representative democracy by bringing democratic institutions in line with the realities of the post-industrial era, the societies of the South and the East develop and learn sustainable democratic order and democratic practice, appropriate for their conditions and traditions. From the theoretical point variations “of future scenarios of democracy” are possible: a fundamentally new phase of democratic process in some regions and its stagnation in others, interweaving and mutual enrichment of its various streams. In the medium-term vision it can be argued that in most societies the principle of variability of power on the basis of relatively stable legitimate procedures involving the vote will be firmly established.

With globalization and the associated growing dynamism of economic and social processes, sufficiently flexible response of the political sphere to the new “challenges” and therefore ordering turnover of power is a necessary condition for the survival of modern societies. Thus today illiberal democracies differ neither in political nor in economic efficiency, as the ruling elite is not composed on the meritocratic principle. The basis of illiberal democracy is populism (as in Russia), or tight control over political life (as in most African countries). Both one and the other are possible due to the lack of secured and independent middle class. Often because of this illiberal democracy becomes a consequence of premature democratization. The main danger that conceals illiberal democracy, are, on one hand, that the people see how the power manipulates their opinion, comes to deep disappointment with democracy as such, on the other hand – that the economic foundations do not stimulate economic modernization, which leads to a gradual lag in the economic sphere and creates in people a sense of “deprivation” [Zakaria, 2007: 145].

However, planting of Western values and democracy in Western societies is not correct. Conversely, premature transition to Western-style democracy could lead to serious economic difficulties and political instability, and as a consequence to raise authoritarian and dictatorial regimes which are a nutrient medium for organized crime. Choosing which, according to F. Za-

karia the developing countries should do for themselves is a choice between illiberal democracy and liberal autocracy [Zakaria, 2007: 97].

Liberal autocracy, or at a higher stage of development, liberal constitutionalism, is a more effective way of becoming a liberal democracy. Considering the variety of cases that have occurred in the last three decades, of the transition of non-Western societies to liberal democracy, it is easy to find that significant progress achieved by those countries which used their version of the European model: capitalism and the rule of law in the first place, and democracy – in the second. As a result they have achieved impressive commercial success, and over the past 15 years they have passed to democracy – and far more stable and effective one [Schmitter, Karl, 1993: 51]. Chance of building a truly liberal democracy is still far above where illiberal democracy entrenched.

The successful functioning of democracy depends on citizens as independent individuals. This means the ability to maintain their identity, to avoid emptiness and loneliness through their own intellectual resources.

In the modern world there are a number of trends and factors that will threaten democratic institutions today and in the nearest future: the growth of fans of extreme forms of nationalism, religious intolerance and theocratic aspirations, terrorism and criminal violence, the crisis of the modern model of socio-political system that dominates most developed countries, the increasing role that is played by advertising specialists and consultants on the media in policy, the lack of interest of citizens in public affairs, unless it comes to protecting their specific interests. As Henry Kissinger said: “Politicians under pressure of voters are reluctant to turn to the problems, the existence of which goes beyond the electoral cycle” [Kissinger, 2002: 260–261].

Potentially the most important threat to democracy may come from long-term changes that are detrimental to mankind: overpopulation, resource reduction of agricultural land, water and ecological disasters that require future austerity measures, including the presence of many undemocratic restrictions.

Widespread democratic reforms in many countries do not mean smooth development of this political phenomenon. The experience of developed countries, democracy faces serious problems, which experts characterize differently: Zh. Beshler calls “distortion of democracy” N. Bobbio – “unfulfilled promises of democracy” F. Schmitter – “threats to democracy” Sh. Eyzenshtadt – “fragility of democratic regimes”. Robert Dal notes inequality of citizens as a fundamental problem in all democratic countries [Dal, 1991: 9–17]. The prospect of democracy, from his point of view, depends on the degree of approximation to the elite of the people who make decisions. Improving citizens, their active participation in society and the life of state is a necessary condition for democracy. And the higher the level of political participation, citizens closer to the ever increasing level of requirements for participants in the political process, the closer democracy is to its ideal.

Political scientists often believe the demand for more “pure” and perfect democracy to be a true threat to democracy. Democracy can not but causes the creation of myths that are favorable to it, but not realized in time, these myths become utopia that destroys democracy. He also believes that democracy is fraught with tyranny, but the bearer of this threat is not the majority, which can weaken the centers of power but the minority which can take the advantage of the difficulties of the democratic system either to destroy it, or to give it closed oligarchic character.

The most important problem of democracy is the principle of majority when making collective decisions. Thus, the American political scientist Dankwart Rustow believes that “democracy is a system of governing of a temporary majority” [24]. The considerable part of researchers recognizes the imperfection of this principle, but can not offer another versatile alternative. The



experience in various democratic countries shows that in different circumstances the democratic process can be implemented with other principles of collective decisions that take into account the conditions in which they will be accepted.

But most experts are convinced of the loyalty of key theses: the democratic process is no more sophisticated alternative, and its deficiencies can be corrected by creating a real alternative process for improving a number of specific decisions or political strategies within the democratic system or the improvement of the democratic regime itself. At the same time a certain degree of democratic principles may be accepted as a payment for the benefits of the democratic process.

Reflecting on the inevitable gap between the ideal and reality, introduces the concept of “democratic deficit”, which he has in mind not only the shortcomings inherent in democracy as a political system, but also the problems that arise in the process of establishing democracy. These deficits, according to the French political scientist, are of two kinds. The first arises from the differences between the ideal and reality, because democracy is a democratization process extended in time, often for a long time: at each moment there is a gap between what should and can be done and what is actually done. Other deficits are associated with the circumstances that prevent historically specific democracies from coming closer to his ideal. The delay of democracies is explained by the fact that the previous system left behind a non-democratic legacy, associated with the elimination of the previous political regime, burdened with traditional vestiges, revolutionary transformations, historical features. Lack of democracy, in this logic, is also explained by fatal hostile circumstances. First of all, this is an economic cycle, which does not remain in a stable state for a long time, which affects the implementation of the promises that come from the government to the citizens. Even more significant fact hostile to democracy is social stratification. In an ideal democracy distribution according to most researchers should not be equal but fair. Everyone gets his share of power, wealth, prestige, in accordance with his competence, contribution to total wealth and his merits.

Political scientists P. C. Schmitter and T. L. Karl fears of another kind, focusing on the transition after the collapse, toppling autocracies when citizens of countries with strong liberal and democratic traditions that have long been accustomed to limited participation in governance and limited accountability of the executive, begin openly doubt of such practices negatively affecting citizens in new democracies that are just beginning to learn this practice [Schmitter, Karl, 1993: 4–9]. Two reasons made the American scientist to investigate the danger that lurk democracy: the ideological hegemony of democracy can dry with growing frustration of new democracies in the actual results; the likelihood that democracy will move forward without meeting the expectations of its citizens without establishing acceptable and predictable set of rules for political competition and cooperation. And the first and the second case can lead to the death of democracy. In these terms, in countries that embarked on the path of democratic reforms, there are at least another two options: to create a hybrid regime, uniting elements of autocracy and democracy, and creation of sustainable, but unconsolidated democracy.

In cases when the transition is initiated and imposed from above, the former rulers are trying to protect their interests by authoritarian methods. In cases when they spend liberalization without democratization, there is a hybrid mode which the American researcher named “dictablanda”. In those cases when they spend democratization without liberalization the neologism “democradura” was proposed. And “dictablanda” and “democradura” become quite common, as authoritarian rulers are trying to introduce democratic mechanisms in their states to create visibility progressive changes in the international force, demanding democratization.

P. Schmitter allocates internal dilemmas inherent in a modern democracy, regardless of time and place of its occurrence and external, that questioned the compatibility of the new demo-

cratic rules and practices with the existing social, cultural and economic conditions. To the internal dilemmas scientist refers, above all, an oligarchy, withdrawal, due to the lack of rational incentives for citizens to participate actively in political life, “cyclic recurrence in policy”, which is explained by the uneven distribution of costs and benefits among social groups, which leads to creating an unstable majority formed by temporary coalitions, functional autonomy, the essence of which is accountability to citizens and experts of undemocratic state institutions, interdependence with other democracies and some autocracies associated with limited ability to control the borders and the activities of transnational corporations [*Schmitter, Karl, 1993: 137–156*].

External dilemma is primarily determined by collective choice between alternative institutional arrangements that are compatible with the existing socio-economic structures, and cultural realities. Threats to democracy may go from the masses, as well as from the elite. Despite the fact that the elite are more than the masses, committed to values of democracy, they often reject these values in times of crisis and turn to repressions. Activity of masses and elites is often combined, creating numerous threats to democracy. The activity of the masses, which is manifested in riots, demonstrations, extremism, violence, arouses fear and insecurity in the elite. They return imprisonment and increase security measures for it. The dissent is questioned, newspapers are censored, freedom of speech is restricted, representatives of potential counter-elite get in prison, and police and security forces are strengthened in the name of “national security” or “law and order”. Elites themselves argue that these steps are necessary for the preservation of liberal democratic values. T. Dye and H. Zeigler conclude: “The irony is that in trying to preserve democracy, elites make society less democratic” [*Dye, Zeigler, 2008: 48–49*].

S. Huntington believes that obstacles to the democratization of countries can be divided into three broad categories: political, cultural and economic. As one of the potentially significant political obstacles he highlights the lack of experience of democratic governance of political leaders, manifested in the lack of commitment to democratic values. Deeply anti-democratic culture prevents the spread of democratic norms in the society, denies the legitimacy of democratic institutions and thus can greatly impede its construction and efficient functioning or even prevent it. Among the major economic obstacles to democratic development the American political scientist names poverty, that’s why, he connects the future of democracy with advanced economies. What hinders economic development is an obstacle to the spread of democracy. “Most poor societies will remain undemocratic until they remain poor” – sums up the American scientist [*Huntington, 1993: 41*].

The overall increased interest in democracy that began in the late XX century and is continuing in the new century, was caused primarily by mass aspirations of countries liberated from authoritarianism, to find a perfect form of government. The political experience of the developed countries shows that the most significant progress has been achieved by those political systems that were based on liberal democratic values. This vivid example was the determining factor in selecting prospects of development of yesterday’s authoritarian states. However, the future of democracy is far from being clear. Many countries have not coped with democratic overload and returned to authoritarian rule. In addition, there is a striking affirmation according to which most of the future challenges will gestate in the womb of the already established liberal democracies, and there are two reasons for such fear: the first is the inability to explain their shortcomings by threat of constant rivalry with another system, preventing its collapse; the second is that the population of these countries is much more “tainted” with normative expectations about how the democracy should work. The specialists most often refer to Robert Dal, who noted that the practice of democracy has undergone several revolutions, while its defenders often did not fully re-

alize what they were doing. All you need at this time is to ensure sufficient pressure from below in the form of institutional crisis and to adapt changes to democracy by introducing new rules and regulations. As a result of these changes the new democracy will be perfect [Dal, 1991: 404].

The future of democracy boils down to two issues: the definition of its versatility and adaptability associated with the existing system, or the need to use a special “transition model” of undesirable state to the desired.

No exception of all these processes is also a global level of social interactions. World system as a democratic one is imagined in two ways: as a system consisting of free societies and democracies and as a system in which relations between states and peoples are determined by law and by the general principles of justice. Some researchers believe that there is a gradual and evolving international architecture of collective institutions and formal agreements, focused both on the principles of democracy and human rights and on the legitimacy of international action aimed at their improvement and protection. The most optimistic approach is focused on finding a historic opportunity to transform truly democratic world into reality. Achieving this goal requires the solution of three main objectives: to deepen and consolidate democracy where it is formally realized; to continue development and strengthening of joint structures and institutional rules of democracy at the level of regional and international organizations; to encourage many different streams of change and transformation that could merge into single fourth wave of democratization.

Since the processes of democracy are closely interrelated with other global processes, especially with globalization, it leads not only to internationalization, but also to various crises in less developed countries. At the same time an attempt to create in emerging democracies institutions through an eclectic mix of democratic forms which are practiced in various democratic countries, not only contributes to discredit the ideas of democratization in post-authoritarian societies. Substantial harm is inflicted to the general prospects of democracy globally. So American political scientist J. Markoff writes: “In order to avoid the trivialization of democracy and ensure its ability to meet the challenges of the XXI century, the process of democratization itself must be something more than simply spreading to new regions of the world well known, established models of democratic government. If democracy is going to acquire the full meaning of the future, it will have to undergo rethinking and transforming as it always happened in the past” [18].

Currently, there are two approaches to the characterization of the phenomenon of “global democracy”. The first approach is based on the unification of democratization on the model of Western liberal democracy, which leads at different speeds, with different efficiency, but the bulk of the former authoritarian countries to common democratic standards. The second approach considers the “global democratization” is not a unifying political map of the world, but as diversification of democracy, expanding democratic development options. Proponents of this approach are based on the fact that the assessment of democracies based on textbook models of Western democracy is wrong, and it should maintain the existence of different models of democracy. Thus, the agenda put forward the task of analysis of the process, occurring in the world of post authoritarian transformations as a process of expanding the typological diversity of democracies.

As the key factors which the future stability and spread of democracy will depend on, often marked economic development and political leadership are often marked. As powerful structural factors that facilitate the expansion and deepening of democracy, social development and the expansion of global wealth and education are also called. But in the long run, the ultimate

significance is given to the crucial political leadership, its choices and actions on many levels, which imposes obligations on government officials, political parties, interest groups and organizations in the “young” democracies, but also on institutions in those countries where the democracy has already been established. But democracy as a global and local process will eventually spread in the world as much as those who use power around the world and in some countries want to extend it.

Each country of the modern world is in search of an optimum combination of transparency and the protection of national interests. First of all, I would like to mention the United States, guided in their foreign policy by their own national priorities and where the preservation of the democratic system is among foundation (historically without alternative) elements of the state, which logically leads to the use of all possible activities and modes of action for the protection and propagation of democratic system and development of civil society. Among the latter the most important are the ensuring of economic growth, regional and global strategic dominance, creating an effective system of control and prevention of threats. It is important to note that the USA, which attracts significant investments in the national economy, is the first among the leaders of foreign investment. Logically, the observance of this approach is considered a strategic contribution to the strengthening of the U.S. position in the world. Lead channel of exports and imports have become TNC. Their promotion goes along with the movement of direct investment abroad, where the U.S. retains leadership [Miotti, 2007: 9]. On the basis of direct investments the formation of foreign production that is mutually beneficial process takes place. The desire to promote liberalization coincides with the interests of the states where competitive advantages make their economies stronger and allow you to maximize the positive aspects of globalization.

The strategy of economic growth is a priority among global initiatives of American administrations. Applicants for assistance must meet three principles of economic growth: ensuring economic freedom, governance by laws and investing in people. The most important indicator of targeted funding remains Index of Economic Freedom, which is the product of a common definition of Foundation “Heritage” and of “Wall Street Journal” [19]. Along with it, the U.S. approach to international assistance makes it possible to fix the three types of economic disparities between countries: domestic or social inequality, individual inequality, mixed type according to the results of both the aforementioned. Among the countries for which the participation of Americans is significant, most successfully convert social capital into positive action on a global scale were “little dragons, tigers and elephants” that focused the reforms on liberalizing exchange and respect for intellectual property rights. In particular, China and India have greatly increased exports to rich countries and created favorable conditions for attracting direct investments. Here they actively use the positives of presence of US companies and their networks for variability of own competitive advantages and quick access to markets [Miotti, 2007: 5–6]. However the effectiveness of this strategy in Asia and Latin America is not a recipe for poor African countries. Too low starting level of development of several countries on the continent makes it difficult to determine the path of integration into the world economy. It is necessary to note that the impact of growth on poverty reduction is a double one-both direct and indirect. On the one hand, the growth increases incomes. On the other it increases state revenues, which in turn makes it possible to increase investment in the social sector and therefore, production capacity of the population as a factor in maintaining the same growth.

So we can see that growth is the preference in solving the problems of poverty, but not a panacea. Too much depends on the system of income distribution in the country, and here it becomes important the internal system organization and activity in overcoming the negative phe-

nomena like corruption. That is, the effectiveness is determined by social and structural factors, as well as the political choice. The poorest states of the South, where even the conditions for modern social organization and discovery of the world of information technologies are often absent, require significant international effort to create effective mechanisms of governance and the formation of national social capital. However, the latter point remains overlooked by the main practical priorities of the leaders of the world community.

An important area that at all times is trying to support non-violent image of a state is public diplomacy and especially non-governmental organizations activity. Modern political science often offers the insight of NGOs as pressure groups. It is accepted that this approach has some merit. Voluntary social associations that are separate from the state is the traditional phenomenon of socio-political culture of the West, including the United States. In connection with the extension of civil rights in the XVIII – XIX centuries in America there was the need to support the interests of social groups and new trends in political practice. Even Alexis de Tocqueville after his trip to the United States stressed the importance of political associations as the institutions of democracy and noted that they are very numerous and influential in the United States. Americans were among the first to see the political profitability of such projects and began active use of their potential. Moreover, the American state less than any other is sponsoring the activities NGOs their own – about 30% of total investments. In France, for example, this figure reaches 60%. First of all, this approach, due to special American model of NGO vector in national politics, is defined as the model of interest groups with a high degree of competition [Lee, Kigali, 2005: 4–13]. Public organizations use the mechanics of indirect effects primarily on the legislative branch through the mechanisms of civil society. Among them there is a widely used method of lobbying this or that solution. It is clear that the representatives of non-governmental dimension have significant personal interests in business and politics. It is also clear that their niche in the domestic management allows them to influence on decision-making process in foreign policy. The close ties with business and political forces allow the most powerful non-governmental structures function as major political actors of outside influence. Large organizations that operate internationally develop two or three strategic ideas a year that are brought to the attention of Congress. A classic example is the functioning of the military-industrial complex of America, where the modern “corporate warriors” get privileges in the distribution of orders of the Ministry of Defense [30]. Thus, bringing the capacity of NGOs in the field of international relations is for America a logical step both from the positions of accordance to the peculiarities of the internal political development and compliance features of formation of its foreign policy.

Since the late 90’s of XX century active role of NGOs in foreign policy was the recognized need in the context of increasing global spectrum of international humanitarian and social policy, in principle, impossible without the participation of the leaders of the world community. In fact, NGOs constitute institutional and corporate network through the operation of which another single space of management of international political processes is formed. It combines the state, business and public diplomacy. So we are talking about the structural and regulatory aspects of the impact on the world system evolution. In the context of the last NGOs is often treated as part of the creation of social space, wider than management. In the scientific and analytical literature (including the U.S.) regarding public sphere interactions most tolerant is a term introduced in the 80’s of XX century – civil society. Its principal drawback almost immediately was identified an excessive vagueness. Interdisciplinary study of 90-ies of XX century showed that in many countries primarily developed ones NGOs can claim a significant share of political legitimating, comparable only with the state [30]. The sector of international economic cooperation in the desire

to divide the government, private business and non-governmental organizations that perform specific practical mission began to use actively the term “third sector”. At this stage concerning the actors who operate in the field of international relations, the most commonly used category of “non-actors”, which also includes multinational corporations. In purely political terms, where the decisive role belongs to the state, such recognition is important: an original triad is fixed, which is directly involved in making foreign policy and international policy decisions. Many researchers convinced that the success of NGOs (primarily American) in the international arena is closely linked to processes of globalization and the creation of social conditions in which ordinary citizens must use regulatory mechanisms outside the field of civil structures [Daveport, 2005: 15]. From their part, government officials also recognize that the support of non-governmental forces makes their political decisions more socially legitimate. So, we can agree with the vision of international organizations the structures of global politics. The joining of the “third dimension” to the state and market, the major players in world politics, should be considered as a just one. This refers primarily to the role of civil society in support of the problem of global balance.

Extending social norms, NGOs do create more democratic social reality, however, is difficult to establish the degree of democracy of their actions. The opponents say that it is difficult to delegate power to the entities that establish themselves bureaucratic system for real democratization process. According to the degree of importance of the role of non-governmental organizations from the standpoint of national interests, the primacy rests with the discourse between advocates of realistic and pluralistic approaches. According to the pluralist paradigm governmental dimension occupies a leading place in the interaction between the state, multinationals and NGOs. Realists reserve the society the secondary role, limiting the jurisdiction of NGO to human rights, environmental protection and economic cooperation. Unlike its predecessors, which have become the classics of the American school of realism, neorealists withdrew from the remit of public diplomacy trade and financial activities in the international arena, adding these lines to the higher policy priority list [Baylis, Smith, 2001: 256–283].

Thus, the critical importance has potential of the functional efficiency of NGOs. Therefore, NGOs, policy, and NGO diplomacy are becoming more functional units in practical mechanics of the foreign policies of leading countries. They are successfully used by the White House in the case of increasing influence on the formation and development of civil society at different levels of world politics. Adequate to expansion of complex foreign policy issues, the question of effective ensure their successful implementation with the necessary social support (normative component) and personnel, institutional support (structural component) primarily from the standpoint of humanitarian management is being settled. Promoting the widespread development of civil society, NGOs support important contact mechanism in global governance, especially in the recovery or changing priorities of national and regional development. Increasingly, citizens of different countries discuss these issues of socio-economic and political nature. It forms a unified field of political debates in a single historical time, whether it's a human rights issue, the issues of privatization and monetary policy, or the issues of preservation of the environment. So it really is about the global process and, increasingly, the scope of activities of NGOs, including the U.S., is compared with the concept of human security [Michel, 2002: 3–7]. The security of such an order becomes the priority of global international political governance. In the focus of governmental actors are the problems of health services, education, economic development and human rights. That very experience of NGOs is often involved to solve the issues of global social balance primarily in the context of asymmetry of North-South. This part of their work proves the need to support the development of the poorest southern states by international non-gov-

ernmental and state organizations. It is clear that the problems of human security relevant and similar in every region of the planet. The objectives of the relevant policies are multidimensional and transnational. On the other hand, the U.S. government does not hide the fact of building exterior, including social, strategies based on national geopolitical and geo-economic interests. It is clear that due to the activity of the state, American non-governmental forces are often perceived as competitors for influence in the political evolution of society. Moreover, sometimes the NGOs themselves are the main opponents of U.S. projects abroad, first of all, in the economic sphere, where the struggle for environmental and social safeguards is successfully combined with the tactics of political pressure on the U.S. government. For example, the development of gas fields in remote areas of Peru is accompanied by angry protests from the environmental movement. Among the arguments of supporters of the project and major holders, the corporations “Hunt Oil” and “Holliberton” is promoting employment, economic growth and fiscal revenues. Among the opponent arguments of NGO is lack of social protection of the population and ignoring environmental problems for communities that support Republicans [*Mal-laby*, 2004: 50–58]. NGOs are forcing U.S. companies to give hard guarantees on local development, thus demonstrating a positive cut of their own functioning.

Globally, international political dimension of perception of NGO wing diplomacy is even more ambiguous. It is clear that the global space is not limited, by the African continent, where such support is absolutely necessary, because there often comes to basic survival. The functions of non-governmental organizations operating in Europe, the Middle East or Asia, are more politicized. Examples include the National Endowment for Democracy Forum Community of Democracies and the global initiative in Washington – World Movement for Democracy. In response to the intensity of the action of Americans in the direction of reforming the political systems of other countries, there is a fairly frequent rejection of NGOs in the world, even where their problems are related only to the creation of infrastructure or medicine, not to mention assistance in reforming the systems of law and public administration. Even with sincere intentions of the U.S. humanitarian missions in their activity, the desire to encourage local people to the culture and lifestyle of society is often seen, which violates cultural worthiness. Thus, in the East the approval of the ideas of rationalism is contradictory to traditional canons.

But it is clear that it is too difficult to resist even the “non governmental impact”. At present NGOs effectively operate the most significant manifestation of globalization – the communication. Thanks to the development of communication it became possible the establishment of interaction even between small groups, the development of cooperation between them without reflection on the spatial factor. NGOs through adequate favorable conditions of development have significant opportunities for transnationalization, often become global bureaucracies, which are present in several countries. At present in the United States operates nearly 15 thousand non-governmental organizations that are directly related to the foreign policy sphere. They represent a fairly wide range of foreign policy interests of different social groups. Long time, the primacy of the degree of activity in the international arena was held by religious organizations and human rights defenders. Today, many transnational NGOs are focusing on the following areas of world politics as ecology and energy [*Daveport*, 2005: 9–12]. From the standpoint of classification, we can distinguish four main areas of international political activities of U.S. NGO: specific groups with a narrow professional specialization, cosmopolitan groups with a focus on the field of spiritual development, multinational groups, which also include or have close contacts with TNK, analytical corporations or “brain” centers.

“Brain” centers play a major role in the foreign policy because the mechanism for duplication of public-analytical structures creates a reasonable alternative to the production of strate-

gic decisions. Special Councils and Associations at “brain” centers organize research on current issues in international relations. Their strength from the positions of influence on decision making in foreign policy is its participation as a structural element in programs realization of leading political forces. It is no secret that analytical centers of the American school of geopolitics are under the strong influence of the conservatives [11]. There is a point to note the apparent strengthening of the role of their representatives as presidential advisers and special units in the mechanics of the adoption of foreign decisions by the head of the state. In addition, the institute of advisors enables to accomplish the objectives of foreign policy management with the use of more flexible than a formal compliance with the constitutional authority of the president. Of course, the primacy effect is owned by the advisors who are ideologically close to the leadership. Debates in collegiate circle can be tough, but not those that violate general line treatment on the international arena. It should be noted that the marked potential of conformism of analysts in the team is not fully realized due to the clear bias in favor of law enforcement agencies. However, group or corporate logic of thinking of the executives to manage foreign policy is largely based on a common ideology.

Despite discussion of question, there is not too strong doubt that the active involvement of NGOs is essential in achieving success and development of free societies. They play a vital role in strengthening democratic governance.

However, in a democratic actionalism of Western societies, including the countries of Eastern Europe (including Ukraine) recently manifested the effect of “enlargement fatigue”. And this is not the only obstacle to the realization of the policy goals of democratic influences. In the mass and the political consciousness of Europeans actualized Kantian principle of eternal peace dominates now, when evolutionary evaluation of the reality gives rise to an optimistic approach to the future of the democratic process within geographical Europe, which can be completed, according to estimates of European experts, to 2026. Compared with the U.S. global democratizing offensive, evolutionary and geographically limited approach of the European community creates fewer problems, and at least conceptually is more constructive. But the main object of Western “policy impact” on the post-Soviet states with semi-consolidated democratic and authoritarian regimes is political, business and intellectual elite, while criteria approach to post-totalitarian transformation remains unfulfilled in most NIS, causing growing negativism to their possible inclusion in the EU and Euro-Atlantic integration. Along with this there has been another negative trend: the community of the EU and NATO has very cautious stance on the expansion of democratic Euro-Atlantic community and because of the internal problems of development.

In the general sense diagrammatic approach to post-communist and post-totalitarian transformation in Central and Eastern Europe provided four main components, including: implementation mechanisms of the market economy, establishing democratic political system and the norms of “good governance” (responsible before government); emerging civil society and the integration of new democracies into Euro-Atlantic security structures. Fundamentally important element of socio-economic transformation in CEE countries was the constant presence of external control, forcing hurry with conducting adaptation and simulation reforms.

Regarding post-Soviet countries, including Ukraine, the situation looks different. The external control of the EU does not warrant these countries guaranteed prospect of membership and serves primarily the needs of adaptation to semi-peripheral status within the Neighborhood Policy. However, for Ukraine the model of pluralistic approach to cooperation with the EU is the most promising. Among other areas of foreign policy of Ukraine, European integration vector concentrates in itself the biggest transformation and modernization potential, and to the greatest extent comes from outside the purely foreign policy of the country, covering the widest range



of segments of domestic politics in Ukraine that need a qualitative development, including development of civil society and human rights.

On the other hand, it should be taken into account in Ukraine that the impact of Euro-American model of democracy on transformation of the current system of international relations is limited by the fact that it is not universal. Further internal development in a number of countries can go both toward democracy and toward authoritarian. Democratizing countries should consider the need for moral, political and value innovation of modern liberal democracy.

The current stage of democratic transformations in Ukraine celebrated the fact that on the one hand, democracy is a coveted symbol of the future, on the other hand, democratic institutions and the media, the practice of public participation in elections coexist with disappointment in democratic reforms. Contradictions also occur in conjunction inertia monopoly power and constant reproducibility of authoritarian reflexes with a focus on Western democratic values, where determination of the major trends shaping new value orientation is the basis for predicting future development and acquisition of new quality is extremely important for a more adequate understanding of the political system and the content of political processes in society.

If you judge democracy not as an abstract ideal, but as a vital reality, it becomes apparent that it has a set of formal attributes, which did not provide hopes of people. Their rights and freedoms did not protect the country from the chaotic development, and most of the people from poverty. It happened so, because for full democracy there was no adequate material and spiritual foundation that had to develop in organic unity.

Modern Ukrainian political realities are largely determined by the social structure of the society. Low socio-political activity of the population, superficial political parties and the political process in general, inefficient mechanisms for processing and representation of social groups and strata, the prevalence of "shadow" forms between different political forces—all these phenomena are largely conditioned by social factors. All this creates a favorable environment for the preservation of such a distorted form of political regime as semi democracy.

Democracy as a basis for management has a greater deterrent effect only in those countries where there are common interests and fundamental values that are shared by the vast majority of citizens. This is what makes possible life for democratic parliamentary government. The decline of democracy comes when the unity of values and interests disintegrates, when there is no general agreement on the main principles and objectives, when supporters of various political parties are no longer willing to work together with the government, but they themselves want to become a state [12].

**Conclusions.** Based on the current economic and political realities of different national state, the implementation of catch-up strategy of social development does not allow reducing significantly the distance from Western countries. Moreover, what is thy most important in strategic terms, heading this way states can be on the side of European and, moreover, general civilization development. In particular, not be able to form its own social and creative environment, without which the future accession to the community of developed countries will be extremely difficult.

That is why it is necessary to focus public resources and efforts on the processing task main directions of further development of Ukrainian society and the state in accordance with the progress of the leading trends in developed countries in Europe and elsewhere, as well as the implementation of specific measures for such targets. Solving these problems seems very difficult and lengthy process. Moreover, the current economic, social and political realities even more difficult to achieve the necessary results of social transformation.

Since Ukraine became independent, the world has undergone a cardinal change. New threats and challenges appeared, international problems became more complicated, overall crisis in-

creased. Hope of many countries for a more just, equitable and most importantly safer world was not justified. The nature of global transformations and the rise of a new range of threats to national security of Ukraine determine the feasibility of strengthening the policy of pragmatic defense of Ukrainian national interests in the global international environment. The main feature of Ukrainian politics is realism based on a clear understanding of the opportunities of the Ukrainian state in the world, setting the basis for its policy the constructive dialogue and the search for mutually acceptable solutions with its partners. The main resource for strengthening the role of Ukraine in the world must increase its economic and political opportunities and the development of social capital

Thus, the nature of contemporary social processes remains controversial and conflicting. On the one hand, new trends are apparent in facilitating interpretation and convergence rates of development, and on the other they are accompanied by significant deformations, deepening enforcement mechanisms, shaking and watching the traditional norms of national and international law, the use of double standards. However, despite the listed deficiencies of democracy, good optimistic reasons are preserved about the future of democratic development, basing this optimism that their gradual filling strengthens the stability of democracy. Modern democratic institutions and practices capable of solving problems between the government and society by peaceful means, and that is the biggest acknowledgment of its passing ahead effectiveness compared with other forms of social organization. Despite all the difficulties faced by democracy on its thorny path, the opinion expressed by Robert Dahl remains relevant "...Democratic idea will not lose its appeal for people in non-democratic countries, and, to the extent that these countries will form modern, dynamic and more pluralistic societies, their authoritarian governments will become increasingly difficult to resist the desire for the expansion of democracy" [13].

## References

1. *Baylis J. B., Smith S.* The Globalisation of World Politics / Baylis J. B., Smith S. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. – 344 p.
2. *Beck U.* The Reinvention of Politics. Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order / Beck U. – Cambridge, 1997. – 206 p.
3. *Bobbio N.* The Future of Democracy: A Defence of the Rules of the Game / Bobbio N. – University of Minnesota Press, 1987. – 184 p.
4. *Castells M.* The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture – Available at: [https://deterritorialinvestigations.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/manuel\\_castells\\_the\\_rise\\_of\\_the\\_network\\_societybookfi-org.pdf](https://deterritorialinvestigations.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/manuel_castells_the_rise_of_the_network_societybookfi-org.pdf).
5. *Chandhoke N.* How is Global Civil Society? / N. Chandhoke // Journal of World-System Research. – 2005. – December. – P. 354–369.
6. *Dal R.* Democracy and its critics / Dal R. – Yale University Press; New edition edition, 1991 – 397 p.
7. *Daveport D.* The New Diplomacy / D. Daveport // Policy Review. – 2005. – December / January. – P. 9–12.
8. *Dunning J. H.* Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy / Dunning J. H. – Wokingham, England: Addison-Wesley, 1993. – 687 p.
9. *Dye T. R., Zeigler H.* The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics / Dye T. R., Zeigler H. – Cengage Learning, 2008. – 424 p.
10. *Etzioni A.* The Limits of Privacy / Etzioni A. – N.Y.: Basic Books, 1999. – 280 p.
11. *Haas R.* Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy: A Policy – Makers Perspective // U.S. Department of States. – Available at: <http://www.states.gov.s/p/rem/15506htm>.

12. *Hallowell J.* Moral foundation of democracy. – Available at: [https://archive.org/stream/moralfoundationo00inhall/moralfoundationo00inhall\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/moralfoundationo00inhall/moralfoundationo00inhall_djvu.txt)
13. *Huntington S. P.* Will More Countries Become Democratic? / S.P. Huntington // *Political Science Quarterly*. – 1984. – № 99. – P. 193–218.
14. *Huntington S.* The Third Wave. Democratization at the end of the twentieth century / Huntington S. – University of Oklahoma Press, 1993. – 384 p.
15. *Kissinger G.* Does America need foreign policy? Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century / Kissinger G. – Simon & Schuster, 2002. – 352 p.
16. *Lee J., Kigali R.* Comparing NGO influence in EU and the US / J. Lee, R. Kigali // *Conference Report*. – Ottawa. – 2005. – June. – 128 p.
17. *Mallaby S.* NGOs Fighting Poverty, Hurting the Poor // *Foreign Policy*. – 2004. – September / October. – P. 50–58.
18. *Markoff J.* Globalization and the Future of Democracy / J. Markoff // *Journal of World-Systems Research*. – 1999. – Vol. 5, № 2. – Available at: <http://www.csf.colorado.edu/ws-systems/jwsr.htm>.
19. *Methodology for the 10 Freedom*. – Available at: <http://www.heritage.org/indexoamethodology.pdf>.
20. *Michel S.* The role of NGOs in Human Security / Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations / S. Michel // *Working Paper*. – 2002. – № 12. – November. – 30 p.
21. *Miotti L.* Systemes nationaux dans la nouvelle phase de la mondialisation. Une comparaison transatlantique / Michel S. – L. – P.: Ifri, 2007. – 40 p.
22. *Nissanke M.* Linking Globalization to Poverty / M. Nissanke // *UN University Policy Brief*. – 2007. – № 2. – P. 1–7.
23. *Priest G.* Reducing Global Poverty: Theory, Practice, and Reform / G. Priest // *SELA*. – 2005. – № 26. – P. 4–32.
24. *Rustow D. A.* Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model. – Available at: <http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1521414.files/March%209/Rustow%20170.pdf>.
25. *Pasquino G.* The Political Science of Giovanni Sartori / *European Political Science*. March 2005 – Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248876541\\_The\\_Political\\_Science\\_of\\_Giovanni\\_Sartori](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248876541_The_Political_Science_of_Giovanni_Sartori).
26. *Schmitter P. C., Karl T. L.* What Democracy Is ... and Is Not / Schmitter P. C., Karl T. L. – Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993. – P. 49–62.
27. *Smith G. S.* New Challenges for High Level Leadership Training / G. S. Smith // *Public Management and Governance in a Globalizing World*. – 2002. – August. – № 19. – P. 4–19.
28. *Welzel Ch., Inglehart R.* Liberalism, Postmaterialism, and the Growth of Freedom / Ch. Welzel, R. Inglehart // *International Review of Sociology*. – 2005. – Vol. 15, Iss. 1. – P. 81–108.
29. *Zakaria F.* The future of freedom: non-liberal democracy in the US and beyond / F. Zakaria – W. W. Norton & Company, 2007. – 301 p.
30. When NGOs face repression and under siege, freedom and democracy undermined, says United States // *Asian Tribune-Washington D.C.* – 2006. 12. 15.