

Список використаних джерел

1. Бодян М. В. Система охорони здоров'я в Чеській Республіці. URL: <http://www.mif-ua.com/archive/article/38604>
2. Досвід країн Європи у фінансуванні галузі охорони здоров'я : уроки для України. URL: https://eeas.europa.eu/archives/delegations/ukraine/documents/virtual_library/14_reviewbook_uk.pdf
3. Мартинович А. Охорона здоров'я Чехії: якість, яку не приховаєш. URL: <http://health-ua.com/article/16501-ohorona-zdorovya-cheh-yakst-yaku-ne-prihovash>
4. Stará Dana. Systém organizace a financování zdravotnictví v České republice: disertační práce. Praha. 2012. 285 p.

Mykhailova I., Ph.D, Associate Professor,
Musa Ismail, Student of Building faculty, Palestine
*O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy
in Kharkiv, Ukraine*

PROCESSES OF LEGITIMATION OF STATE POWER IN THE POLITICAL SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD: POLITICAL AND LEGAL CONTEXT

The legitimation of state power is the subject of many studies that relate to the sphere of relations both between the branches of state power and between civil society and the state. In recent years, many European countries have undergone large-scale changes in government models. New concepts have emerged that are designed to break down barriers in the relationship between the state and society, to fix a new relationship between politics and public administration. At the same time, there is a need to identify priority vectors for the development of state power in Ukraine, because today it demonstrates its internal contradictions, detachment from public interests.

The government's practical actions to improve it were often slow and sometimes unsuccessful and extra systemic. Modern political and social development has been closely linked to the spread of liberal ideas in various spheres of public life. Increased interest in the ideological component of modern political life in particular highlights the issue of legitimation of state power in the context of world politics. A fundamental feature of modern world politics is its mission and ability to modernize societies. Modernization is sometimes inevitably destroyed by the structures of the usual established social order and worldview.

Appearing in the public arena as an opponent of traditionalism, communitarism and universalism themselves later became a tradition. At present, there is a powerful process of restructuring the entire world order and the need for a new approach to understanding the common destiny of mankind.

The process of globalization is accompanied by the development of new socio-political, economic and ideological trends. In recent decades, the world community has undergone a number of rapid and radical changes. Individual national markets, despite barriers and restrictions, cultural and political differences, are beginning to form a

single global market. State power, because it relies on coercion, always needs justification. One of the classic tools for legitimizing state power in society were formal rules of law.

The urgency of the problem of legitimation of state power in modern society is due to the fact that due to the secularization and detraditionalization of modern society, legitimate state power can no longer be justified by reference to law and tradition closely related to religion. In the conditions of classical liberal democracy, the legitimation of state power by means of two principles is quite widespread and well-founded: the principle of human rights and the principle of people's sovereignty. State power is legitimate if it protects the rights and freedoms of the individual, and if the laws can be understood as an expression of public opinion and will, that is, if the idea of the very legislation of citizens is realized.

This way of legitimizing state power is effective within a democratic state governed by the rule of law. But will it be able to maintain its power in an era of globalization when cultural agglomerations challenge democratic principles?

Economic globalization and the growing importance of transnational corporations weaken the ability of many third world countries to self-regulate economic exchange, control trade and financial flows.

Primary for any society is the so-called "evidence" of the legitimacy of power, namely, certain generally accepted indicators that indicate a positive attitude of the subordinates towards the rulers. In many cases, the government's desire to be legitimate is manifested in efforts to clearly follow all established procedures, namely:

- public consensus on the basis of a certain idea, which is spread by the authorities;
- obligatory various oaths and promises, supported by references to a certain tradition;
- constant search for individual recognition of decisions made;
- increased attention to the formal procedures of power formation - various kinds of plebiscites, etc.

What is the exceptional importance of such procedures? In fact, they are not evidence of public belief in the legitimacy of the current government, as the power consensus can be dictated by a variety of motives, including purely personal. But, at the same time, the consensus of political power acts as a certain conductor of legitimacy, a mandatory principle. And if this consensus is present, approved by society, it does not matter much about what it was reached. The government will constantly try to show the society its positive attitude to itself through the mechanisms and technologies that are widely used today. However, this is by no means proof of illegitimacy due to the fact that only a certain part of the population is politically active, depending on the specific society.

In the context of the above, it should be noted that there is a big difference between a real social consensus and the government's efforts to pass the current situation off as such. This situation carries potential threats of such a phenomenon as delegitimization. After all, the legitimacy of political power is not its static characteristic, it changes dynamically day by day, acquiring new forms and colors.

Even a very successful government at certain times can experience the phenomenon of delegitimization through the adoption and implementation of unpopular decisions - as objective factors, and targeted information counteraction as a subjective factor.

REFERENCES

1. Алмонд Г. Гражданская культура и стабильная демократия / Г. Алмонд, С. Верба; [пер. с англ.] // Антология мировой политической мысли: В 5 т. М.: Мысль, 1997. Т. II.: Зарубежная политическая мысль. XX в. / Нац. общественно-науч. фонд; [отв. ред. Т. А. Алексеева; ред.-сост. Г. К. Яшин, Е. Г. Морозова]. 832 с. С. 592–610.
2. Гьофе О. Демократія в епоху глобалізації / Отфрід Гьофе; [пер. з нім. Л. Ситніченко та О. Лозінської]. К. : ППС-2002, 2007. 435 с.
3. Єрмоленко А. Морально-етична легітимація сфери політичного. *Філософська думка : наук.-теор. журнал*. 2013. № 2. С. 51–58.
4. Луман Н. Медиакоммуникации; [пер. з англ. А. Глухов, О. Никифоров]. М. : Логос, 2005. 280 с.
5. Тур М.Г. Права людини та суверенітет народу в фокусі комунікативної влади. *Сучасність*. К., 2000. № 5. С. 54–69.
6. Тур М.Г. Теоретико-методологічні засади процедурної легітимації Лумана. *Практична філософія*. К., 2005. № 3. С. 31-44.

Солових В. П., доктор наук з державного управління, доцент, професор,
Дзюндзюк В. Б., доктор наук з державного управління, професор,
завідувач кафедри політології і філософії,
*Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління
НАДУ при Президентові України, Україна*
доктор **Алекс Горелік**, доцент кафедри масових комунікацій,
Коледж Бенедикта, Колумбія, Південна Кароліна, США /
Dr. Alex Gorelik, Assistant Professor of Mass Communication,
Benedict College, Columbia, South Carolina, USA

КОНЦЕПЦІЯ УРЯДУВАННЯ («GOVERNANCE») В ПУБЛІЧНОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ

В кінці 90-х років XX ст. серед науковців посилюється інтерес до державного управління і політики. Цьому сприяє критика бюрократичних і ринкових (менеджерських концепцій державного управління. Критика бюрократичної (адміністративної) моделі відбиває пошуки демократичної законності, відхід далеко від централізованого, ієрархічного уряду в бік управління мережами, що характеризується довгостроковими зобов'язаннями, довірою і взаємністю між громадянським суспільством та державою [5; 7; 9]. Звернення до демократичної ідеології та проблем влади вимагає коректив звичних уявлень щодо політики і уряду, які були сформовані раніше в межах