

3. Бэкон Ф. Сочинения в 2 т. Т. 2. О мудрости древних. С.231 – 301.
4. Виступ П. Н. Мілюкова на засіданні Державної думи. (Зі стенограми засідання 1 листопада 1916 року). URL: <http://doc20vek.ru/node/1428> (Дата звернення 09.05.2021).
5. Кант И. Критика чистого разума. М.: Мысль, 1994. 591 с.
6. «Людство весь час регресує в бік дурниці», – видатний французький філософ Бернар Стіглер. Huxley. URL: <https://huxley.media/chelovechestvo-vse-vremja-regressiruet-v-storonu-gluposti-vydajushhijsja-francuzskij-filosof-bernar-stigler/> (accessed 19.06.2021).
7. Марина Х. А. Поверженный разум. Теория и практика глупости. – Астрель, 2010.
8. Спирина Э. Разум в окоеме глупости. *Философская антропология*. 2017. Т. 3. №. 1. С.117 – 134.
9. Gardner H. Stupidity and the Three Faces of Intelligence. *Le philosophoire*. 2014. №. 2. С. 9 – 17.
10. How politics makes us stupid. Ezra Klein. Vox. URL: <https://www.vox.com/2014/4/6/5556462/brain-dead-how-politics-makes-us-stupid> (accessed 09.05.2021).

References:

1. Aristotel'. Sochineniya v 4 tomah. T.1. M., Mysl', 1976. 550 s.
2. Bekon F. Sochineniya v 2 t. T. 1. M., Mysl', 1977. 567 s.
3. Bekon F. Sochineniya v 2 t. T. 2. O mudrosti drevnih. S.231 – 301.
4. Vistup P. N. Milyukova na zasidanni Derzhavnoi dumi. (Zi stenogrami zasidannya 1 listopada 1916 roku). URL: <http://doc20vek.ru/node/1428> (accessed 09.05.2021).
5. Kant I. Kritika chistogo razuma. M.: Mysl', 1994. 591 s.
6. «Lyudstvo ves' chas regresue v bik durnici», – vidatnij francuz'kij filosof Bernar Stigler. Huxley. URL: <https://huxley.media/chelovechestvo-vse-vremja-regressiruet-v-storonu-gluposti-vydajushhijsja-francuzskij-filosof-bernar-stigler/> (accessed 19.06.2021).
7. Marina H. A. Poverzhennyj razum. Teoriya i praktika gluposti. – Astrel', 2010.
8. Spirova E. Razum v okoeme gluposti. *Filosofskaya antropologiya*. 2017. Т. 3. №. 1. С.117 – 134.
9. Gardner H. Stupidity and the Three Faces of Intelligence. *Le philosophoire*. 2014. №. 2. С. 9 – 17.
10. How politics makes us stupid. Ezra Klein. Vox. URL: <https://www.vox.com/2014/4/6/5556462/brain-dead-how-politics-makes-us-stupid> (accessed 09.05.2021).

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2021.6.2

УДК 304.4:316

D. BELL ABOUT THE INNOVATIVE NATURE OF POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8827-3569>

**Sashchuk H. M., Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor at the Institute of Journalism
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**

The essence of D.Bell's understanding of post-industrial society is analyzed. It turned out that the scientist understood it as an "analytical construction", and not a characteristic of a particular society, focusing on the main factor of this society, which determines its radical differences from the industrial society, namely, the large-scale growth of "intellectual technology".

It is noted that the scientist distinguishes eleven important features of a new society, five of which are closely related to science and knowledge. The rest – with the dissemination of information, the development of information technologies and their impact on the political sphere of society. Interesting are the thinker's opinions on political power in the future society, in particular about the "meritocracy", the transition from representative democracy to "democracy of participation", the place and role of a democratically minded politician in the political processes of the information age.

Now the focus is on threats associated with the use of sophisticated information technology and general control over information that can be poured out by abuse, from hiding information to illegal or false disclosure. Therefore, institutional restrictions in the field of information are needed.

It is summed up that industrial society is considered D.Bell mainly through the prism of its main advantages: the innovative nature of production, the growing role of knowledge as a strategic resource of development and knowledge carriers as a leading stratum of society, its transformation into a "collective good", subordination of economic social and cultural.

Keywords: post-industrial society, information technology, science, knowledge, meritocracy, democracy are compliant.

Сашук Г. М. Д. Белл про інноваційний характер постіндустріального суспільства

Проаналізовано сутнісне розуміння Д. Беллом постіндустріального суспільства. З'ясовано, що вчений розумів його як «аналітичну конструкцію», а не характеристику конкретного суспільства, акцентуючи увагу на головному чиннику цього суспільства, що визначає докорінні відмінності його від індустріального суспільства, а саме – масштабне зростання «інтелектуальної технології».

Зазначається, що вчений виокремлює одинадцять важливих ознак нового суспільства, п'ять з яких тісно пов'язані з наукою, знаннями. Решта – з поширенням інформації, розвитком інформаційних технологій та їх впливом на політичну сферу суспільства. Цікавим видаються думки мислителя щодо політичної влади в майбутньому суспільстві, зокрема про «меритократію», про перехід від представницької демократії до «демократії участі», щодо місця і ролі демократично налаштованого політичного діяча в політичних процесах епохи інформаційної доби.

Заразом акцентується увага на загрозах, пов'язаних з використанням витонченої інформаційної техніки і взагалі контроль над інформацією, що може виливатися зловживаннями, починаючи з приховування інформації і закінчуючи її незаконним, або недостовірним оприлюдненням. Отже, потрібні інституційні обмеження у сфері інформації.

Підсумовується, що індустріальне суспільство розглядається Д. Беллом здебільшого через призму його головних переваг: інноваційний характер виробництва, зростання ролі знання як стратегічного ресурсу розвитку і носіїв знання як провідної верстви суспільства, перетворення його в «колективне благо», підпорядкування економічного соціальному й культурному.

Ключові слова: постіндустріальне суспільство, інформаційні технології, наука, знання, меритократія, демократія співучасті.

We immediately focus on the fact that "post-industrial society- behind D.Bell- is an analytical construct, not a picture of a specific or specific society. It is a certain paradigm..." he said, believing at the same time that it is "the perfect type of society..." [1, p.655, 661]. D.Bell's three-stage history of human society – agricultural, industrial and post-industrial, sought to outline the contours of post-industrial society, largely based on the characteristics of the industrial stage.

However, some researchers recognized the term "postindustrial society" unsuccessful. Naibit noted: "... thinkers come to a standstill, trying to describe the coming era... Eras and movements are always called "post", or "ne", if they do not know what else to call them" [2, p.25]. However, this term has taken root. The foreigner, the definition of post-industrial society, formulated by D. Bell, is characterized by a certain ambiguity: on the one hand, it is a real society that is just born, and, on the other hand, it is a concept and "insinuation of theoretical analysis" [3, p.27].

D. Bell's response to such accusations was as follows: "Equally, I rejected the temptation to define this fertile society with some term like "service society", "information society" or "knowledge society" [1, p.145]. And then: "I use the term "post-industrial" for two reasons. First, to emphasize the intermediate or transitional nature of the changes taking place in society. And, secondly, to distinguish the axial factor that determines these changes – intelligent technology" [1, p.146].

D. Bell highlights eleven important features of a new society, five of which are closely related to science. Let's bring all the features of post-industrial society to two main ones: the central role of theoretical knowledge and expansion of the services sector for the "producing economy". Three of them concerned the growing role of knowledge: 1) the "central role of theoretical knowledge"; ... 3) "growth of the class of knowledge carriers"; ... 7) "Science reaches its maturity" [1, p.154-156].

In this case, D. Bell's thoughts are interesting, first of all, about political power in the future society. According to him, today there are three models of power: 1) the previous model of power, which is based on property, and inherited; 2) model of power, the basis of which is knowledge gained through education and 3) model of power, the source of which is a political position, obtained through the organizational apparatus. "The difficulty of analyzing power in modern Western society, D. Bell believed, is that these three systems exist, partially coincide and penetrate each other" [1, p.485].

D. Bell's significant contribution to the development of political science, first of all, due to his analysis of the evolution of democracy in industrial and post-industrial societies. "Modern media", he notes, "give us an opportunity, and sometimes forced to respond immediately..." social and political problems. "The media increase the likelihood of clearly expanding "democracy complicity", but such phenomena are largely due to emotional factors..., which can lead to chain reactions that can disrupt the course of civilized political process and civilized discussion" [1, p.426-427].

D. Bell identified the intensification of the trend of transition from representative democracy to "democracy of participation", which at one time was also revealed by J. Masuda. "People want to be able to influence decisions that affect their lives," D. Bell notes. He proves that in a post-industrial society, the revolution of participation is one of the reactions to the professionalization of society and the increase in decision-making by technocrats [1, p.491].

At the same time, D. Bell believed that "democracy of participation" is no more a panacea than the efforts made half a century ago to create political mechanisms for a plebiscite in the form of a referendum or the right to recall an MP. Only a few supporters of "concocted democracy" tried to think through to the end at the logical level the meaning of these words [1, p.491]. However, D. Bell believed that democracy of compliance is another way of setting

classic questions of political philosophy, namely: who and at what levels should make decisions, what type and what social games should they spread? [1, p.492].

He devoted this question in the book "The coming post-industrial society" a special unit "Whose hands is the power?" [4, p.481-488]. "Decision-making is a matter of power, and in any society the main question is: who is in power and how is it held? The question of how the government is carried out is a systemic concept, and about who is in power is a group concept... Naturally, when there are changes in the systemic nature, new groups come to power" [1, p.481].

"It is worth mentioning," writes the national researcher O. Marukhovsky, – revealed D. Bell tendency to redistribute political power between different "branches" in the conditions of the formation of the information society. The essence of this trend, which was inherent in "... almost all political systems", was "... transition of real power from legislative and other bodies to executive bodies" [5, p.47]. In support of this trend, D. Bell gives the example of the United States, where for almost a quarter of a century the process "... transformation of the institute of the presidency into the executive administration of the president with the emergence of new institutions, such as the Budget Office, the Committee of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council and some others that are directly part of the presidential administration.

Reflecting on the essence and consequences of this trend, he noted: "In the end, this means not so much the strengthening of personal power and the president (which is also important), but the consolidation of the most important control and leadership functions in the executive branch of power ..., which reinforces the shift in the structure of power" [1, p.47].

There is reason to believe, continues O. Marukhovsky, that modern events in Ukraine resemble to some extent the trend that was observed in the United States and some other countries in the mid-70's of the twentieth century. However, it should be borne in mind that today another global trend is leading, namely, strengthening the legislative "branch of power" and the transition of many states to the parliamentary form of government... So, should Ukraine copy the former US experience, while neglecting modern trends, can only show time and life... [5, p.48].

However, some of D. Bell's ideas about the place and role of a democratically minded politician in the political processes of industrial and especially information age should be taken into account by all modern political forces of Ukraine [6, p.75-87].

"The task of a political or statesman in a democratic society comes down to maintaining a balance between the requirements of competitive interests and values..., – argued D. Bell after V. Kay – Politician in a democratic society ..., in order to retain power, must be able to manipulate a significant part of these interests: in one case, he must concede, in the other – to show firmness, somewhere to show slowness, and somewhere to act vigorously... politician... must play the role of arbitrator and mediator, being criticized from all sides. In order to avoid or mitigate the conflict, he compromises" [5, p.48]. So, a politician is the arbiter and mediator of a complex and controversial process of achieving and strengthening political stability in a state capable not only of certain manipulations, but, most importantly, of compromise.

As for the term "situ" ("situ" – lat. – position), this concept D. Bell introduced in contrast to such concepts as "classes" or "executions", which are horizontal units of society and the relationship between which are built on the principle: higher – subordination.

In post-industrial society, in his opinion, "more important nodes of political ties may be situs..." [1, c.157]. They are divided into "... four functional situs – scientific, technical..., administrative and cultural and five institutional situs – economic enterprises; state institutions; universities and social complexes... and the army." According to D. Bell, the main conflicts of interest will take place between situs groups. However, the concept of "situs", says O. Marukhovsky, has not found support in the scientific literature, and the forecast for the growth of their role in political life has not yet been confirmed.

There was no prediction of D. Bell, who, in his words, "... underpins all political philosophy." "The politics of the future – at least for those who act within society," he predicted – will not be a dispute between functional groups with their economic interests regarding the distribution of national product, but a concern for ... low-income population groups. The main problems will be... providing greater amenities, beauty and better quality of life, arranging our cities, a more differentiated and intelligent education system, improving the nature of our culture." This forecast turned out to be erroneous even for Western countries (with the exception of Scandinavian ones), not to mention post-totalitarian states, including Ukraine, where everything happens exactly the opposite... But these individual miscalculations of D. Bell do not reduce the significance of his contribution to the development of political science. Thus, if industrial society is the organization of machines and people for the production of things, then the basis of post-industrial society is intellectual technology, and its main resources are information. Any modern society lives through innovation and social control over change, it tries to anticipate the future and carry out planning. It is the change in awareness of the nature of innovation that makes theoretical knowledge crucial [5, p.49].

However, D. Bell considered the excess of information one of the biggest potential threats to the political stability of the state, as it can create problems for society and puts obstacles in the way of the implementation of political processes. Access to information is a condition of freedom... The computer industry is not yet subject to state regulation and is developing in the free market" [7, p.335].

He noted that given that "... knowledge and information become strategic resources", the threat of police and political surveillance of individuals using sophisticated information technology and in general control of information is most often resulted in abuse, starting with the concealment of information and ending with its illegal publication" [7, p.335, 340].

"As for the political process," he clarified, "imagine only one thing: reports of all the problems in the country in a threatening number come to Washington..., asking the president a lot of questions that require urgent resolution. Can this system exist further without interruption?" [1, p.428-429].

The combination of science, technology and economics, according to D. Bell, should play an increasingly important role in a future-oriented society, and this is another sign of a post-industrial society that involves control over technology, technology evaluation, and the development of technological forecast models.

Finally, a significant characteristic of post-industrial society, Bell believes, will be a new intelligent technology, which, by the way, has already arisen and is used in management decisions. The researcher hoped that by the end of the 20th century, new intelligent technology would play an equally important role in human affairs played by machine technology in the last century. Intelligent technology, in Bell's interpretation, involves the use of algorithms as rules for solving problems instead of intuitive judgments. These algorithms can be implemented in an automatic machine, in a computer program, or in a set of instructions based on some mathematical formulas.

The central role of theoretical knowledge in post-industrial society will determine, according to Bell, and the position of the scientist as the central figure of such society. The researcher noted that "the concept of post-industrial society is a broad generalization, and its content can be easier to understand if you distinguish five components of this concept." One of them he considered the so-called "axial principle of society", based on theoretical knowledge as a source of new day and formulation of politics [1, p.18].

Explaining this, the scientist noted: "Post-industrial society, interested in controlling innovations and escalation of changes, consists around knowledge, which, in turn, causes new social relations ..., which should be governed by political methods. knowledge... necessary for the functioning of any society. However, post-industrial society is distinguished by the fact that the nature of knowledge itself has changed. The main thing in decision-making and change management was the home of theoretical knowledge..." [1, p.25].

D. Bell once again draws attention to the fact that in post-industrial society knowledge becomes the basis, and education – a means of achieving power, while researchers and scientists become the elite of society. At the moment, he emphasizes that this does not mean that scientists are monolithic and act as a corporate group. In practical political situations, they are able to diverge ideologically and unite with different parts of other elites [1, p.482].

Another object of D. Bell's research was the concept of meritocracy. The founder of this concept of "meritocracy" (from Lat. *meritus* – worthy and Greek *kratos* – power, that is, the power of the most gifted) is the English scientist Mitchell Young, who outlined her ideas in the book "The Rise of the Meritocracy: 1870-2033" [8]. Young believed that capitalist society is gradually transformed into a society in which the principle of nomination to leadership positions, including political, most gifted people from all walks of life, will be established. [1, p.51].

In turn, D. Bell in the pre-speech to his work "The coming post-industrial society" set the task "... to define the character and defend the idea of 'fair meritocracy' or high status, which is given on the basis of personal achievements of a person who enjoys the respect of equals" [1, p.158]. In post-industrial society there is a principle of "achievement", that is, power is achieved due to the personal virtues of people, their high level of education and qualifications. In such a society, there are almost no higher positions available to those who do not have qualifications. The politician, from D. Bell's point of view, is a highly qualified specialist in his field, who has the necessary skills to manage society.

D. Bell himself explained his increased scientific interest in meritocracy issues in that post-industrial society "... according to its original ideology is also meritocracy" [1, p.548]. "Today, – emphasizes D. Bell, – in medicine, law, financial sphere and in many other areas, to start professional activities, you need to have a university diploma, and, having withstood the exams, get the appropriate certificate from official commissions created by professional associations. However, only in politics there is a relatively open ladder upwards, which does not provide for formal qualification certificates and here in politics, the situation can be achieved due to the ability to attract followers or with the help of patronage relations" [5, p.52]. Being a supporter of the idea of a "fair meritocrat of today", D. Bell emphasized that post-industrial society involves the emergence of a new intellectual class, whose representatives at the political level act as anti-counsel, experts or technocrats [10].

So, D. Bell summed up, in post-industrial society all this should be taken into account in the political process, which was not the case before. Thus, if in the last hundred years the main institute was a plant or a similar enterprise, in the post-industrial society, the university comes first with its focus on knowledge.

On this basis, it should be concluded that D. Bell quite positively evaluates post-industrialism in general, paying attention mainly to its advantages: the innovative nature of production, the growth of the role of knowledge, its transformation into a "collective good", subordination of economic social and cultural, the establishment of the class of knowledge carriers as the main in society. This concept marked the beginning of many different interpretations of post-industrial society, and today the concept of such a society is one of the most common in sociological research.

References:

1. Bell D. *Hriyadushchee postyudustrialnoye obshchestvo: Opyt sotsyalnogo proghnozyrovaniya*; per. s anhl. / pod red. V. L. Ynozemtseva. Yzd. 2-oe, yspr. y dop. Moskva: Academia, 2004. 788 s.
2. Neisbytt D. *Mehatrendy*; per. s anhl. M. B. Levyna. Moskva: OOO «Yzd-vo AST»; ZAO NPP «Ermak», 2003. 380 s.

3. Ynozemtsev V. L. Postindustrialnyi myr D. Bella // Bell D. Hriadushchee postindustrialnoe obshchestvo: Opyt sotsyalnogo prohnozyrovaniya / pod red. V. L. Ynozemtseva; per. s anhl. Yzd. 2-oe, yspr. y dop. Moskva: Academia, 2004. S. 9-84.
4. Alekseeva Y. Yu. Voznyknovenye ydeolohyy ynformatsyonnoho obshchestva. *Ynformatsyonnoe obshchestvo*. 1999. № 1. S. 30-35.
5. Marukhovskiy O.O. Politychni aspekty zarubizhnykh kontseptsii informatsiinoho suspilstva: dys... kand. polit. nauk : Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I. F. Kurasa. Kyiv, 2008. 239 s.
6. Kartunov O. V., Marukhovskiy O.O. Informatsiine suspilstvo: analiz politychnykh aspektiv zarubizhnykh kontseptsii. Kyiv: Un-t ekonomiky ta prava «Krok», 2012. 344 s.
7. Bell D. Sotsyalnye ramky ynformatsyonnoho obshchestva; per. s anhl. // Novaia tekhnokratycheskaia volna na Zapade / sost. y vstup. statia P. S. Hurevycha. Moskva: Prohress, 1986. S. 330-342.
8. Young M. The Rise of the Meritocracy 1870-2033: An Essay on Education and Equality. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1961. 218 r.
9. Vysotska O.Ie. Komunikatyvna polityka derzhavy v itsstoryko-filosofskomu vymiri. *Politolohichnyi visnyk*. 2020. Vyp. 85. S. 210-225.
10. Karpchuk N.P. Stratehichna komunikatsiia YeS yak zasib u borotbi z dezinformatsiieiu. *Politychne zhyttia*. 2019. № 1. S. 52-58.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Белл Д. Грядущее постиндустриальное общество: Опыт социального прогнозирования; пер. с англ. / под ред. В. Л. Иноземцева. Изд. 2-ое, испр. и доп. Москва: Academia, 2004. 788 с.
2. Нейсбит Д. Мегатренды; пер. с англ. М. Б. Левина. Москва: ООО «Изд-во АСТ»; ЗАО НПП «Ермак», 2003. 380 с.
3. Иноземцев В. Л. Постиндустриальный мир Д. Белла // Белл Д. Грядущее постиндустриальное общество: Опыт социального прогнозирования / под ред. В. Л. Иноземцева; пер. с англ. Изд. 2-ое, испр. и доп. Москва: Academia, 2004. С. 9-84.
4. Алексеева И. Ю. Возникновение идеологии информационного общества. *Информационное общество*. 1999. № 1. С. 30-35.
5. Маруховський О.О. Політичні аспекти зарубіжних концепцій інформаційного суспільства: дис... канд. політ. наук : Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса. Київ, 2008. 239 с.
6. Картунов О. В., Маруховський О.О. Інформаційне суспільство: аналіз політичних аспектів зарубіжних концепцій. Київ: Ун-т економіки та права «Крок», 2012. 344 с.
7. Белл Д. Социальные рамки информационного общества; пер. с англ. // Новая технократическая волна на Западе / сост. и вступ. статья П. С. Гуревича. Москва: Прогресс, 1986. С. 330-342.
8. Young M. The Rise of the Meritocracy 1870-2033: An Essay on Education and Equality. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1961. 218 p.
9. Висоцька О.Є. Комунікативна політика держави в історико-філософському вимірі. *Політологічний вісник*. 2020. Вип. 85. С.210-225.
10. Карпчук Н.П. Стратегічна комунікація ЄС як засіб у боротьбі з дезінформацією. *Політичне життя*. 2019. № 1. С. 52-58.

DOI 10.31558/2617-0248.2021.6.3

УДК 321.01

СУЧАСНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7335-2256>

Філіпчук В. О., к. н. з держ. упр., доцент Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4137-3690>

Постригань Г. Ф., к. філос. н., професор Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

Публічна політика торкається багатьох вимірів «політичного», що вимагає від дослідників не тільки характеристики кожного виміру, але і встановлення взаємозв'язків і перетинів, з яких складається система координат публічної політики. Метою цього дослідження є розкриття змісту існуючих підходів до визначення «публічна політика» та обґрунтування використання комплексного (який би враховував вся виміри) підходу до розкриття суті даного феномена. У статті проаналізовано сучасні