

## GENERALLY CIVILIZED CONTEXT OF GOVERNING THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE WORLD

**OKSANA GAIEVSKA** — Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,  
Kyiv National Economic University  
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: gaevoxy@gmail.com

*Analyzing the contemporary global mechanisms of governing relationships between peoples represented both in procedural and institutional aspects the author notes their fundamental and globally civilized meanings in the historical progress of mankind to a higher level of social system organization. Therefore, the actual European process and principles of creating the efficient ordering system, according to which certain international institutional structures function, should be considered in the context of today's total sovereignty and at the same time ensuring the safety of international relations. This trend suggests that the presence of some basic concepts of self-governance aimed at creating mechanisms for intergovernmental governance in the global community should remove the possibility of destabilization of international cooperation. Thus, generally civilized pillars of social governance, including international relations, lie in the understanding that people have to base their relationships on principles of the highest administrative feasibility, which should embrace economic, political and spiritual energy of any nation. This interpretation of general issues of international relations seems quite logical and well grounded in the light of recent developments in Ukraine.*

*Therefore, the expression "reason rules the world" should be viewed as an objective opportunity of any institution through the energy of its own organization and by management to achieve a holistic level of the system which is too important for humanity, which in its historical development has always longed for a high level of organization, and consequently reached in its civilization development a level where management has become the most productive type of production. In this view management as a science can be perceived as the most lucrative and prudent source of allocating capital.*

*Biological organizational evolution appears to have been locked: in its highest form — for a human being it has found its reflection and the most organic way of life. And the higher the development of civilization, in particular management, the more organically the mankind enters this circle, the more harmonious relationships people have with nature. A knowledge of harmonization mechanisms through people's self-submitting to nature in all its forms of existence is a superior necessity for humanity, and hence a source of eternity and management as a science.*

*Key Words: socialgovernance, generalcivilizationofmanagement, socialsystemorganization, governance civilization of the world.*

Human beings and humanity in general in their biological development are lucky: the nature has gifted them the highest ability to self-management by providing them with an appropriate management tool — the brain that has the desired biological and social information to perform administrative actions. The biological history of human beings has its age, but in the known time a man has always had this ability, although, of course, with varying degrees of managerial excellence. In this context, management has its multimillion century history, the study of which should be the subject of management science. Historical sources of acquiring management knowledge enable to establish certain common, generally civilized support of management, the stages of

---

© Oksana Gaievska, 2015

its evolution — from experiential science that revealed itself in the form of studying organizational traditions, in particular, ethnic, theoretically meaningful to the knowledge already gained in relatively recent times of management status as a science.

Management as a calculation of organizational movement capacity serves as an organization of institutions, and therefore it should define ways of organizing, summarizing and organizing them; offer some schemes of possible organizational forms. Without governance the organization is meaningless, it simply cannot exist. So we can say that the organization creates governance. In the simplest reflection a human activity is aimed at two main processes: integration and separation of certain elements. The former and latter mainly relating to a technological sense are the organizational basis for the creation of a product with the prerequisites that require separation and joining the invasion of the subject, which thus becomes an organizational source, chiefly the manager. In more complex version these two approaches in the real activity have a different content in relation to the result, which requires an accurate calculation of their impact on product activity, and this is management. The compilation, regarded as the highest sense of management in cybernetics, in the most general terms is a preliminary comparison of elements that are subject to be united or separated. Here we encounter so called Bogdanov's "tectology": "If societies, classes, groups confront destructively, disorganizing each other, it means that each collective endeavors to create the world for itself in its own way. This is the result of separateness, isolation of organizing forces, the result of the fact that their unity, notably their common and coordinated organization, has not been achieved yet. This is the struggle of organizational forms."

The appearance of the rulers and the ruled in this way is thus mainly as an objective phenomenon, viewed as a subject and object of management, in which the former is only the need of the latter; only social, economic and political history of mankind distorts this healthy, natural state of the human self-management. A man as part of nature serves in this context as its organizational formation, and also on its internal structure, which also has a set of interrelated elements, as the organization of this "interaction" is a function of the human brain. The social organization creates management through the human brain as well as the biological organization through hereditary information controls the movement of living organisms.

This comparison is more fully introduced in the theory of algorithms aimed not only at revealing the intellectual reproduction of organizational structures and objects of the activity itself, but also the possibility of mental calculation that will enable the organization to show the natural end product of human activity. Therefore, the theory of algorithms is a natural reproduction of mental organization, which the manager must understand in order to create his own product, which is not contrary to the laws of nature; otherwise it will be turned in its destructive principle. But it will be the separation of elements, which in time stretches it so that it will transform the process of separation into a tragic thing for a man, on which, in fact, the entire history of mankind is built.

Finally, the union or separation of elements applying management creates a system in which the former and the latter decide the fate of its existence, depending on how these processes take place and the system functions.

In this sense, management is crucial to the system, because it is able to find in the variety of elements often opposing each other such properties that can significantly

---

---

nourish the system, notably contain it. This process of continuous selection belongs to management activities as its contents element marked in cybernetics as a term «regulation». In a sense, the genius of the organization is to find the largest number of related items in the object, combine them taking into account this relationship and during the system existence divide and re-unite them in accordance with the target harmony, the energy that they create during joint activities. Calculating energy is another meaningful implication of the organization as a determinant of management. It doesn't particularly relate to the absolute similarity (such elements practically do not exist), it mainly embraces the possibility of joining the organic system what defined as the manager's organizational genius.

Therefore, management acts as a link system that «engaged» its elements and thus the application of human brain in the social organization ultimately depends on the excellence degree of this part as a unifying principle. In global terms, this is the formula for the salvation of mankind.

The constant search of opportunities of improving one's own activities leads to specific, proven by experience management methods and eventually to the creation and accumulation of knowledge, which at a certain frequency system can be converted from sustainable into typical quantity and quality of facilities. The clear understanding of management principles creates the science that only in the nineteenth century received this status, though it had long before its historical recognition. The constant possibility of direct life-laboratory testing its efficiency was the most convincing argument in favor of this scientific context. Hence the creative search could not be a purely laboratory one as real life experience along with the needs of material, spiritual and political production turns out to be a source of expertise. The scientific and philosophical understanding of the material world organization, its objective foundations completed this search as a proven guarantee of a specific effect of mankind social self-management. It consequently relates to only a certain level of civilization management, organizational mechanisms and management efficiency of social systems as a whole and in certain types of human activity. Today, such a focus of mankind management interest has not considerably changed and only the temperature of contradictions, especially those ones that create a tragic situation can aggravate either side of the objective interest of mankind or part, including national one, but overall it remains unchanged. Ideological doctrines, in this context, added nothing new to the universal understanding, particularly democratic one, of the meaning and role of management in life, and just the existence of mankind itself. And it is next to impossible to add anything fundamentally new, because it is a well-established, proven by history and experience managerial civilization's need, that even in its ideological form it is so reasonable and well-justified that can disappear only with the disappearance of mankind. But even in this scenario, nature is able and prone to informative self-management through the transfer of information from generation to generation and a certain organization of biological self-nature. Mankind and its intellectual energy in this context is no different from other parts of nature and therefore various prophecies about their disappearance have no scientific proof mainly in terms of informative one. As information is eternal, as well as everlasting management as its organizational expression.

However, for the organizational coordination and streaming of elements this system as a fastening material may be insufficient. Thus arises the necessity of

obtaining the total energy of the system temperature, which may be a sufficient reason for such a union. This is a well-known main link, introduced in management as a condition of a chain reaction, as the total concentration in particular, and sometimes in the unit, which makes it a gumming up factor. Mainly in this organizational meaning governance acts as a catalyst for the movement, as a concentrated energy throttle of the coordinating system which constantly nourishes all its elements, because governance in this context is a pillar, the «inspirer and organizer,» in social terms portrayed as leader or doctrine. The main precondition of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the existence of this organizational phenomenon is a profound penetration into the system elements and the most adequate reflection of their energy in their own body. In this sense the genius of organization, management genius should not be considered as a supernatural presence, often mysterious implications of leadership or governance, but mainly a deep penetration into the management object, the most accurate calculation of its capabilities and needs of its institutional capacity. In terms of calculations this potential should be introduced by the first and the last link, between which it is located. And it doesn't mean the minimum and maximum, which quantitatively determine the quality potential of the object, but determine a possible effectiveness in constant growth behavior, in the infinity, into which sometimes unrealistic temporal and spatial factors must be put. That is what should be presented as the highest managerial accounting, notably as the manager's higher expertise, regardless of whether it comes to element of the system, or the whole system itself, the separating or unifying effect. The task of management is to change a whole, on the basis of which its new, more powerful quality should emerge.

Consequently, the organization has to confront the disorganization, the state when the whole system falls below even the simple sum of its components. Therefore, management should prevent the organizational foundation form turning into another foundation of the component. That is why the power significantly decreases that might be viewed as a fallacy of managerial behavior. The general collision of organization and disorganization lies in attempts to preserve the balance of components, constantly create space to add their energy towards strengthening not only parts, but the whole organic as their interaction. The manager as an integral component of the organizational system should prevent the release of any element beyond it, because it means breaking the link, power aggression of another system or environment on their own system. Moreover, this aggression is usually carried out in those elements of the system that do not have sufficient energy to resistance, which consequently leads to the penetration of negative energy environment into it. If this energy were positive, it would be part of the energy system, in which it is turning around, on the basis of which the world community is chiefly founded as a unity of energy diversity.

The integrative nature of the world is mainly reflected as a tendency that removes the minus sign in the variety of energies, although at a higher level it is part of the human being as the bearer of natural harmony. In this respect the objective of management lies in the opportunity to neutralize the collision of energies, or at best, to use them to strengthen the system, as appropriately redistributing at least in terms of collision. It is the power of the management system, which is designed to provide healthy contradictory directions to disorganization.

It mainly relates to the elements of the organization (system) when it does not have sufficient force to maintain the balance of elements which leads to the breakdown

---

---

of relations between them, even at the system level. It is assumed to consider this situation a negative phenomenon, which indicates a weakening effect on your system element. The main source of this state is conditions for the interaction of elements that appeared as a result of administrative failure, because the system itself that has not reached the level of integrity, does not create such an element as management.

According to the laws of their parts and the whole their interaction has yet to reach this level, and only through management. In this sense management is not just a consequence of the organization complete system, but also, under certain conditions, it is the energy of creating the organization as a whole. Therefore, the expression “brain rules the world” should be seen as an objective possibility of any system phenomenon through the energy of its own organization and by management to go on a holistic level of the system that is too important for humanity, which in its historical development will move to a higher level of organization.

Vividly the contemporary international community is in its state of transition and the epistemologically accepted in science and policy human skills as a system of states because of management science are ones that accurately indicate the energy inequality of the system’s elements, which affect the main activities of the International Institute of Management – United Nations.

Even the emergence of a special or unique unit in the organizational respect is in a management sense not just the usual gap in communications, but it is some kind of measurement of the systemic crisis at the whole, at least it does not reflect the sufficient clarity, because their existence is filled with the system energy and that is why they are looking for other connections, other opportunities to enter into it. This process is chiefly focused on creating new unit formations, which are then converted into element links requiring a new habitat.

This is a classic disruption of the link between the element and system which means a possible creation of new system’s properties and therefore it must take into account the necessity (if objectively) of finding new relationships, relationships of another order, which has to be in the organization of the system or go beyond it. The latter usually is not used in management, because it does not strengthen the organizational system, although it may have a different energy impact on it.

The first approach implies that the task of management lies in the fact that it as an intermediate contributes to strengthening basic trends – the development of partnership principles of cooperation that is possible only on the basis of strengthening ties between the people and their environment, as well as between the elements of the environment. Moreover, this process must take place continuously, which makes continuous improvements to institutional relations and thus management role as a catalyst for these relationships.

From the point of view of philosophy these ties share profound origin that acts as an objective regulator of any management relationships and mechanisms. This is a well-known regular formula of conservation and extinction of the existence of the dialectical law of contradiction, the development of which determines the movement as a form of existence of substance.

Concerning management we should clearly perceive objects that are exposed to the influence through the institutional channel, and the nature and limits of this effect should be presented as an organizational capability. The influence mechanism encompasses the administration subject that can influence it creatively

or destructively, though it might be quite persuasive that that even a possibility of destruction or preservation is embedded in the potential that, in our opinion, is viewed as an axiomatic vision: the destruction of the object implies the action embodied in institutional mechanisms and it can generate the appropriate management system. The opposite approach, it seems to us, has a subjective sense as it raises a unit to the level of the total, and in management a unit is prior to the whole.

Another thing is that each controlled object has its inherent structural properties which have initially a decisive influence on the preservation or destruction of the object provided that they are supposed to be an integral part of the subject, especially its institutional arrangements. So the energy of constant preserving the mechanisms of the object management is viewed as a task, because it should keep itself in that way. It should be emphasized that self-regulation does not mean self-management, as it can also influence the object through management, at least when it concerns social objects. Management in this case acts as a reflection of the organizational capacity of the object and at the same time it is a factor in its development at the subjective level.

In terms of organizational management the quantitative and structural equation of the object bears a special burden, the power of which ultimately lies in the extent to which it structurally brings sufficient quantitative characteristics. Moreover, the balance should be a dialectical balance that exists even in action implying opposite trends. The opposite in the organizational sense means the emergence of new energy as a result of the development of a substantial part or even one element, so the crucial point lies, in organizational sense, in the way of combining elements, their organizational communications.

After all, having created the material and spiritual guarantees of its own existence, the mankind civilization has reached in its development the state when management has become the most productive type of production, and management as a science has been consequently the most favorable source of allocating the capital. The biological organizational evolution appears to be locked: in its highest form it has found the most organic way of life for a human being. The higher the development of civilization, the more organically the mankind enters this circle, the more harmonious relationship it shares with nature. Knowledge of harmonization mechanisms through nature self-ordering in all its forms of existence is eternal needs of humanity, the source of eternity and management as a science.

So management as a science has always been as an eternal self-organization of humanity and only different forms of its existence as a conscious objective or subjective phenomenon, creating its history, saturating its specific evolutionary uniqueness.

So in order to convert management into a socially productive science we should identify human, including national, organizational principles which directly reflect the national picture of managerial mentality of a nation, but not through social pressure and even direct investment in research activities. This process is both national and universal, as the social element of the system and civilization it cannot carry its energy, in turn, constantly providing its system as a whole and developing domestic energy sources.

The general methodological theses of the classical heritage of social management as a science are the fact that the modern world civilization, which has a certain

---

---

organizational self-sufficiency, is currently reaching the level of self-management through information energy of this civilization that continually experiences catastrophic explosions which are precisely such ones as they are only if a human being is unable to manage these processes. The proposed by V.G. Afanasyev characteristics of the system properties of social organization, which he also connects with the world all living things, emphasize the consistence of the society, its government opportunities through self-awareness. The latter, self-awareness, form V.G. Afanasyev's point of view is logically consistent with the N.A. Berdyaev's paradigm.

As the main methodologies of the theory of organization A. Bogdanov and M. Weber created scientifically accurate conceptual idea of the organization as a form of existence of material substance and spirit, but the information richness of their scientific works is hard to fit into definitional characteristics.

In a particular way typical methodological characteristics of the science of social management to some extent are inherent to the number of other works of authors which are devoted to the analysis generally civilized principles of social management.

In this context, management as a science has to offer knowledge of these principles, which guide the subject and object of management in organizational objective channel in order to come into such coordination between management and truth, which sufficiently displays its informative power. The truth of management is to detect the presence of necessary institutional guarantors which is the most striking proof of its instrumental potential.

And finally, one of the most powerful tasks of management in terms of self-assertion in the practical management activities is to portray its content aspect as a permanent source of national management thinking, its empirical and theoretical level of Ukrainian managers' creative thinking skills and their understanding of their own activities. However, such creative thinking is possible only on the basis of objective vision of self-reflection, acquiring in this regard that "local" information sufficient enough to produce sound management decisions. Nowadays in the world the most powerful flow of such information is the national information, which recreated the state of modern civilization, level of development and diversity. The consistent human development is reflected in the national information. This development embodies a basic structural unit of modern humanity, which seeks a balanced state of all its elements of regularity that eventually removes contradictions accumulated during the history of civilization, and thus turns them into an absolute source of system development as a whole and its individual elements.

The functional approach to understanding the content of management and organization as its generally civilized basis is epistemologically proven and significantly represented in the modern science of social management. From the point of view of generally civilized understanding of social governance it is necessary to focus on the fact that the organization is the essence of management, namely management is some kind of property of the social system, which it received in connection with the smart principle of absolute substance — human.

Such understanding of generally civilized principles of social management makes a number of tenets and truths that do not exclude, in our opinion, a crucial feature of social governance — the necessity and ability to accurately calculate the organizational capacity of the social system and emerging on this basis, the

possibility of administrative error free performance, at least at the level of the social system. Concerning the social and administrative aspect it is also necessary to point out that the dialectic of subject and object management, considered by many scientists, are present in the relationship of certain parts of the social whole, but management includes this alignment as an organizational feature of the system that sometimes even shifts in organizational space, replacing each other under certain system administration, reproducing the motion of the system. Absoluteness in this dialectical understanding is absent, although the traditional vision of such a relationship is sufficiently encountered in the modern management practices.

Consequently, management as a phenomenon is such a vivid level and potential of the object that adequacy in this term is the prerequisite of the calculated efficiency of management.

Cooperation as one of the generally civilized foundations of social management is a certain organizational form that exists not only in an active state, but also in the form of beyond activity, actually as an objective organization that has, saying, a spring mission in the existence of mankind as a society. So even a negative activity —an expression of cooperative principles — is also defined as an expression of objective principles existing in the form of cooperative work. It doesn't necessarily relate to the division of labor, which leads to cooperation, but mainly the biological energy of mankind.

First of all, it should be noted that the classification of generally civilized understanding of social governance somehow incompletely reflects its true potential. We can to some degree of scientific completeness argue that the subject of social management as a science focuses on mankind as the system and a human being as its defining quality reflected in the civilization context, as the highest achievement of mankind it is the creation of civilization. And identifying its generally civilized phenomena, regardless of the level of development of certain parts of humanity is one of the leading problems of social management of both science and practice.

This approach relates to various generally civilized social phenomena, but this difference only proves the main idea, regardless of the content and form of civilization, it has a number of common manifestations (qualities) that emerged in the process of development and this process continues. Social governance is a general expression of (quality) development of civilization, the ability to self-organization of the human community, primarily through management, objective and subjective its potential, in modern conditions is mainly due to the political system of society and the state as its main institution.

But above mentioned leading positions are leading ones and in order to view the generally civilized context of social management as a concept in its full meaning, it needs to determine its basic characteristics, bringing its organizational connection with the basic concepts (categories) of social management, the most important phenomena that it studies. The sequence of these events, their significance to the society in relation to social management as a civilization phenomenon in this context do not matter.

Concerning social management as a subject of academic intervention from the perspective of bringing its generally civilized context its structure is of fundamental importance, which is quite weighty represented, especially in such social phenomena as production (material and spiritual), industrial relations, society's political life,

---

---

political relations, people in the context of a self-managed society, international relations as a management target, their genesis as an expression of general civilization foundations of social management. The global management increasingly focuses on the idea that social management has not only the current impact on certain social forms, but also the profound, genetic history of mankind. The latter, of course, indicates the generally civilized context of this phenomenon, its historical and modern principles of existence, the impact on the various, sometimes controversial, particularly in Ukraine, social phenomena. Consequently social management is of crucial significance for the countries of the so-called transition state, which, as we know, Ukraine belongs to, which confirmed a new social system. Finding basic, objective for social management, generally civilized factors which have the most effective impact on the social system should be the methodology of calculation of its potential and identifying opportunities for self-management.

Civilization foundations of social management are mainly represented, especially in those mentioned above, social phenomena as an organization, its essential content in relation to the management, production (material and spiritual), industrial relations, and industrial cooperation, political society, political relations, people in the context of a self-managed society, international relations as a management object and expression generally civilized principles of social management. As a methodological indication of social management it proves the presence of such a basic, defining quality in any society as the ability to conscious self-management and so the task is only to find basic support, basic principles, where the fateful self-organization is, in fact, crucial to the movement of society in a civilized way.

In the structure of social management as a science, production management (both material and spiritual) is a civilization phenomenon that is historically and most effectively reflected due to the cooperative society (in broad terms) in an active personal form — business management, and the person under such conditions is becoming a more capacious carrier of social relations, in particular, the nature of social management. Thus, cooperation is presented as a phenomenon which has its own organizational capacity as sometimes seemingly independent workers (which has deep historical roots) and the other side of the issue — is a cooperative interdependence, which openly today reached the level of management globalization.

The historical and evolutionary way of mankind self-management has passed through various forms, especially public administration, a higher level of which is democracy as an organic combination of object and subject of management, the effectiveness of which is calculated within the framework of human needs like playback, including institutional capacity of a particular social structure. Prudently this calculated efficiency as the process is to reach the level of absolute dominance in management science in the nonpolitical space, which will exert a more and less negative impact on the relationship between object and subject of management. The harmonization of social relationships, the removal of contradictions that cause their continued political tension and thus the transfer of management organizational energy as the highest expression of social organization in general will have the greatest potential. This quality will mean a need for professionalization of management, in particular at all levels of modern state organization.

This state may be reflected in the offered characteristics of democratic governance as a concept of management model of professional democracy. In a very concise

form, this concept can be formulated as the need and the ability to directly use the target of management, especially in social management, scientific knowledge, in fact, science management for the organization of society, which means the possibility of preparing managers at all levels and who will be selected and engaged in this activity on a competitive, democratic basis. Therefore, harmonization of interests of all members of society through scientific understanding and real opportunities for their implementation should be in the main objectives for managers of all levels. The politicization of managers in such circumstances should disappear as an administrative phenomenon.

It should be noted that management relations at all times have never relied on the science of management which has ever determined self-management and self-organization of the society as scientifically proven information, ensuring maximum efficiency of administrative activity in general, and organic matter – as the most effective organizational fulfillment of society, a human being as a determining factor and also the presentation of mankind as a system of social relationships, which currently have a level of institutional development which transforms management in crucial source of civilization.

The system state of humanity implies main features of this consistency: this feature is reflected namely in the self-organization of the state, which reflects a deeper systemic phenomenon – self-organization of sovereign nations, streaming cooperation which is the main function of management of international institutions and organizations. The state sovereignty significantly shares the possibility of organizing humanity's consistency, which today is represented in the management of international relations.

Thus, the system state of international cooperation is a managerial phenomenon, because any system is a set of elements that is self-managed in a cause-and-effect regime, organizational and functional interdependence, which is inherently systemic administration. The latter implies not only in public understanding, but in the objective concerning the autonomous ability of the various elements of the system to communicate with one binding factor: the presence of a single energy movement that must be grasped by subjective efforts of those who represent both needs and the possibility of all elements. That “caught” model can be represented by, for example, aims, which should have a calculated potential of the elements and the whole system that needs constant management influence.

Indeed, governance as a generally civilized phenomenon has several aspects which share the nature of objective economic, political and cultural processes. The most crucial one among them is the creation of an adequate legal framework to guarantee equality among peoples that is secured through public equity, which is based on the respect for sovereignty rights, the nation as a whole which must be mandatory. In terms of management such relationships between peoples, nations and states are equal values that can guarantee equal rights. Moreover, the overrating of one of these elements over the other two leads to disruption of the system of relationships between nations, because any of these elements offline can only act as a catalyst for the development of relations between nations, but not a self-sufficient unit in the system. In this sense the management vision of international relationships, their development is conceived as a synonym for relationships between states and nations. Therefore, establishing relationships between different social environments

---

---

in international management decisions should take into account the real state of the nation state, which is especially important for those who do not have their statehood as the respect for equality has no state boundaries and it reaches the highest principles of humanism.

Such notions as “system”, “integrated system” imply a profound, authentic bellwether of relationships’ self-development: the system cannot function properly, grow rapidly without its own adequate capacity, the allocation of elements that organizes them in such a ratio of international and national content, which would significantly contribute to the development of relationships of different nations.

An equally important factor is the development of this new systemic consistency of mankind as an objective and potential ability of harmonization which is based on the contradictions of organizational and managerial factors between the system and the national interests of humanity. Increasingly the effective balance of interests of the international community and national interests of individual nations can be achieved using managerial efforts of international institutions, which reached the global level of civilization development. Moreover, national and state interest becomes a major source of stabilization and development of the world community as a system.

Thus, governing the actual state of social and systemic relationships between nations changes its context: countries of different levels of development have an opportunity of organizing subjective efforts, because on the basis of relations developing in the new type of contradictions, their normal functioning and development require exactly correct, scientifically prudent management of international relations. Scientists view the current state of these relationships as chaotic, in their perception it reflects the objective contradictions existing among nations; this tendency requires a certain “handling” of this situation in the world. Moreover, the essential characteristics of this process, mainly management, are the fact that the objective contradictions that constantly arise should be the object of administrative streaming and harmonization. The understanding of management context allows us to offer a vision of humanity and organizational capacity of its parts as a permanent factor of management improvements. Indeed, the presence of the international community as a system of states is the evidence of a systematic self-management of mankind based on certain fundamental pillars, particularly law. It should be noted that despite the fact that in the management science and practice, the term “state” has a somewhat dominant interpretation, from the point of view of social management the rule of the law is a basic, fundamental, generally civilized creation in relation to the state. This means that methodologically any state should be viewed as a manifestation of particular legal state of self-regulation as part of the global system, and governing it is a legal regulation of relationships. Indeed, international law as a social phenomenon of management system, through its elements such as internal law, human rights, etc., have different forms of their reflection, the higher of which is the state, but in managing international relationships not the state, but namely the right should be the basis for social organizations, including international relationships.

From the perspective of management a lack in governing certain international relationships is a crucial disadvantage of mankind self-management, including international institutions as responsible senior management structures of the

modern world order as a preventive direction in their work is, in fact, essential, decisive.

Organizing international relationships on the principles established by these institutions is their initial purpose, because the autonomy and independence in particular states' activities that violate these principles is evidence of insufficient management energy of international institutions. In this connection a considerable potential for improving management of international cooperation is inherent to the process during which countries are being transferred to such a type of management which can be classified as social management, built on a fairly effective combination of national and international interests in accordance with the objective needs of international life, the interests of all peoples of the world if, of course, the organizational principles of cooperation are founded on the basis of its actual, usually controversial, conditions.

Moreover, understanding the mutual benefits of cooperation in the modern history of international relations has a fundamentally different context because it relates to the interests of millions of people; it has become a sign of international relationships, so governing them, namely governing people or countries' cooperation can be very effective if it is based on the following principle: national must strengthen the international community and vice versa.

It is clear that the implementation of this principle has a concrete historical content, because cooperation relationships not only exist, but they are constructed through mutually beneficial activities, mutually beneficial exchange of products and cooperative efforts to address both domestic and international challenges facing the world community. Therefore, this cooperation has crucial forms of providing the participants with opportunities of solving internal management problems through potential cooperation of nations. It means that the acceleration or deceleration of this development primarily depends on the creation of institutional spaces for collaboration, direct interaction of interests of various countries and cooperation of international institutions, the development of institutional mechanisms and so on. The structural backbone of international relationships encompasses such principles as respect for national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, mutual benefit, non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. However, each of these items does not answer the question of the nature of organizational relationships of cooperation as joint activities with the strengthening and development of the international community both in international and in the domestic sense.

Therefore, we must rely on the following methodological principles of international cooperation that allow determining the potential, on the basis of which we can create a system of organizational coordinates, it means representing management cooperation among countries in generally accepted, theoretical terms of a phenomenon that characterizes cooperation in general and it is an indicator of its organizational development.

It is especially true because in cooperation management it is necessary to isolate the two sides of the phenomenon: the objective and subjective associated with conscious activity of the State Cooperation Organization, its management, although this division is not only quite complicated, but also to some extent scientifically incorrect because it concerns the theoretical understanding of the essence of international cooperation.

---

---

Concerning the objective management cooperation reflects the inherent to the relationships consistency, formed as a result of international division of labor, specialization and cooperation in the sphere of material and spiritual production. And this consistency is present in the relationships between countries regardless of the number of countries entering into these relationships, and even at the level of their development.

The evidence of such kind of managing international cooperation is an organizational expression of the relationships between them in the form of governing integration processes that determine the level of cooperation. In this sense, governance itself as a necessary condition for the development of these processes to some extent is objective, and the level of its organization must meet this basis, that fully exploit the potential of interstate cooperation in its functioning. Moreover, a new organizational and political level of relationships between nations appears in establishing direct contacts between the subjects of cooperation, which greatly complicated the management of cooperation between them. Therefore diversified cooperation is significant for a scientific analysis of the main areas of cooperation in order to better introduce not only the object of control, but also likely to find out possibilities for methodological foundations of the process of international integration management.

Self-organization of the international community, new qualities of the modern world development respectively cause the objective necessity for management responses, so that the countries that currently receive independence in their choice of economic, political and cultural development could have the opportunity to maximize their national potential and also could be systematically and correctly placed in the global integration process, it is necessary to create new management mechanisms.

In other words, the generally civilized foundations of social governance, their scientific understanding are methodological knowledge that is closely connected with the object of management and transforms the science into the active construction the operation of which acts as a true factor of any managerial object development according to its organizational capacity, its basic structural elements. And in this sense this unity, the level of its development, is the highest level of the unity of the modern world community and its basic elements — the nation. Therefore constant verifying the validity of the conceptual apparatus of science in the management system and element dimensions is a condition of the science self-management. And the national aspect is also autonomous in relation to management as a science, as a system of knowledge about the general principles of management, creating a structure of management as a science in general.

The latter is especially important because it is not just about the general science, but also about its national element, mainly a Ukrainian one, which enjoys not only the general organizational potential as human experience, but also creates our own national knowledge. The latter, in turn, uses the general science of management and simultaneously creates its own one, the national science. This fact also requires accent characteristics because the Ukrainian management practices established national management as a structural element of the world's one.

It is clear that the structure of national knowledge does not imply a disorderliness of management as a world science. This structure is a human diversity and adequacy

of knowledge, which is cemented by its systematic state, its original condition and social and intellectual diversity of its implementation.

It means that management as a science is not just a separate science, some organizational formation, but also an information phenomenon that reflects a structural condition of management in general. The total management science and its reflection are a separate unit, including calculated intellectual potential and only in this form it can efficiently serve society as a social phenomenon. It does not mainly refer to a certain reality in general and particular, but also mutual, complementary knowledge, though it is commonly believed that management as general knowledge in the Ukrainian science is “very demanding” and as a science its arsenal encompasses just something that can serve as something general in management. But it’s not true, because Ukrainian governance as a separate phenomenon is not only complementary to the overall management in the Ukrainian reality, but also the only source of science like any other national human element of social structuring, although at the overall level it has a great element of its own system capacity.

Thus, management as a general science is general concerning a national one, which obviously is not a sign of hierarchical correlation: national management as a science is not comparable to the general one in terms of its total capacity, the effect of exposure to any object and intellectual power. The integration of generally civilized foundations of human society in the real movement of material and spiritual civilization is direct evidence of this perception.

As you know, it is very important to understand the current concern of determination (most accurate) of the role and place of science in the system of knowledge for the scientific and creative process in the society, since not only does the creative process customarily depends on it, but also the problem of the efficient influence of this or that science on targets it examines. That is why the structuring of scientific knowledge has almost a universal methodological sense.

The mentioned above idea mainly concerns not only management as a science in general, but also social governance. The latter is especially important, and should be investigated, because social governance is the science that occupies a fundamental place in the management knowledge. It determines sufficient efficacy of branch disciplines of management, since it deals with the main source, which determines the ability to manage certain objects: public relations, material and spiritual production sectors of the society, the division of labor, etc., and finally, it focuses social self-management on its main factors — a human being as a bearer of interests of the specified structure of objects.

And, in this context the stipulated consistence has objective principles, which is especially important because sometimes it removes the existing “creative” practice of manipulating scientific knowledge with regard to the definition of the role and place of a science in the modern information space, including governing the society.

This objectivity lies in the fact that management is a phenomenon almost endless because it implies the adherence of any social, biological or technical systems to governing, possessing sometimes too complicated vertical and horizontal organizational capabilities to self-management, which embraces the organizational capacity of any self-governing object.

Erecting on this basis the system of management sciences is completely natural and objective. Therefore, it is the objective and academic necessity to identify management

knowledge in this system that would determine the methodological background of other management sciences.

Social management as a science is supposed to fulfill this function due to its profound determinant — generally civilized approaches (foundations) of social management. That is why social management as the science refers to knowledge that represents the most complex system of government of the world — human society, a key element of which is the human being. This knowledge has a generally civilized and social context that helps housing management to exercise its mission — to establish a highly developed modern social organization of the world.



## References

- Afanasyev*, 1995 — Afanasyev V.G. Nauchnoe upravlenie obschestvom [Scientific society management] — Moscow, 1995. — 245 p.
- Bevzenko*, 2002 — Bevzenko L.D. Socialnaya samoorganizaciya: sinergeticheskaya paradigma: vozmozhnosti socialnuh interpretaciy [Social self-management: the synergy paradigm: opportunities of social interpretation] — Kiev, 2002. — 436 p.
- Bogdanov*, 1989 — Bogdanov A.A. Tektologiya: vseobschaya organizacionnaya nauka [Tectology: management science ] — Moscow, 1989. — 412 p.
- Veber*, 1990 — Veber M . Izbrannue proizvedeniya [ Selected works] — Moscow, 1990. — 566 p.
- Voronkova V. G.* The concept of relationship among man, consciousness, mind in the context of the virtual information space / Philosophy and Cosmology 2013 (Vol.12): academic journal — Kiev: ISPC, 2014 — P. 170-182
- Gaievska*, 2000 — Gaievska O.B. Upravlinnya yak socialyuy fenomen [Governance as social phenomenon] — Kyiv, 2000. — 182 p.
- Gaievska*, 2012 — Gaievska O.B. Upravlinska cuvilizaciya: zagalnocuvilizacijnyy rozvutok upravlinnya micshnarodnumu vidnosunamu cherez nacionalnu dercshavnu samoorganizacieyu [Management civilization: generally civilized development of international relationships management through national state self-management] / Herald of politics 2012 (Volume 66) — Kyiv, 2012 — P. 324-334.
- Gaievska*, 2014 — Gaievska O. B. Zagalnocuvilizacijnyy zmist socialno-sistemnoyi organizaciyi [Generally civilized context of social organization] / University faculty 2014 (Volume 3) — Kyiv, 2014 — P. 92-101.
- Gaievska*, 2014 — Gaievska O.B. Nauka socialnogo upravlinnya v sustemi profesynoyi pidgotovku [social governance as a science in the system of professional preparation] / Theory and practice of governing social systems. Periodical quarterly journal 2014 (Volume 3) — Harkiv HTY «XIII», 2014 — P. 105-113.
- Luman*, 2004 — Luman N. Obshestvo kak socialnaya sistema [Society as social system ] — Moscow, 2003. — 232 p.
- Pochepcov*, 2005 — Pochepcov G.G. Strategiya: instrumentariyi po upravlniyu budusshim [ Strategy: management tools of future] — Kyiv, 2005. — 377 p.
- Pushulin*, 2003 — Pushulin M.P. Socialnoe upravlenie: sinergeticheskaya paradigma [Social governance: synergy paradigm ] — Moscow, 2003.

- Farenik, 2003* — Farenik S.A. Upravlinnya socialnumu protsesami: pobudova ta realizaciyasocialnuhmodeley [Governingsocialprocessesandimplementation of the social model] — Kyiv, 2003. —368p.
- Shepelev, 2004* — Shepelev M.A. Globalizaciya upravlinnya yak megatendenciya suchsnogo svitovogo rozvutky [Governance globalization as the world development tendency] — Kyiv, 2004. — 512p.