UDC 323.2:321.7
BBK 66.0

Nataliia Holubiak

ONLINE TECHNOLOGIES OF CIVIC PARTICIPATION: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF E-DEMOCRACY

The article analyzes the characteristics of the use of e-mechanisms of civic participation. The author provides the following opposition: rationale of cyberspace opportunities and refutation of mobilizing resource of the Internet. The author considers practices and projects of online participation in Ukraine. The summary features advantages and disadvantages of introducing e-democracy.

Key words: *e-participation, civic activity, online technologies, information society, e-democracy*

Evolution of democracy is a distinct product of time, when permanent changes determine the emergence of new political practices. Creative ideas and trends in institutions of state and public sectors are formed with the improvement and development of information and communication technologies. Using innovative approaches allows reviewing monological interaction between government and society, updating civic education and political competence, encouraging individual and collective forms of civic participation, modernizing decision-making based on equality of all interested parties, and more. The aforenamed opportunities are becoming a source for open discussion and transparency of political institutions, and this, in turn, increases the credibility of the government and facilitates the creation of social capital.

Therefore, the aim of our study is to analyze the Internet technologies for implementation of civic participation in the context of creation of e-democracy. The controversial issues include features of formation of an interactive Internet space for political participation, technological accessibility and inclusion for different segments of society, justification of the importance of new plebiscitary mechanisms of political process, analysis of advantages and disadvanrages of e-democracy.

In general, topics of the Internet technologies, political participation and e-democracy have become objects of research for political science, sociology and public administration. It is necessary to mention the theoretical works by Y. Masuda, M. Castells, S. Arnstein, R. Dahl, H. Rheingold, B. Barber, B. Bimber, S. Coleman and others. In Ukraine, particular attention is focused on mechanisms of e-government and e-democracy, tools of participation at the level of local government due to decentralization processes, issues of information exchange, e-participation and growth of online activism (N. Hrytsiak, O. Dubas O. Yemelianenko, T. Kravchenko, N. Vinnikova, S. Denysiuk, M. Yakovlev, O. Radchenko, I. Kharechko et al.).

Scientific and technological progress in the second half of the twentieth century gave rise to a new phenomenon of "information society" that led to complication of communication environment and objectivization of information. Japanese scientist Y. Masuda has suggested that participatory democracy will prevail in the society of the future called Computopia, which will establish a feedback in the political sphere in order to take account of the views of ordinary citizens and therefore facilitate access to sources of information for all social groups [8, p.944].

Theoretical foundations of e-democracy should also include works of J. Habermas on cyberspace as a new public sphere of free discussion of current social issues [14]. C. Kush in his book Cybercitizen specifies that citizens can now easily connect with one another in order

to create a unified voice to influence government officials [21]. J. Fishkin stresses the need to create a public space that motivates citizens to become "public" where the implementation of democratic values is possible [19].

Founder and researcher of virtual communities H. Rheingold upholds a position of success in building cyberspace as a tool to strengthen the democratic values. "In cyberspace, we chat and argue, engage in intellectual discourse, perform acts of commerce, exchange knowledge, share emotional support, make plans, brainstorm... We do everything people do when people get together, but we do it with words on computer screens" [13, p. 58].

However, there are certain e-democracy opponents, who point to the phenomena of hyperpluralism, paradoxes of e-participation, slacktivism, digital divide, unitary collectivism and mindless consensus. For example, M. Castells believed that information technologies generate atomization of the individual while reducing his time to communicate with family members [8, p. 945]. B. Bimber and M.S. Nisbet point out that the Internet barely affects the level of civic participation in society [17].

Bimber draws the conclusion that obtaining information does not necessarily increase the likelihood of participation outside the Web. He contends that political participation is not directed by the availability or cost of political information. Nevertheless, for the present purposes it is valuable to note that there is no evidence reported of a negative link; or that Internet activity should decrease the propensity to be active [16, p.55].

One of the founders of participatory democracy B. Barber calls for activity of the citizens, but not "at every level and at every moment", but only when it is time to decide major political issues. He warns that the use of technology can reduce the meaning of face-to-face interaction and increase the threat of manipulation on the part of elite [2, p. 257].

R. Dahl notes that it is advisable to supplement existing structures of political power by new technologies, but we should be wary of over-involvement, which may result in oversaturation regarding politics and electoral apathy. Instead, control of the political process requires a certain critical mass of well-informed and competent citizens [4, p. 514-515].

American Professor M. Hindman explores the myth of digital democracy and appeals to the possibilities of mobilizing potential of the Internet, stressing a significant impact of elite on configuration and accessibility of material on the network. Some scientists consider the paradox of mediation as an e-involvement of citizens in the political space eliminates the role of politicians and parties as representatives of the people [20, p. 127].

Popularity of slacktivism interprets online activity that has no appreciable influence on political and social issues, but creates the illusion of involvement through a series of clicks on the web. Researchers mostly include into pseudo-activism following activities: viewing political commercials on YouTube, commenting on blog posts and online media, subscribing to newsletters from politicians, spreading news and information messages, sending e-mails on the topic, joining groups dedicated to public campaigns, causal change of information in social media profile and others. It means that most of these actions have no analogues among offline activities [15, p.58].

Despite the differences, scientific world does not deny a direct connection between the development of technological innovations and their impact on political and economic processes, in particular on the nature of political participation itself. New online tools enhance political participation principles of representative democracy and complement it with mechanisms of direct democracy. The Internet, while being an interactive, relatively inexpensive, decentralized and accessible regardless of the temporary or physical location, opens opportunities to participate in public discussions and forms the preconditions for political activity.

However, apart from the technical side, one should pay attention to the readiness and ability of people to take advantage of online mechanisms, since the formation of political

engagement involves assimilating democratic values (i.e., a certain level of political development of the state), acquiring political culture and political vocabulary (cognitive socialization), gaining experience of participation in political life. The formation of "culture of participation", "civic culture" is determined to be an important empirical indicator.

In general, e-democracy reinforces the four key concepts of good governance: transparency, accountability, participation and civic education, and also access to the benefits of the information development of the society [7]. In our study, we will focus on building a transparent e-participation in Ukraine.

One of the basic conditions for implementation of civic participation is an association of individuals in order to achieve social results. In the process of joint activities, they create structures that encourage a broader participation, provide an opportunity to publicly express one's position, to form an organized influence on authorities. Traditionally, the scientific literature on "participation" turns to the classic concept of a "Ladder of Citizen Participation" by S. Arnstein which determines the intensity of political involvement starting from the level of informing citizens through consultations, including them into decision-making, partnership, and empowerment as the strongest forms [1, p. 216].

Therefore, in order to encourage civic engagement, it is necessary to implement programs and projects at the national and local levels using new information technologies that are the embodiment of direct democracy in the form of public hearings, monitoring, public consultation, collective appeals etc. Thus, according to recommendations of the Council of Europe, there are following sectors of e-democracy: e-parliament, e-legislation, e-justice, e-mediation (pre-trial dispute settlement), e-environment (ecology), e-election, e-referendum, e-initiative, e-consultation, e-petitioning, e-campaigning and e-surveying [9].

It should be noted that e-democracy as a dynamic process is carried out at different levels, by different subjects with different levels of responsibility. Thus, providing free public access to all relevant information is achieved by interdependent systems Government-to-Citizens (G2C) and Citizens-to-Government (S2G), in which an initiative of a particular operation is coming from citizens.

Professor S. Coleman suggests the following criteria for evaluation of e-participation: how developed are public discussions and interactive information flows; are there mechanisms through which citizens and government officials could learn each other's thoughts; is there a sufficient amount of structured information which citizens trust [18, p. 160].

Let us consider the situation in Ukraine with the introduction of electronic mechanisms for civic participation. The normative term E-Democracy was defined in the Strategy for the Development of Information Society in Ukraine in 2013: "Electronic Democracy is a form of social relations where the citizens and organizations are involved in state building and state administration, as well as in local self-government through the widespread use of information and communication technologies" [12].

Technically, for the practical implementation of electronic mechanisms, it is advisable to analyze the computerization of Ukrainian society first. According to the digital statistics as of February 2016 (data from Kyiv International Institute of Sociology), 61.6% of adults used the Internet, the proportion of users among people between 18 and 39 was 91%, while the growth rate of users continued to increase. Differentiation continues to persist among the age categories and types of settlements, technical opportunities in sparsely populated areas being particularly limited [5].

An important step for Ukraine in the implementation of e-democracy was the introduction of a mechanism of electronic petitions, i.e. online appeals to the state authorities, Parliament, President and local authorities. According to the Law "On Amendments to the Law of Ukraine "On the Application of Citizens" on Electronic Application and Electronic

Petition", it is necessary to overcome a certain threshold of signatures in order for petition to be considered, for example, settlements with population up to 1,000 people are required to gather at least 50 signatures, communities up to 1000-5000 people need at least 75 signatures, etc [11].

Further promotion of e-democracy projects is possible under the program The Electronic Governance for Government Accountability and Community Participation (EGAP, funded by the Government of Switzerland), which will be implemented in 2015-2019. In particular, one of the objectives of the program is the implementation of pilot initiatives in the field of e-democracy to enhance the involvement of citizens at local and regional levels, which is implemented in the form of IT projects in the field of e-democracy EGAP CHALLENGE. The system of local petitions www.e-dem.in.ua is recognized as the most successful example, considering that more than 50 Ukrainian communities joined it within first six months of its operation [6].

The new tool to monitor the situation in the community is the introduction of participatory budgeting, which provides a possibility for the citizens to be more informed about the budget process and also directly participate in the allocation of budgetary resources. This type of budgeting provides greater transparency and accountability of governance, especially in the fight against corruption and shadow schemes. In Ukraine, the mechanism of participatory budgeting began to function thanks to Polish-Ukrainian Cooperation Foundation PAUCI and other civil society institutions, including the Institute for Budgetary and Socio-Economic Research and local government's own resources. In 2015, Cherkasy, Chernihiv and Poltava were the first to launch the participatory process; later in 2016, the participatory budgeting was introduced in more than 20 Ukrainian cities [3].

In addition, we should mention the resource of the project "Open Budget" (openbudget.in.ua), which includes a set of nine interactive modules that contain detailed information on the budget allocation in the form of interactive infographics, data on key indicators of budget execution with the possibility to compare them by year and with other cities of Ukraine, information on the budget calendar of the city, map of city renovations, library of most important documents related to the city budget, and more. In order to use it, it is enough for members of local councils to register on the website and to upload their budget documents; the system recognizes information automatically and creates interactive budget infographics without user intervention. As of September 2016, about 40 local government bodies have used this tool [6].

Furthermore, the process of transparency and openness is ensured by The Unified State Open Data Portal (access to public information from authorities), ProZorro (the pilot project of e-procurement system that allows online selling to the state), E-Data (unified web portal of use of public funds), The Open City Portal (the portal created for interaction of citizens, local authorities, communal enterprises, public associations, charity foundations and businesses in the process of solving urgent social problems), and others.

According to the study "The Practice of Using E-Democracy Tools by Civic Organizations in Ukraine (2016)", the analysis and use of open data are the most common instruments in the area of e-democracy used by civic organizations. A positive response to activity in this area was reported by 64.4% of respondents. In addition, there are records of high rates of using Google-services, electronic applications and requests, registrations of e-petitions [10].

In general, online tools are designed to enhance the asynchronous interaction, to reduce operating costs, improve opportunities for self-mobilization and collective actions, to get new high-quality services, to ensure the principles of openness, transparency and accountability, to increase the level of trust in government institutions and information technologies, to improve the efficiency of public services.

The disadvantages of the introduction of direct democracy in Ukraine include: creation of additional potential threats connected to information noise and information security, in particular, in terms of hybrid conflict in the East; digital divide and technical unpreparedness; lack of a developed policy on e-inclusion (the need for additional support for the elderly, minorities, individuals with disabilities), information manipulation; political obstacles (political will of leaders); low liability for noncompliance with laws that regulate democratic processes in digital form; lack of the systematic, strategic planning of reforms and their financial support; insufficient interaction between the government and the public sector regarding possibilities and functions of e-democracy.

Lack of competence of citizens in the possibilities of e-participation is evidenced by the survey of Kyiv International Institute of Sociology conducted in February-March 2015 on the order of EGAP program: 79% of the adult population of Ukraine have never heard the term "e-democracy"; results on the online and offline preferences show that 47% prefer direct contact with government officials; the only positive trend is the involvement of young respondents (18-35) in online participation. The expert survey of Podolian Agency of Regional Development "The Practice of Using E-Democracy Tools in Ukraine" (2016) is worth mentioning separately; it shows that many public figures (98.8%) are convinced of the need to carry out measures in order to increase the level of civic education in the field of e-democracy [6].

We can note that Ukraine is currently in transition of administration and direct democracy from offline format to e-instruments. The society increasingly requests the legislative and executive implementation of e-democracy: online consultations, public discussions and online public boards, e-voting, e-election, e-plebiscites, appointment and removal of public officers online.

Thus, building e-democracy is a two-way process of interaction between the authorities and the public. On the one hand, state institutions should ensure the normative regulation of e-participation of citizens, consistently implement the system changes, create a competent environment among government officials, promote and inform the communities about the updated mechanisms of influence. This means that the main priorities of e-democracy are accessibility, initiative, knowledge and professionalism. On the other hand, people should not forget the achievements of the Revolution of Dignity and focus their efforts to control the political process, particularly at the local level. In other words, implementation of Reanimation Package of Reforms requires thoughtful and functioning mechanism for decentralization, mediatization and openness of the political process.

1. Arnshtein Sh. Lestnytsa hrazhdanskoho uchastyia [Elektronnyi resurs] / Sherry R.Arnshtein //Zhurnal Amerykanskoho ynstytuta hradostroytelei. – №4–Tom 35. – 1969. – S. 216-224. – Rezhym dostupu: http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ru/ladder-of-citizen-participation_ru.html

2. Barber B. Sylna demokratiia: polityka uchasnytskoho typu / B. Barber // Demokratiia: Antolohiia; [uporiad. O. Protsenko, V. Lisovyi]. – K. : Smoloskyp, 2005. – 1108 s. – S. 254-262.

3. Hromadskyi biudzhet – novi mista Ukrainy [Elektronnyi resurs]. / Fundatsiia ukraino-polskoi spivpratsi PAUSI. – Rezhym dostupu: http://www.pauci.org/one_news.php?id=98

4. Dal R. Demokratyia y eё krytyky / R. Dal. – M.: „Rossyiskaia polytycheskaia эntsyklopedyia"(ROSSPЭN), 2003. – 576 s.

5. Dynamika vykorystannia internet v ukraini: liutyi-berezen 2016 [Elektronnyi resurs]. / Kyivskyi mizhnarodnyi instytut sotsiolohii. - Rezhym dostupu http://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=621&page=2

6. Elektronne vriaduvannia zadlia pidzvitnosti vlady ta uchasti hromady (EGAP) [Elektronnyi resurs]. / Rezhym dostupu http://egap.in.ua/

7.   Zakonodavchi Aspekty Elektronnoi Demokratii v Ukraini [Elektronnyi resurs] //
Analitychni Zapysky z Efektyvnoho E-Uriaduvannia. – Vyp.1. – 2016. – Rezhym dostupu:
http://egap.in.ua/natsionalna-polityka/
8.   Istoriia politychnoi dumky: pidruchnyk / za zah. red. N. M. Khomy [I. V.
Aliieksieienko, T. V. Andrushchenko, O. V. Babkina ta in.]. – L. : Novyi Svit-2000, 2015.- S.1000
9.   Pantsyr S., Kohut A. E-demokratiia v Ukraini: rekomendatsiishchodo vprovadzhennia
polityky ta zabezpechennia yii rezultatyvnosti [Elektronnyi resurs] /Serhii Pantsyr, Andrii Kohut. –
Rezhym   dostupu: http://radaprogram.org/sites/default/files/infocenter/piblications/e-
demokratiya_tekst.pdf
10.   Praktyka   vykorystannia   instrumentiv   elektronnoi   demokratii   hromadskymy
orhanizatsiiamy v Ukraini [Rezultaty ekspertnoho opytuvannia] [Elektronnyi resurs]. – Rezhym
dostupu: http://dialog.lviv.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Report_E-Democracy-Tools-for-NGOs_1-
1.pdf /
11.   Pro vnesennia zmin do Zakonu Ukrainy "Pro zvernennia hromadian" shchodo
elektronnoho zvernennia ta elektronnoi petytsii : Zakon Ukrainy vid 2 lyp. 2015 r. № 577. – Rezhym
dostupu : http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/577-19
12.   Pro   skhvalennia   Stratehii   rozvytku   informatsiinoho   suspilstva   v   Ukraini
:Rozporiadzhennia Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy № 386-r vid 15.05.2013 r. [Elektronnyi resurs]. —
Rezhym dostupu : http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua//laws/show/386-2013-r.
13.   Reinhold H. Umnaia tolpa: Novaia sotsyalnaia revoliutsyia / H. Reinhold. – M. :
FAYR- PRESS, 2006. – 416 s
14.   Khabermas Yu. Budushchee chelovecheskoi pryrody / Yu. Khabermas // per. s nem.-
M.: Yzd-vo "Ves Myr", 2002. – 144 s.
15.   Yanchenko   A. Slaktyvizm – problema politychnoi uchasti v Interneti chy
"nevyznachene poniattia"? / A. O. Yanchenko // Hrani : Naukovo-teoretychnyi i hromadsko-
politychnyi almanakh. – 2013. – № 10. – S. 56-60.
16.   Bimber B. Information and political engagement in America: The search for effects of
information technology at the individual level / Bruce Bimber //Political Research Quarterly. –
Volume 54. – № 1. – 2001. -P. 53–67.
17.   Christensen H. Political activities on the Internet: Slacktivism or political participation
by other means? [Electronic resource] / Henrik Serup Christensen. – Volume 16, Number 2 – 7
February 2011. – Available at: http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3336/2767
18.   Coleman S. The Future ofthe Internet and Democracy.Beyond Metaphors,Towards
Policy / Stephen Coleman // Promise and problems of e-democracy: challenges of on-line citizens
engagement.OECD publication service . – 2003. – P. 143—162.
19.   Fishkin James S. The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy/ James S.
Fishkin. – New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995 – 252 p.
20.   Hindman M. The myth of digital democracy / Matthew Hindman. – Oxford: Princeton
University Press, 2009. – 200 p.
21.   Kush Ch. Cybercitizen: how to use your computer to fight for all the issues you care
about / Ch. Kush. – St. Martin's Griffin, 2000. – 272 p.

*Стаття присвячена аналізу особливостей застосування електронних механізмів
громадянської участі. Автором наводиться протиставлення -обґрунтування можливостей
кіберпростору та спростування мобілізаційного ресурсу Інтернету. Розглядаються онлайн
партисипаційні практики та проекти в Україні. Підсумовуються переваги та недоліки
впровадження електронної демократії.*

Ключові слова: *електронна участь, громадянська активність, он-лайн технології,
інформаційне суспільство, електронна демократія*

*Статья посвящена анализу особенностей применения электронных механизмов
гражданского участия. Автором приводится противопоставление -обґрунтування
возможностей киберпространства и опровержения мобилизационного ресурса Интернета.*

Рассматриваются онлайн партисипацийни практики и проекты в Украине. Суммируются преимущества и недостатки внедрения электронной демократии.

__Ключевые слова:__ электронная участие, гражданская активность, он-лайн технологии, информационное общество, электронная демократия

Oleksandra Hrujeva

HAPPENING POLITYCZNY JAKO TECHNOLOGIA POSTMODERNISTYCZNEGO DZIAŁANIA POLITYCZNEGO (ANALIZA ZAGRANICZNEGO I KRAJOWEGO DOŚWIADCZENIA ZASTOSOWANIA)

Artykuł poświęcony jest badaniu happeningu politycznego jako formy aktywności politycznej, która powstaje w epoce postmodernizmu. Badane są akcje przeprowadzone przy pomocy technologii happeningu politycznego pod koniec XX i w XXI wieku.

__Słowa kluczowe:__ happening polityczny, protest polityczny, postmodernizm, teatralizacja polityki.

Happening polityczny jest niewystarczająco zbadaną akcjonistyczną formą udziału politycznego o charakterze uteatralizowanym, która powstaje w epoce postmodernizmu. Stawiamy przed sobą zadanie przeanalizowania happeningu politycznego poprzez zbadanie potencjału danej formy artystyczno-kulturalnej w życiu społeczno-politycznym współczesnej społeczności.

Bazę filozoficzno-metodologiczną analizy happeningu politycznego stworzyli H. Arendt, J. Butler, S. Sontag i inny. Wśród badań naukowych happeningu politycznego warto wyróżnić dorobek D. Lewczyka, który analizował wczesne happeningi postradzieckie w okresie od 1991 do 1995 roku. Happening jako praktyka akcjonistyczna na przestrzeni postradzieckiej jest obiektem analizy D. Bułyczewej. W badaniach krajowego historyka W. Okaryńskiego rozpatrzone zostały ukraińskie praktyki akcjonistyczne w okresie przebudowy (kontrkultura), kiedy dopiero rodziły się warunki do wyrażania opozycyjnych idei, powstawały kreatywne formaty protestu (ruch „dżuczystów"). Wyróżnić należy głębokość analizy praktyk akcjonistycznych, charakterystyczną dla dorobku naukowego ukraińskiej badawczyni-kulturołożki K. Stanisławskiej. N. Choma bada happening jako protestową formą udziału politycznego, uteatralizowane działanie o ukierunkowaniu społeczno-politycznym.

Happening w szerokim rozumieniu jest kierunkiem akcjonizmu; jest to pewna forma działań, akcji, uczynków, podczas których wykonawcy happeningu starają się zaangażować widzów do gry, scenariusz której określony jest jedynie w przybliżeniu. Teoria i praktyka happeningu opiera się o doświadczenie artystyczne futuryzmu, dadaizmu, surrealizmu, teatru absurdu. Happening zrodził się na granicy modernizmu i postmodernizmu (zapoczątkowany został w 1952 roku).

Istotny akcent w happeningu politycznym robiony jest na charakterze improwizacyjnym; brak jest konkretnego scenariusza wydarzeń: jedynie częściowo przewidziano sytuacje i nawet rozwój linii fabularnych, nie zawsze znane są wyniki gry. Wydarzenie obywa się w czasie rzeczywistym, zawsze po raz pierwszy i nigdy nie może zostać powtórzone. Specyfika happeningu politycznego polega na tym, że nie jest on po prostu widowiskiem, lecz zewnętrznie spontanicznym (sprowokowanym, improwizowanym,