

УДК 323(4-6ЄС):329.78

DOI: 10.24144/2078-1431.2022.1(28).98-104

*Svitlana Zub,
Leading Specialist
Educational and Research Institute of European Integration Studies
Uzhhorod National University*

ФОРМУВАННЯ ТА РЕАЛІЗАЦІЯ МОЛОДІЖНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ В КРАЇНАХ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО СОЮЗУ: ДОСВІД ДЛЯ УКРАЇНИ

У статті окреслено особливості формування та реалізації молодіжної політики в країнах Європейського Союзу та досвід для України. Проаналізовано тенденцію розвитку молодіжної політики в західноєвропейських державах, яку можна охарактеризувати як перехід від допомоги окремим найбільш уразливим категоріям молоді до здійснення соціальних програм, що охоплюють дедалі більше молодих людей. Розглянуто рекомендації Ради Європи, де визначено 11 індикаторів національної молодіжної політики, які необхідно сприймати як керівництво для службовців у сфері роботи з молоддю, а молодіжні громадські об'єднання, що відстоюють інтереси молоді, можуть використовувати їх як інструмент для лобіювання. Ці індикатори також можуть бути використані при оцінюванні поточного стану молодіжної політики.

Запропоновано комплекс заходів з питань удосконалення в Україні державної молодіжної політики, що дасть змогу створити її нову вітчизняну модель з урахуванням найкращого європейського досвіду та відповідно до стандартів Європейського Союзу.

Ключові слова: *молодіжна політика, Європейський Союз, Україна, рекомендації Ради Європи, Європейська хартія, відповідальність держави за інтеграцію молоді, вплив на рішення влади.*

The article outlines the peculiarities of the formation and implementation of youth policy in the European Union and the experience for Ukraine. The tendency of youth policy development in Western European countries is analyzed, which can be characterized as the transition from assistance to some of the most vulnerable categories of youth to the implementation of social programs that cover more and more young people. The recommendations of the Council of Europe are considered, which identify 11 indicators of national youth policy that should be taken as a guide for youth workers, and youth NGOs that advocate for youth can use them as a tool for lobbying. These indicators can also be used to assess the current state of youth policy.

A set of measures has been proposed to improve the state youth policy in Ukraine, which will allow to create its new national model taking into account the best European experience and in accordance with the standards of the European Union.

Key words: *youth policy, European Union, Ukraine, Council of Europe recommendations, European Charter, state responsibility for youth integration, influence on government decisions.*

Formulation of the problem. Ukraine's European integration course focuses on a detailed study of the experience of European countries in order to find guidelines for further development of youth policy. A systematic study of the European experience in the implementation of youth policy contributes to the identification and solution of its problems. The peculiarity of the process of formation and implementation of state youth policy in Ukraine is that both government institutions and civil society must take into account the peculiarities of domestic historical traditions in youth work, as well as modern needs of young citizens, society and the state.

Analysis of recent research. Theoretical and practical issues of youth policy development in the European Union are a very important issue that attracts the attention of many foreign and domestic statesmen and scholars. Such research includes the works of G. Altynbekova, S. Bezkletny, Y. Galaburda, M. Kerbal, G. Koval, V. Kulik, O. Meleshkina, O. Ovchar, N. Panin, E. Pardus, D. Rosh, V. Sokolova, S. Soroka, R. Storozhuk, A. Schizerotto, S. Tucker, R. Thomson, V. Yaroshenko, etc.

Conventionally, the youth policy of European countries can be divided into static (Nordic countries) and dynamic (UK, Denmark, Mediterranean countries). In fact, a dynamic model is more appropriate for Ukraine, as it allows for active transformation of youth policy in accordance with the changing needs of young people, while the static model provides minimal and sustainable impact on the target population.

A general trend in the development of youth policy in Western European countries is the transition from helping some of the most vulnerable categories of young people to the implementation of social programs that reach the majority of young people [2]. This reorientation is due to the coming to power of social democratic governments, which put forward and developed the idea of recognizing the responsibility of the state for the integration of all young people into society.

During the independence of Ukraine, a sufficient legal framework for youth was developed, which testifies to the existence of many regulations: Declaration "On General Principles of State Youth Policy in Ukraine"; Decree of the President of Ukraine "On the Strategy for the Development of State Youth Policy for the period up to 2020"; Law of Ukraine "On Promoting Social Formation and Development of Youth in Ukraine"; Law of Ukraine "On social work with children and youth"; Law of Ukraine "On Youth and Children's Public Organizations"; Law of Ukraine "On Education"; and other.

Legislative decisions on youth policy in Ukraine were made mainly depending on the political situation in society [1]. However, during the development of the sectoral legal framework, young people ceased to be perceived as a passive object of government, and became an equal partner of the authorities. In addition, a fairly comprehensive and strong regulatory framework has been formed, which provides for the regulation of youth policy in all its main areas.

In my opinion, in the field of youth policy of Ukraine it is expedient to implement the recommendations of the Council of Europe, which defines 11 indicators of national youth policy [5]. They were first made public in 2001.

The document's preamble states that 11 indicators should be seen as a guide for youth workers, and youth NGOs that can advocate for youth can use them as a tool for lobbying. These indicators can also be used to assess the current state of youth policy. Let's consider these indicators in a brief comparison with the national specifics of compliance with them.

Indicator 1. Non-formal education (increasing the role of non-formal education – education outside the formal school system; development of youth initiatives, youth clubs and youth organizations). Regarding the development of non-formal education, we have rather disappointing indicators in Ukraine: only 10% of young people were involved in non-formal education (3% – on a paid basis, 7% – on a free basis). A number of local programs have identified a priority for the development of non-formal education, but without the available youth infrastructure, sufficient funding and information support, it is impossible to increase this indicator. This problem is especially acute at the level of newly created united territorial communities.

Indicator 2. Youth training policy (training of trainers in the youth sector, multipliers to raise awareness of young people on various issues). As for the experience of conducting trainings for young people (especially on a free basis), it is not widespread enough, although this area is quite relevant. Thus, for the implementation of both educational and educational (in terms of general education and the formation of narrow professional skills) areas, this is important. In our opinion, a special role here can be played by the creation and operation of hubs with free events, as well as on a paid basis and on terms of co-financing.

Indicator 3. Regulatory framework in the youth sphere (legislation should recognize the participation of young people and youth NGOs in political decision-making, create a legal framework for work). Regarding the legal framework of Ukraine, the necessary legal grounds for ensuring the participation of young people in it are available. The problem is not in the rule-making, as such, but in the practical implementation of existing legal documents.

Indicator 4. Youth budget (budget to promote the development of youth initiatives and youth organizations, allocation of administrative grants). With regard to youth budgets, grants, concessional lending and various financial initiatives, the experience of grant funding in a small number of large cities is still available, but it is absent at the level of newly created integrated territorial communities.

Indicator 5. Youth information policy (transparency of state policy on young people, informing young people about the various opportunities that exist for them). Regarding the effectiveness of information policy, we also have a very interesting situation: youth centers are now actively operating, the Model Regulation on Youth Centers has been approved, but only a quarter of young people are informed about the availability of such centers and even fewer.

Indicator 6. Multilevel policy (development of action plans to be implemented not only at the national level, but at all levels of government). As for multilevel, it is true that the existing target programs form a conditional hierarchy, but the content of these programs does not allow us to talk about their relationship and proper coordination.

Indicator 7. Youth research (policy should not be based on assumptions, but only on the facts and results of youth research). Positive in the implementation of this indicator is the availability of annual reports and annual materials of opinion polls, which allows to form a general picture.

Indicator 8. Participation (forms of involving young people in the decision-making process, promoting the process in which young people participate and actively contribute to society). The practical implementation of forms of youth involvement in Ukraine is not effective enough, some institutions (individual youth councils) are purely formal and do not have a significant impact on youth policy.

Indicator 9. Interdepartmental cooperation (responsibility and cooperation between different line ministries – youth, sports, education, culture, defense, health, transport, labor, agriculture, etc.). Coordination mechanisms for interdepartmental cooperation are present, sometimes representatives of these areas are united in a single humanitarian department. However, the only emphasis should be on cooperation between line ministries, not on merging or duplicating ministries.

Indicator 10. Innovation (promotion of innovations, creative approach to solving problems and stimulating youth creativity). In terms of innovation and creativity, its manifestations can be better traced at the local level than at the national level.

Indicator 11. Youth advisory bodies (establishment of structures for consultations and partnerships between the state on the one hand and youth and youth organizations on the other). Advisory bodies have become operational, but so far they have not become fully functional.

An important promising direction in the transformation of legislation governing educational youth projects in accordance with modern societal needs was the participation of Ukrainian youth in EU programs “Youth in Action” and the European Voluntary Service. The implementation of the order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine “On the implementation of the Association Agreement”, which provides for the expansion of Ukraine’s participation in the EU Erasmus + program, which provides a number of opportunities for young people, also plays a positive role. Its impact extends to education or employment, and the main objectives of the program are the participation of young people in the democratic life of Europe, the promotion of active citizenship, intercultural dialogue, social integration and solidarity [4]. The program, as a comprehensive document, provides for the promotion of quality change in youth through proposals for reforms in youth at the local, regional and national levels. Such measures include improving management and innovation capacity, cooperation of youth organizations in partner countries, and promoting new forms of youth education. The projects support the development of dialogue on reforms, cooperation, networking, and various youth educational activities. Such programs, creating an alternative to conventional activities at the state level, bring a fresh understanding of information and education activities, methods, tools and methodologies for working with young people.

The EU4Youth initiative helps the Eastern Partnership countries to encourage the active participation of young people in economic development. The

Youth Window of the Eastern Partnership, as part of the program, offers opportunities for direct funding of projects of youth NGOs under the Erasmus + program.

On March 17, 2016, the Ukrainian Youth Pact 2020 was signed for the first time in order to unite the efforts of companies, the state and education to solve the problems of youth employment. The initiative was implemented by the CSR Development Center together with the Ministry of Youth and Sports of Ukraine and is implemented within the framework of the European Pact for Youth. The Ukrainian Initiative is one of the most active in Europe and has now brought together 38 organizations in Ukraine that have pledged to promote at least 300 partnerships between business and the education sector and jointly provide 10,000 places for internships and youth jobs.

The direct implementation of youth policy requires special training. As for working with young people in European countries, according to experts from the Council of Europe Directorate, it depends on the vector of state influence [6]. Therefore, in Europe there are different concepts of working with young people, based on relevant traditions, content of work and the tasks set before professionals.

Despite these differences in the choice of youth policy models in European countries, it was possible to develop common approaches to the inclusion of young people in social processes. This is evidenced by the adoption of the European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Public Life at Local and Regional Level (hereinafter referred to as the Charter). The Charter is based on three provisions:

- participation of young people in public life at the local and regional levels should become part of the general policy of involving citizens in public life;
- local and regional authorities are convinced that the strategies implemented in all oblasts should include a youth component. In this regard, they undertake to abide by the provisions of the Charter and to ensure in practice the various forms of participation of young people in society, to be determined in agreement with and with young people and their representatives;
- the provisions and various forms of participation in society enshrined in the Charter apply to all young people without any discrimination.

The Charter proposes the main directions of integration of young people into society. The first is the introduction of policies aimed at increasing youth employment and combating unemployment [3]. And secondly, the introduction of policies in the field of education and training, which promotes the participation of young people in society.

Common positive features of European countries in the formation and implementation of youth policy are:

- ✓ the existence of social connections between government, youth and society through the use of a consultation mechanism;
- ✓ conducting informational and educational activities;
- ✓ guarantees of freedom of cultural, creative and political expression;

- ✓ adherence to the culture of continuing general and vocational education;
- ✓ providing state support to young families;
- ✓ providing special attention to representatives of the “risk group”, which include people with special needs and juvenile (young) criminals;
- ✓ support and encouragement of active leisure;
- ✓ research on the difficulties faced by young people;
- ✓ expanding international relations between young people.

In summary, we can offer a generalized set of recommendations for improving the state youth policy in Ukraine: to focus on building youth infrastructure in the newly created united territorial communities, to expand the centers of non-formal education of youth; to intensify the conduct of educational trainings on a free basis; to conduct professional trainings on the basis of employment centers on the prospects of choosing a profession, starting your own business, finding your first job, preparing for an interview, writing applications for internships abroad; to expand informational and educational work on youth policy; to create a special direction in the budget financing of local development projects, which would concern young people (1 project per 1 community), where young people could present their projects in a separate competition; to provide incentives for young people to start their own business within the framework of the current legislation; ensure the formation of effective youth councils at the local level; to hold creative and artistic actions, competitions among young people to find prospects for community development; expanding the activities of youth counseling centers; to conduct constant monitoring of public opinion and study the needs of young people for youth policy measures, to conduct sociological research at the local level.

Given the growing trend of openness, transparency and public participation in the development and implementation of youth policy, as well as in the process of managing it, the role of the social component is growing. It is the expansion of the participation of the general public in the implementation of youth policy that will make it possible to create a new national model of youth policy, taking into account the best European experience and in accordance with the standards of the European Union.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Кербаль М. Зарубіжний досвід формування нормативно-правової бази щодо молодіжної політики. URL: <http://lib.chdu.edu.ua/pdf/ukrpolituk/3/15.pdf>.
2. Овчар О.М. Сучасні тенденції молодіжної політики Європейського Союзу: досвід для України. URL: http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/ejournals/tppd/20107/zmist/R_2/11Ovchar.pdf.
3. Сторожук Р.П. Зарубіжний досвід реалізації молодіжної політики. URL: www.nbuv.gov.ua/e-journals/DeBu/2006-1/index.html.
4. European Commission, Promoting young peoples full participation in education, employment and society Brussele, 5.9.2007 COM (2007) 498 final. URL: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/.../site/en/com2007_0498en01.pdf.

5. Council resolution of 27 November 2009 on renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018). URL: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/pdf/doc1648_en.pdf.
6. Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe 9 (Final report). – UN, 2001. – 147 p.

REFERENCES

1. Kerbal, M. Zarubizhnyy dosvid formuvannya normatyvno-pravovoyi bazy shchodo molodizhnoyi polityky [Foreign experience in the formation of a regulatory and legal framework for youth policy]. Retrieved from: <http://lib.chdu.edu.ua/pdf/ukrpolituk/3/15.pdf>.
2. Ovchar, O.M. Suchasni tendentsiyi molodizhnoyi polityky Yevropeys'koho Soyuzu: dosvid dlya Ukrayiny [Modern trends of youth policy of the European Union: experience for Ukraine]. Retrieved from: http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/ejournals/tppd/20107/zmist/R_2/11Ovchar.pdf.
3. Storozhuk, R.P. Zarubizhnyy dosvid realizatsiyi molodizhnoyi polityky [Foreign experience of youth policy implementation]. Retrieved from: www.nbuv.gov.ua/ejournals/DeBu/2006-1/index.html.
4. European Commission, Promoting young peoples full participation in education, employment and society Brussele, 5.9.2007 COM (2007) 498 final. Retrieved from: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/.../site/en/com2007_0498en01.pdf.
5. Council resolution of 27 November 2009 on renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018). Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/pdf/doc1648_en.pdf.
6. Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe 9 (Final report). – UN, 2001. – 147 p.

УДК 327.5(477+470)»20»+341.34:342.93+355.45

DOI: 10.24144/2078-1431.2022.1(28).105-116

Ярослав Артьомов,
випускник
юридичного факультету (ОС «Бакалавр»)
ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»

СБУ ТА РНБО ЯК БАЗОВІ СУБ'ЄКТИ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ УКРАЇНИ

В умовах анексії Криму, війни на Донбасі, а потім і розв'язання Росією повномасштабної війни проти України проблематика дослідження національної безпеки нашої держави є надзвичайно актуальною.

Забезпечення територіальної цілісності, непорушності кордонів України, захист суверенітету є пріоритетними завданнями державної політики. Їх вирішення можливе лише при взаємодії та координації відповідних суб'єктів як на національному, так і на міжнародному рівнях.

Для успішної і результативної роботи із забезпечення національної безпеки держави аналіз правових засад України у цій сфері є дуже важливим. У статті розглянуто проблематику правових основ національної безпеки України, що базується на нормативно-правових актах та збагачується науковцями, які вносять важливий вклад у вдосконалення принципів, форм і методів цієї роботи з урахуванням вимог часу.

Ключові слова: повномасштабна війна Росії проти України, національна безпека держави, СБУ, РНБО, нормативно-правові аспекти.

With the annexation of Crimea, the war in Donbass, and then Russia's resolution of a full-scale war against Ukraine, the issue of studying the national security of our state is extremely relevant.

Ensuring territorial integrity, inviolability of Ukraine's borders, protection of sovereignty are the priority tasks of state policy. Their solution is possible only with the interaction and coordination of relevant actors at both national and international levels.

For successful and effective work to ensure the national security of the state, the analysis of the legal framework of Ukraine in this area is very important. The article considers the legal framework of national security of Ukraine, based on regulations and enriched by scientists who make an important contribution to improving the principles, forms and methods of this work, taking into account the requirements of the time.

Key words: full-scale Russian war against Ukraine, national security, SSOU, NSDCU, regulatory and legal aspects.

Аналізуючи різні погляди науковців на поняття суб'єктів системи забезпечення національної безпеки держави, є підстави стверджувати, що до них належать:

- народ, нація, територіальні громади та інші спільноти;