

TRUST IN PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AS AN ETHICAL ISSUE

This paper is an attempt to consider trust in terms of contemporary communicative ethics and its socio-philosophical context. Trust in state power is analyzed according to the theoretical principles of communicative philosophy (J. Habermas and K.-O. Apel). It is suggested that trust in state power is a prerequisite for a harmonious development of society. Trust is seen as a determinant contributing to the formation and disclosure of meaningful components of the dialogue between government and civil society institutions, which takes place on the basis of compliance with social norms such as responsibility, justice, tolerance, mutual understanding, equality and respect. It is argued that trust in the government is the most important factor in socio-political relations, the role of which has become increasingly important in recent years. As globalization develops, trust in power becomes more in demand, as its interests effectively co-ordinate the interests of world policy actors. Trust not only reduces transaction costs and strengthens international cooperation, but also builds new quality of relationships.

Keywords: trust, political trust, human moral, ethics of public communications, public authority, individual trust, collective trust, social activity.

Formulation of the problem. When addressing virtually all the most pressing issues of contemporary world politics, the notion of trust is inevitably mentioned as one of the key ones. Lack of trust is one of the most important problems for any modern state. Trust as an ethical problem arises in the context of negotiating international relations and is constantly emerging when searching for political tools for ending wars and resolving ethical conflicts, a crisis of trust leads to social tension between society and representative power – in other words, it is difficult to find any politically or socially relevant context, in which trust would not have a leading place. The factor of international trust is being actively discussed today in the context of growing economic crisis, as well as in the context of integration and disintegration processes in the EU.

The analysis of trust in government as an ethical problem is relevant not only because today this topic is back on the agenda, but also because such a study would enable for better understanding of the role of the factor of political responsibility as a whole, and could be seen as the basis for highlighting the key determinants of the emergence of social tension in Ukrainian society. For example, one could take into account the credibility of the authorities when analyzing the process of implementation of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement between Ukraine and the EU, as well as in finding framework models for resolving the military conflict in the east of Ukraine.

Of course, such a theoretical study cannot be automatically translated into public practice, but it can provide the ground for finding some alternative ways and established patterns that systematically link the factor of trust in authorities with internal political processes, institutional structures, systems of value, etc., it can also be very useful for analyzing problems outside the socio-political context.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In contemporary social studies, trust has become a focus of attention in behaviorism, especially in the field of game theory. Methodological basis is laid here by such researchers as von Neumann and Robert Axelrod. Subsequently, game theory (and, along with it,

the study of trust) became extremely popular in political science, conflictology, and economics. Equally important studies of the social role of trust have been carried out in the framework of structural and functional analysis by, for example, Niklas Luman.

In addition to actualizing the issue of trust in power in the context of the development of political institutions, trust is one of the methodological positions within the framework of communicative philosophy. Thus, in the middle of the twentieth century, there was a transformation of understanding of communication: from transcendental existence into social plane. A significant role in this transformation was played by German communicative philosophy, represented by Y. Habermas and K.-O. Apel. Basically, trust is the basic condition for everyday interaction. Trust in communicative philosophy is seen as a determinant that contributes to the formation and disclosure of such indicators of “qualitative” communication as responsibility, justice, tolerance, understanding, equality, respect and recognition of the sovereignty of an individual.

Studies of trust in world politics were conducted within the framework of a liberal approach. Such studies mostly address Cold War containment issues (such as the work of Andrew Kidd’s “Trust and Distrust in International Relations”) or armed conflict resolution (such as the work of Charles Kegley and Gregory Raymond “When Trust Breaks Down”).

Many studies of political factors of trust have been conducted within the framework of institutional analysis (such as Aaron Hoffman’s “Establishing Trust”), and more recently they have increasingly been linked to institutions of a new format - global network structures, as in the work of Sokratis Coniordos “Networks, Trust and Social Capital”).

The concept of trust in social sciences is particularly well researched within the behavioral model in economics and sociology, and these methods remain largely relevant. The most convenient methodological basis for systematically analyzing the changes that are taking place in contemporary international relations is the language of the new institutional theory. It has become not only a convenient tool for analyzing integration processes and institutions, but also simplified the task of using an interdisciplinary approach, which is inevitable in the analysis of processes at the junction of economics, politics and sociology.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to disclose the content of trust in public authorities in terms of contemporary communicative ethics and socio-philosophical context.

Presenting main material. The problem of trust in power is one of the key themes of socio-philosophical discourse in the context of finding ways of transcendental-pragmatic justification for the development of moral consciousness. Thus, in his work *Discourse and Responsibility*, Carl Otto-Apel, revealing the nature of joint and several liability, states: “... no one can speak openly even with himself unless he recognizes, in principle, in the context of mutual recognition of communication partners, all norms of frank communication ”(Karl-Otto Apel, 1988). On this basis, the scientist concludes that the achievement of the level of post-conventional moral development of mankind is impossible without the equal recognition of partners, which is based on trust as an integral component of public communications. First of all, the researchers raise the problem of intersubjectivity, a kind of special community between the subjects. According to K.-O. Apel, intersubjective interaction involves four normative requirements: “Clarity of expression, integrity, normative correctness and truthfulness” [1, p. 70].

All of these components are essential prerequisites for building trust in your interlocutor. In his work *Transformation of Philosophy* K.-O. Apel, developing a transcendental-pragmatic concept of the communicative community, sees the realization of the idea of substantiation of fundamental principles of ethics through the transformation of the transcendental philosophy of the private subject into a transcendental philosophy of intersubjectivity. First of all, the philosopher considers this problem in the aspect of discursive ethics. All interests, desires, needs, goals of people can be understood and considered only in the course of discourse. Any misunderstandings that arise during interaction can be resolved in the course of rational discourse and subsequently continue communication. By following the rules of argumentation, its participants automatically recognize the existence of a community of the same participants in the argumentation. Recognition and understanding of each other's communication participants form the basis for their ethical perception. Thus, rational reasoning presupposes a consensus among partners based on ethical prerequisites. It is a process of communication in which the basis of people's moral attitudes toward one another lies in mutual respect, recognition of sovereignty and individuality, tolerance and trust.

Ukrainian researcher O. M. Kozhemyakina views the culture of trust as the norm of communication. In her opinion, trust is a formula for the success of the society, reflecting the degree of sociocultural activity of people, their ethical positions, ability and desire to cooperate. The culture of trust is based on the principles of mutual responsibility, while reducing the degree of social tension and alienation of people from each other. It has the strength to build mutual trust, acting as the most important part of social integration, leading to the establishment of social bonds. However, mutual trust, mutual responsibility, commitment, attention to each other, mutual interest are the most important components of any interaction process. The willingness to trust and the ability to effectively interact with the social environment indicates a high level of organization of all social life, which in the future affects the development of science, culture and economy. Trust is the basis not only for the holistic self-perception of an individual, but, passing into the layer of social interaction, the foundation for the stability of society as a whole [2, p. 124].

In Habermas's *Theory of Communicative Action*, he also addresses the ideal of social relations. Y. Habermas's ideal communication can be compared with K.-O. Apel's transcendental communicative community. The transcendental subject is replaced by a "self-institutionalized community." Like the "communicative community" in K.-O. Apel, in Habermas's notion of community characterizes both real society and ideal social relations. Also, the German philosopher is inclined to think that true agreement may be achieved in the process of communication and intersubjective interaction of individuals. True agreement can only be reached when the panelists are competent on the issues under discussion. True understanding is possible as a result of validation of the agreement reached on truth. Perfect communication eliminates any compulsion, communication is based only on the recognition of equality between partners.

Y. Habermas expresses the idea of a universal consensus that is meaningful to anyone who enters into argumentation and is able to overcome coercion in communication. The discourse serves as a dialogically-substantiated check of controversial statements in order to achieve universal consensus. The sense of personal importance of partners determines the responsible rational respect for them, and creates a central point of the principle of universalization of communicative ethics.

The philosopher believes that the achievement of understanding in discourse is driven by certain intuitive expectations. An expectation of a particular behavior from a partner “creates that horizon of probable traditional life forms and structures of a socio-cultural community that are inducing trust and which, through the direct interaction of subjects, provide human understanding of the basic semantic relationships of everyday life” [1, p. 43]. By trusting the discourse participant, we expect him to behave in a certain way. These expectations form the basis for mutual understanding in daily communication between people. While, in author’s opinion, the place and time of discourse, social status and psychological characteristics of its participants do not in any way relate to the achievement of mutual understanding and agreement. However, despite the role that trust plays, one should not limit the discourse to intuitive expectations. Subjects of discourse are to master communicative competence as a prerequisite for the possibility of establishing mutual understanding between participants of discourse.

Trust in the other is manifested precisely in the context of communicative rationality. What is important here is an intersubjective relationship that is established by subjects who possess communicative competence rather than a detached attitude towards the subject as part of an objective world that can be manipulated and neglected. Habermas divides the world into external and internal. The outside world includes the social world – the world of regulated interpersonal relationships. Whereas the inner world – the subjective – is the world of experience of each individual, accessible only to oneself. Thus, entering a contact, we determine through the expressions of the individual his attitude to the objective world, his desire for ordering the social world, and hope for his sincerity and truthfulness in statements about his inner world of experiences. The result of such communication is trust.

The extent to which a subject’s words are consistent with his or her behavior is the basis for building trust. Communicatively reached agreement becomes a source of conviction of partners that they are understood and appreciated, which, in turn, serves as a basis for mutual commitments to continue the interaction based on mutual trust. The unity of society is ensured by the agreement reached between its members. Consent is formed in the process of joint communication activities. Trust becomes a background condition for concerted action of individuals.

Interpolating theories of communicative action into the realm of real political practices, J. Habermas summarizes: “Communicatively acting participants are oriented towards reconciling their interests by achieving a common understanding of the situation with others and creating an atmosphere of trust. The purpose of such interaction is to create social bonds and maintain social order. Strategic action implies manipulative influence through threats, rewards, deceit, etc. Unlike strategic action, it is communicative interaction that facilitates the recognition of the words and thoughts of the actors involved, introducing into discourse claims of importance, and contributing to the creation of relationships of trust”[1, p. 38].

It is well known that trust in government arises when citizens evaluate power or individual political leaders in terms of keeping their promises effectively and honestly. In other words, trust in government is “the judgment of citizens that the system and politicians are receptive to expectations and will do what is right, even in the absence of constant control” (Miller and Listhaug, 1990) [3]. Thus, “trust in government is a central indicator of the public’s basic sense of policy quality” (Newton and Norris, 2000) [4]. Trust can be directed at the political system and its structural subdivisions, as well as at individual politicians. The first category of

trust is called macroeconomic or organizational trust. Organizational trust refers to a problem-oriented perspective when citizens become trusting or distrustful of the government “because they are satisfied or dissatisfied with political alternatives” (Miller, 1974) [5]. Organizational trust can be further divided into components - diffuse or systemic trust, as well as specific or institutional trust. Diffuse trust refers to citizens’ assessment of the effectiveness of the overall political system and regime. On the other hand, specific trust is directed at certain political institutions, such as parliament or local government. The second category of trust, or so-called micro-level or individual political trust, arises when trust is directed at individual political leaders. Individual political trust implies a person-centered perspective by which citizens become trusting or distrustful of power “through their approval or disapproval of certain political leaders” (Citrin, 1974) [6].

Both organizational and individual trust in the government depend on the political actions that arouse such confidence. In general, the ability to inspire confidence can be defined as an indispensable criterion for quality policy. Trust is generally evaluated in terms of different perceptions of effectiveness associated with different policy decisions. A reasonable expectation of improved efficiency as such is a prerequisite for establishing confidence in a new policy (Taylor, 1982) [7].

Organizational and individual trust in power is a categorization based on the trusted object. Trust also has options that are based on the different types of motives that people have when they trust their political institutions or leaders. Citizens adhere to the principles of sound political trust, so they seek to trust the political party or political leaders with whom they identify. Thus, trust goes beyond party or ideological boundaries.

If to talk about trust in power, based on psychological reasoning – people seek sincerity and truthfulness in a particular individual, paying attention to public speeches, self-presentation and behavior of their political leaders. People, trusting their representatives and political institutions, combine rational and psychological trust, thus seeking to strike an acceptable balance between maximizing their interest and perceiving the ethical qualities of the political elite (or trustees). In other words, legitimacy and longevity of democratic systems depend to a large extent on how much the electorate trusts the government to do what is right and perceived to be just (Easton 1965, 1975) and what is effective [8].

Trust in power does not arise and does not work in a vacuum. Social trust, which refers to citizens’ trust in each other as members of the social community, is inseparable from the concept of political trust. According to Putnam’s well-known theory of social capital, civic engagement in the community and interpersonal trust among its members contribute to increasing overall social trust in a given society (1993, 1995, 2000) [9]. Personal contact with community members in public associations not only allows people to get to know each other better in a personal way, but it also allows them to extend positive feelings that flow from their civic experience to strangers in society and government. It is well known that citizens who do not participate in public activity tend to view the government and its institutions in more negative plane. Keele and Luke (2005) confirm that social capital has a significant and strong influence on trust in the government along with how the government fulfills its responsibilities [10].

Although social trust and political trust are not mutually exclusive, there is controversy about the causality of the relationship, and the direction of that causality, if any arises. It is social capital and social aspiration that then engenders political trust. Can credible governments promote social capital and create trusting

and active communities? What are the tools to bring social and political trust closer to ensuring an effective and robust political system? Different theoretical schools offer different answers to these questions: modernization theorists like Almond and Verba (1963) and Finifter (1970) argue that increasing social trust is associated with increased political participation, especially in the form of voting. Increasing participation, in turn, is a common sign of political trust and democratization. On the other hand, sociologists have linked increasing social distrust, not trust, with more political involvement and, as a result, increased political confidence (Gamson 1968). Tarrow (1994), for example, goes so far as to argue that controversial politics, in the form of intensified social protests and new social movements, is a sign of working confidence in industrialized democracies [11].

Conclusions and prospects for further exploration in this direction. Trust in both rational and ethical forms is a prerequisite for harmonious development of society. Today, trust in government is the basis of good governance. A high level of trust in government gives benefits to all citizens, especially people who are in a relatively disadvantaged socio-economic or political situation. Although democratic governance generates trust, trust, in its turn, is a prerequisite for democratic governance. In order for the government to function smoothly and effectively, it must rely on public support, that is, public trust. Democratic governance cannot be implemented in a society where there is a lack of trust in government. The link between trust and good governance is essentially about building and supporting an active civil society. In a society where people do not trust each other and choose not to engage in meaningful activity on social networking, there is a high likelihood that the government and its representatives have low political trust. Forming and supporting a successful and effective partnership between the government and other institutions depend on social trust as well as on a strong civil society in constant interaction with government and private sector.

References

1. Yermolenko, A.M. (1999). *Komunikativna praktichna filosofiya* [Communicative practical philosophy]. Kyiv: Libra [in Ukrainian].
2. Kozhemyakina, O.M. (2016). *Dovira ta socialnij kapital: prostorova cinnisno-normativna interpretaciya* [Trust and social capital: a spatial value-normative interpretation]. *Demography and social economy*, 1, 118–131 [in Ukrainian].
3. Miller, A.H. and Lijphart O. (1990). Political Parties and Confidence in Government: A Comparison of Norway, Sweden and the United States. *British Journal of Political Science*, 20, 3 (July): 357–386.
4. Newton, K. and Norris, P. (2000). Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture, or Performance? *Disaffected Democracies: What's troubling the Trilateral Democracies?* S.J. Pharr and R.D. Putnam (Eds.). New Jersey: Princeton University Press: 52–73.
5. Miller, A.H. (1974). Political Issues and Trust in Government, 1964–1970. *American Political Science Review*, 68, 3 (September): 951–972.
6. Citrin, J. (1974). Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government. *American Political Science Review*, 68, 3 (September): 973–988.
7. Taylor, J.B. (1982). Establishing Credibility: A Rational Expectations Viewpoint. *The American Economic Review*, 72, 2 (May): 81–85.
8. Easton, D. (1965). *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: Wiley.
9. Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
10. Keele, Luke. (2005). The Authorities Really Do Matter: Party Control and Trust in Government. *Journal of Politics*, 67, 3 (August): 873–886.
11. Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ігнатенко Ліна Юріївна,
старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов,
Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління
Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України,
м. Харків
ORCID 0000-0002-1628-1244

ДОВІРА ДО ВЛАДИ ЯК ЕТИЧНА ПРОБЛЕМА

Робиться спроба розглянути довіру з точки зору сучасної комунікативної етики і соціально-філософського контексту. Довіра до влади аналізується ґрунтуючись на теоретичних положеннях комунікативної філософії (Ю. Хабермас і К.-О. Апель). Висловлюється припущення про те, що саме довіра до влади виступає фоновою умовою гармонійного розвитку суспільства. Довіра розглядається як детермінанта, що сприяє формуванню і розкриттю змістовних складових діалогу між владою та інституціями громадянського суспільства, що відбувається на підставі дотримання таких соціальних норм, як відповідальність, справедливість, толерантність, взаєморозуміння, рівноправність, повага і визнання суверенності особистості. Доводиться теза про те, що довіра до влади є найважливішим фактором суспільно-політичних відносин, роль якого в останні роки набуває все більшого значення. У міру розвитку глобалізації, довіра до влади стає більш затребуваною, так як за її сприяння ефективно узгоджуються інтереси акторів світової політики. Довіра не просто дозволяє знизити трансакційні витрати і зміцнити міжнародне співробітництво, а й сформуванню відносин нової якості.

Ключові слова: довіра, політична довіра, моральна ситуація людини, етика суспільних комунікацій, публічна влада, індивідуальна довіра, колективна довіра, громадська активність.

Список використаних джерел

1. Ермоленко А. М. Комунікативна практична філософія : підручник. Київ : Лібра, 1999. 488 с.
2. Кожемякіна О. М. Довіра та соціальний капітал: просторова ціннісно-нормативна інтерпретація. *Демографія та соціальна економіка*. 2016. № 1. С. 118–131.
3. Miller, A. H. and Lijphart A. Political Parties and Confidence in Government: A Comparison of Norway, Sweden and the United States. *British Journal of Political Science*. 20. 3 (July 1990): 357–386.
4. Newton, K. and Norris P. Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture, or Performance? *Disaffected Democracies: What's troubling the Trilateral Democracies?* S.J. Pharr and R.D. Putnam (eds.). New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 2000: 52–73.
5. Miller, A. H. Political Issues and Trust in Government, 1964–1970. *American Political Science Review*. 68, 3 (September 1974): 951–972.
6. Citrin, J. Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government. *American Political Science Review*. 68, 3 (September 1974): 973–988.
7. Taylor, J. B. Establishing Credibility: A Rational Expectations Viewpoint. *The American Economic Review*. 72, 2 (May 1982) : 81–85.
8. Easton, D. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York : Wiley, 1965.
9. Putnam, R. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York : Simon and Schuster, 2000.
10. Keele, Luke. The Authorities Really Do Matter: Party Control and Trust in Government. *Journal of Politics*. 67, 3 (August 2005) : 873–886.
11. Tarrow, S. Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Надійшла до редколегії 12.02.2020 р.