"Public" as a "social actor" vs "public" as a "target audience".

Conceptual connection between "the public", "civil society" and "community"

Abstract

According to the "classical" definition of Habermas, the public sphere - is a phenomenon of modern bourgeois society (and "the public", initially – members of bourgeois salons, who were able to discuss social and political events and then publish their views in papers and magazines). It is important to notice, that this vision of "public sphere", that was formulated in the middle of 20-th century, observing "the public of 19-th century". By the end 20-th century public space and the public itself had changed dramatically – together with the changes in society from "modernity" to post-modernism, driven by mass media and dominated by mass culture, where TV is changing the "responsible public" into the "target audience".

The goal of "re-defining the public" is closely connected with the task of clarifying the new meaning of "public space", which is also rapidly changing, due to technological revolution, availability of modern communication technology to the wide range of active citizens and the same time – new power of electronic mass media, particularly the television and internet, that had created the new phenomena - "mediatization" of society.

Our research collective at the HSE public policy department was working quite a long time on the issues of interaction between "the civil society" and "the power" in a particular political regime, mostly in Russia and former USSR countries, but also in a broader comparative prospective [Belyaeva. 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2011]. Recently, searching for the "true actors for social change" and 'civic agents for new public policy', we focused on big on-line survey of social activists groups in Russian Federation, seeking to distinguish "real civil society actors" from "fake ones" - and the methodology we used, was based on "matching' those groups activities with their beliefs and values, like "public awareness", "civic ethics", and "community spirit" - all of the notions, that are mentioned in the description of this work-shop – meaning their close relation to each other.

As our contribution to the main goal of the work-shop, we want to re-define the concept itself, that we see as central to all the other notions mentioned –" the public" – and to see it not as an adjective, like in "public space' or 'public good", but as a definition of a social actor,– and its transformation with the changing world of 'globalised informatization'

What is particular relevant to the workshop theme, are the events in Russia during last months, known as "White Revolution", when hundreds of thousands of "ordinary citizens" were protesting

against unchangeable power and elections fraud in streets of Moscow, Snt-Petersburg and many other cities, that had totally transformed the "public space" of seemingly-controlled political regime in Russia.

Attempts to describe those events in the analytical language of "civil society versus power" were proved not adequate, because the collective social actor in this case was different, so the new analytical frame is needed to describe both this new actor and the new space in which it is acting, as well as new language needs to be developed.

In this paper I will begin with describing three main traditions in understanding public policy and governance and suggest the explanation on how those traditions are related to the public itself, or the 'quality of public', that allows – or does not allow – certain political institutions and certain mechanisms of coordination of public interests be formed and take root.

Then, I will try to define certain characteristics of "public" and especially 'protesting public' as a social actor, which allows to distinguish it from close, but different category 'structures of civil society'/

Following this, I will look into specific case of "White Protests" in Russia, which is used to demonstrate specific behavior of 'protesting public' and its major characteristics.

In a concluding part, I will look for an adequate social theory, that may be productive to explain the phenomena of 'protesting public as social actor," and look into its relationship between the concept 'public as a social actor" with another concept, widely used in social science – 'community'.

I will finalize with some proposals for the further studies.

Public policy in three traditions

Conceptualization of the notion "public policy" had begun in the United States at the end of 60es, and was driven by the need to re-design public service, to make it more effective, more dynamic, more responsive to societal needs. Since then, though experiencing many amendments and variations, a recognizable model of defining public policy notion has existed, which connects it closely to the actions of governing bodies.

Public Policy is "what Government do or do not do" – is the most famous definition. So it allows to define a particular "American tradition" in public policy and governance studies, that is very close to 'public administration' – and defining 'public policy' is viewed - in many cases - as just a 'first step' of "public administration", creating the "program" that would need to be implemented.

"European" tradition developed later, using the "American" tradition, but much more focused on the "variety of actors", among which the Government itself is not necessarily the main one. European tradition is focused more on the non-state actors, as well as on defining their different and often conflicting interests, mechanisms of regulations, procedures of agreement and reconciliation, including the monitoring of the decisions, based on compromises.

New understanding of public policy as a system of "co-management" (governance) is developing in the practice of international supranational European institutions, the Council of Europe and the European Union [R.Holzhacker, E.Albaek. Edward Elgar. 2007].

No wonder that the concept of "public policy" and the concept of "governance" presents the most relief in studies of the European Union devoted to the analysis of decision-making and institutions, because, unlike the nation-state, there is no essentially "chief executive institution", and states incoming the EU are completely equal. Thus, all members of this alliance are equally involved in "co-management", which is managing the mutual influence on each other. Of course, this system of co-management demanded the creation of an additional set of structures and systems of coordination of interests, both between countries and governments, and with the involvement of other actors external to the EU - representatives of national and international business networks, public and municipal associations, etc. in the decision of each task: movement of labor resources, common education and migration policies, the harmonization of price policies for different sectors of the economy, etc. - creates an appropriate structure. The result was a layered system of coordination of interests named "the committee system".

The authors of report "Russian Business Lobbying in the U.S. and the EU: Evolution and Prospects" [Peregudov, Utkin, Kostyaev, 2009: 14-15; see also Wallace, Young 1997: 20; Shokhin, Korolev, 2008] indicate that at various levels of EU public policy there were approximately 1400 different committees and working groups at the end of 1990 in addition to the basic political institutions of the EU, and this number has risen to 1800 by 2005, and these institutions employ 80 thousand people. The authors emphasize that "the very nature of the formulation and decision-making in the EU turns out to be largely mediated by non-direct participation of EU interest groups and pressure groups of various nature and purpose in the institutional structure. Those groups include business organizations, and large corporations, and civil society organizations, regional and ethnic formations of the Union countries, many cultural, scientific and other entities"[ibid.]

However, this European approach does not put an end to formation of the concept of public policy. At the present stage, the increasing popularity and interest to the development of public policy moved to the global level, where co-management and mutual influences include not only the

countries of one region - Europe - but countries around the whole world. Most current works about public policy and governance today are devoted to global relations. Among them we should note compilation of works under the edition of Patricia Kenneth, in which, based on the vast material of the analysis of practical examples of the mechanisms "of global coordination" the author explores the strategy and tactics of global co-management actors, which lead to approval of new norms and rules of engagement in a rapidly globalizing world, and to formation of new institutions of harmonization of different interests, whether in the sphere of international trade, the global labor market, the environment or protecting the rights and interests of citizens, united in the global social network [Kennet 2008].

There are several approaches to conceptualization of the concept of governance, defined as "a minimum of government interference, as corporate management, as the new public management, as "good governance", or a socio-cybernetic system, a self-organizing network" [Rhodes, 2008: 51-74]. However, the diversity of these approaches is insufficient to explain the ongoing changes in modern politics like the process of globalization, the growing influence of international and supranational institutions, the emergence of new political spaces beyond national borders, "diffusion of political power" - from government to non-state political actors as well as "delegitimization of the nation state", crisis of "welfare state" and the old management paradigm based on hierarchical control of the state, sending signals from the "top" to the "down" [Archibugi, Zurn. 2006: 178].

The new understanding of governance must encompass the idea of joint management, changing management paradigm and offering a new style of management which means the inclusion of an increasing number of political actors in the process of formulation and implementation of public policy. The process of blurring the boundaries between public and private sectors has started which demands new mechanisms of governance, based on other resources than the government's authority and sanctions [Kennett P., Edward Elgar. 2008: 4]. Political administration in the style of this new understanding of governance ("joint" or "mutual" control) suggests a new role for government and the state, acting as the moderators of political and administrative process to harmonize and promote the interests of different social groups and political actors competing with each other.

Moreover, the "mutual" administration is based on the inclusion of non-state political actors and institutions not only in the process of a broad and public discussion prior decisions, but also in the process of direct "doing policy" (business of policy). Non-state actors are included in these processes - at the stage of elaboration and adoption of policies, and also at the stage of implementation of public-policy decisions - through a variety of institutions, methods and techniques (outsourcing, delegation, transfer of state functions).

What unites the three existing traditions of Public Policy (American, European and global), except that they have consistently evolved, maintaining the continuity of the "core" concept, comprehending, and are based on the new social reality?

Main thing in common is the preservation of the concept of public space as the arena, which hosts reconciliation of interests, and the public - as a set of independent, competent and concerned citizens who are able to participate in formulating and implementing policy decisions. It is important to note that in the development from American and European traditions to the global tradition, requirements for "quality" of the public will only increase.

Their second thing in common is regarding reconciliation of interests as a policy goal, its governance, understood as collective solutions to common problems.

The third common trait that unites these traditions - is an open public space for the stakeholders and the rate for approval as a principle of decision-making instead of pressure.

What distinguishes these traditions, and why we consider them as independent?

Most significant trait to distinguish them is the attitude to the main actor in the public sphere or in other words to the "strategic management subject". In the first case ("American" tradition) such subject is a public authority - the state. In the second case (the "European" tradition) there is no main actor, and all subjects of public policy deemed to be equal participants in decision making. In case of the "global" tradition, the focus generally moves away from the actors and focuses on the procedures, mechanisms and ways of coordinating interests.

Nevertheless, if jointly agreed decisions are adopted and other different actors accept them, it shows that in some way – through particular coordinating activities - the process of such decision-making had been organized. It is also obvious, that this kind of task cannot be handled by "average" or "ordinary" actors. It is clear, that acting in the space of highly contradictory interests, such type of coordination can only be exercised by those, who can suggest a strategy of collective action. Hence, our next step is the analysis of these "strategic actors".

Categories of public policy actors. Public as an actor

Attention to "actors" of public policy was "starting position" for the establishment of research approaches of the team of the Department of Public Policy, established in the National Research University "Higher School of Economics" in the early 2000's, to develop the concept of "public policy" [Belyaeva. 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2011]. Indeed, if admittedly research institutes in

Russia are weak and perform poorly, then who determines political development? Who are these actors, how they arise, how are they managed, how do they acquire resources and influence?

Finding answers to these questions have led to a series of studies, and then to the development of university courses devoted to specific kinds of "actors", and, namely, "collective actors" having a common social nature, common symptoms that are similar types of use of political resources and similar strategies to achieve political influence.

The main actors reputedly include government authorities at different levels of government, political parties, federal and regional press, big business, regional elites, civil society organizations and movements, the local communities. Obviously, not only between species but also within each species, the actors are very different - and not just "political weight", but also on other criteria, in our opinion not less important - on the degree of independence of its conduct in the political field . This criterion is central to political analysis, since converted to its own, "inner" qualities of the actor, allowing or not allowing it to build its own strategy for political behavior.

Further analysis led us to the "structuring" of all actors in the field of public policy in three main categories - depending on their degree of "political independence".

The first category - the lowest level of political independence - is the political "agents" who have not and do not implement any of its own strategy of political action, agents act in politics for "another's interests" and "at the expense of another resource", in fact, carry political will of someone else , usually called the "political booking".

The second category - it is actually "political actors" who may have their "own" agenda in the current policy (they have a collective consciousness and will, capable of goal-setting), but they have very little of their own resources to exert significant influence on the behavior of other actors in political field.

A third category of actors - most resourced - we called the "independent actors" of public policy, because such entities (their representation in Russian political field is limited) are not only able to formulate their own strategies for their own behavior, but also able to offer (to impose) such strategies to other political actors. They have enough resources to decisively influence the behavior of other political actors (as dependent agents, and independent, but weak actors).

Moreover, in accordance with our research, "full-fledged actors" of modern public policy in Russia is not only a "collective Kremlin" or in person the President or Prime Minister, but also a number of public entities. For example, the "Memorial" non-governmental society or the Soldiers' Mothers Committee, not only offering the state and society their agenda in public policy field, but also forced

authorities to take their agenda into account. For example, "Memorial" had lobbied for Federal Law on "Victims of political repressions" and Soldiers Mothers contributed greatly to the Army reform.

Similar approaches to the various "roles" that social actors may play in public policy are developed by sociologists within the framework of institutional theory. Within this approach a question had been raised : how do the new institutions come about?, and how much their characteristics depend on their formation. N. Fliegstien one of the most famous representatives of institutional theoretical school, discovered, that actors do not simply follow accepted patterns in their field, but "have a certain amount of social skills allowing to reproduce or challenge the system of power and privilege" [Fliegstien. 2001: 45], in order to transform institutions. While agreeing with the basic idea of Fliegstien about the role of "strategic actors" in the creation of institutions, we want to add that in this case we see both the 'overlap' and mutual enrichment of two related disciplines - sociology and political science.

Cognitive and analytical capabilities of a combination of subject-oriented approach with the "new institutionalism" in its various versions proved to be quite productive and allow to use a broader range of tools for analyzing Russian political system, as an example of with week institutions and strong actors [see ex. Belyaeva. 2010, 2011a, 2011b].

Our understanding of 'the public' mean selective part of the society members, uniting knowledgeable, competent citizens who are able to organize themselves in pursuit of common interests. This understanding is based on the "classical" interpretations of this term, which is dating back to the meaning of the term in the word "Res-publica". It was much later, when development of social science had created a concept of "civil society", in the meaning we use it today., when the activity of voluntary self-organized people , together with other social and political actors leads to the articulation and implementation of the "public interest" and achieving "common good", which may bring radical change, if necessary, of the existing political institutions.

Phenomena of Res-Publica and 'new-republicanism' has recently caused significant academic attention in search of the new ideology, that would be strong alternative to overall collectivization of Marxism and still not so individualized as Liberalism [Kharhordin. 2007b] this led to re-examining the functioning of democracy in some 'classical republics' and its governing institutions, based on regular and volunteer public participation. This, definitely, demanded certain type of competencies, devotedness and scence of responsibility but most important was the feeling of 'connectedness', that made those people feel and act as 'one body'[Kharhordin. 2007a]

Ability to cooperate, assist "others", work for the common good, based on solidarity and mutual trust – these are the qualities of the members of 'responsible public'.

.. Since the public is composed of citizens who develop certain qualities - competence, awareness, personal autonomy and care for the community– their involvement in political governance , and on a regular basis, establishes certain social practice, that creates an institution of public participation. Thus, only the active members of the community – through their actions - support and re-create public institutions, such as Governments, Presidents, electoral rules, etc, or transform them by their actions, including a possibility to destroy the old institutions and create new ones.

If compared to the 'society at large', one of the major defining characteristics is :a much higher, than average, level of caring for community and capability of participating in governance. Members of. the ' active public' are not "everybody", but selected members of the society, that are both willing and capable to do certain things

- Understand the social environment in which they live

- Set up strategic social goals for their community

- Communicate with each other to discuss problems and find solutions

- Put common community benefits s a priority to their own ones

- Organize the common work for the common good

Role of public in different public policy models

Getting back to the public policy traditions, that we described earlier, and based on understanding of the actor-institution relations in public policy design, we now want to pose a question – why does it happen, that those traditions differ? What is the reason, that in one place - for example, the United States, there is one tradition, and the other place –in Europe – it happened to be different? What are the conditions, that create those traditions or public policy models?

Our answer to this question is , that the reason this is on the different "quality of the public" in those places.

For example, what kind of public participation tradition we see in the US, that had created its basic political culture? Based on the evidence of Tokville, we can call it "participatory culture", when in most cases the public is competent, educated , active and demanding from the Government

institutions quality services, where the citizens see their Government as a true 'public institution', that has to 'serve the public',and this is insured by many citizen watch-dog organizations.

If over the years their democratic institutions – from elections to Government public hearings – are functioning according to the constitution and the court system is insuring Rule of Law and Government is kept under citizen control , people do create a habit to see their State as an instrument for public policy . And people have no doubt that if they change their beliefs or preferences, through public institutions and representative democracy, media, etc. – they can change public policy and the character of the Government itself. All of these factors created what we know – in very general terms – the type of public in America

Moreover, even if such active participation is not made by 100% of citizens, but those 30 or 40%, that participate, would be trusted by the other part of society and their decisions would be seen as legitimate. American public – with all the controvercies it has, is still pretty consolidated as a nation, which is also proved by not a big number of political parties – there are just two of them

The second public policy tradition, which can be called European, is very different, mostly, by its diversity. It is determined by the alignment of interests and interactions of multiple committees. Commissions hearings, creation of the "white books" and "green books" while discussing legislation on many levels, expert tips, a large number of non-State actors involved in the harmonization of political decision-making These are the European public space features, where the public life is public life is mode divided and more politically structured. Here we see "well-institutionalized public", with large numbers of actors, we multiple negotiation and coordination procedures, and exclusively many political parties. Here we see fairly detailed articulation of specific interests, only more than a dozen of leftists parties, and many options of political nationalists So, it is not surprising, that public policy tradition in Europe makes an emphasis on the multiplicity of actors.

The third tradition, which we marked as Global – there is a notable shift from actors to the procedures of different interests coordination. To our mind , the explanation to is may be the fact that at the global level in the process of coordination there may participate so many actors, that their number is simply impossible to take in full account. Moreover, while the process of coordination is already going on, some new actors may have emerged, like new social movement could have been created – specifically for the issue under consideration. The other important peculiarity is that in the global space participating actors may be completely incomparable by their size and weight – on the one hand, the EU, UN, NATO, WTO and on the other hand - hundreds and thousands of small and

tiny citizen organizations from different parts of the world, that are effective only if and when they act together on common agenda. So, creating a strong agenda is more important, than the names of the organizations, that will finally sign it.

But the most interesting phenomenon of making public policy at the global level is the creation of the 'global public" (Donatella, Sydney Tarrov) the phenomena, discovered by the recent research is stunning : most effective actors in the global space are not "Global NGOs' with big budgets, but hundreds of thousands, and millions of individual citizens, who together create the "global public", who raise concerns and are involved in campaigns on saving environment to preventing slavery and torture to changing economic conditions for providing development funds to poorer nations. Seeing, hoe citizen agendas are taken on board by Global actors, we can talk about making public policy at the global level and creating the public agenda of global development,while its increasingly significant actors a "global citizens"[ссылкаъъX

Needless to say, that public participation on the global level requires particular qualities and competencies of the 'global public' [quote]

This review allows you to make a preliminary conclusion, that the nature of public policy including its actors, structures and institutions is primarily depending on "the quality of the public".

There may be hundreds of different types and characteristics of public – active competent and responsible members of politiea (political community), depending on territory, national characters or historic traditions – each country and each level of governance may present very different kind of active public. Jurgen Habermas in his later works is speaking about the re-feudalization of public space and creating 'specific public' in each specific 'public domain', created by the 'new information-feudals' [Habermas. 1962]

But there is always the major cleavage between all cases of public behavior : public may behave as an independent social actor or it can exist as an 'audience to be amused'

Public as an audience

According to the "classical" definition of Habermas, the public sphere - is a phenomenon of modern bourgeois society (and "the public", initially – members of bourgeois salons, who were able to discuss social and political events and then publish their views in papers and magazines) [Habermas 1962, 1973].

It must be noted that although the use of the words "public" and even "public policy" in modern texts has been steadily increasing lately, in most cases "public" still refers to the audience that needs to be entertained. In this context, the Russian word meaning "public" is very different from what Aristotle meant and the original or "classic" meaning, which is confined in the word "Res-publica"

The public in the cities of ancient Greece, which we keep recalling was primarily a community that had several characteristics. Such a community, primarily related to general co-dependency of life on a common territory, a people with shared responsibilities, understands the common challenges involved in addressing these issues, people with the quality of freedom of thought, will and action. And only then the aggregate of all these qualities gets the same "real audience" that wants and can have an influence on the public administration. This classical understanding of public, had a meaning of public as an active and responsible part of society, acting on its behalf. Later on, through development of social and legal science, we have gone rather far from, and today this concept is used more as a theoretical construct, and as an adjective to several important social concepts, like Public law" or 'public space". Public, as a "thing in itself", as a self-motivated and self-esteemed social actor, had largely disappeared. Its place had been taken by the "crowd', or the 'masses", or the "audience", that is not acting on its own will, but is largely manipulated and 'organized from outside". The reason for this is the transformation of society itself – due to the post-modernism, with its special culture, "mediated" by mass-media.

The emergence of a mass audience -"target audience"- of newspapers, radio, television and finally the audience of the Internet completely changed the understanding of the phenomena of "public", because in the current world most of the people do not communicate directly, but through the media. In this case personal connection, recognition and the scence of community, which was the major characteristic of 'acting public" is lost, and people feel being treated as one 'big audience", getting same 'information signals', but largely separated from each other. In such environment - even with people from same social or professional group – communication is organized mostly "virtually", when someone see on a TV-show, that they share the similar conditions of life or suffer the same problems, that are discussed at the show. People may get emotionally involved in what they see, but it is almost impossible to participate in solving those problems and to share responsibility for the organization of this process. Every television show has its audience, but there is no interaction inside the audience, and hence there is no discussion of the problems, not making personal and common positions, and even more - no shared responsibility. A related problem is to identify the "public opinion".

Public opinion always stumbles on what is "opinion", as revealed by the polls, is not a generalization of the individual meaningful solution, but the result of manifestation of individual will. There is now a "massivization" of samples of public behavior - the imposition of replicable ways of thinking and behavior, basically - through the media and advertising. "Hundreds of thousands of people have chosen this book! (listened to this song, watched this film, joined this political party, bought this vacuum cleaner) –and this means 'public have made its choice', so, everyone who is a member of the public should simply follow. And this type of 'suggesting patterns of behavior" it is not limited to choosing consumer goods; everything without exception is being set for 'public distribution' - from dividing family roles at home and at work to stereotypes of social behavior, such as installation on a "personal success" despite "common good".

Modern technology of "marketing networks" create and distribute a certain pattern of behavior, taste, and opinions on a particular issue, the attitude to a political symbol or character. Then, this sample spreads from one point of information on a wide network: it may be it a newspaper, radio or Internet, and positioned as a successful, "all backed by" almost "universal", so is very difficult to keep from following this model, especially if it is the consumption of information. Definition of the modern notion of "public" in dictionaries is also linked to the consumption of information - in hall, stadium, etc. Film and television viewers, fans, audience of rock concerts – it is public. There is a "massivization" - the spread of a single sample of thinking and behavior. And public follows this samples.

We must admit that all of this - the realities of our time, the inevitable product of mass culture, which is incredibly difficult to maintain individuality, not to follow with a mass, and save your own personal opinion. The more difficult is articulate this original view, clearly express, and convey it to others in such a convincing way that this opinion could "break" through the noise of mass phenomena.

In Russia, as in other countries with un-finished democratic transition and week political culture, the "true public" is yet to be created. "Public-audience" that wants "bread and show" is confined to any kind of "informational abuse" and manipulation - and it can easily be "converted" and driven to support authoritarian leaders, aggressive ideologies or other myths, created by skillful propaganda.

Only in a few places in Russian regions - especially in small townships and villages – there are some visual attempts of citizens efforts of consolidation, which is a manifestation of "real public" which represents itself in meaningful collective organized and responsible behavior: the creation of community-based awareness of their own collective identity, and hence the preservation and reproduction of this identity . If such "citizen coalitions" are built on common ethical norms or the general political views - they are able to maintain and reproduce common citizen values and through

that are able to influence the broader community, thus creating a "responsible public" – in a true meaning of the word.

Civil society structures, NGO's and protesting public

   The need for the new analytical instruments often comes all over sudden, when some unexpected social events are happening and analysts are trying to explain it – with the analytical instruments they used to apply before – and they realize, if they are honest with themselves – that those old instruments can not explain what is going on. This is exactly how it happened right after the beginning of the mass public protests in Russia. Though, it also happened unexpectedly in many places before – in Arab World -Tunizia, in Egypt, in Libia, and in post-Soviet Asia, like in Kyrgizia.

   Many had already forgotten, that about the year before this democratic and civilized mass movements we now have in Russia, there was far less civilized spontaneous mass meeting – led by right-wing aggressive nationalists, that gathered about 5.000 young nationalists at Manezhnaya square in Moscow, right beside the Kremlin wall. Both the police and the society was shocked, as there was no visible organizer and this was claimed – the new "fascist face" of civil society. This led many analysts to re-think what is the true meaning of the term ' civil society', as the nationalist gathering was clearly falling under all the 'classic' definitions : non-governmental, spontaneous, voluntary, almost grass-roots…We had many discussions with colleagues at department and research committee, and what came about, that this was 'special type of public', that easily assembled - as reaction on the killing of the Russian-ethnic football fan by Dagestani –national, also Russian citizen –This public was rather quickly calmed down by Premier's promiss to severely punish guilty ones.

   When this past December almost 50 thousand people were out in streets of Moscow, demanding free and fair elections, immediate reaction of the analysts were : now it is the "true civil society". But the attempts to explain what kind of civil is this was not easy to answer, as there were very few of the established NGO's seen as organizers and the names of the leaders were mostly from artistic and journalist professions.

   Then there were many other attempts made to some-how define, who were all those people, some of whom were coming out to five or more mass events, with more and more radical political demands, often risking to be beaten by the police and taken to custody. The protesters were first called 'angry citizens', but it was not too clear, angry with what, then they were called 'fur-coat

revolution', but this was not adequate either, as there were many people with quite low income among protesters, finally, the "creative class', but also happened to be only part of the truth.

So, we want to offer our own definition to this – this was '***protesting public', behaving as collective social actor, dissatisfied by the political regime and demanding its change.***

It is the global tradition, that is emphasizing that public policy is a horizontal management links, which enable people to work together on common problems and meet global challenges. It appears that the tradition of protest movements were the closest thing: gather together people who want to make their country was living in dignity. It seems that it is this tradition, the most recent of their occurrence and the "global" from existing, having received a conditional name of collective problem solving – is gaining popularity now.

A significant number of people are aware of social problems and unite to address them. But that deal must generate the list. To create such institutions and political forces that will work on this agenda will be able to participate in the decision-making system. However, pokamest is clear to everyone that in Russia there is a political system that runs by its own rules, and there are people who are not satisfied with this system, they live, Act, think, and build up their civil and political context outside of it. Not only non-systemic opposition, but also a large proportion of the population lives outside the political system. (A) public policy is still system solutions, and they do not exist.

It seems that "post-material shift", that is "the solution of the main economic problems", which some authors, such as Inglhardt, have sharply increased social participation, is responsible only for the phenomenon of "active audience" only partially. For example, in Russia, including the monitoring of the mass rallies of the December-February, it is clear that this phenomenon has affected a small part of the population, primarily in major metropolitan areas, in Moscow, and in the rest of Russia the public-a clear minority. Realizing that it was not a question of "society as a whole", as well its obvious minority, need to find a concept, more accurately describing the events of "mass political participation" than "active society" or "civil society"

Many analysts in Russia and abroad – explain the surge of popular participation "social contract" by the authorities and society. However, it is a dangerous oversimplification to equate "our audience and society as a whole, which largely remained very conservative and changes very slowly. This exacerbates the issue: what, then, is the driving force behind the protest public activity of the analytical tool, this phenomenon can be described. The phenomenon of the protest public there is a serious thing to consider separately. There are, of course, the temptation to say that the protests that "civil society", which is always linked to the progress of democratic transit.

However, one cannot help but notice that too frequently equate the concept of "civil society" with "the list of public associations" has led to an atrophy of the term, his inability to capture the essence of the new phenomenon. Moreover, even a cursory review of sociological characteristics of mass protest actions shows that it is not the "voluntary associations and non-profit organizations, who suddenly together came together and came out to the square. On the contrary, most of these organizations both in Russia and in other countries was totally incapable as in the Organization of these events. Participants – another part of society and at all motivated and organized. This suggests that their audience is a separate phenomenon and a type of social actor-and it's worth exploring.

There are several analytical techniques, how to distinguish the new subject of social action entitled "audience" of civil society.

1) **Space of existance** Civil society, conditionally, can be "sitting at home", while the **protesting public** definitely goes to an open public space, it's always risky. Feature outdoor that everyone is on their own behalf, it is visible and equally prone to criticism, at risk for what he's doing in public.

2) Key **features of the consolidation**. Civil society we will learn by his actions, of course, but there is another part of this phenomenon – public opinion, social awareness and social attitudes. And all this is mainly from the outside. (A) to the public is characterized by its own ability to articulation: the swamp everyone was with his poster. It says full human subjectivity: a unity of consciousness, will and action. All analysts have noted that this is not a crowd, this is not someone managed featureless mass, this individual and collective action. Feature of public actions, collective response to a public call.

3) Way of **reaction to risks.** In a crisis situation possible answer civil organizations to call – hide. If in Russia, for example, recognize that any event is held at the United States Department of State money, they expand and go. With a substantial risk of the system of civil society "is often" go under the table ", tries to ride out the confusion", and "lean". . The public is at risk, and is not afraid to take risks. I'm not arguing that it's good or bad, it has to make sense.

But at the turning points of society development the neede social action is taken by 'protest public". There can be no political development without the active political organization of society and active organized public, that is ready for rists to its own well-being.

At the same time such 'protest public "is very fluid and its mood is changeable. This why, so that its activity be retained and effective, it requires a lot of organizational work to keep joint understanding of common goals and true meanings of common values. The public is invited to the format of political participation, which will enable it to engage in the political system.

RUSSIAN PROTEST CASE STUDY

Let us now look at those notions at the example of real case of Russian protests this winter

Mass political meetings of the citizens of Russia have begun after the elections to the State Duma of the VI convocation, held December 4, 2011, they continued during and after the Russian presidential election campaign March 4, 2012. The shares have stated that the elections were accompanied by violations of the law and massive fraud[1].

One of the main slogans of the majority protest actions became the slogan "for fair elections". One of the major symbols of protest is the White Ribbon[2]. Feature presentations was their anti-Putin's thrust[3]. Mass actions of protests in Moscow and St. Petersburg began on the evening of 4 December. The first mass rally took place in Moscow December 5, 2011 year. It was authorized by action of the "Solidarity" movement. It took place on the Chistoprudniy Boulevard under slogans "Elections are a farce!", "Give back the choice to the country!", "Give the power back to people!". Due to the dissemination of information in LiveJournal, Twitter and Facebook, the action brought into streets from 2 up to 10 thousand participants[4]. Most of the sources estimated the number of about six to seven thousand. At the rally speeches were made by well-known oppositionists: Alexei Navalniy, Eugenia Chirikova, Boris Nemtsov, Ilya Yashin, Artemy Troitsky, Viktor Shenderovich, Dmitry Bykov.

According to the Kommersant and "Vedomosti", journalists, it was the most numerous public meeting in Moscow since 1993, after which there were massive clash of the of protesters with police at the Lubianka square[5]. As a result of the meeting more than 300 people were arrested[6]. On 6 December internal troops of Russian military were brought in to Moscow. "In connection with the permitted mass actions and to prevent possible unauthorized gatherings the total number of mobile reserves increased, at the expense of internal troops," the ITAR-TASS News Agency[7].

December 10, 2011, protests were held in 99 cities in Russia and 42 cities abroad[8]. Moscow opposition rally December 10, 2011, at Bolotnaya square in Moscow became the most popular in the

---

[1] Vladimir Milov. Kak Putin oppozitsiu perehitril. Gazeta.Ru, March, 05, 2012 // http://www.gazeta.ru/column/milov/4026641.shtml

[2] http://infox.ru/authority/state/2011/12/09/Simvolom_protyestov_.phtml

[3] "Kak je nas mnogo…". Novie Izvestiya, 26, December, 2011 // http://www.newizv.ru/politics/2011-12-26/156953-kak-zhe-nas-mnogo.html

[4] http://www.interfax.ru/moscow/news.asp?id=220276

[5] http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1831691; http://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/news/1444277/policiya_presekla_pohod_oppozicii_na_cik

[6] http://www.ria.ru/incidents/20111205/507566861.html

[7] http://www.rbcdaily.ru/2011/12/06/focus/562949982225251

[8] http://lenta.ru/articles/2011/12/10/worldprotest/

last decade[9] (on other data — the largest since the beginning of 1990-s[10]). Evaluation of the authorities of Moscow stated, that rally gathered around 25 thousand people, but according to independent observers and foreign journalists, Bolotnaya brought together over 60 thousand participants[11]. Among the demands of the protesters were re-elections, as well as the release of political prisoners and the resignation of the head of the Central Electoral Comission of Russia - Vladimir Churov. It became known that the FSB had proposed appellation of social network manager "vkontakte" Paul Durov - to block five internet-communities (four of which contain in the title, the word "against" United Russia ") Durov refused[12] after that hi was called to give explanations to the Public Prosecutor's Office in St. Petersburg[13].

 In two weeks, on 24 December , even more large-scale protest rally took place in Moscow, at prospect Akademika Saharova, that was prepared by the 'protests Organizing Committee', formed after Bolotnaya meeting. Meeting at Sakharova gathered about 100.000 participants in Moscow , many protest meetings were held same day in other Russian cities. Among the participants of the protest actions supporting demand for the Russian authorities to abolish the controversial results of the voting was the first President of USSR Mikhail Gorbachev[14], Putin's former friend Anatoliy Sobchack daughter Ksenia Sobchack, former Minister of Finance Aleksey Kudrin. White House Press Secretary Jay Carney[15] called the meetings "a positive sign for democracy in Russia".

In February 2012, there was a new series of mass actions "for fair elections". Rallies and marches were held in more than 100 cities in Russia and abroad. 4 February was one of the largest rallies against rigged results of the election meeting "For fair elections!" – it was a rally through Yakimanka street and a meeting at Bolotnaya square in Moscow. According to different estimates this meeting collected from 36 thousand to 120 thousand participants[16].

An important role in organizing the protest marches was played by social networks, where the members of Organizing Committee discussed the dates of actions, slogans and speakers at the meetings. Date 4 February was chosen not by chance - it was timed to the 22th anniversary of the 'March of the Democratic Forces" in 1990, initiating a mass protest of citizens against the Socialist Regime. At the end of February and in March 2012, mass protests have continued.

[9] http://kpravda.com/oppozicionnyj-miting-v-moskve-stal-samym-massovym-za-poslednee-desyatiletie/

[10] http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2011/12/protest-russia-0

[11] http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/elections2011/2011/12/10_a_3922210.shtml

[12] http://lenta.ru/news/2011/12/08/mrdurov/

[13] http://www.gazeta.ru/news/lastnews/2011/12/09/n_2129114.shtml

[14] http://lenta.ru/news/2011/12/25/gorbachev/

[15] http://www.panarmenian.net/eng/news/86500/

[16] http://www.gazeta.ru/news/lastnews/2012/02/04/n_2191809.shtml

5 March -the day after the election of the President of Russia- protest rally took place in Moscow with the number of participants from 14 to 30 thousand people. 5 and 10 March in Moscow were two major events, each of them gathering from 10 to 30 thousand people[17]. Rally at Pushkin square was broken up by riot police[18]. The same day, non-authorized action of the "The Other Russia" was dispersed by police at the Lubyanka square in Moscow and in Petersburg.

7 and 18 March there were series of unauthorized actions, in particular in support of political prisoners and against the provocative lie of TV channel NTV, broadcasting the film , blaming the opposition for taking money for protests from USA State Department. Protest rallies were also held in Rostov-on-Don, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Barnaul, Tomsk, Nizhniy Novgorod, Arkhangelsk Kostroma, Tula, Voronezh, Ekaterinburg. A table below show the complete list of cities in Russia,

where sizable protests were held, with the number of participants and the source, where the data is taken from.

City	Region	Participants	Date
Moscow	Central Federal District	150 000[19]	Febriary, 4
San-Petersburg	North-West Federal District	25 000[20]	Febriary, 25
Ekaterinburg	Urals federal district	10 000[21]	December, 10
Novosibirsk	Siberian Federal District	6000[22]	December, 10
Tomsk	Siberian Federal District	4000[23]	December, 10
Samara	Volga Federal District	4000[24]	December, 24
Ekaterinburg	Urals federal district	2000[25]	March, 5
Arkhangelsk	North-West Federal District	2000[26]	December, 10
Volgograd	Southern Federal District	2000[27]	December, 10
Chelyabinsk	Urals federal district	2000[28]	December, 10

[17] http://www.rg.ru/2012/03/05/pushka.html

[18] http://www.newsru.com/russia/06mar2012/popova.html

[19] http://grani.ru/Politics/Russia/activism/m.193917.html

[20] http://www.kasparov.ru/material.php?id=4F48D5E72717B

[21] http://www.66.ru/news/society/108546/

[22] http://metkere.com/2011/12/10dec.html

[23] http://www.tv2.tomsk.ru/news/v-tomske-proidet-lmiting-protiv-falsifikatsii-vyborov/

[24] http://kp.ru/daily/25809/2789303

[25] http://www.nr2.ru/ekb/376261.html

[26] http://www.rosbalt.ru/federal/2011/12/10/922885.html

[27] http://www.rosbalt.ru/federal/2011/12/12/923316.html

Ijevsk	Volga Federal District	2000[29]	December, 18
Perm	Volga Federal District	2000[30]	December, 24
Barnaul	Siberian Federal District	1500[31]	December, 10
Krasnodar	Southern Federal District	1500[32]	December, 10
Tyumen	Urals federal district	1500[33]	December, 10
Kaliningrad	North-West Federal District	1000[34]	December, 7
Vladivostok	Far-East Federal District	1000[35]	December, 10
Vologda	Far-East Federal District	1000[36]	December, 10
Ufa	Volga Federal District	1000[37]	December, 10
Kazan	Volga Federal District	1000[38]	December, 24

Some results of protest actions-

On 15 December President-elect and still a Prime-Minister of the Government of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin announced the return for the elections of the Governors of the Regions of Federation – right in the coming year of 2012.

On 22 December in his annual address to the Federal Assembly of the RF President Dmitry Medvedev said: "I hear those who speak of the need for change, and understand them. The President said that he proposed "comprehensive reform of our political system":

The simplified procedure for registration of political parties was introduced through a Federal Law,- so that parties can be created upon request of 500 people representing not less than 50 per cent of the regions of the country);

[28] http://www.russian.rfi.fr/node/79001

[29] http://www.dayudm.ru/news/2011/12/12/51110/

[30] http://www.echo.perm.ru/news/20/31927/

[31] http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1836250?stamp=634591573290349891

[32] http://www.dg-yug.ru/a/2011/12/10/Miting_proshel_v_Krasnodare

[33] http://www.nashgorod.ru/news/news47147.html

[34] http://www.newsru.com/russia/07dec2011/kaliningr.html

[35] http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1836092?stamp=634591087510046946

[36] http://xn--b1aaefabadrcoci1do.xn--p1ai/archives/6585

[37] http://ria.ru/society/20111210/512346671.html

[38] http://www.itar-tass.com/c12/305770.html

The need to collect signatures to participate in the elections to the State Duma and regional legislative bodies was cancelled for the parties already represented in Duma and for the non-represented parties this number was reduced - up to 300 thousand to participate in Presidential elections

President Medvedev had decided to create an independent public television.

On of 23 December Council under the President of the Russian Federation on the development of civil society and human rights expressed his distrust of the head of the Central Electoral Commission Vladimir Churov and asked him to resign[39].

On 27 December Vladislav Surkov, according to presidential decree was relieved from the post of Deputy Head of administration of the President of the Russian Federation[40]

The results of 'informal sociological surveys'.

Study conducted two research centers: Social Research Fund of Samara and the Centre for the study of social processes of Leonid Kessel′man in St. Petersburg, results were published by the Yury Levada Centre. .According to the survey, 46% of Muscovites supported the protests, and 25% against. 73 per cent supported the demands of the protesters to punish all perpetrators of fraud and 71% to investigate irregularities in the election. According to the survey "public opinion" Foundation, held in mid-December, across Russia demand to cancel the results of the elections and to hold another fair vote support 26% Russians, 40% are requirements for re-election by Parliament, but only 6% of respondents believe that the elections passed without cheating[41]. According to the poll, on the eve of the rally in december it has no less than 150 thousand Muscovites who supported it.

Self-organization of the protest public

After a rally in Moscow on December 10, 2012 organizing Committee was established to prepare for and implement the new December 24 rally. Members of the Committee included : Boris Akunin (writer), Leonid Parfenov (TV-journalist and producer), Sergey Parkhomenko (Radio-journalist and publisher), Vladimir Ryzhkov (leader of the banned Republican party), Alexei Navalny (initiator of the anti-corruption web-project "Ros-Pil'), Gennady Gudkov (Deputy of the State Duma from party "Just Russia"), Anastasia Udaltsova (Left Front activist), Dmitry Bykov (poet and journalist)Yelena Lukyanova (Professor of Moscow State University, attorney at law for case of YUKOS), Oleg Kashin

[39] http://kremlin.ru/news/14088
[40] http://www.ria.ru/politics/20111224/525151834.html
[41] http://newsru.com/russia/22dec2011/quarter.html

(journalist), Yuri Saprykin (Chief Editor of the Internet publication Slon. Ru), Olga Romanova (TV journalist REN TV).

The Organizing Committee has met several times, including the sessions, that were broadcasted publicly through internet.. Workspace sites for the Organizing Committee were Museum and Center of Andrey Sakharov and Club "Master".   Decisions were taken on various organizational issues: composition of the speakers at the rally, sources of finance, organizational costs (installation, sound-amplification equipment, rent monitors for video presentations), the substantive items of the draft resolutions to be adopted at the rally, security issues, participation of the moderators in social networks.

List of speakers at the rally was on the public vote on the Web and represented the full spectrum of the protest movement. To cover the meeting costs organizers used the method of "crowd funding", that allowed them to collect 3 million rubles in less than a week – for the second meeting.. The task of collecting donations via the Internet was given to journalist Olga Romanova, who opened a "purse" in the electronic system "Yandex.money", so that anyone can contribute any amount. On her website the journalist had posted all the scanned documents evidencing the transaction committed. All for the protest actions since December 2011 till February 2012, approximately 18 million roubles had been collected.

In preparation to the meetings more than 400 known Russian actors and public persons, as well as writers, poets, scientists and journalists have signed an Appeal to citizens with an invitation to participate in the protest meetings, many of them recorded series of video-appeals to come to the meeting, these videos have been broadcast on the Internet.

To help the organizing committee a dozen of informal groups was created, attended by hundreds of volunteers, including students, businessmen, school teachers and university professors, who created, designed and distributed organizing materials, spread stickers, posters and slogans.

Exit poll on the marchers and rally the swamp 24.12.11 (Moscow). Quay. g. sample size -600 persons

Tab. 2. **Your gender? (one reply)[42]**

---

[42] ВЦИОМ, Опрос участников митинга 24 декабря 2012 г., г. Москва, пр-т Сахарова, объем выборки – 600 чел.

Male	64
Female	36

Tab. 3. **Age of respondent (one reply)**

18-24 years	17
25-34 years	24
35-44 years	21
45-59 years	24
60 and over	13

Tab. 4. **Your education? (one reply)**

Primary and lower secondary	7
Secondary general schools	9
Secondary special education	13
Higher	70

Tab. 5. **What is your primary occupation? (one reply)**

Skilled worker	2
Unskilled worker	11
Employees without higher education	3
Specialist with higher education in the commercial sector	44
Specialist with higher education (Government – funded social work)	5
Soldier in the army, internal affairs, including police	2
Businessman	5
State or municipal employee	2
Pensioner	10
I do not work, I am on maternity leave	2
Student	10
Another	2
Difficult to answer	1

Tab.6 **Evaluate your financial situation (one reply)**

Very good	5
Good	29
Average	56
Bad	9
Very bad	0
Difficult to answer	0

Tab.7. **What are the slogans came up at the rally, you more like?**

(open question, any number of answers)

For a free, fair and honest elections	37

Down With Putin	25
Cancel, review the results of the elections	19
Down with Churov (Chair of the Russian Central Electoral Commission)	9
Down with crooks and thieves, Liars, corrupt	7
Putin – thief, jailed his	6
The change of Government, political system	5
We are not banderlogi, not slaves, Rams, etc.	4
Freedom for political prisoners	3
Russia will be free	3

Exit poll on the marchers and rally the swamp 4.02.2012 (Moscow). Quay. g. sample size-800

Tab. 8. **Your gender? (one reply)**[43]

Male	71
Female	29

Tab. 9. **Age of respondent (one reply)**

18-24 years	20
25-34 years	28
35-44 years	23
45-59 years	20
60 and over	10

Tab. 10. **Your education? (one reply)**

Primary and lower secondary	3
Secondary general schools	15
Secondary special education	26
Higher	56

Таб. 11. **What is your primary occupation? (one reply)**

Worker	11
Soldier in the army, internal affairs agencies, including police, FSB	2
Businessman	5
Public servant, an employee of administrative organs	12
Engineers, technical specialists	10
Office employee	18

Government – funded social work (a doctor, social worker, teacher)	7
Artistic professions	4
Unemployed	1
Student	8
Pensioner	9
Housekeeper	3
Another group	3
Difficult to answer	4

Tab.12 **Evaluate your financial situation (one reply)**

Very good	1
Good	26
Average	59
Bad	11
Very bad	2
Difficult to answer	1

Tab.13. **What are the slogans came up at the rally, you more like?**

(open question, any number of answers)

Down with Putin's, Russia without Putin, Vova get out	47
For a free, fair and honest elections	16
The change of Government, political system	5
Down with crooks and thieves, Liars, corrupt	4
Freedom for political prisoners	2
Power to the people	2
Russia will be free	2
The power for millions	2
Down with Churov (Chair of the Russian Central Electoral Commission)	1
The will of the people, law, freedom	1

The results of the sociological survey of the 'protesting public' of 'White revolution" in Russia in winter 2011-2012 provide some characteristics of the "qualities' of this public as a social actor.

First important characteristic, that all the attempts to find a 'specific social group' behind the protests is impossible, because there are representatives of all the genders, ages, professions and social strata – and shows remarkable diversity of participants. This allows to call this real "broad social protest".

 Other "special qualities" of Moscow protest public- are;

- exclusively peaceful protest, totally non-aggressive in attitude

- very well organized - both by public protests committee and by Moscow police, as most huge mass actions were officially 'sanctioned ' by Moscow authorities.

- very creative, full of funny , humorous and sarcastic messages, being critical to power

- very well articulated messages – both personalized – every 5-th one with own slogan – but also developing the same commom idea – for the changing of power and empowering the people

   Interestingly enough, that in many of those recent works on social movements and mass protests more attention is given to self-identity of the protesters and creating the "identification through the protest actions" – Poletta

We also see this in Russian "Snow Revolution" in 2011-2012and in several other cases of spontaneous mass protests – at least in 'our part of the world' – in Ukraine Maidan and in Belarus after elections / - first comes action itself, then – reflection and identification with conscious protest movement, as Karic Kleman points out in her book :"From ordinary people to activists'

We want to conclude with returning to our initial question – how to move from 'public as an audience' to 'public as a social actor' : as we currently see it happening right in front of us, it is our duty to document it thoroughly and honestly, trying to grasp the very moment, the "turning point", when it happens and what are the both the "conditions" and the "triggers" of it.

This would be , definitely, the task for the further studies, and we hope that the 'protesting public' would not fade away quickly, getting away from public space, and, with this, disappearing from public life , so that "collective social actor" would be turning into 'ordinary passive people' back again.

We should realize this risk, as the protest activity can never keep the same level of passion for too long, especially when authorities deliberately ignore their demands and organizing counter-demonstrations and public actions in support of present regime, as it currently happens in Russia. So, we may soon see rapid shrinking and, possibly, total disappearance of the mass protest actions in the streets of Moscow, Saint-Petersburg or Voronezh, but it poses even more interesting research question to our over-all goal to 're-defining the public':

-   Would this ever be the SAME public, that existed BEFORE those mass actions? Or, instead,

-   This experience in participating mass and lasting protest is creating NEW QUALITY of public, that would behave differently in any other social interactions, particularly , vis-a-vis government authorities, corrupted bureaucracies, inadequate government structures?

Our hypotethisis, grounded in social actor theories and acquisition of "social competencies" suggests, that this would be completely different kind of public, that would be able to transfer the whole public space, by gradually demanding more transparency, accountability and effectiveness – from both private and public actors, be them Presidents, local officials or Global companies.

References

Archibugi M., Zurn M. (ed.). New Models of Governance in the Global System. Explorong Publicness, Delegation and Inclusiveness. 2006.

Belyaeva N. (Ed.) Constitutional development in Russia: goals of institutional designing. Collection of articles Moscow. 2007b.

Belyaeva N. (Ed.) Public Policy in modern Russia: actors and institutions. Moscow, 2006.

Belyaeva N. (ed.). Analytical communities in Karelia. // *Collection of articles of series "Regional analytical communities in Russia development"*. Moscow, 2011a

Belyaeva N. (ed.). Analytical communities in Saratov region. // *Collection of articles of series "Regional analytical communities in Russia development"*. Moscow, 2010

Belyaeva N. (ed.). Analytical communities in Tatarstan. // *Collection of articles of series "Regional analytical communities in Russia development"*. Moscow, 2011b

Belyaeva N. Development of the concept of public policy: the "driving forces" and the actors. *Polis*, №3, 2011;

Belyaeva N. Public Policy in Russia: strength of environment. Polis. 2007a. № 1. P. 22-32.

Capano G. Howlett M. Introduction: multidimensional world of policy dynamics. European and North American Policy Change: drivers and dynamics. Edited by G.Capano and M.Howlett. Routledge: ECPR Studies in European Political Science. 2009

Fliegstien N. Spaces, power and social skills: critical analysis of new institutional theories // Economical sociology, 2001, Volume 2, № 4 // http//www.ecsoc.msses.ru.

Goodin R., Klingemann H.D. (ed). A new handbook of Political Science. Moscow. 1999.

Habermas J. "The Public Sphere" in Seidman, S. (ed.). – Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics. Boston: Beacon Press. 1973.

Habermas J. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge, Mas.: The MIT Press. 1993.

Habermas J. Inclusion the other Political theory essays. Sankt Petersburg. 2008.

Habermas J. The Public Sphere. – Contemporary Philosophy (Ed. by E.Goodin and Philip Pettit). Oxford Blackwell. 1997.

Habermas J. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge. 1962 (trans. 1989).

Holzhacker R., Albaek E. Edward Elgar. (ed.). Democratic Governance and European Integration. Linking Societal and State Processes of Democracy. 2007. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA.

Kennet P. Governance, Globalization and Public Policy. Chentelhem, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc. 2008.

Kennett P., Edward Elgar. (ed). Governance, Globalization and Public Policy. 2008. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA.

Krasin Y. Public sphere and public policy in Russia. Moscow, 2005.

Lasswell Harold D. 1930. Psychopathology and Politics. Chicago.: University of Chicago Press.

Originally published in Jiirgen Habermas on Society and Politics, ed. Steven Seidman. 1989. Boston: Beacon Press.

Peregudov S., Utkin A., Kostyev S. Lobbism of Russian business in the USA. Moscow. 2009.

Pouds R., New method of government: governance. Sankt Petersburg. 2008. P. 51-74.
Shokhin A., Korolev E. Vzaimodeistvie biznesa I vlasti d Evropeiskom Soyuze. M. 2008.

Wallace H., Young A. (ed.). 1997. Participation and Policy-making in the EU. Oxford.

Zaytsev D. Intellectuals' role in democratic development: European experience and Russian practice // Russia-Europe Relations: a Look from Sweden. Academic Papers of the 8th International session of the HSE "Baltic Practice" which took place at the Stockholm Research center, Sweden, from August 1st to 8th, 2008. Moscow: INTELCORP, 2009.

Zaytsev D. Think Tanks in political process. Main features and assessment of influence on decision-making. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, Saarbrucken. 2010.
Роудс Р. 2008. Новый метод управления: управление без правительства. – *Публичная политика: от теории к практике (сост. и науч. ред. Н.Ю.Данилова, О.Ю.Гурова, Н.Г.Жидкова)*. СПб.: Алетейя. С. 51-74.
Хархордин О. Была ли Res Publica вещью? *Неприкосновенный запас, №55*. December, 5, 2007.