

so much a fashion trend as a reflection of the spirit of the times: cities want to find unique faces, even if sometimes such a face turns out to be only a hypocritical, but necessarily original, mask.

The well-being of urban life is achievable in two ways: a) administrative and distributive and b) cultural and political. The first one involves the desire (and the ability because desire alone is not enough) for comfortable inclusion in the existing parastatal network. Such a city will always proceed from considerations of "correct behaviour" (correct towards the highest echelons of state power). The cities that have refused such a path are still in the minority, and they are not satisfied primarily with the fact that all the time they have to "reach out for the sour executive committee rouble," as Ostap Bender used to say in relation to himself. They want to overcome their subordinate status towards state power, or at least not to depend on it so clearly: they are ready and intend to take on more. Such cities, as a rule, are ambitious and have a great conceit; most often they are waiting for a difficult path of desperate competition with other cities.

#### **Literature:**

1. Венец любви или прихоть графини: история «Софиевки». URL : [https://md-ukraine.com/ru/object/detail/1231\\_sofievskij-park.html](https://md-ukraine.com/ru/object/detail/1231_sofievskij-park.html) (Accessed: 24 January 2022).

2. Радионова Л. А., Сапега А. Н. Брендинг города как ключевой элемент стратегии развития территории // Підприємництво та бізнес-адміністрування: сучасні тренди [Електронний ресурс] : матеріали міжнар. наук.-практ. інтернет-конф., Харків, 01–28 лютого 2021 р. / Харків. нац. ун-т міськ. госп-ва ім. О. М. Бекетова [та ін.] ; [редкол. : П. Т. Бубенко, О. Ю. Палант, С. Ю. Юр'єва]. Харків : ХНУМГ ім. О. М. Бекетова, 2021. 345 с. URL : [https://science.kname.edu.ua/images/dok/konferentsii/2021/\\_2021.pdf](https://science.kname.edu.ua/images/dok/konferentsii/2021/_2021.pdf) (Accessed: 24 January 2022)

## **METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH OF URBAN SOCIETY IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALISM**

L. A. RADIONOVA, PhD, Docent,

Assistant Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Political Science

K. R. SOLODOVNYK, student

*O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, Kharkiv, Ukraine*

For a modern city inscribed in the global world, the most interesting and still relevant approach to the study of urban issues was proposed by the Chicago School of Sociology. They treated the city like a social laboratory. Actually, it was precisely due to the intensity of life in the city and the intensification of social relations that sociologists could use the urban environment as a testing ground for studying various social phenomena that had not been observed before. The ancestor of the Chicago School, Robert Park, distinguishes between two levels of urban life: ecological or symbiotic on the one hand, and moral or cultural on the other.

The ecological level is a fairly clear, simple level that exists not only in human communities or societies, but also in nature. This level is associated with the need for living units to live on the same territory, where competition naturally arises between

them, the need to fight for resources, the need to share space, and so on [1, p. 117-127]. When we observe the city, we can also see the processes that take place at the ecological level. These processes are related to the fact that people compete, for example, for resources, jobs, food, and so on, compete for space. They need to somehow coordinate their physical presence in one place. But at the same time, Park notes, human societies differ from natural ones in that there is a moral (or cultural) level. In other words, they can transform the environment in which they live. And it is transformed and correlated with the relations that exist in human communities.

The combination of these two levels allowed Robert Park and subsequent theorists of the Chicago School, such as Louis Wirth, to make a fairly clear stratification of different types of urban environments. The only problem that arises is that the Chicago School did not offer a clear idea of how the ecological level, on the one hand, and the moral level, on the other hand, correlate. How can these two types of human habitation in an urban environment be combined - ecological and moral? We can offer three concepts that allow one way or another to relate to these two levels: the first of them is trust, the second is a sense of security, the third is social capital.

The category “trust” is the most inclusive. As L. Radionova notes, trust includes relations with two others – both with security and with social capital [2]. Sociologists distinguish three types of trust. The first of these is institutional, that is, trust in social, economic and other institutions. The second type of trust relationship is interpersonal trust. This is trust in specific people you know with whom you are in some kind of relationship. The third type of trust is generalized. Generalized trust is most relevant to the urban environment. Since this trust is not in a specific person, it is trust in the so-called generalized other, a stereotyped idea of a city dweller, of a person whom you can meet in a certain territory. The relationship between interpersonal and generalized trust is most interesting because interpersonal trust often characterizes communities that are less characteristic of the urban environment. Those communities where people know each other, where trusting relationships are established between them, are communities that exist in low-urbanized cultures. A resident of a modern metropolis more often interacts, encounters people whom he personally does not know or with whom he is only superficially familiar, therefore there is no relationship of interpersonal trust between them. This is where the relationship of generalized trust begins to play the greatest role, how much you trust your ideas about some people. And in this sense, when we talk about the urban environment, about the actual urban way of life, the relationship of generalized trust becomes the most important.

Generalized trust relations are unevenly distributed throughout the city. People more often trust the center, because they think that they can meet those people in the center who pose less danger to them, less threat. The city center is becoming the most sought after as a place of safety. The generalized relationship of trust is directly related to the feeling of security. The more you trust the stereotypical other you may meet in that territory, the more secure you feel in that territory.

### Literature:

1. Радионова Л. А. Город как социальная система: хрестоматия / Харьков. нац. ун-т гор. хоз-ва им. А. Н. Бекетова. Харьков : ХНУГХ им. А. Н. Бекетова, 2016. 163 с.
2. Радионова Л. А. Философский проект мира Канта и доверие в международных отношениях: Украина-Республика Беларусь. Беларусь в меняющемся мире: история и современность: материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф., Минск, 22 февр. 2019 г. / Белорус. гос. ун-т ; редкол.: М. Э. Чесновский (пред.) [и др.]. Минск : БГУ, 2019. С. 201-208.

## ПРОБЛЕМА ДЕРЖАВНОГО БОРГУ В УКРАЇНІ

Т. А. ДЯЧЕНКО, канд. екон. наук, доц.,  
доц. кафедри загальної економічної теорії  
Т. Л. ЗБОРЩИК, студентка  
*Національний технічний університет «Харківський політехнічний інститут»,  
м. Харків, Україна*

Надзвичайно актуальною для України є проблема державного боргу. Існують різні підходи науковців до тлумачення терміну «державний борг». Виходячи з їх визначень, можна стверджувати, що державний борг - це сума усіх фінансових боргових зобов'язань держави перед внутрішніми та зовнішніми кредиторами та відсоткові ставки на них.

Метою даної роботи є пошук доцільних шляхів погашення державного боргу України.

Україна взяла курс на побудову самодостатньої держави із високим рівнем соціально-економічного розвитку. Найбільш вагомим інструментом, що впливає на соціально-економічний розвиток є державний бюджет. Коли видатки перевищують надходження, настає дефіцит держбюджету. Поява державного боргу з'являється разом з позиками для покриття дефіциту державного бюджету. Розглянемо динаміку державного боргу України, використовуючи дані, наведені в табл. 1.

Таблиця 1 – Динаміка державного боргу України в млрд грн.

Дата	Загальна сума державного та гарантованого державою боргу	Державний борг	Гарантований державою борг
на 31.12.2016	1929,81	1650,83	278,98
на 31.12.2017	2141,69	1833,71	307,98
на 31.12.2018	2168,42	1860,29	308,13
на 31.12.2019	1998,30	1761,37	236,93
на 31.12.2020	2551,88	2259,23	292,65
на 31.12.2021	2671,83	2362,49	309,33

*Примітка: складено за [1].*