

THE PERSONAL AND COMMON GOOD IN THE THEORY OF STATE SOLIDARISM

^aPAWEŁ DULSKI, ^bALEKSANDER ILNICKI, ^cLESZEK KURNICKI, ^dWOJCIECH SŁOMSKI

^{a,c}*Collegium Humanum, 1a, Moniuszki Str., 00-014, Warszawa, Poland*

^{b,d}*University of Economics and Human Sciences on Warsaw, 59, Okopowa Str., 01-043, Warszawa, Poland*
 email: ^apaweldulskii@poczta.onet.pl, ^bilnickialeex@gmail.com, ^clech@kurnicki.eu, ^dw.slomskii@vizja.pl

Abstract: The article analyzes the relationship between the concepts of the common good, public interest, individual (private) interest, and the problem of reconciling individual interest and the common good in the theory of state solidarity. The authors reveal the concepts of solidarism and solidarity at different stages of the development of social thought. The importance of updating the solidarity strategy for modern society is argued. The ideology of solidarism did not have full development in the 19th century – in contrast to the complete ideologies of liberalism, social democracy, and conservatism. However, in a postmodern society, solidarism can increase its attractiveness. The ideas developed in the philosophy and ideology of solidarism (solidarity, trust, cooperation, subsidiarity, self-organization, non-hierarchical interaction) can provide an answer to many actual challenges of our time.

Keywords: Common good, Coordination of interests, Personal benefit, Solidarity, State, Theory of solidarism.

1 Introduction

The initial elements of society are individuals, each of which is a separate, independent personality with interests, needs, and unique features. However, any society is a complex social system and is not reduced only to the sum of its constituent individuals. Society is commonly understood as the totality of various social groups and the relations that develop in their joint activities [2]. The existence of society as an integral phenomenon presupposes the presence of a common interest, which is not reduced to the sum of the private interests of its members, and sometimes conflicts with the interests of individual individuals.

The development of scientific categories and their manifestation in scientific discourse have their history, flourishing, and oblivion or filling with new meanings that change the previous understanding of the significance of the phenomena behind these concepts. So, today, for example, "tolerance," "trends," "innovations," and "modernization" are categories that are actively used by political scientists, sociologists, and culturologists, and the concepts of "solidarity," "solidarism," have practically disappeared from scientific circulation [1, 5, 6]. Together with them, the social guidelines that are essentially significant for modern conditions, expressed by these concepts, left the problematic field. In our opinion, the real status of the concepts of "solidarity" and "solidarism" requires a more serious study of their interpretation at different stages of social development and the fixation of certain traditions in the formation of the concepts they define.

With all the variety of definitions of the essence and functions of political ideology, with all the ephemeral nature, conventionality, and elusive nature of ideological discourse, it can be stated that ideologies, unlike political and philosophical doctrines, are not only and not so many worldviews, ways of knowing, understanding, interpreting and descriptions of social reality [8-10]. Moreover, ideology is always connected with social practice - the mobilization of the subject of collective action and the struggle for power and influence necessary for implementing political projects.

Ideology is, as defined by Bernard Sasser, ideas striving for power. The task of any political ideology is the construction of meanings and motivations, the creation of a picture of reality, and the "editing" of the present and the future, in accordance with its ideas about the common good, about what exists and should. At the current stage of development, ideologies are turning from a system of ideas and values into a manipulative

political technology, into a set of simulacra, into a means of pre-election agitation and propaganda.

In theoretical terms, solidarism is developed worse than "full" ideologies – its ideas did not often become centers of intense ideological and polemical struggle. In addition, it was pretty much forgotten – not only by theorists but even by historians of ideas and ideologies. There is often a preconceived notion that solidarists have compromised solidarism by collaborating with fascist regimes [2].

Any political ideology, as a more or less ordered system of ideas, is described and constructed after the fact, from the future – by "pulling" under the modern ideological template, under the modern idea of this or that "change" of certain ideas, teachings and persons from the past. Hobbes and Locke did not expect they would become the forefathers of liberalism, and even such a word in the 17th century didn't exist. And Chateaubriand, who was the first to use the word "conservatism" and gravitated towards a conservative worldview, was called by his contemporaries a liberal. Plato could hardly have imagined that he would become the "first communist" and an obligatory figure in anthologies on the history of communist doctrines.

Solidarism should be spoken of in three different ways:

- First, about solidarism in the narrow sense of the word – concerning the teachings for which "solidarism" was a self-name.
- Secondly, about solidarism in the broadest sense of the word – concerning the authors who did not use this word as a self-name but actually reproduced precisely solidarist ideas and interpretations of social reality (anarcho-syndicalism, Christian democracy, corporatism, neo-corporatism).
- Thirdly, the new solidarism (neo-solidarism) – is about modern attempts to create ideological and political-philosophical discourses based on solidarist ideas [4].

The problems of political philosophy and the ideology of solidarism can be revealed through the description and study of the solidarist understanding of the concepts that are mandatory for most ideologies (state, power, freedom, justice, labor, property, common good, authority, equality, human rights, political, traditions, and innovations), as well as through the interpretation of concepts characteristic only of this ideological discourse (social solidarity, subsidiarity, trust, cooperation, synergetic interaction, free loyalty, self-organization, networking, etc.) [7].

2 Literature Review

The problem of reconciling the interests of the state and private interests has been the subject of discussion throughout the entire period of development of society and the state. Turning to the history of the Ancient World, we note that even Ulpian chose interest (benefit) as a criterion for distinguishing between public and private law, opposing the benefit of the state to the benefit of individuals. The ratio of the "common good" (bonum commune), which in Rome was understood as the highest good of the state, and the "individual good" (utilitas), was decided by Roman philosophy and law; unequivocally: "Public benefit should be put above private" [21].

Thus, the Romans reduced the difference between private and public law to the difference between protected interests, distinguishing between private and general interests. Opponents of such a division note that it is impossible, therefore, to oppose the interests of the general and private. On the one hand, only individual people have interests since only people are the real, real elements of community life. On the other hand, the general interest is nothing but the totality of private interests [23]. In this sense, it can be said that all law is established for the protection of the interests of individuals, that is, private interests. On the

other hand, legal protection is given only to those interests of individuals that have more or less general significance or that are inherent in a whole group of individuals. Therefore, every right protects the general interest.

Greek thinkers could not find a compromise between the interests of the individual and the interests of the state. The absorption of the individual by the state or the decomposition of the state in the name of the interests of the individual are the main features of their views on the organization of a *hostel* [40].

In Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, and Stoics, the concept of the "common good" is based on the concept of natural law. According to the authors, the good of all and the good of everyone are the same [43]. The common good relies on law principles (freedom, equality in legal personality, the unity of the rule of law, the legal basis of the state and laws) and legal justice. The common good includes various interests and claims of various subjects to the extent that they correspond to the general legal norm. The state becomes the spokesman of the common interest, the common good. Thus, the public interest is identified with the common good, which is manifested in the functioning of the state [13, 14]. The state, which expresses and protects the common good, is the "cause of the people" and, at the same time, the "general legal order" (Cicero). The situation is similar to the natural law concept of the state (*polis*) of Aristotle.

Thomas Aquinas argued that the law should express the common good of all members of society. Hugo Grotius noted that the state is a perfect union of free people, concluded for the sake of law and the common good. The task of the rule of law is to achieve the greatest common benefit. To do this, the state must rise above any personal interest and take care of the benefit of all equally, that is, ensure justice. He argued the need for the freedom of others, regardless of its personal recognition by the individual, could always, in fact, limit the freedom of the individual on an equal footing with everyone. This requirement of coercive justice, he believed, is brought in from the idea of the common good or public interest [50].

Many of the most prominent representatives of the natural law school recognized that state power as such in relation to the individual has no boundaries and that it is therefore absolute. In this view, even such contrasts as Hobbes and Rousseau converged [16-18, 20]. It was possible to argue about which organization of state power is better (monarchy or republic), but that state power in relation to the individual is absolute; seemed to them indisputable.

Some authors, speaking about the common good as the state's goal, saw in it a combination of opposite elements that make up its composition, personal and public [51, 60, 71]. The benefit of the union lies in the fullness and harmonious development of all its elements. This is the true nature of the state, its idea. The state does not aim at the private welfare of its members. The private good is civil society's goal, not the state's. The latter contributes to developing private interests only to the extent that they are included in the general interest [22, 25-30]. The state is a union that rises above other unions and does not absorb them in itself. Therefore, its purpose does not coincide with the purpose of other unions. The essential difference is that its goal is general, not private. But since the good of the whole depends on the well-being of the parts, the promotion of private interests indirectly becomes the state's goal [32]. Whether this assistance is necessary is a question whose decision depends on the changing conditions of life. But the fundamental principle is that state intervention in the area of private interests is the exception, not the rule.

The real tasks and true goals of the state lie in the implementation of the solidary interests of the people. The common good is the formula in which the tasks and goals of the state are expressed [34-36]. That the essence of the state, indeed, is to uphold the solidary interests of people; this is reflected even in the deviations of the state from its true goals. Considerations of the common good usually justify even the cruelest forms of state oppression.

Freedom, equality, law, property, etc., make sense only concerning individuals, to the individual, and where people are not independent individuals, not individuals, but "members of the collective," integral parts of the class and the masses, there is no there can be no freedom, no right, no equality, no property, no morality. Without an individual, without a personality, all this turns into an allegory, into metaphorical words without an adequate meaning [38, 39]. The primacy of social unity over the concept of the individual would mean the transformation of the individual into a means and instrument for the future bliss of some higher beings, in relation to which the people of the present would be an inferior species that does not have an equal moral value. In contrast to this, the philosopher insisted, it should be recognized that, by virtue of its unconditional significance, the individual represents the only basis that, first of all, must be protected in every generation and in every era as the source and goal of progress, the image, and way of realizing the social ideal.

According to legal libertarianism, the common good is a legal form of recognition and realization of individual benefits on the principle of formal equality [45]. The concept of the common good presents a legal model for identifying, reconciling, recognizing, and protecting various, largely conflicting interests, claims, and wills of members of a given community as their benefit, possible, and permissible from the point of view of a universal measure of equality, a single and equal for all legal norms. From the standpoint of such a general norm, only legally consistent, various interests can be qualified as the good of individuals and the common good [41, 42]. The concept of "good" (individual and general) thus includes various interests, claims, and wills of various subjects (individuals and legal entities) only to the extent that they correspond to the general norm, meet the uniform criteria of legal prohibitions, and permissions, are possible and permissible within the framework of the general legal order. In this sense, we can say that the concept of "good" is a legally qualified interest (claim, will, etc.) [46-49]. The public interest is the common good, the possession of which is valuable for the individual. Restricting the rights and freedoms of the individual is quite possible since it is carried out in favor of the common good, and hence the person whose rights are limited.

As for the very nature of interest, there is no single position regarding its essence. Some authors believe that interest is objective; others believe that it is subjective, interest is inextricably linked with awareness and cannot exist outside of awareness.

Interest, in our opinion, should be understood as an objective component aimed at a conscious and desired result, good, or benefit, the content of which is a need of a social nature, and the form of expression is a social relationship.

In modern legal literature, the most important for our study is the division of legally protected interests by carriers (subjects) into private (interests of specific individuals and their groups) and public (interests of society and the state) [52-55]. The boundary between the spheres of private and public interest is mobile and is established by the legislator.

Public interest is what society and its social groups see as a particular value that satisfies material, spiritual, aesthetic, and other needs. As a result, it is subject to protection in the manner prescribed by law. When interpreting the public interest, the author proceeds from the purpose of the state – to serve civil society, to protect its interests and the interests of individuals.

It should be noted that in different historical periods, public interest was understood to varying degrees: the general interest, the general will, the common good, the public interest, the state interest, etc.

The definition of the common good or public interest is difficult since this category has not been developed in either economic or legal literature [57]. The common good, public interests are not the interests of the state, but interests that benefit the whole

society or are significant for a separate social community and have not a one-time, short-term effect but serve as a condition for the life and development of society (individual social communities) and are focused on the fundamental constitutional values.

The ideas of solidarity and solidarism became widespread in the late 19th and early 20th centuries [12]. This was due to the objective need to search for new forms of interaction between social actors in the context of the growing class conflict of bourgeois society when the former social institutions of traditional society – the family, the neighborhood community, and religion – began to lose their significance and strength [61-65]. There was a threat to the stability of society.

Common in these ideas and the interpretation of the concepts themselves is the allocation of the principles of interaction, which implies mutual understanding, consent, and cooperation of different interaction subjects. In the sociological theories of E. Durkheim, V. Pareto, S. Frank, and others, solidarity is considered as a condition for the development of society and its main constitutive feature [37].

The most established meanings of scientific concepts are fixed in the appropriate dictionaries. For example, the modern sociological encyclopedic dictionary defines solidarity, firstly, as a unity of beliefs and actions, mutual assistance and support of members of a social group based on common interests and the need to achieve common group goals; shared responsibility, and secondly, as "active sympathy and support for someone's actions or opinions [56].

Solidarity (French *solidarite*) means a community of interests, like-mindedness, unanimity, interdependence, interconnectedness, mutual responsibility, and joint responsibility [12]. Thus, solidarity is defined as a principle of social existence involving the pooling of resources and capabilities of the subjects of relations to achieve common goals, while the interests of each of the subjects are in balance with the interests of the community.

The Big Explanatory Dictionary of Sociology (English translation of the D. Jerry edition) contains an article on social solidarity, defining it as integration and its degree or type displayed by a society or group. And further, it is pointed out that the basis of social solidarity changes from simple societies to more complex ones [66-68]. In the first, it is often based on kinship relationships, direct relationships, and common values; in the second, its other foundations appear. Moreover, the dictionary does not explain what these "other bases" are. In addition, it can be noted that not every philosophical and sociological dictionary can find definitions for the concepts of "solidarity" and "solidarism." Apparently, this is due to the fact that modern dictionaries explain the most frequently used concepts, which are not included in the circle we are considering today [59].

The attitude toward the concept of solidarity in the history of social thought has been far from unambiguous: from its sharp criticism (Sorel and other French anarcho-syndicalists) to the substantiation of the fact that solidarity is a norm that has a legal character [58]. In fact, when defining the concept of "solidarity," researchers in most cases list certain characteristics of this phenomenon. The conceptualization of solidarity by a number of authors is seen in the concept of "solidarism" [3, 15, 19]. Until now, there is no consensus among researchers about who exactly and when introduced this concept into scientific circulation.

At the same time, many authors are unanimous in recognizing solidarism as a principle of social organization, in which the driving force of social development is not the class struggle but the unanimity of the members of society, the solidarity of its members, and the interdependence of all social groups, the harmony of the interests of labor and capital [58].

What is common in various interpretations of the concept of solidarism is its definition as an activity aimed at seeking mutual

understanding, harmony, and cooperation between people, organizations, and countries [2]. And in this sense, the concepts of solidarity and solidarism are identified. However, there are differences between them. Solidarity is the real state of society, the nature of social relations between interconnected and interdependent social subjects [12]. In contrast, solidarism is considered both a political ideology, a philosophical doctrine, and social technology and appropriate management practice based on the idea of the common good, solidarity, and the coordination of interests and values [33].

In a narrow sense, solidarism is sometimes used as a synonym for corporatism, an ideological doctrine that arose at the end of the 19th century as opposed to Marxism. Supporters of corporatism advocated the creation of corporate states, where the class struggle would be replaced by class cooperation in the name of the prosperity of the state-corporation. However, other interpretations of solidarism also fix the fact that this concept does not rely on the class struggle but mutual understanding, cohesion, solidarity, the interdependence of all social groups, and harmony of interests of employers and employees [37]. In this sense, solidarism is seen as a doctrine of society, affirming the solidarity of its parts [44].

The point of view has also spread that solidarism is an eclectic ideology that includes elements of the French economic doctrine, the Italian philosophy of a totalitarian orientation, the ideas of Slavic "cathedralism," "all-unity," and "Holy Kievan Rus." Obviously, we can agree with this, explaining the presence of elements of eclecticism by the fact that the search for adequate and effective forms of social order has always worried politicians, philosophers, and ordinary active members of society [7]. At the same time, solidarism as a principle, as an ideology, and as a social technology has always had many guises [24].

3 Materials and Methods

As a rule, the concept of social solidarity is considered the basis of the ideology and political philosophy of solidarism. Solidarity (French *solidarite*) is a community of interests, like-mindedness, unanimity, interdependence, interconnectedness, mutual responsibility, and joint responsibility. Solidarity can be defined as a principle of social existence, involving the pooling of resources and capabilities of the subjects of relations to achieve common goals, while the interests of each of the subjects are in balance with the interests of the community and are not sacrificed to either an abstract common interest or individual egoism. Solidarity should be considered as a mechanism of social self-regulation, self-preservation, and self-development of the collective organism, which allows the maximum use of the capabilities of all members of society for the individual and common good [59].

Solidarism is the principle of building a social system based on the solidarity of its various parts among themselves and not on struggle and not on fierce competition. In such a system, its members (citizens, families, ethnic groups, religious denominations, classes, social groups, political parties, business corporations, etc.) have real legal and socio-political subjectivity, as a result of which their rights, opportunities, interests, and values can be consolidated and solidarized for the sake of achieving consensus goals (the common good) within the social framework of various scales (local, national, global) [44]. Rejecting liberal individualism and totalitarian egalitarianism, theorists of solidarism tried to generate their own "symphonic" anthropology and ontology based on the balance of individual and common interests.

The key issue for solidarism is the relationship between "I" and "we." In fact, this is the only ideology that tries to balance the individualism of the individual and the interest of society as a whole [4]. At the same time, liberalism upholds the priority of the interests of the individual and socialism and the totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century – the priority of the general interest.

The common good must be based on the public interest. The concept of public interest is closest to the legal category of public interest. Public interests are in the sphere of public relations; in the sphere of legal relations, that is, public interests transferred to the legal field become public interests.

The difference in the understanding of public and private interests in the philosophical sense boils down to the fact that a person is a unity in the human individual of the general and the special [70]. The general is that which connects the individual with a historically given set of social relations, a class, a social group, and that which is characteristic of any life activity, of any human organism. The special is individuality, i.e., uniqueness, inimitable in the manifestation of everything in common, distinguishing one individual from another. Since collectivity is a combination, cohesion, and individuality is a selection, the difference between one individual that they are mutually are opposite. At the same time, they mutually presuppose one another, assert themselves one by means of the other, and are linked by an inseparable unity.

The formation of private and public interests is carried out personally. Through individual consciousness, interests are born that makeup both the individual and the common good. Satisfaction of both private and public interests is carried out through the fulfillment of the interests of individuals. In any case, as a result of the implementation of both private and public interests, specific people benefit: specific citizen benefits from the implementation of private interest, and all members of society benefit from the performance of public interest.

The distinguishing features include the fact that private interest concerns individuals. The public interest belongs not to individuals but society or their ideal unity. Public goods can only be realized jointly or with someone's help [72]. These are needs that cannot be objectively met on an individual basis. The public interest is directed towards public goods that cannot be clearly "packaged" that cannot be sold only to those who are willing to pay for them. However, private interests can also be carried out jointly, but what distinguishes them is that in the public interest, the joint implementation of interests is objective. Private interests are subjective (i.e., private interests can be realized jointly or not). The joint implementation of public interests is a condition for providing common benefits to all persons in need. With the individual realization of public goods, many will be unable to use this benefit due to a lack of funds or physical capabilities. The "common good" is often seen as a criterion for balancing public and private interests.

4 Results and Discussion

A person is invariably a member of society and its integral part. The interests of society as a whole and the interests of each individual are inextricably linked and determine each other. Although the formation of a complex of socially significant interests of the individual and society as a whole is determined by the laws of life and the development process of society, they have a single nature [69]. Consequently, the fundamental public interests that are the object of legal protection and the true interests of each individual subject of public relations constitute a single whole.

Based on this, the very possibility of opposing the common good and private interest is denied. On the one hand, the common good is decomposed into the sum of private interests, which gives reason to assert that public interests are protected by law to the extent that they can ensure individuals' well-being. On the other hand, private interests find support in law and protection only when their pursuit is consistent with the common good.

The state very often has to intervene in people's individual lives, guided by a special understanding of the public good [51]. However, if the dominating state uses its power to oppress individuals instead of caring for their well-being of individuals, then it deviates from its goal and violates its duties.

There can be no doubt that the state can and is even obliged to limit, i.e., introduce into certain limits individual freedom and, in this sense, sacrifice individual interests to the public. In this case, the problem of establishing the boundaries of the state's requirements in relation to the individual in the interests of the "common good" arises.

Since the issues of the balance of interests are decided by the legislator, expressing public interests, they initially prevail over private ones in the sense that they serve as a criterion for establishing the limits of the realization of private interests and thus as criteria for their legality.

Suppose, in the name of the common good, it is permissible to resort to immoral means. In that case, it is not because the good of the state is a necessary end, but only because of the consideration that the good achieved by immoral means outweighs the evil caused by them. Machiavelli's rule applies here that of two evils, one should choose the lesser. Immoral means are always evil and remain evil even when they are taken in the name of the common good, but this evil is not so great as the disastrous consequences of a policy that, for moral reasons, does not decide to resort to the means necessary to save the state, which is a necessary assumption of the most vital interests of the people.

There is no unambiguously defined concept of the common good that would suit everyone. This is connected not only with the fact that some individuals have aspirations that do not coincide with the common good, but first of all with the fundamental point that different individuals and groups put different content into the concept of the common good.

In this case, a legal compromise is achieved not by renouncing differences in private interests, wills, etc., not by subordinating some private interests to other private interests or all private interests and wills to some special interest or special will of society and the state, but through the participation of all these private interests and wills in the formation of that general legal norm (i.e., really the general will and common interests of all bearers of private interests and wills), which, with its permissions and prohibitions, expresses an equal measure of freedom and justice for all. The understanding of the common good should be worked out concretely each time, and the maximum possible harmonization of the interests of all individuals should be carried out.

The main criterion for establishing the limits for satisfying the interests of a particular person is the interests of other persons, including public and state ones. The basis for overcoming conflicts of interests of all subjects should be based on the fundamental principle: the state, represented by law-making bodies, should strive to ensure that the observance of public interests is beneficial to each carrier of private interest. At the same time, it is important to limit the manifestation of subjective interests that do not correspond to the interests of society and the state to achieve their awareness by the carriers of private interest.

4.1 Solidarism in Western Europe

Solidarism went through several stages in its development, and in each of them, it acted in a different capacity: in France, socio-economic aspects came to the fore. In England – legal; in Italy and Germany – political; in Ukraine – philosophical and metaphysical [31].

Understanding the states of social solidarity and attempts to conceptualize them in the format of political ideology go back to the philosophy of German romanticism: solidarism, like many other philosophical and aesthetic phenomena of Modernism, appeared as a reaction to disappointment in the liberalism and values of the French Revolution of 1789 [44]. As an alternative to the bourgeois system, the idea of a corporate estate brotherhood was put forward, appealing to the medieval estate society. Adam-Heinrich Müller compared the state to a "family of families," in which the estates correspond to the elements of the family structure (it is in this context that the image of the

"nation-family" is born). The state should have the right to intervene in social and economic life to protect citizens and estates, while corporations – bodies of estate-professional self-government should become a buffer between the state and the citizen. A special role was assigned to the church as the highest moral authority. It is from this source that Christian socialism and Christian democratic ideologies originate. Karl Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* called this type of corporatism "feudal socialism."

But in full voice, solidarism declared itself in France, where at the beginning of the 20th century, for some time, it was even considered the official ideology of the Third Republic (1870-1940) and was called upon to neutralize social antagonism and the class struggle that threatened the existence of the state. There he was understood, first of all, as a political economy or a purely economic doctrine [11].

It is noteworthy that the very word "solidarism" was introduced into wide circulation in the 1840s by the French utopian philosopher, author of the doctrine of Christian socialism, and follower of Saint-Simon Pierre Leroux (1797-1871) (he also owns the term "socialism"). However, in France, solidarism remained a predominantly utilitarian-economic doctrine that received neither a political platform nor a philosophical justification. Moreover, most of its ideologists were "progressives" – atheists, fighters against religion, and non-religious Freemasons [4].

In Germany, solidarist ideas began to actively develop after the defeat in the First World War – in a Catholic environment, in the context of the philosophy of neo-Thomism. The most prominent representatives of the current – Heinrich Pesch and Gustav Gundlach – belonged to the Jesuit order. They rejected the then popular ideas of a "global organism" or "world ontological unity" as a manifestation of pantheism, leading to totalitarianism and having nothing to do with solidarism [24]. Real solidarism and solidary coexistence are possible only in the context of an organic understanding of society. Heinrich Pesch called solidarism a social system "which gives a genuine meaning to the solidarity association of people, such as members of a natural community, from families to the state" [11].

Later, Cardinal Josef Höffner, the author of the treatise "Christian Social Doctrine" (1962), a milestone for the Catholic Church, declared solidarism a synonym for the phrase "Christian social teaching" and called the three most essential principles of social organization solidarity, the common good, and subsidiarity [44].

With certain assumptions, one can speak of solidarity motives about the ideology of Italian, Spanish, and German corporatism (fascism and national socialism) of the 1920s and 1930s [19]. The ideas of the corporate state and the concept of mechanical solidarity were used in these ideological currents to legitimize the Hitlerite, Francoist, and Mussolini regimes and the corresponding totalitarian discourse of the dissolution of the individual in the "common cause."

In post-war West Germany, during the implementation of the so-called "Marshall Plan," it was precisely solidarism ("third way," "ordoliberalism") that became the ideology of the country's economic revival [4]. Solidarity concepts and ideology were seen as a motor for the revival of society and the economy: market freedom was combined with strict state regulation established by the state, while the economic model must necessarily be based on moral foundations. In modern Western Europe, solidarist ideas are noticeable in the ideology of Swedish socialism, Labor (labor), and Christian Democratic parties [31].

4.2 New Solidarity in Modern Times

At the current stage of existence, solidarism looks like a "fragmented" ideology, like a set of concepts scattered and developed within the framework of various ideological systems [2]. Nevertheless, solidarism in an updated and scientifically

reflected form has the opportunity to become in demand in the conditions of the 21st-century system of values, ideas, and models of social reality. The relevance of the ideology of solidarism and ideologemes, which are based on the problems of social solidarity, in the XXI century has increased for two reasons. First, under the new conditions, the potential social subjectivity of the individual and the importance of human capital increase. And secondly, in place of vertically oriented social ties come network ones, in which there is no strict subordination between participants.

As a participant in social relations in the information society, a single person gets more and more opportunities to implement their project for an "asymmetric" influence on society and the state [7]. At the same time, the functions of the state and its significance as a unique organizer of social life are being rethought. Corporations, independent public organizations, and society as a whole are gaining more and more subjectivity, and the institutions of coercion are being transformed. The new social dynamics require an update of analytical tools and a reformulation of the values of the subjects involved in designing and modeling the future. It seems that within the framework of the ideology and political philosophy of solidarism, despite its relatively low theoretical elaboration, answers can be formulated to many questions and challenges of the present time, to which other ideologies do not have convincing answers [4].

5 Conclusion

The common good expresses the objectively necessary general conditions for the possible joint existence and coordinated coexistence of all members of a given community as free and equal subjects, and thus, at the same time, the general conditions for expressing and protecting the welfare of everyone. In this concept, the common good is not separated and opposed to the good of everyone. On the contrary, historical experience and theory testify that only this type of organization of the community of people and the coordination of the interests of the community and its members, the whole and the part, the private and the public, individuals and authorities, is compatible with the freedoms and rights of people, with recognition of the dignity and value of the human person. The true bearers of the common good are initially and permanently the members of this community themselves (each individually and all together), organizing the appropriate state-legal forms of their lives based on equality, freedom, and justice.

Solidarism can become an acceptable ideology for saving the state from social upheavals. Analyzing more than two decades of history, we can conclude that the ideological solidarity alternative was not in full demand. As of today, solidarism in both the narrow and broad sense and neo-solidarism can be defined as a "fragmentary" ideology. Solidarism has no prospects of becoming a "complete" ideology in an era in which the discussion is either about the "death of ideologies" or about the "universal ideological mix." However, to give answers to the most critical challenges of the time, which is not possible either within the framework of "full" or within the framework of new "fragmentary" ideologies, as well as to take part in the modern competition of ideas and political projects, solidarism is quite capable.

In modern society, the order and stability of the entire social system can be ensured, among other things, by the actualization of the solidarity strategy in the activities of various social actors. And suppose solidarity as a project of social order in the context of the conflicting interests of modern society is possible only in the distant future. In that case, solidarism as an orienting feature and a specific vector of a social movement can become a constitutive beginning already at the present time.

Literature:

1. Akimova, L., & Liakhovich, O. (2017). State regulation of foreign economic activity. *Scientific Bulletin of Polissia*, 4(12), P. 1, 98-103. DOI: 10.25140/2410-9576-2017-1-4(12)-98-103.

2. Allen, K. (2022). An anarchical society (of fascist states): Theorising illiberal solidarism. *Review of International Studies*, 48(3), 583-603. DOI: 10.1017/S026210521000437.
3. Amitav, A., & Buzan, B. (2019). *The Making of Global International Relations: Origins and Evolution of IR at its Centenary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bain, W. (2021). Pluralism and Solidarism. In: Navari, C. (Eds.) *International Society. Trends in European IR Theory*. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56055-3_7.
5. Bashtannyk, A., Kveliashvili, I., Yevdokymov, V., Kotviakovskiy, Y., & Akimov, O. (2021). Legal bases and features of public administration in the budget sphere in Ukraine and foreign countries. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 1(1), XVIII, 63-68.
6. Bashtannyk, V., Kondratska, N., & Fedyna, C. (2020). Formation of the system of financial-information support of environmentally-oriented management of the enterprise. *Financial and credit activity: problems of theory and practice*, 32(1), 434-443. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V1I32.200606.
7. Bettina, A. (2017). The Solidarisation of International Society: The EU in the Global Climate Change Regime. GLOBUS Research Paper, 5. Available at: <http://www.globus.uio.no/publications/globus-research-papers/>.
8. Bezus, P., Gavkalova, N., Mashchenko, M., Grudtsyna, Y., Bazko, A., Moiseyeva, L. (2022) Project management as a technology for optimizing resources in terms of reforming socio-economic relations: the experience of the EU. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 67-72.
9. Bilan, S., Yurchyk, H., & Navickas, M. (2020). Impact of the shadow economy on social safety: The experience of Ukraine. *Economics and Sociology*, 13(2), 289-303. DOI: 10.14254/2071-789X.2020/13-2/19.
10. Bobrovska O., Lysachok A., Kravchenko T., & Akimov O. (2021). The current state of investment security in Ukraine in the context of covid-19 and its impact on the financial and economic situation of the state. *Collection of scientific papers Financial and Credit Activity-Problems of Theory and Practice*, 1(36), 233-242. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V1I36.227770.
11. Boesso, G., Cerbioni, F., Kumar, K., & Redigolo, G. (2022). Determinism vs. solidarism: the philanthropic approach of foundations. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 16(3), 317-336.
12. Brunkhorst, H. (2005). *Solidarity: From civic friendship to a global legal community*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
13. Chang, S., & Gupta, S. K. (2021). Scenario Analysis of the Expected Integral Economic Effect from an Innovative Project. *Marketing and Management of Innovations* 3, 237-251. DOI: 10.21272/mmi.2021.3-20.
14. Denysov, O., Litvin, N., Yegorova-Gudkova, T., & Akimov, O. (2021) Management of state financial policy in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(2), XX, 52-57.
15. Dworkin, R. (2000). *Sovereign virtue*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
16. Filippova, V., Kovalska, N., Yevmieshkina, O., Lohachov, D., Stelmashenko, Y., & Karpa, M. (2022) Local development of alternative energy in the conditions of globalization as a factor of reducing risks and modernizing the economy of the country. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 53-59.
17. Gavkalova, N., Zilinska, A., Lukashev, S., & Avedyan, L. (2022). Functioning of united territorial communities and identification of main problems of organizational support of local budget management. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(43), 107-117. DOI: 10.55643/fcaptop.2.43.2022.3708.
18. Goncharuk, N., Zayats, D., Ragimov, F., Boiko, N., & Karpa, M. (2022) Humanization of public administration in the conditions of transformation processes: European experience for Ukraine. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 60-66.
19. Gooding-Williams, R. (2009). *In the shadow of Du Bois: Afro-modern political thought in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
20. Guzonova, V., Jakúbek, P., Rudenko, O., Shestakovska, T., & Ovrnets, V. (2022) An analytical look at the management of public universities in the Slovak Republic and Ukraine. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 33-40.
21. Hurka, T. (1993). *Perfectionism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
22. Karpa, M., Serohina, N., Oleshko, O., & Lipovska, N. (2021). Public administration as a systemic phenomenon in society. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(1), XV, 56-62.
23. Knudsen Brems, T. (2019). Fundamental Institutions and International Organizations: Theorizing Continuity and Change. In *International Organization in the Anarchical Society: The Institutional Structure of World Order*. In Tonny Brems Knudsen and Cornelia Navari (Eds.), 23-50. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
24. Koslowski, P. (2000). Solidarism, Capitalism, and Economic Ethics in Heinrich Pesch. The Theory of Capitalism in the German Economic Tradition. *Studies in Economic Ethics and Philosophy*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-04084-3_10.
25. Kostiukevych, R., Bilan, Y., Mishchuk, H., Sulowska, J. & Kostiukevych, A. (2020). Possibilities of Integration of Strategic and Project Management in The Supporting System of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses at Local and Regional Levels. Proceedings of the 35th International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA), ISBN: 978-0-9998551-4-0, 1-12 April 2020, Seville, Spain, p. 9253-9265.
26. Kostiukevych, R., Mishchuk, H., Zhidobekkyzy, A., & Nakonieczny, J., (2020). The impact of European integration processes on the investment potential and institutional maturity of rural communities. *Economics and Sociology*, 13(3), 46-63. DOI: 10.14254/2071-789X.2020/13-3/3.
27. Koval, Y., & Dmitrenko, V. (2020). Improvement of the methodological approach to assessing the impact of public governance on ensuring the economic security of the state. *Financial and Credit Activity-Problems of Theory and Practice*, 4(35), 180-190. DOI: 10.18371/fcaptop.v4i35.221969.
28. Kryshtanovych, M., Gavkalova, N., & Shulga, A. (2022) Modern Technologies for Ensuring Economic Security in the Context of Achieving High Efficiency of Public Administration. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*. Vol. 22, No. 2, 362-368. DOI: 10.22937/IJCSNS.2022.22.2.42.
29. Lappo, V., Soichuk, R., & Akimova, L. (2022) Digital technologies of support the spiritual development of students. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 2022, Vol 88, No2. 103-114. DOI: 10.33407/itlt.v88i2.3403.
30. Laptev, S., Parashchenko, L., Koval, Ya., Odarchyk, K., & Panchenko, O. (2021). The impact of the covid-19 pandemic on the loyalty of employees. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(1), XVII, 38-41.
31. Lechtape, H. (1922). *Der christliche Solidarismus - nach H. Pesch dargestellt*. Freiburg i. Br. (Herder), 2nd ed.
32. Levytska, S., Zaiachkivska, O., Karpa, M., & Gupta, S. (2020). Modern analytical instruments for controlling the enterprise financial performance. *Financial and Credit Activity-Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(33), 314-323. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V2I33.206967.
33. Linzalone, R., & Lerro, A. (2014). Between solidarism and business management: assessing management factors for social enterprise: a survey in Italy. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 18(1), 66-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-11-2013-0057>.
34. Liubkina, O., Murovana, T., Magomedova, A., & Siskos, E., (2019). Financial instruments of stimulating innovative activities of enterprises and its improvements. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 4, 336-352. DOI: 10.21272/MMI.2019.4-26.
35. Lola, Yu., Prokopovych, S., Akimov, O., Smalskys, V., & Akimova, L. (2022). Innovative Development of Renewable Energy During The Crisis Period and Its Impact on the Environment. *Virtual Economics*, 5(1), 65-77. [https://doi.org/10.34021/ve.2022.05.01\(4\)](https://doi.org/10.34021/ve.2022.05.01(4)).
36. Marchenko, A., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2021) The current state of ensuring the effectiveness of coordination of anticorruption reform. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(2), XX, 78-83.

37. Metz, K.H. (1999). Solidarity and history. Institutions and social concepts of solidarity in 19th century Western Europe. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity*, 191–207. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1.
38. Mihus, I., Denysenko, M., Rumyk, I., Pletenetska, S., Laptiev, M., & Kupriichuk, V. (2021) Methodology of corporate financial diagnostics in the period of a crisis. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(1), XV, 52-55.
39. Mihus, I., Laptev, S., Zakharov, O., & Gaman, N. (2021). Influence of corporate governance ratings on assessment of non-financial threats to economic security of joint stock companies. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 6(41), 223–237. DOI: 10.18371/fcaptop.v6i4.1.251442.
40. Miller, D., & Taylor, I. (n.d.). Distributive justice and public goods. In S. Olsaretti (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of distributive justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
41. Mishchuk, H., Bilan, S., Yurchyk, H. & Sulowska, J. (2020). Social Protection of Employees as A Tool of Social Responsibility and Increase of Business Efficiency Proceedings of the 35th International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA), ISBN: 978-0-9998551-4-0, 1-12 April 2020, Seville, Spain, p. 9459-9469.
42. Mordvinov, O., Kravchenko, T., Vahonova, O., Bolduev, M., Romaniuk, N., & Akimov, O. (2021). Innovative tools for public management of the development of territorial communities. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(1), XVII, 33-37.
43. Moreau, H. (1930). *De la Solidarité*. Paris, Librairie des Juris-classeurs: Editions Godde.
44. Mueller, Franz H. (1941). *Heinrich Pesch and His Theory of Christian Solidarity*. St. Paul, Minnesota: The College of St. Thomas.
45. Nagel, T. (1987). Moral conflict and political legitimacy. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 16(3), 215–240.
46. Novak, A., Tkachenko, I., Terska, S., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2022) Anti-corruption as a component of state policy. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 79-87.
47. Oliinyk, O., Bilan, Y., Mishchuk, H., & Vasa, L. (2021). The Impact of Migration of Highly Skilled Workers on The Country's Competitiveness and Economic Growth. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 17, 3, 7-19. DOI: 10.14254/1800-5845/2021.17.3.1.
48. Osadcha, O., & Akimov, O. (2018). Improving accounting management via benchmarking technology. *Financial and Credit Activity-Problems of Theory and Practice*, 1(24), 64-70. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V1I24.128340.
49. Pavlov, C., Kupchak, V., & Karpa, M. (2019). The role of accounting in providing sustainable development and national safety of Ukraine. *Financial and credit activity: problems of theory and practice*, 30 (3), 64-70. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V3I30.179501.
50. Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press. DOI: 10.4159/9780674369542.
51. Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (Revised Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
52. Reinska, V. & Karpa, M. (2018). Tax preferences and their influence on the investment in Ukraine. *Financial and Credit Activity-Problems of Theory and Practice*, 3(26), 91-101. DOI: 10.18371/FCAPTP.V3I26.144117.
53. Rudenko, O. Bulba, V. Orobei, V. Polyakova, O. & Kulnich, O. (2021) Project management as a technology for optimizing resources in terms of reforming socio-economic relations. *Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(2), XX, 45-51.
54. Rudenko, O., Mykhailovska, O., Koziura, I., Kolosovska, I., & Kononenko, I. (2022) The latest tools of public administration in the process of solving socioenvironmental problems at the level of local government. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXVII, 181-187.
55. Rumyk, I., Laptev, S., Sehedra, S., & Karpa, M. (2021) Financial support and forecasting of food production using economic description modeling methods. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 5(40), 248–262. DOI: 10.18371/fcaptop.v4i35.245098.
56. Scholz, S. J. (2008). *Political solidarity*. University Park: Penn State University Press.
57. Serohina, T., Pliushch, R., Pobirchenko, N., Shulga, N., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2022) Pedagogical innovations in public administration and legal aspects: the EU experience. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 7-13.
58. Shelby, T. (2002). Foundations of black solidarity: Collective identity or common oppression? *Ethics*, 112(2), 231–266. DOI: 10.1086/340276.
59. Shelby, T. (2005). *We who are dark: The philosophical foundations of black solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. DOI: 10.4159/9780674043527.
60. Sher, G. (1997). *Beyond neutrality: Perfectionism and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511609169.
61. Shestakova, S., Bondar, N., Kravchenko, I., Kuznetcova, M., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2022) Comparative characteristics of social leave: international and foreign experience. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXV, 27-32.
62. Shpektorenko, I., Vasylevska, T., Bashtannyk, A., Piatkivskyi, R., Palamarchuk, T., & Akimov, O. (2021). Legal bases of public administration in the context of European integration of Ukraine: questions of formation of a personnel reserve. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(1), XVIII, 76-81.
63. Slomski, Wojciech (2008) Communication of the organization. *Alta Contemporary Economics*. 2(3), 151-158.
64. Slomski, Wojciech. (2007) Advertisement without Ethical Principles?. *Alta Contemporary Economics*. 1(4), 89-102.
65. Smyrnova, I., Krasivsky, O., Shykerynets, V., Kurovska, I., Hrusheva, A., & Babych, A. (2021). Analysis of The Application of Information and Innovation Experience in The Training of Public Administration Specialists. *IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 21, 3, March 2021, 120-126. DOI: 10.22937/IJCSNS.2021.21.3.16
66. Sukhova, K., Borodin, Y., Tarasenko, T., Komarova, K., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2022) Organizational mechanism of state management of social services in territorial communities. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXVII, 188-192.
67. Sysoieva, I., Poznyakovska, N., Balaziuk, O., Miklukha, O., & Pohrishchuk, B. (2021). Social innovations in the educational space as a driver of economic development of modern society. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 3(38), 538–548. DOI: 10.18371/fcaptop.v3i38.237486.
68. Vahonova, O., Tryfonova, O., Bondar, O., Petrukha, N., Kyrchenko, O., & Akimov, O. (2022) Economic justification for strategic decisions to improve the competitiveness of the enterprise. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 12(1), XXVII, 198-202.
69. Vallentyne, P., Steiner, H., & Otsuka, M. (2005). Why left-libertarianism is not incoherent, indeterminate, or irrelevant: A reply to Fried. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 33(2), 201–215.
70. Venediktov, V., Boiko, V., Kravchenko, I., Tyshchenko, O., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2021) European standards of mediation in civil disputes and their implementation in Ukraine: theory and practice. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(2), XXI, 25-29.
71. Young, I. M. (1997). *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
72. Zapara, S., Pronina, O., Lohvynenko, M., Akimova, L., & Akimov, O. (2021) Legal regulation of the land market: European experience and Ukrainian realities. *Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research*, 11(2), XXI, 18-24.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AA, AD, AE