

NGOs' development in Ukraine and Georgia: social and political dimensions¹

Arsen Yatsenko, *University of Wrocław (Wrocław, Poland)*

E-mail: 326168@uwr.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6058-0014

Irina Tkeshelashvili, *University of Opole (Opole, Poland)*

E-mail: itkesh@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2847-3876

Ihor Hurak, *Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
(Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine)*

E-mail: ihor.hurak@pnu.edu.ua

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8610-4024

Abstract

The article's aim is to analyse the role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and their crucial ability of activeness under critical circumstances such as the transformation of a state. Starting in the 1990s, the studies were mainly focused on NGOs' role as development actors in social and institutional formations. New research makes particular accents on their role in political and social discourses both in Georgia and Ukraine, which enriches the science with new empirical material related to the involvement of civil society organisations (CSOs) in the state progress and legislation processes.

This article is an attempt to provide an argument for moving forward research on NGOs/CSOs within political science and international relations via comparing the institutional involvement of NGOs in two development-oriented countries – Georgia and Ukraine.

¹ The article was prepared and published in the framework of the project *Bridges of scientific cooperation* (pl. *Mosty współpracy naukowej*), which was carried out within the post-scholarship activities of the Alumni of the *Lane Kirkland Scholarship Program* administered by the Leaders of Change Foundation and financed by the Polish-American Freedom Foundation.

The opinions expressed in this article are the authors' own opinions, which do not represent in any manner this journal, the University of Warsaw, Leaders of Change Foundation, or Polish-American Freedom Foundation. The conclusions and assessments in this article are based on the knowledge, research, and experience of the authors.

Keywords: non-governmental organisations (NGOs), civil society organisations (CSOs), Georgia, Ukraine, European Union (EU), Eastern Partnership

Rozwój organizacji pozarządowych w Ukrainie i w Gruzji: wymiar społeczny i polityczny

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest analiza roli organizacji pozarządowych (NGOs) oraz ocena ich zdolności do działania w krytycznych okolicznościach, takich jak transformacja państwa. Od lat 90. ubiegłego wieku badania koncentrowały się głównie na roli organizacji pozarządowych jako aktorów rozwoju w formacjach społecznych i instytucjonalnych. Niniejsze badanie kładzie szczególny nacisk na rolę organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego w dyskursie politycznym i medialnym zarówno w Gruzji, jak i na Ukrainie, wzbogacając naukę o nowy materiał empiryczny związany z zaangażowaniem takich organizacji w procesy legislacyjne oraz w rozwój państwa.

Artykuł stanowi próbę przedstawienia argumentu za rozwojem badań nad organizacjami pozarządowymi w ramach politologii i stosunków międzynarodowych poprzez porównanie zaangażowania instytucjonalnego tych organizacji w dwóch krajach nastawionych na rozwój – w Gruzji i Ukrainie.

Słowa kluczowe: organizacje pozarządowe (NGOs), organizacje społeczeństwa obywatelskiego (CSOs), Gruzja, Ukraina, Unia Europejska (UE), Partnerstwo Wschodnie

In December 2019 current High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Josep Borrell speaking on climate change stressed: "... whatever we do, whatever we are able to perform on, facing this problem, will be much more effective if we work together, the administrations and the civil society. The civil servants and ordinary people who are engaging through the work of the NGOs all over the world, by many ways enabling access to information, supporting land governance (*EU-NGO Human Rights Forum* 2019). This way, Josep Borrell explicitly underscored the extraordinary relevance of civil society organisations in contemporary European society at one of his first public appearances in his new position. Such statements are natural given the critical role that NGOs play in the lives of the world's major Western countries. Furthermore, it should be highlighted how important the actions of all forms of public associations are for countries aspiring to join a united Europe. This is particularly true in the case of Georgia and Ukraine, which are parts of the Eastern Partnership. At the same time, there is a clear pattern that the intensification of democratisation and reform of Georgian and Ukrainian societies coincide with the intensification of non-governmental organisations' activities in these countries.

The aim of this article is to analyse the peculiarities of the development of non-governmental organisations in Georgia and Ukraine with an emphasis on the social and political spheres. In order to achieve this goal, the following research questions were formulated: (1) which grounds for the development of non-governmental organisations were in Georgia and Ukraine in the post-bipolar era? (2) what are the primary areas of work and accomplishments of Georgian and Ukrainian civic organisations at the present stage?

Methodology

The purpose of using discourse analysis is to identify the role of NGOs in social and political discourses during state transformation. According to Phillips and Hardy: "without discourse, there is no social reality, and without understanding discourse, we cannot understand our reality, our experiences, or ourselves" (Phillips, Hardy 2002: p. 2). Therefore, the usage of discourse analysis as a research methodology has great potential during examining the processes of NGO participation in social processes.

The application of comparative analysis as second research method is an attempt to demonstrate the similarities and differences of participation and involvement of the NGOs in two post-soviet states and show their role in social and legislative processes. In this article the elements of institutional analyses are also used, in order to study the NGOs' involvement in legislative processes on different administrative levels of the state.

Terminology and definitions used in the research

According to the World Bank's publication *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development* (1991), the term *non-governmental organisations (NGOs)* was defined as a "residual category – organizations that are neither governmental nor for-profit" – in fact, a wide range of organizations can be classified. "NGOs can be large, highly visible organizations with long histories – the Catholic Church, Oxford University, the International Red Cross. NGOs can also be small neighborhood groups formed for community self-help, social, or charitable activities – village sports clubs, labor sharing groups, rotating credit groups" (Korten 1991: p. 20). In this article the second scope of NGOs will be analysed.

The European Institute of Gender Equality defines *non-profit organisations* as "voluntary citizens' groups, principally independent from government, which are organised on a local, national or international level to address issues in support of the public good" (EIGE WWW; see also: Council of Europe 2007). Helmut K. Anheier in his famous book *Nonprofit Organizations: Theory, Management, Policy* (2006, 2014) indicated the full range of these organisations: "service providers, membership organizations, foundations, community groups – in different fields, such as arts and culture, social services and education" (Anheier 2014b; see also: Anheier, Toepler 2019). Another, wider term defined such organisations is *CSOs – civil society organisations* (see more: Anheier 2014a; Anheier et al. 2019).

In current usage, a *community* is defined as an assembly of people who share common objectives, goals, and forms. But „community" should be clear. Its pronunciation explains its essence, which is conditioned by „commonality", „belonging" and „unity" (Barrett 2010: p. 117). In the social sector, it is widely used as a symbol of good intentions. According to the United Nations Report from 12 May 1957: "Community development aims at increased and better participation of the people in community affairs, revitalization of existing forms of local government and transition towards effective local administration where it is not yet functioning" (United Nations 1957: art. 2.d, p. 92).

As it was stated in the above-mentioned report of the United Nations related to the concepts and principles of community development: "Activities undertaken must correspond to the basic needs of the community; the first projects should be initiated in response to the expressed needs of the people" (United Nations 1957: art. 2.a, p. 92).

The relationship between NGOs, local communities, and the state varies depending on the institution's relationship with the state. While the article mentions local community-based NGOs, there is also a "spectrum of government-sponsored NGOs", which are referred to as „governmental nongovernmental organizations (GONGOs)" because they are led by government officials or family members (Korten 1991: p. 30). This article considers NGOs/CSOs founded by individuals and local community representatives, not GONGOs.

Social change is a transformation that occurs throughout the community's life. In other words, only those changes that may be felt on a community level are considered as social changes. Social change is a social process (Shankar 2008: p. 473). It is a shared space bound by values. The common beliefs draw people to the community. Members of the community are identified by the following issues: „Who am I? What do I do?" Shared values and identity influence community members in various ways. Being a part of the community entails caring for its members and maintaining its values. „Moral codes" shape communities. Restrictions, boundaries, and norms are set up to enforce the community's ideals and shared identity.

In this circumstance, "NGOs mobilize communities to be self-reliant." It helps communities realise their potential and use their own resources (Nikkhah, Redzuan 2010: p. 85). It benefits the World Bank because of NGOs' „experience in identifying community needs and promoting community participation" (Paul 1991: p. 9). According to the UN Social Commission's report: "To be fully effective, communities' self-help systems require both intensive and extensive assistance by the government" (United Nations 1957: art. 2.g, p. 92).

Decentralised society have a central node where all relationships converge (see: *Decentralized and Centralized Societies W/W*). This core node allows its connections to create subgroups by becoming small centers of gravity. Subgroups are usually not connected to each other and are only linked by a single central node. Unlike centralised communities, distributed communities (Cianciolo, Evans 2013) rely on a network of relationships to connect each node. In this scenario, there is no central authority or control. In theory, each node is a co-owner of the group, able to configure it jointly. There are numerous distinct types of communities. A community of actions and circumstances (Millington 2018) is one of them. It is a group for people who want to make a difference in their lives, dedicated to changing the nature of support or providing unique and long-term assistance to people in similar situations.

Community work is primarily concerned with influencing the direction of social change by evaluating social problems and building relationships with diverse groups in order to effect the desired change. It has three primary goals: the first is to involve people in thinking, planning, and actively participating in the development and operation

of services that affect their daily lives; the second is to emphasise the value of belonging to the community for personal fulfillment; and the third is to emphasise the importance in community planning of considering people's needs as individuals, rather than focusing on a group (Winwood 1977: p. 5).

Prerequisites for the formation of NGOs and civil society in Ukraine, their impact on the social and political sphere

The twentieth century saw a renewal of Ukraine's statehood concept and the establishment of civil society. National liberation movement activists attempted to make sense of the emerging political realities in Ukraine, Russia, and Europe. Their theoretical work was based on the concepts of T. Shevchenko, M. Kostomarov, I. Franko, M. Drahomanov, and B. Kistyakivsky. The diversity of theoretical inquiry in Ukrainian political and legal thought stems from the exceptional complexity of political and geopolitical development brought about by the First World War, Eastern European revolutions, and the emergence of totalitarian governments in Russia and Germany.

The ideologist of the „Ukrainian cause” was Mykhailo Hrushevsky, the leader of the early twentieth-century national liberation movement, who stated: «They appeared to be on the verge of national annihilation. However, the masses discovered the limitless potential of revival inside themselves, and the same eighteenth century that saw the greatest decline of the Ukrainian people following the previous rise laid the groundwork for the resurrection» (qtd. in: Bondarenko 2017: p. 58).

Each public organisation and institution of civil society cannot simultaneously pursue their own specific goals that contribute to the development and formation of civil society, even if they are more focused on specific aspects of society.

In Ukraine, civic society organisations began operating before the collapse of the USSR. Between 1985 and 1989, the sociopolitical movement was primarily concerned with criticising the existing Soviet system and with reviving Ukrainian history and culture through its actions. The movement, which subsequently evolved CSOs in other parts of the country, was mostly led by former dissidents who convened meetings to discuss current issues.

As an example from Central Ukraine, the first independent CSO in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was the Ukrainian Cultural Club (Bazhan 2019).

Restoring the knowledge of historical reality became the primary objective of the Ukrainian Cultural Club, which was founded in August 1987 in Kyiv on the initiative of former dissident S. Nabotsi and artist V. Halynovsky, among others.

Criticising the existing Soviet system and the central leadership's national policy, the UCC's members also discussed the history of Ukrainian statehood, elucidating the nature of the national liberation movement of 1917–1920, the causes and consequences of Stalinist repressions in Ukraine, and a variety of other contentious and taboo subjects. The UCC's open presentation of information to the public enabled the sad truth about the Holodomor of 1932–1933 to be uncovered.

Simultaneously, in Western Ukraine, in Lviv, the cultural and educational „Lev Society” and a Youth Debate Club were created. They discussed issues of national history, literature, and economics (Hnatiuk 2001).

In early 1988, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHS) resumed its activities, which had grown to over 1.5 thousand members by 1990. The UHS proclaimed the imperative of establishing an independent Ukraine and safeguarding individual civil rights. (Zinkevych 1993).

Taking into account the importance of the Ukrainian language for civil society, the *Ukrainian Language Association named after I. T. G. Shevchenko* was founded in February 1989, which was renamed as the *All-Ukrainian Association „Prosvita” named after T. G. Shevchenko* after the collapse of the USSR. Therefore, the CSOs in Ukraine made a great step forward in amplifying the civil society and opening the new dimension of civic activism for the values of the entire country.

In XXI century, the development of social capital in Ukraine has been unprecedented, a trend that can be traced back to the Euromaidan protests, in which civil society groups, volunteer projects, and ordinary citizens played a crucial role (in contrast to political parties).

The participation in civil society has increased in recent years, and since 2014, for the first time since independence, the level of confidence in civil society has exceeded the level of mistrust. As a result of Euromaidan and its aftermath, an increased number of residents have expressed a desire to be committed to voluntary activities. Despite the fact that only around 10% of officially registered Ukrainian NGOs function continuously and are funded by foreign donors or partners, their societal and policy influence has expanded. Civil society has increased the awareness of its role in the reform process and bolstered its lobbying efforts by forming networks and NGOs' coalitions, collaborating closely with international non-governmental organisations that support Ukraine's reform process, and exerting increased pressure on government officials (see more: Bertelsmann Stiftung 2020).

The changes that have taken place since Euromaidan are unprecedented in the history of independent Ukraine. The changes have been achieved in some areas as a result of the combination of pressure from civil society and international actors. Reforms² were especially successful, when new institutions³ were established rather than old institutions being reformed. Anti-corruption agencies, the electronic public procurement scheme ProZorro, and electronic asset declarations, as well as modern directorates in central executive authorities, are only few examples.

Civil society played a significant role in promoting change and applying pressure to authorities. Civil society representatives were included not only in numerous dialogue groups and advisory bodies with the authorities, but also in the selection of state sec-

² See more in publication: *Lessons from the Ukrainian Transition: Reform, Driving Forces in a Captured State* (CASE-Ukraine 2005).

³ See more in Chapter 02 *Institutional reform: successes and failures* in the research paper *Cultural Revival and Social Transformation in Ukraine* (Pesenti 2020).

retaries, staff for new ministerial reform agencies, and judges during civil service and judiciary reforms, not least due to the conditions imposed by foreign actors.

However, talking about the general state of community development, which determines public order, the prerogative of creating and promoting new initiatives, encouraging society to unite, Ukraine, among other countries in Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus, also maintains a stable level (Freedom House 2021).

Civil society organisations and communities development in Georgia

Georgian civil society began in the mid-nineteenth century when it took the form of national movements and educational institutions. These movements were part of the national liberation fight after Georgia was annexed around the turn of the century. The *Georgian Society for Promoting Literacy in the Georgian Nation* (see more: Kappeler 2014: p. 231), which is regarded as the country's first civil society organisation, was founded in 1879 by significant public leaders of that period.

In the context of educational associations, which due to Georgian civic society of XIX century was the only long-term strategy to come out of Russian expansion and occupation, should be mentioned numerous prototypes of contemporary CSOs, but the limit of this article does not allow to highlight even dozen of them. As a leading example and pro-western enlightener, founder of CSOs at the end of XIX and beginning of XX centuries both in Georgia and outside was dr Niko Nikoladze⁴ (Avaliani 1955: p. 49-51; Jones 2005: p. 306), who must be mentioned due to his contribution both into economic and social projects, liberal journalism development, influence on the political elite, and especially Georgia's formation as a state. He established many CSOs in Georgia, the Russian empire, and even in Switzerland (see more: CSO Georgia 2019).

Therefore, at the beginning of the XX century Georgian population, the same way as Ukrainian, was educated enough despite pro-Russian provocations and was eagerly willing to escape russification in every sphere of social life, culture, politics. Georgian society tried to advocate for own rights and appealed to the 44-nation, four-month Second International Peace Conference in Hague in 1907 (see more: Scott 1920). Nearly 3000 people (Peace Conference distinguished members) signed the *Memorandum of the Georgian People* informed about the oppression of Georgia by the Russian Empire and demanded autonomy. According to historian Beka Kobakhidze, the number of 3000 at that time was so numerous that today every second Georgian can find his family name among the signatories (see: Gogua 2018).

Following the Soviet conquest of Georgia in 1921 (Tkeshelashvili 2021), civil society took on a new shape and focus. Various industrial unions, sports groups, and authors and artists' unions sprouted up at that time. During the Soviet era, however, civil society

⁴ In 1868, Niko Nikoladze became the first Georgian ever to receive a doctorate from western european university. He defended the dissertation entitled *On the Social and Economic Consequences of Disarmament* at the University of Zurich, Faculty of Law (source: <https://rarebooks.library.nd.edu/exhibits/polievktov/nikoladze.shtml>)

was essentially dormant, because all of these groups and unions were controlled by the Communist Party. Initiatives arose in Georgia in the 1980s, paving the way for modern civil society organisations. In Georgia, the term „civil society” is directly connected with non-governmental organisations.

In Georgia, NGOs became active in the early 90s, and if in the beginning were involved in social work and support of people in the closest cities and regions, a decade later they were directly involved in work with Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) on the ground and quite challenging processes like help to IDPs from Abkhazia or South Ossetia. Quite a time NGOs played more important role than governmental institutions, because in intensive cooperation with INGOs local organisations implemented a huge range of projects helping IDPs to gain the identification documents from the conflict zone (or later from the occupied territories), to deliver food products and warm clothes, as well as to be integrated into a new reality in Georgia.

During 1991–1995, Georgia saw the emergence of modern civic society, which was made up of political groups and social movements, making the communities, with students and youth playing a prominent role. Civil society was based on volunteerism and marked by strong anti-communist beliefs and liberal ideas. However, Georgian civil society was weak due to the civil war and economic turbulence.

CSOs in Georgia began to flourish after international aid at the beginning of the 1990ies. International institutions opened offices in Georgia, offering financial and technical assistance directly to the beneficiaries and providing sub-granting systems to local NGOs and CSOs.

Local NGOs/CSOs' role is vital because they were acting directly in society and local communities, while international agencies did not always have relevant access to the population in rural areas or in high mountain regions. Local NGOs, consisting of citizens of Georgia, who spoke the local languages⁵ were subgranted by INGOs and monitored accordingly, which was important, considering the ethnic diversity of the Georgian population.

Therefore, the absolute majority of international organisations and agencies and INGOs implemented projects with or rather via local NGOs (OCHA Georgia 2004).

Branches of foreign foundations, such as the Open Society Georgia Foundation⁶, were critical in the establishment of CSOs. The number of CSOs grew over time, and they became challenge for the government, which was seen as corrupt and ineffective. For example, in the run-up to the Rose Revolution of 2003 (see: CSCE 2004), a civic youth resistance organisation called *Kmara* was crucial (see: Lomsadze 2003). The political clout of the NGO sector at the time was amply reflected in later events, with a substantial number of former NGO leaders serving in the ministerial cabinet. Many competent CSO employees also migrated to government agencies, resulting in a “brain drain” from the CSOs.

⁵ In Georgia specifics is based as well on the fact that two regions in Western Georgia – Samegrelo and Svaneti, which are neighbouring to Abkhazia region use megrelian and svanuri languages, which differs from the Georgian, though uses the same alphabet. As for the Eastern Georgia – in two regions closer to Armenia and Azerbaijan minorities use Armenian and Azeri languages accordingly.

⁶ See OSGF website – <https://osgf.ge/en>

OSGF was mentioned due to its impactful role in the further development of NGOs. The portal www.csogeorgia.org was created through the partnership of Civil Society Institute and OSGF with the support of *Brot fur die Welt* Fund and the European Union (CSO Georgia W/W).

Considering "brain drain" from NGOs into the governmental sector, financial donors' priorities were moved to funding the new government rather than investing in civil society. For example, USAID kept to follow the same strategy⁷ as after the Rose Revolution – firstly funding was dedicated to NGOs, but after two years – financial aid shifted towards direct support government of Georgia.⁸

After political tensions in 2007 exposed the government's shortcomings, donors' interest in monitoring and advocacy organisations resurfaced, and a new wave of young professionals entered the civil society sector. The anti-Russian, anti-occupation feeling that is strongly shared by the Georgian population once again appeared on the agenda of NGO activism. Taking into consideration the referendum of 2008,⁹ in which 77 percent of the Georgian population voted for integration into NATO (see: NATO Public Diplomacy Division 2013: p. 15), NGOs joined the cooperation process as well. NATO Liaison Office played an essential role in the engagement of interested NGOs into projects and programmes related to defense and security oversight to reinforce „the role of civil society in national security and defense issues" (NATO Liaison Office Georgia W/W).

After the conflict in Abkhazia and later the Russian-Georgian conflict in South Ossetia (Leszczenko 2020), representatives of local NGOs worked on conflict resolution and were involved in reconciliation processes both in the 1990s and after 2008. NGOs were involved as local representatives of INGOs, as well as filled the applications to ECtHR on behalf of the victim's relatives (Council of Europe 2018: p. 2, 7, 8).

Governmental institutions on a regular basis receive information from missions of international organisations like the UN¹⁰, OSCE¹¹, IOM¹², and the EU¹³ to Georgia, as well as from INGOs like Transparency International¹⁴ about the positive results of their cooperation with local NGOs. Active involvement and efficient collaboration ensured deep transformation of the state structures representatives towards a solution-oriented mechanism of cooperation with NGOs. In 2012 was established a tradition of the annual meeting of the Parliament of Georgia and the civil society organisations (*Open Parliament Georgia Action Plan 2015–2016*: p. 39).

⁷ See: *Country Development Cooperation Strategy, July 11, 2012 – December 31, 2020* (USAID Georgia 2020).

⁸ See more on website <https://www.usaid.gov/georgia>

⁹ Decree of the President of Georgia on the appointment of a plebiscite, 23 XI 2007, document number 657, paragraph "b", Legislative Herald of Georgia, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/96046?publication=0> (28.11.2007).

¹⁰ See: United Nations Georgia website – <https://georgia.un.org/>

¹¹ OSCE Mission to Georgia till 2009 due to expiry of its mandate at the end of 2008 – <https://www.osce.org/georgia-closed/43383>

¹² International Organization for Migration Mission to Georgia – <https://georgia.iom.int/>

¹³ Delegation of the European Union to Georgia – https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/georgia_en

¹⁴ Transparency International Georgia – <https://www.transparency.ge/en/content/mission>

Therefore, the Parliament of Georgia included CSOs into the legislative processes by admitting them the participation and attendance at committee hearings, by the rules of procedure of the Parliament of Georgia, which prepared the *State Concept of Development of Public Organisations*.

The *Memorandum of Cooperation between the Parliament of Georgia and Civil Society Organizations* was signed in the Parliament of Georgia in Kutaisi in 2013 (Parliament of Georgia 2013). The memorandum is an open document allowing any CSO to join it based on the agreement on the content. Later, the parliament of Georgia developed the action plan of cooperation with CSOs and citizens' involvement in legislation processes (see: *Open Parliament Georgia Action Plan 2015–2016*). Any NGO/CSO that join the CSOs database declared to support the Integration of Georgia into European and Euro-Atlantic structures (see: *Declaration... WWF*: art. 15). The annual meeting tradition is kept (Fileeva 2018), and taking into consideration the dissonance within Georgian parliament between the ruling party and the opposition, separately were held the meetings between the opposition party representatives and the NGOs and INGOs representatives respectively (see: *Meeting of opposition MPs...* 2019).

As well as the Ukrainian parliament¹⁵, the Georgian national parliament is actively involved in Open Government Initiative,¹⁶ within which local and international NGOs participate in legislation processes and prepare recommendations, as well as provide an evaluation of the *Action plan* activities implemented by the national parliament (Fileeva 2018). The proactive approach and openness of the Georgian parliament were admitted, and "for instance, the Inter-Factional Working Group of the Parliament of Georgia was recognized with the first Open Government Champion Award at the OGP Summit in Mexico City for its collaboration with civil society in the development of an open parliament plan" (Open Government Partnership 2016: p. 26).

According to the rules of procedures of Georgia, the statute of the Permanent Parliamentary Council of Open Government defines the powers of the Council, its rules of procedure, organisational issues of its work, issues related to cooperation of the Council with civil society representatives, issues of organising annual meetings of Parliament and non-governmental organisations (Parliament of Georgia 2018: art. 77)

Following the report of the Georgian Parliament in 2020 and respective 2021 Action Plan, CSOs prepared alternative thematic reports to discuss in relevant committees of the parliament in order to strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation (Parliament of Georgia 2021: p. 27, 70, 77). Therefore, cooperation ties between the Georgian parliament and CSOs are developing. Taking into account the dynamics of CSOs' direct involvement in cooperation with governmental institutions we can conclude that their recommendations based on their expertise are making a significant impact and improving cooperation between the civic society, legislative institutions of the state, and the EU institutions.

¹⁵ Ukraine is a member of the Open Government Partnership since 2011 (<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/ukraine/>)

¹⁶ Georgia is a member of the Open Government Partnership since 2011 (<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/georgia/>)

When it comes to the variety of field NGOs that are active in Georgia, it is worth mentioning the following directions: support of internally displaced persons (IDPs), anti-corruption activities, and youthwork. Although currently most actual fields of activism are human rights, involvement of active society into judicial reforms, and democratisation in general, which entails activation of all NGOs on multiple levels, confirming through own activities readiness to follow integration of Georgia towards the EU and NATO, while the government of Georgia received the biggest amount of remarks from its Western allies and the EU.

Youth NGOs are well structured under the umbrella organisation, which on behalf of the Georgian youth communicates with the Council of Europe and Association of Local Democracy Agencies. Leaders of youth organisations, taking into account the experience of participating in the EU programmes, are quickly moving to governmental structures as a source of personnel.

Separately should be mentioned the role of NGOs as „watchdogs”, which are actively monitoring the activities of the Georgian government. For example, “Prime Minister Bidzina Ivanishvili considered the activities of several civil society activists to be “threatening”, which in return was condemned by 46 NGOs in a joint statement on 2 February 2014” (Reisner 2018). NGOs that are operating as “watchdog” institutions are well prepared and aware of government architecture. They represent another target group for the recruitment of government and political personnel.

Conclusions

However, following the most significant socio-political events in Ukraine and Georgia, such as the Revolution of Dignity, and Rose Revolution along with the social and political challenges in Georgia, military conflicts in both countries, societal transformations have breathed new life into the whole non-profit sector in both countries, mobilising it to act together. Over time, the spontaneous communities that arose were institutionalised, and they now operate as regular and influential NGOs daily.

The changes after Euromaidan are unprecedented in independent Ukraine's history. Changes have occurred in several areas and the crucial one for the society development due to the combined efforts of these actors, civil society, and international actors.

NGOs in Georgia represent an impactful segment of the society due to the variety of fields which their work covers and due to the fact that human resources from NGOs drain to governmental structures. NGOs that are involved in legislative processes or keep a “watchdog” function as well represent the source of personnel to the government and even political parties.

The role of NGOs is increasing, taking into consideration their direct involvement in legislation processes in the states, as well as intensive and effective cooperation with the INGOs and international agencies. In Georgia OSCE, NATO, USAID, or the EU structures kept cooperation with the NGOs and with the governmental institutions motivating them to work together.

Considering that after the Rose Revolution in Georgia when NGO representatives came to power, USAID shifted funding from the third sector into direct interactions with the governmental structures, as well as after the Revolution of Dignity in Ukraine, USAID not only intermediated 16 new memorandums of cooperation between NGOs and the Ukrainian government (USAID Ukraine 2017), but as well increased funding of governmental projects, we can assume that during current political transformation processes in both countries funding of NGO sector will be increased as the way of indirect but effective support to the states.

Arsen Yatsenko – MA in management of non-governmental organisations (Institute of Leadership and Management), a PhD student at the Institute of Political Science at the University of Wrocław. He is also a graduate of the *Lane Kirkland Scholarship Program* (2020–2021). Research interests: communities and their influence on politics, activities of non-governmental organisations, cooperation between the civil society and the government.

Arsen Yatsenko – mgr w dziedzinie zarządzania organizacjami pozarządowymi (Instytut Przywództwa i Zarządzania), doktorant w Instytucie Politologii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. Jest absolwentem *Programu Stypendialnego im. Lane'a Kirklanda* (rocznik: 2020–2021). Zainteresowania badawcze: wspólnoty i ich wpływ na politykę, działalność organizacji pozarządowych, współpraca społeczeństwa obywatelskiego z rządem.

Irina Tkeshelashvili – MA in international law, PhD student at the Institute of Political Science and Administration of Opole University. She is also a graduate of the *Lane Kirkland Scholarship Program* (2008–2009). Research interests: external strategic communication of a state, propaganda, integration of Georgia into the EU, foreign policy of a state.

Irina Tkeshelashvili – mgr prawa międzynarodowego, doktorantka w Instytucie Nauk o Polityce i Administracji Uniwersytetu Opolskiego. Jest absolwentką *Programu Stypendialnego im. Lane'a Kirklanda* (rocznik: 2008–2009). Zainteresowania badawcze: zewnętrzna komunikacja strategiczna państwa, propaganda, integracja Gruzji do UE, polityka zagraniczna państwa.

Ihor Hurak – PhD, associate professor at the Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University. In academic year 2020–2021 he was a fellow of the program *Kirkland Research* administered by Leaders of Change Foundation in Poland. Research interests: Ukraine within the foreign policy of Russia, the European Union, the United States, and Poland; Poland, Russia, the European Union, and the United States within the foreign policy of Ukraine; international security in Eastern Europe; integration processes in Europe.

Ihor Hurak – doktor, adiunkt na Przykarpackim Uniwersytecie Narodowym im. Wasyla Stefanyka. Jest absolwentem *Programu Stypendialnego im. Lane'a Kirklanda* w ramach *Kirkland Research* (rocznik: 2020–2021). Zainteresowania naukowe: Ukraina w ramach polityki zagranicznej Rosji, Unii Europejskiej, Stanów Zjednoczonych i Polski; Polska, Rosja, Unia Europejska i Stany Zjednoczone w ramach polityki zagranicznej Ukrainy; bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w Europie Wschodniej; procesy integracyjne w Europie.

➔ References:

- ANHEIER Helmut K. (2014a), *Civil Society Research: Ten Years on*, "Journal of Civil Society", vol. 10(4), <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2014.984973>
- ANHEIER Helmut K. (2014b), *Nonprofit Organizations: Theory, Management, Policy*, London: Routledge.
- ANHEIER Helmut K., LANG Markus, TOEPLER Stefan (2019), *Civil society in times of change: shrinking, changing and expanding spaces and the need for new regulatory approaches*, "Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal", vol. 13 (2019-8). DOI: 10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2019-8
- ANHEIER Helmut K., TOEPLER Stefan (2019), *Policy Neglect: The True Challenge to the Nonprofit Sector*, "Nonprofit Policy Forum", vol. 10, issue 4.
- AVALIANI Sergei (1955), *Ruset-saqartvelos kulturuli urtiertobebis istoriidan XIX saukunis meore nakhevari*, Tbilisi
- BARRETT Stanley R. (2010), *Community: The Career of a Concept*, "Anthropologica", vol. 52, no. 1.
- BAZHAN Oleg (2019), *Ukrainskyy kulturologichnyy klub (UKK)*, in: A. Smoliy et al. (eds), *Entsiklopedia istorii Ukrainy: Ukraina – Ukrainsi*, Kyiv.
- BERTELSMANN STIFTUNG (2020), *Transformation Index (BTI) 2020, Country Report – Ukraine*, Gütersloh, https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2029521/country_report_2020_UKR.pdf (28.12.2021)
- BONDARENKO Natalia O. (2017), *Civil Society in Ukraine: Historical and Legal Aspects of Formation and Development*, "Forum Prava", no. 5. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1189314
- CASE-Ukraine (2005), *Lessons from the Ukrainian Transition: Reform, Driving Forces in a Captured State*, Centre for Social and Economic Research, CASE-Ukraine, https://www.case-research.eu/files/?id_plik=3227 (01.02.2005).
- CIANCIOLO Anna T., EVANS Karen M. (2013), *Distributed Communities of Practice*, in: John D. Lee, Alex Kirlik (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Engineering*, Oxford, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199757183.013.0042
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2007), *Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)17 of the Committee of Ministers to the Member States on gender equality standards and mechanisms*, Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 21 November 2007 at the 1011th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (2018), *Consolidated report on the conflict in Georgia (October 2017 – March 2018)*, SG/Inf (2018)15, <https://rm.coe.int/consolidated-report-on-the-conflict-in-georgia-october-2017-march-2018/16807b81cc> (11.04.2018).
- CSCOE (2004), *Georgia's Rose Revolution*, A Report Prepared by the Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 108th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, <https://www.csce.gov/sites/helsinkicommission.house.gov/files/Report%20on%20Georgia%27s%20Rose%20Revolution.pdf> (11.12.2021).
- CSO GEORGIA (WWW), *About us*, <https://csogeorgia.org/en/about> (13.01.2022).
- CSO GEORGIA (2019), *Niko Nikoladze: Examples of European Life*, <https://csogeorgia.org/ge/post/niko-nikoladze-katsi-romelmats-evropuli-tskhovrebis-bevri-sauketeso-magaliti-sheistsavla> (24.07.2019).
- DECENTRALIZED AND CENTRALIZED SOCIETIES (WWW), Louisiana State University, <https://www.lsu.edu/faculty/fweil/CentralizedSocieties.htm> (15.12.2021)

- DECLARATION of the key principles of Civil Society Organizations of Georgia (WWW), <https://csogeorgia.org/en/declaration> (13.01.2022).
- DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO GEORGIA (WWW), https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/georgia_en (13.01.2022).
- DOUGLAS James (1987), *Political Theories of Nonprofit Organization*, in: *Nonprofit sector: a research handbook*, 1st ed., Yale University Press.
- EIGE (WWW), *non-governmental organisations (NGOs)*, <https://eige.europa.eu/thesaurus/terms/1302> (08.01.2022).
- EU-NGO HUMAN RIGHTS FORUM: speech by the HR/VP Josep Borrell (2019), <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/eu-ngo-human-rights-forum-speech-hrvp-josep-borrell> (03.12.2019).
- FILEEVA Elena (2018), *Assessment on the implementation of the Action Plan for an Open Government in Georgia*, Tbilisi, December 2018, <https://eap-csf.eu/wp-content/uploads/Policy-Paper-Article-42-Georgia.pdf> (31.12.2018).
- FREEDOM HOUSE (2021), *Freedom in the World: Ukraine*, <https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/freedom-world/2021> (12.12.2021).
- GOGUA Giorgi (2018), *Ipove sheni gviri 1907 tsli petitsiashi rusetis tsinaagmdeg*, Radio Freedom, <https://www.radiotavisupleba.ge/a/ipove-sheni-gviri-peticiashi-rusetis-cinaagmdeg/29127639.html> (27.03.2018).
- HNATIUK Ola (2001), *Pozegnanie z imperium. Ukraińskie dyskusje o tożsamości*, Lublin.
- JONES Stephen F. (2005), *Socialism in Georgian Colors: The European Road to Social Democracy 1883-1917*, Harvard University Press.
- KAPPELER Andreas (2014), *The Russian Empire: A Multi-ethnic History*, Routledge.
- KORTEN David C. (1991), *The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations in Development: Changing Patterns and Perspectives*, in: Samuel Paul, Arturo Israel (eds), *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- KORTEN David C., BROWN L. David (1991), *Working More Effectively with Nongovernmental Organizations*, in: Samuel Paul, Arturo Israel (eds), *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- LESZCZENKO Larysa (2020), *Borderyzacja Gruzji jako element trwającej wojny rosyjsko-gruzińskiej*, „Przemiany Ustrojowe”, <http://przemianyustrojowe.pl/eseje/borderyzacja-gruzji-jako-element-trwajacej-wojny-rosyjsko-gruziskiej> (22.08.2020)
- LOMSADZE Giorgi (2003), *Amid controversy, Georgian student protest movement grows*, „EurasiaNet”, <https://www.refworld.org/docid/46a484fdc.html> (10.06.2003).
- MEETING OF OPPOSITION MPs with NGO representatives (2019), <https://parliament.ge/en/media/news/meeting-of-opposition-mps-with-ngo-representatives> (21.09.2019)
- MILLINGTON Richard H. (2018), *The Indispensable Community: Why Some Brand Communities Thrive When Others Perish*, FeverBee.
- NATO Liaison Office Georgia (WWW), https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_81066.htm (13.09.2017).
- NATO Public Diplomacy Division (2013), *Deepening relations with Georgia*, „Backgrounder”, https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/2013530_backgrounder_nato_georgia-eng.pdf (31.12.2013).

- NIKKHAH Hedayat Allah, REDZUAN Ma'rof Bin (2010), *The Role of NGOs in Promoting Empowerment for Sustainable Community Development*, „Journal of Human Ecology”, vol. 30, issue. 2. DOI: 10.1080/09709274.2010.11906276
- OCHA GEORGIA (2004), Humanitarian and Rehabilitation Assistance Programs in Abkhazia in 2003, January 2004, <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/128F9224CD2AC8DA-85256E21005E0882-ocha-geo-20jan.pdf> (20.01.2004).
- OPEN GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP (2016), *Steering Committee meeting papers*, New York City, 19-22 September 2016, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2001/01/Pre-Packet-Papers_SC-meetings_Sept2016.pdf
- OPEN PARLIAMENT GEORGIA ACTION PLAN 2015-2016 (2014), <https://csogeorgia.org/storage/app/uploads/public/5ce/c12/432/5cec12432cf39976201266.pdf> (13.01.2016).
- OSCE/ODIHR (2000), *NGOs in the Caucasus and Central Asia: Development and Co-operation with the OSCE*, Warsaw, <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/2/13991.pdf> (08.01.2022).
- PARLIAMENT OF GEORGIA (2013), The Memorandum of Cooperation between the Parliament of Georgia and Civil Society Organizations, 13 December 2013, Kutaisi, <https://csogeorgia.org/storage/app/uploads/public/5d6/92c/784/5d692c784d7b1133164577.pdf> (13.12.2013).
- PARLIAMENT OF GEORGIA (2018), *Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Georgia*, document number 3875-rs, 06 XII 2018, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/4401423?publication=27> (30.12.2021).
- PARLIAMENT OF GEORGIA (2021), *Activities of the Parliament of Georgia. 2020 Report and 2021 Action Plan*, Tbilisi, https://info.parliament.ge/file/1/BillReviewContent/267996?fbclid=IwAR3w1Log-wHokgyPKRluKsfnUvPvowlCyu-u-VnfdBadEs1G_6zq1foNU_k (30.12.2021)
- PAUL Samuel (1991), *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: An Overview*, in: Samuel Paul, Arturo Israel (eds), *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- PESENTI Marina (2020), *Cultural Revival and Social Transformation in Ukraine*, London.
- PHILLIPS Nelson, HARDY Cynthia (2002), *Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction*, London.
- PRESIDENT OF GEORGIA (2007), Decree of the President of Georgia on the appointment of a plebiscite, 23 XI 2007, document number 657, Legislative Herald of Georgia, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/96046?publication=0> (28.11.2007)
- REANIMATION PACKAGE OF REFORMS (WWW), <https://rpr.org.ua/en/> (23.12.2021)
- REISNER Oliver (2018), *On the specifics of the development of civil society in Georgia*, in: Giga Zedania (ed.), *Modernization in Georgia. Theories, Discourses and Realities*, Bern, Berlin etc.: Peter Lang
- SCOTT James Brown (1920), *The Conference of 1907*, vol I, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington D.C., Oxford University Press, https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/Hague-Peace-Conference_1907-V-1.pdf (09.01.2022)
- SHANKAR Rao C.N. (2008), *Sociology: Principles of Sociology with an Introduction to Social Thoughts*, New Delhi.
- TKESHELASHVILI Irina (2021), *Rosyjska propaganda w przestrzeni informacyjnej Gruzji przed i po konfliktach w sierpniu 2008 roku*, „Wschodnioznawstwo”, vol. 15, DOI: 10.4467/20827695wsc.21.003.14710

- TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL GEORGIA (2010), *Mission*, <https://www.transparency.ge/en/content/mission> (10.01.2010)
- UNITED NATIONS (1957), Report „*Concepts and principles of community development and recommendations on further practical measures to be taken by international organizations*, 12 March 1957, Economic and Social Council, Social Commission (11th edition), Athens Center of Ekistics, vol. 4, no. 26, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43613175>
- USAID (WWW), Georgia, <https://www.usaid.gov/georgia> (13.01.2022).
- USAID GEORGIA (2020), *Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), July 11, 2012 – December 31, 2020*, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1863/CDCS_Georgia_Dec_2020.pdf (13.01.2022).
- USAID UKRAINE (2017), *Ukraine 2017 Annual Report*, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1863/2017_report_eng.pdf (20.01.2022)
- WINWOOD Michael G. (1977), *Social Change and Community Work: Where Now?*, "Community Development Journal", vol. 12, no. 1, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44258356>
- WORLD BANK (1989), *Involving Nongovernmental Organizations in World Bank-supported Activities*, Operational Directive 14.70, <https://www.gdrc.org/ngo/wb-ngo-directive.html> (28.08.1989).
- ZINKEVYCH Osep (1993), *Ukrainian Helsinki Group*, in: Volodymyr Kubiiovych, Danylo Struk (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, vol. 5. University of Toronto Press.