Svetlana Naumkina

Professor, Ph.D., State institution Southern National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushinsky

Baleria Golka

graduate student of department of political sciences and right

Political of of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding: European experience of constructing and practical embodiment

Аналізуються технології політичного краудсорсингу та краудфандингу як сучасні підходи конструювання політичного діалогу та забезпечення прозорості влади. Аргументується виправданість їх застосування у громадсько-політичній сфері. Вивчаються причини, які актуалізують використання краудсорсингу та краудфандингу у політиці, а також світовий та український досвід їх застосування. Визначаються чинники, від яких залежить успішність краудсорсингових і краудфандингових проектів у політиці.

Ключові слова: *політичний краудсорсинг, політичний краудфандинг, політичне інвестування, громадськість, інформаційно-комунікаційні технології.*

Technologies of political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding are analysed as modern approaches to make political dialogue and provide transparency of authorities. Justification for their use in socio-political sphere is being argued. Reasons that actualize the use of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding in policy as well as global and Ukrainian experience of their application are studied. There are identified the factors that affect the success of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding projects in policy.

Keywords: *political crowdsourcing, political crowdfunding, political investing, public, information and communication technologies.*

Within the recent years, search for new effective technologies of public interaction at all levels from global to local one takes place in political science. "From the model of *co-operation* we turn to the model of *co-creation*. Exchange of ideas and views to achieve the best results comes in the foreground"[1]. The leading trend is intensification of political discourse through its virtualization and the use of new information and communication technologies.

---

[1] Левина Е. А. Применение технологий краудсорсинга в социально-политическом диалоге / Е. А. Левина // Проблемный анализ и государственно-управленческое проектирование. – 2012. – № 5 (25). – Т. 5. – С. 36–41.

The term "political (socio-political) crowdsourcing" and "political (socio-political) crowd-funding" are new concepts of political science. Their development has just begun. Difficulty in understanding of their essence lies in: 1) lack of research unity in interpretation of basic concepts – crowdsourcing, crowdfunding; 2) conceptual phenomena novelty of socio-political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding and their varieties; 3) still negligible empirical base to explore practice of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding mechanisms use, especially in Ukrainian policy.

At the same time, current political process is open to new technological mechanisms – organizational and financial one. The political practice of the recent years shows the commitment to the crowdsourcing and crowdfunding mechanisms, which, having started as a business mechanism, broadened the scope into the socio-political sphere. The importance of study the possibility to use crowdsourcing and crowdfunding in policy is caused by continual growth of the role of public participation in policy, and, consequently, need to clarify the modern mechanisms of organization and activation of community in its involvement into the political processes. Study of possibilities of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding application in policy is actualized to clarify new approaches, which help to solve the problem of lack of human and financial resources for the implementation of socially important projects.

Crowdsourcing today is increasingly used as a new method of public involvement into the political process. It is one of mutual interpersonal formats. Crowdsourcing is attracting of human capacity to joint decision of the certain issues or projects implementation. Thanks to the crowdsourcing, specific work is implemented with joint efforts; planned idea is embodied by ordinary people – volunteers and caring one.

Crowdsourcing means: 1) "use of collective intelligence and work of volunteers for a variety of useful purposes, including commercial one" [2]; 2) "problems transfer to significant, often anonymous, amount of individuals – human crowd" (the Internet community) and involving of their assets, resources, knowledge or experience" [3]. So, crowdsourcing is a common intellectual work of a large number of people unfamiliar to each other on a common task in the network environment. This is a new method of obtaining needed services, ideas or information by reference to the large number of different groups, often through the Internet.

Crowdsourcing can be considered as a new format of the socio-political dialogue. Its key features are: 1) lack of payment (occasionally – minimal compensation) for the executable function; 2) a significant number of volunteer performers in the project; 3) use of virtual networks that enable optimization of expenses for information search, collecting and processing, and allow to divide work on a number of components that unite a whole, resembling mosaic. Certainly, crowdsourcing would not be possible without the Internet – just through a network, people can coordinate their actions, discuss ways to solve problems and join into communities on a voluntary basis. Internet is used by users to create instruments that can adjust government

---

[2]   Долгин А. Манифест новой экономики. Вторая невидимая рука рынка / А. Долгин. - М. : "АСТ", 2010. – 256 с. (С. 39)

[3]   Hemer J. A snapshot on crowdfunding / J. Hemer // The Open Access Publication Server of the ZBW. - 2011. - pp. 1-39 (P. 8).

policy. For example, "Arab Spring" motivated many activists and ordinary Internet users to primarily use of Twitter and Facebook to schedule the protest acts and spread of revolutionary appeals against establishment of Egypt, Yemen and Libya.

Crowdsourcing in Ukraine just begins to root, having started with social projects like public acts of cleaning the city. Less is Ukrainian practice makes political displays of crowdsourcing, but this experience is rapidly acquired. For example: 1) ElectUA – project of monitoring violations during the parliamentary elections of 2012 as apolitical initiative to draw public attention to the transparency of voting. The project was aimed to attract volunteers on fixation violations during the parliamentary elections and visualization of the data on the virtual map; 2) "Chancellery hundred" as a volunteer project that arose during the events on the Maidan in winter 2014 and restored documents, which the deposed regime tried to destroy; then documents of runaway oligarchs were started to be recovered and published.

The reasons, because of which crowdsourcing is appropriate to be applied in policy, are the following:

1. generation of a large number of new ideas (crowdsourcing provides much more insight, derived from ordinary Internet users. Getting new ideas allows hoping for better proposals);
2. selected ideas will be more closely related to the community of followers (personal ideas will be useful to the target audience, because it offers generated data);
3. open methodology creates transparent and democratic system (users can see where are certain ideas come from, that will help to increase their involvement and makes an additional support of policy that is carried out).

Political crowdsourcing is useful and technologically justified in many socio-political dimensions – from designing the state constitution to implementation of local projects. This provides still small, but slowly accumulating by international practice experience of use such a practice of open cooperation.

We select several successful crowdsourcing campaigns in policy.

1. Iceland, 2012. This is an interesting country to study experience of crowdsourcing in political practice for at least two reasons: 1) it is the only state in which crowdsourcing technology has already been successfully applied to the development of the constitution; 2) crowdsourcing has become one of the ways out from the political crisis that was the result of the hottest economic downturn of the country in 2008 [4].
2. Finland, 2012. Launched crowdsourcing platform Open Ministry was designed to create new bills by the public. If the bill, proposed by a citizen, gathers more than 50 thousand signatures, it is put to parliamentary vote.

---

[4] Курочкин А. В. Краудсорсинг как новый метод политического управления в условиях сетевого общества / А. В. Курочкин // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. - 2013. - № 9-1 (35). - С. 78-81 (С. 80).

3. The USA. Citizens do not publish their own bills, but they can communicate with the politicians using resource PopVox, where the bills, proposed in Congress, are placed on separate pages, giving voters the opportunity to leave their comments. This resource helps to establish communication between politicians and voters.

Modern politicians are trying to find new ways of interacting with potential voters and the public in general. The main areas, in which the use of crowdsourcing is justified to attract attention and promote political campaigns, are the following:

1. *Creation of political profile.* examples: 1) the President of the USA Barack Obama cooperated with Artworks by creation crowdsourcing posters dedicated to increase working places; posters of three finalists were signed by the head of the state, designed for sale to raise funds for the further advancement of the project; 2) a candidate to become a deputy of the Australian Parliament in 2013 K. Rudd worked with crowdsourcing platform DesignCrowd to create design of a pre-election slogan and a T-shirt. He selected the winner from more than four hundred drafts and really used the chosen idea for his campaign.

2. *Providing power to people.* Examples: 1) even in "pre-crowdsourcing era" the first Australian prime-minister E. Barton in 1901 initiated an international competition to create a sketch of the Australian national flag; competition received more than 30 thousand proposals; 2) in 2010, the Government of India created design of the new Indian rupee using crowdsourcing. There were suggested more than 8 thousand drafts from participants from all over the country; the project has attracted global attention and rupee became a recognizable symbol in the world.

3. *Aid to people in the crisis regions.* Examples: 1) In South African Republic there was operating an crowdsourcing site Agang South Africa to help to rebuild a country that gained independence in 1994; the aim was to increase public influence on the election results; 2) a number of projects today (such as projects of the organization Italian coalition for civil rights and freedoms (Cild) and Chicas Ponderosas), that are aimed at finding ways to help those19 million people that in 2014 became refugees because of wars or persecutions) and the number of which increased sharply in 2015 (Syrians, Iraqis and Eritrean etc.).

4. *Bills development.* The examples are the already mentioned experience of Finland and Ireland. Iceland has become a political example of crowdsourcing in development of constitution draft. Its implementation passed through a number of steps: 1) Constitutional Committee of Iceland provide the public with an extensive report (700 pages) about the state of constitutional law in the country and prospects for its improvement; 2) at general elections there were elected 25 members of the Constitutional Assembly (non-party representatives from different regions of Iceland) – a special authority set up to design and improve the draft of the new constitution of the coun-

try [5]; 3) every week members of Constitutional Assembly placed on a special Internet portal new legislative proposals, which have come from citizens using Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc. All Assembly meeting were also broadcast on the Internet and were open for online citizen participation [6].

Structures of the different levels, from global to local, come with crowdsourcing projects. Thus, the UN in 2015 implemented the project "Beyond 2015" – a global initiative that aims to attract young people to solve social problems and inform the world political leaders of what should be their priorities. Crowdsourcing model allowed young people from more than 80 countries to share ideas, discuss vital issues and their possible solutions. For three months' period crowdsourcing project has collected over a thousand unique ideas and received more than 27 thousand responses and comments; Internet community, which was embraced with this project, makes more than 16 million people from around the world.

With crowdsourcing in many cities around the world there are implemented projects codenamed "smart city" (eng. *Smart City*). Today we are talking not just about expanding the range of electronic services but about merging them into a system of "smart city", which organizes management thanks to initiatives of the public, generated ideas, namely social and political crowdsourcing. Crowdsourcing allows actively promoting policy of open municipal government, through various portals, on which public proposals are accumulated. In the "smart city" every interested resident is not only a consumer of services but also the member of the decision-making to improve life quality. The only availability of modern electronic services does not ensure public involvement in solving problems; instead the focused crowdsourcing practices are aimed on generating collective idea.

Successful implementation of crowdsourcing projects in policy depends on several factors, including:

- *how clearly the ultimate goal and planned incremental movement to it are defined.* Crowdsourcing project should clearly declare its goal, the way to achieve it and the role of project participants. Clear focus on the citizens as the main participants is required. At the beginning of the project implementation it is important to understand what the result will be: ideas, knowledge or experience;
- *communication quality after project launch.* Crowdsourcing does not happen automatically once put into Network, but information about the political project is necessary to be spread with all possible ways. Political crowdsourcing does not always attract attention; patience and perseverance in making interest and involvement of participants are required;

[5]   Gylfason T. Constitutions: Financial Crisis Can Lead to Change / T. Gylfason // Challenge. - 2012. - № 55 (5). – pp. 106-122.

[6]   Курочкин А. В. Краудсорсинг как новый метод политического управления в условиях сетевого общества / А. В. Курочкин // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. - 2013. - № 9-1 (35). - С. 78-81 (С. 80).

- *simple technological solution* of crowdsourcing project, making it accessible to ordinary users (simple user interface);
- *further permanent project management*: moderating of debates, questions responses etc. And, in addition, specific additional tasks, such as: delete of abusive comments, "reflection" of trolling attacks; all this are integral characteristics of Internet conversations on political subjects;
- *right determination of the project duration*, as crowdsourcing is not a permanent project on promotion of the certain political objectives. If there is known that one can join the project within the outlined time (e.g. several weeks), it encourages people to get involved. However, there exist long-term projects – such as several months signatures collect for a petition. If the project is a long-term one, periodic publication of interim results of the project is necessary;
- regular *offline activities carrying* for the project support. This format of communication that helps to spread information about the project is an opportunity for participants to meet with the organizers;
- constant *analysis and monitoring of the project* during its implementation, and analysis of results after completion. The analysis results, which testify the effectiveness of crowdsourcing campaigns, are certainly necessary to be published online for review by all interested participants and the public.

Of course, there are a number of obstacles on the way to sustainability practices of political crowdsourcing:

- *digital isolation* of rather significant number of adults as political actors. Although the number of people integrated in the Network is growing, to organization of crowdsourcing projects there is advisable to add such opportunities to participate in the project that do not require the mandatory use of the Internet, namely, the offline events;
- *crowdsourcing is not the equivalent of democracy*, opinion of the participant of any political crowd-project is not, as a rule, the majority opinion. But crowdsourcing can be seen as part of democracy, for example, using the method of survey. The importance of crowdsourcing for citizens is that it becomes a new tool for socio-political activity and lobbying of socio-political interest of society;
- *crowdsourcing does not change the opinion of experts*. However, depending on the topic, public opinion can be equated to an expert opinion, though it can be minor;
- *political crowdsourcing requires technical and human resources*. However, not all crowdsourcing projects always require presence of new technical solutions, as there are a lot of software and free tools like Twitter or Facebook;
- *the problem of attracting participants*. Usually citizens learn about crowdsourcing and get involved to it not unexpectedly. As political crowdsourcing is new and unfamiliar

process for most of them, it is necessary to pay special attention to work with the community and promotion of crowdsourcing opportunities;

- – socio-political crowdsourcing is facing a difficult challenge: how to integrate the views of people into the final decision – whether the proposal of the bill, or the strategy of the country (region, city). There is a danger that crowdsourcing will only become a policy tool to attract attention. That is, crowdsourcing may stop responding its meaning and motivation of people to get involved in such projects in the future will decrease.

Particular importance of crowdsourcing technology makes for forming active political community and ensuring the transparency of political decision-making. Crowdsourcing allows not only achieving a high degree of public participation in the development of certain projects, but also creating a sense of national unity. Free participation of citizens in the development and policy making allows avoiding pressure of the interest groups that usually have privileged position in the legislative process.

Among the definitions of crowdfunding there is its interpretation as a process of uniting the resources, especially financial, for implementation of a specific project dominates. We define it as voluntary collective cooperation of unspecified range of people who unite material or non-material resources, typically using the Internet-platforms, for socio-political support (or a purely political) projects, initiated by individual or collective political actors. If we try to define crowdfunding through legislation, we are faced with the problem of legal gaps – particularly in the Ukrainian legislation the concept of "crowdfunding" (or national synonyms) is missing. And this is despite the functioning of many crowdfunding platforms.

When we talk about crowdfunding, first of all we separate thousands of socially useful projects, creative products that come to the market thanks to donations from the public, who believed in initiatives social usefulness, which need support to be implemented. That is, in the public mind there exists perception of crowdfunding as an economic mechanism – a "crowd funding". Thus, this technology, at first glance, would not cover political issues, which, unlike the social, not often cause sympathetic sentiment mood of donors-volunteers.

Socio-political crowdfunding enables transformation of "social" capital, accumulated in social networks, into the financial one"[7].

Political crowdfunding is one of the innovative social technologies. Its important feature is lack of traditional intermediaries in financing: investor cooperates directly with the recipient. The uniqueness of crowdfunding is that this funding instrument, using Internet technologies, allows quick getting of small investments from a large number of people to support the project.

Rate of political crowdfunding, as an effective tool of capital involving, increases. Thanks to the rapid development of information technology, new attractive financing opportunities

---

[7] Горобец В. Краудфандинг политиков / В. Горобец [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://dou.ua/lenta/columns/political-crowdfunding/

became available for the policy investors. Funding is provided through Internet platforms. Examples include the following resources: *kickstarter.com, indiegogo.com, seedrs.com, boomstarter. ru, crowdcube.com, smartmarket. net, EquityNet.com, betterplace.org, respekt.ne*t and others. The rapid development of national financing is provided with the social networks (Twitter, Facebook, "Vkontakte" etc.), which can, within the short term, promote attracting investments into specific projects.

In a situation, when policy (Ukrainian in particular) is often rightly accused in uncertainty of funding sources and further depending on the "political patrons" – oligarchs, crowdfunding has the potential to become an alternative format of political projects financing.

Russian politician Ilia Ponomaryov (the only member of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, who voted against Crimea annexing to Russia) expressed an opinion that "worldwide crowdfunding starts from policy". Undoubtedly, his words have sense. For example, "March of millions" in Russia gathered over 2 million RUB with crowdfunding. We support the approach on which policy should begin with crowdfunding, and not vice versa [8]: virtuous policy has to start with crowdfunding, which will become a proper marker of the fact whether the public supports specific political initiative and is ready to contribute to its implementation.

In business, we can speak of at least of three types of crowdfunding, depending on the compensation, offered to the investor: 1) free or conditionally free of charge; 2) conditionally returned; 3) certainly returned (private investment). When talking about the political (socio-political) crowdfunding, political crowdfunding can be divided into types by at least three criteria: 1) *by financing sphere*: electoral, anti-corruption etc.; 2) *by nature of donations*: financial (cash), social (non-cash); 3) *by reward offered to crowd-investor*: free (conditionally free of charge) – provides possible gratitude by the recipient, notice of the investor (donor), for example, on the site, in speeches to the voters, opportunity to participate in activities initiated by the political party; conditionally returned – suggests that in future there will be performed some exchange of the investor's deposit on, for example, lobbying of interests of the investor, inclusion of him or his representatives into the electoral list, etc.

Generally, all types of political crowdfunding directly related to information and communication revolution. In particular, social (non-cash) political crowdfunding works primarily in social networks. Nobody spends funds to support activist, but makes it known with likes and reposts. With this technology number of contemporary figures, such as Italian politician Beppe Grillo, become Facebook "stars", and then the politicians and prominent figures.

In the countries with developed democracy crowdfunding has demonstrated effectiveness in the political sphere, as it combines attracting of financing and conducting a campaign. Appeal to entire groups of voters by allowing crowdfunding to create a community of people inspired by the same promise that seek to support political project financially. Appeal to entire

---

[8] Голембіовська А. Сучасні тенденції української політики. Частина 2. Політичний краудфандинг / А. Голембіовська [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://blogs.korrespondent.net/blog/politics/3525247/

groups of voters allows, with crowdfunding, creating a community of people inspired by the same promise, who seek for financial support of the political project.

Money has always played an important role in policy, but today more than 90 % of candidates in the West win the election thanks to attracting of more funds. With electoral crowdfunding the voters can collect more than 80 % of the campaign budget. Crowdfunding helps to avoid excessive costs on campaign carrying, such as huge bills for rent, telephone calls, travel, etc. Organisation of crowdfunding campaign is nearly free of charge and political leaders get a list of investors, who supported them as a project. This database can be used during the subsequent campaigns. Obviously, sponsors of political campaigns are likely to vote for the sponsored political force and, in addition, will share information about it within their environment.

Since 2007 political crowdfunding has helped Barack Obama to collect 16.1 billion dollars[9]. In particular, in 2008 the strategy of the presidential election of Barack Obama was based on use of the own website to attract funding; Obama's campaign collected more than 750 million dollars from the multiple retail investors (average investment was $ 86 per person)[10]. This strategy has received public attention and was repeatedly reproduced by other players of the political arena.

During the presidential campaign (2012) candidates have already actively used mobile payment platforms, though not in such volumes as during current campaign 2016. Barack Obama included online payment platform Square into instruments in his election campaign in January 2012, and earlier, in August 2011, the Republican Party has distributed more than five thousand readers Square during the National Congress. The exact figure of the accepted donations was not called, but there existed comments that using Square to receive donations by Republicans and Democrats was successful[11].

During the presidential campaign of 2016 in the US many ways were used to collect donations. For example, to collect donations all US presidential candidates, from H. Clinton and B. Sanders to R. Paul and M. Rubio, use online payment platform Stripe. The presidential campaign of 2016 shows a high level of candidates' involvement into modern technologies. H. Clinton campaign, according to "Forbes" as of August 2015, has already received only donations more than $ 20 million through Stripe[12].

Organization "The Center for Public Integrity" conducted a study, which results show in which countries organizers of crowdfunding fundraising campaigns for B. Obama received diplomatic posts. Project results have shown a strong relationship between high finance and the most desired positions in the diplomatic corps; diplomatic posts are received not only the

[9] Швальц В. Политический краудфандинг помог Бараку Обаме собрать $16,1 млрд с 2007 года / В. Швальц [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_kraudfanding_pomog_baraku_obame_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda

[10] Швальц В. Почему политики все чаще обращаются к краудфандингу / В. Швальц [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_kraudfanding_pomog_baraku_obame_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda

[11] Шерман А. Краудфандинг, политика и Stripe / А. Шерман [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://futurebanking.ru/post/2932

[12] Шерман А. Краудфандинг, политика и Stripe / А. Шерман [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://futurebanking.ru/post/2932

diplomats but organizers of campaigns of collecting funds. This practice is not unique to B. Obama; it has been existed around for decades.

History of crowdfunding in the USA and Western European countries confirms the theory of solidarity. Public financing was developed here through projects that did not offer the investors packages or shares in any of the enterprises or any future payment of introduced shares. Instead, investors were given awards, often in the form of the final product or reference and public thanks [13].

In the West, where the tradition of political patronage (political investment) is strong, one can see modification of political crowdfunding: now more and more "small" sponsors are involved in the financing of large undertakings. The potential of the Internet community today is obvious and powerful political players have to listen to it.

As examples of using the crowdfunding method at the post-soviet area there can be called a campaign of collecting means for the project "RosPil" (http://rospil.info/) of O. Navalny, fundraising by Moscow Helsinki Group, fundraising to support "Pussy Riot" and others. Trend by which to support the organizers of, at first, protests, such as "March of Discordants" (Russian Federation) became more clear. Under the pressure of authorities there always arise such mechanisms of political struggle that cannot be controlled by the authorities. Opposition began to use political crowdfunding (its online format) to finance their projects. For example, O. Navalny organized "RosPil" to combat abuse in the sphere of public purchases; collected funds were spent on labour of lawyers and the server. O. Navalny was supported by a number of active Internet users with opposite moods. Meanwhile, the lagging nature of Russian political culture that is not adapted to innovative mechanisms of political cooperation is underlined by the researcher O. Sokolov [14]. He argues: 78 % of funds in support of punk band "Pussy Riot" was collected not in Russia, but abroad.

At present, socio-political crowdfunding in Ukraine is only beginning to develop. Mechanisms potential of online fundraising is used not enough. Among domestic crowdfunding platforms are to be noted the following: "Spilnokosht" (https://biggggidea.com/); "Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace" (https://ubb.org.ua/); "Na-Starte" (http://na-starte.com/ua/); "JQ Star" (http://jqstar.com/). One of the research objectives is to study their practices to determine whether these platforms practiced the political projects and how successful they were. It looks like the absence of political projects themselves is clearly seen at all crowdfunding platforms. Let us argue this thesis with the example of two major Ukrainian crowd-platforms:

- *platform "Spilnokosht"* highlights such project-groups as "Media", "Human Rights", "Professional Journey", "Children", "Transport", "City" and many others. If to draw attention on the projects, supported by the public, there will be Urban Studies, support

---

[13]   Котенко Д. А. Краудфандинг - инновационный инструмент инвестирования / Д. А. Котенко // Закон. – 2014. – С. 140-141.

[14]   *Соколов А. В.* Особенности возникновения политического краудфандинга в российской политической практике / А. В. Соколов // Вест. Рос. ун-та дружбы народов. - Сер.: "Политология". - 2014. - № 2. - С. 31-38 (С. 36).

of camps, summer schools for teens, cultural projects and support of separate creative teams etc. There are no politically oriented projects; close to the socio-political topics can be considered support of public radio and television, programs of adaptation of internally displaced persons, "Sh.Fest – Taras Shevchenko Festival" (popularization of T. Shevchenko), integration camp "Big Game for TEENS" (for teens from different regions of Ukraine to master leadership skills) and similar (social rather than political) projects;

• *platform "Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace"* has no political projects, instead there are singled out projects "Help UA" (restoration of schools in the ATO area, rehabilitation of soldiers, etc.), "Health" (patients support), "Education" (books for schools of Donbass, furniture for rural schools, school uniforms for children of immigrants, carrying so called "scientific picnics", support of children with mental, emotional and behavioural disorders, inclusive education), "Environment and Animals" (aid for animal shelters), "Our Town" (lunch for children from crisis families), "Like home ..." (food and hygiene for evacuees from the ATO area, care of orphans, children from boarding schools etc.).

Instead, in Ukrainian political practice there are the examples of electoral crowdfunding. Thus, O. Bogomolets collected funds as a candidate for the post of the President of Ukraine: "The only my sponsor is the Ukrainian people. Money for pledge was collected by volunteers and ordinary citizens" [15][1]. Fundraising on pledge to the Central Election Committee (2.5 million UAH) was completed in two days. At the account of election fund (from 08.04 to 21.04.2014) there were received 181 495 UAH. One of the candidates for president of Ukraine A. Grytsenko used crowdfunding practice at the election in 2014; costs were claimed in sum of about 8 million UAH. With crowdfunding Ukrainian political party "Democratic Alliance" is functioning.

It seems that in Ukraine attitude to national funding policy is still quite sceptical.

Firstly, the public has doubts whether fundraising is not one more fraud, whether the collected funds will be used to implement the declared goal. Absence of legislation becomes a significant "negative" factor, because the citizen, as a political investor, needs effective protection against the financial crimes.

If you analyse such subjects of national policy as political parties, at the present they appear as attractive objects of political investment. Traditional parties cannot rely on basic audience of online crowdfunding – active users of social networks, who are eager to support rather those, out of system, protest initiatives.

Over the past two impassionate years of Ukrainian history we have seen many examples of collective financing, such as the army, volunteer battalions, process of treatment the soldiers

---

[15] Богомолець О. "Передвиборча кампанія кандидатів у президенти має бути абсолютно прозорою!" [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://bogomolets.com/ua/ news/372-olga-bogomolets-peredviborcha-kampaniya-kandidativ-u-prezidenti-mae-buti-absolyutno-prozoroyu.

etc. It is notable, that this technology is effective, and therefore the question of its testing on policy, namely to nominate candidates "from the bottom", to support their campaign and then delegate them their voting powers. So the politician, to be really from public, should be nominated by people; and not only to be promotes but also to be financed [16] [3] (primaries, donations, charitable contributions, etc.). Otherwise, we cannot demand independence of the candidate, as the campaign will certainly be financed from some "oligarchic pockets" or by the candidate, who is an oligarch himself.

In crowdfunding scheme there takes place direct popular vote for a particular project, and the vote is the amount allocated by the donor. In this way competition of politicians as the project, their struggle-presentation for the national funding is made possible. We assume that this is a civilized transparent way to win the most reasonable political projects. Each crowdfunding project, particularly political one (when every politician is under the "anti-corruption eye"), should be based on ensuring complete transparency at every stage of fundraising, opportunities for free access (if not of all the public, then at least donors and authorized regulatory agencies) to view revenues and expenses.

Research of political crowdfunding brings us to a number of issues, including: 1) whether political crowdfunding is to be considered as a fundraising exclusively through specialized Internet platform. After Ukrainian remember well all the variety of ways of accumulating resources (money, medicine, food, fuel, etc.) in support of Euromaidan; how resources are still collecting to finance the needs of the army today, etc.; 2) whether political crowdfunding should be materialized in its form as support can be shown not only in cash; at least we already mentioned non-material (social) crowdfunding.

However, it should be noted that methods of financing Euromaidan and army in fact cannot be considered as crowdfunding technology in its classic sense because of violation of the basic principles of crowdfunding: goal – rather abstract, no clear required amount, process transparency – more fragmented. In this case we rather deal with charity, but such measures can be considered successful start of crowdfunding implementation in Ukraine.

Unfortunately, the culture of mass patronage, in particular socio-political one, has not acquired permanent bases, among Ukrainians and there was not formed stable layer of the middle class, which is the driving force of sacrificial support of any creative endeavours. To our mind, popularity of crowdfunding is directly correlated with the size of the middle class. Use of political crowdfunding is still a prerogative of out of system business subjects. Political actors of the system itself nearly do not use this mechanism of communication with their political supporters.

Thus, technologies of political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding create new opportunities for civic activity. This is a truly revolutionary approach to achieve the goal – to build a community in which everyone can be heard.

---

[16] Горобец В. Краудфандинг политиков / В. Горобец [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://dou.ua/lenta/columns/political-crowdfunding/

Application of these technologies in the political sphere is a global technological trend by which transparency of state bodies, public involvement in the process of political communication and work on socially significant tasks, which really can improve the quality of life of the citizens, is increased. New technologies can enable truly democratic policy implementation at all levels.

REFERENCES

1. Богомолець О. "Передвиборча кампанія кандидатів у президенти має бути абсолютно прозорою!" [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://bogomolets.com/ua/ news/372-olga-bogomolets-peredviborcha-kampaniya-kandidativ-u-prezidenti-mae-buti-absolyutno-prozoroyu.

2. Голембіовська А. Сучасні тенденції української політики. Частина 2. Політичний краудфандинг / А. Голембіовська [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://blogs.korrespondent.net/blog/politics/3525247/

3. Горобец В. Краудфандинг политиков / В. Горобец [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://dou.ua/lenta/columns/political-crowdfunding/

4. Долгин А. Манифест новой экономики. Вторая невидимая рука рынка / А. Долгин. - М. : "АСТ", 2010. – 256 с.

5. Котенко Д. А. Краудфандинг - инновационный инструмент инвестирования / Д. А. Котенко // Закон. – 2014. – С. 140-141.

6. Курочкин А. В. Краудсорсинг как новый метод политического управления в условиях сетевого общества / А. В. Курочкин // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. - 2013. - № 9-1 (35). - С. 78-81.

7. Левина Е. А. Применение технологий краудсорсинга в социально-политическом диалоге / Е. А. Левина // Проблемный анализ и государственно-управленческое проектирование. – 2012. - № 5 (25). – Т. 5. - С. 36-41.

8. *Соколов А. В.* Особенности возникновения политического краудфандинга в российской политической практике / А. В. Соколов // Вест. Рос. ун-та дружбы народов. - Сер.: "Политология". - 2014. - № 2. - С. 31-38.

9. Швальц В. Политический краудфандинг помог Бараку Обаме собрать $16,1 млрд с 2007 года / В. Швальц [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_kraudfanding_pomog_baraku_obame_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda

10. Швальц В. Почему политики все чаще обращаются к краудфандингу / В. Швальц [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_kraudfanding _pomog_baraku_obame_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda

11. Шерман А. Краудфандинг, политика и Stripe / А. Шерман [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://futurebanking.ru/post/2932

12. Gylfason T. Constitutions: Financial Crisis Can Lead to Change / T. Gylfason // Challenge. - 2012. - № 55 (5). - pp. 106-122.
13. Hemer J. A snapshot on crowdfunding / J. Hemer // The Open Access Publication Server of the ZBW. - 2011. - pp. 1-39.