

Viktoriia Timashova, PhD in Law

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine

INTERACTION OF POLITICAL SPHERE WITH CREATIVE SPHERES AND OVER-SPHERES OF PUBLIC LIFE

In the article the author offers classification of spheres of public life and fixes the concept «over-sphere of public life». The paper approves that interrelation of political sphere with other social spheres in circulation of social over-sphere is manifested in two aspects. On the one hand, policy is determined by economic, spiritual, political, cultural, ethnohistorical factors, but on the other hand, political sphere is able to influence these areas, to penetrate and interact with them. That happens owing to the fact that a political sphere is designed to: (1) provide conditions under which creation and appropriation of public values, produced within material, spiritual, cultural and other spheres, could be consistent with the interests of various social groups, implemented through power as a tool to distribute values in a society; (2) political sphere is present in all spheres of social life through its inherent regulatory functions. Eventually, the degree and intensity of impact of political sphere at people's life (social over-sphere) in any country is conditioned by a type of society, a model of citizenship and a form of state in a country.

Key words: political sphere, over-sphere of public life, consumer or consumptive over-spheres, productive (creative) spheres.

Any modern society is the integrity of interrelated spheres, systems, subsystems, branches and other "plots" of human activity. Each of them has its own structure, functions, tasks and features; each forms, develops, reforms based on their own, unique natural, social, economic, spiritual, cultural environment, internal and external political circumstances, experience, traditions and so on. But, processes in the political sphere define further development of society and state in a country. Considering the afore and Ukraine's way towards irreversible reformation changes, interaction of the political sphere with other spheres of social life gets sharp and loud public resonance.

Spheres of public life differ depending on the type of social activity that people carry out in each sphere, the kind of roles they perform, which obligations assume, what values are professed. Each sphere has its own relations, institutions, ideology, culture, i.e. forms of interaction. The concepts of social, political, economic, cultural, spiritual and other systems are considered as theoretical models that structurize, arrange mentioned spheres as a triadic interaction of relations, institutions, ideologies, and become their paired concepts.

In our previous publication¹ there was a try to determine the number of spheres of public life, which to this day remains debatable; we proposed a new classification of spheres of public life with the consent of its author - academician, Professor I.M. Varzar who voiced this opinion at a meeting of the Specialized Academic Council on Science at Ivan Franko National University of Lviv in March 2013.

I.M. Varzar put forward a proposal to acknowledge these two groups of spheres: *productive* and *consumer*. With the consent of the author, we renamed these areas as follows: 1) **productive** or **creative** – encompasses creative abilities of an individual as a willingness to accept and create fundamentally innovative ideas that do not coincide with traditional patterns of thinking and become an independent factor in structure of talent, and the ability to solve problems that arise in static systems. Productive or creative sphere includes economic, spiritual, political, cultural, ethnohistorical spheres; 2) **consumer** or infrastructural **over-spheres** will be called in this paper **consumptive** (lat. *consumo* – to consume). Consumptive spheres (or infrastructural over-spheres) include social, legal, ethical, communicative, informative (table 1). Element structure of both groups remains unchanged, i.e. it has the same three components: 1) relations; 2) institutions; 3) ideology.

¹ Тімашова, В.М. (2014). Надсфери і сфери в теоретичній призмі змісту політичного життя суспільства як системи Україна. Київ: *Політичні науки та методика викладання соціально-політичних дисциплін*, 15, 80–81.

Table 1

Spheres and over-spheres of public life

Productive or creative spheres	Consumer or consumptive over-spheres
1. Economic	1. Social
2. Spiritual	2. Legal
3. Political	3. Ethical
4. Cultural	4. Communicative
5. Ethnohistorical	5. Informative

To this we add that in early 2015, Lviv publishing house “New World – 2000” published encyclopedic Reference Dictionary “The newest political vocabulary (neologisms, occasionalisms and other modernisms)” under the general editorship of N.M. Khoma. This dictionary fixed the concept over-spheres of public life, namely: “... it is the expanse of social and collective life, where foremost takes place satisfaction of average being needs and interests associated with consumption of previously created values and fundamentals values for being of an individual and a society as the whole”¹.

Based on the theme of this article, we’ll trace the interaction of political sphere with: (1) productive (creative) spheres, and (2) over-spheres (consumer or consumptive).

1. Economic sphere. In the last quarter of the eighteenth century Adam Smith pointed out that along with a political sphere there is “demanding neighbor and rival” in any society - economic sphere. In the “Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations” (1776) Smith came close to formulating “explosively-topical” even nowadays thought about political and economic determination of the type of social order in the abstractly taken and medium-rich country. Correlative roles in these modification processes belong to a state, which under all conditions is central element of a political sphere, but not under all conditions is an economic entity². For this he identified three ways of positioning of political and economic spheres of public life.

Firstly, if political sphere is linear neighbor to an economic sphere, in such a country democratic social order gradually emerges. In such conditions a state hardly intervenes economic life of a society, if not to consider development of economic and commercial legislation by a parliament (political body) as “interference”. Almost a hundred years later, K. Marx (in the first volume of his “Capital”) noted: in such society a state serves as the “night watchman” of bourgeois property from “revolutionary attacks of the proletariat”.

Secondly, if a state is not very strong economic owner, political and economic spheres “as if share the power among them”. Under such conditions and under power impulses from a state a society irreversibly divides into classes and strata and gradually becomes authoritarian by the main political and economic grounds. The tone of public life is set by “authority of economic ownership in all conceivable forms” (later it would be called “capital”). Authoritarianism as such is under dominant influence of state political power, i.e. under the influence of political sphere.

The “third” item A. Smith left the shortest argued: in a country where “politics through a state or a state through politics dominates economy, - as in the eastern despotisms, - in such country society is totalitarian...”³.

Spiritual sphere. In enlighten (barely united in 1870) Germany sociologist F. Tönnies in the book “Community and fellowship” (1878), firstly, placed between political and economic spheres a new one - spiritual sphere, including to its context spiritual freedom, civil liberties, political thinking, values of democracy, unbiased religious and ethical orientation, ethnocultural heritage of centuries and so on; and, secondly, F. Tönnies invented antipode of totalitarian politics in general, namely the system of lower classes’ institutions, organizations, associations and proto-political parties. All this set of “non-political” and even apolitical formations of self-governing type T. Parsons in the twentieth century called “social

¹ Вдовичин, І.Я., Угрин, Л.Я., Шипунов, Г.В. (2015). *Новітня політична лексика (неологізми, оказіоналізми та інші новоутвори)*. Львів: Новий Світ – 2000, 242.

² Смит, А. (2007). *Исследование о природе и причинах богатства народов*. Москва: ЭКСМО, 879–901.

³ Смит, А. (2007). *Исследование о природе и причинах богатства народов*. Москва: ЭКСМО, 808.

system". Matters of political and spiritual spheres do not bypass economic sphere, but permeate it with two cornerstones factors – “political will” and “spiritual and creative thinking”¹.

Cultural sphere. American culturologist and sociologist of Russian origin Pitirim Sorokin (1889-1968) formulated the law of socio-cultural dynamics, according to which exist alternation of sociocultural supersystems, and therefore societies with all their components. He regarded sociocultural factor as dominant regarding political and economic factors². According to this law there are constant fluctuations of specific societies and their particular areas. Cyclical fluctuations of supersystems cause fluctuation of societies between progress and regress, development of political freedoms and authoritarianism, revolution and evolution³. Changes occur in a quantitative and qualitative direction until they reach “saturation point” or state of being on the “razor blade”, which ends up with bifurcation, i.e. choice of further condition. Then everything changes by inertia or coercion. When potential of movement in one direction is exhausted, a reverse movement begins. Thus there is a replacement of one system to another. Accordingly, types of policies are not stable and do not develop for the uplink, but constantly oscillate between the poles of totalitarianism and free regimes. This situation may be compared to squaring of a circle: a circle only moves towards or away from boundaries of a square, but never crosses them. Taking into account this opinion of P. Sorokin, we conclude that all political regimes have already existed and emergence of a qualitatively new political state of society this “quadrature of a circle” does not provide. That is, at best, humanity may have a democratic political regime, which is also questionable in different areas of human life, but anything better was not offered at this stage of human existence.

Ethnohistorical sphere. In his two differently-accented works titled “State and Nation” (1899), “Nation and State” (1918) and reissue of latter in 1937 K. Renner also addressed to the paradox of “quadrature of a circle”: “The postulates of nation and state relate to each other as a square and a circle; quadrature of a circle was not found. Similarly miraculous formula that will eliminate friction between a state and a nation will never be found”⁴.

In the light of the problem, in this paradox one relevant opinion is worthy of attention: in a multi-ethnic society not only the title, but each minority ethnic group, despite the depth of historical roots of its existence at that land, its physical array and level of socio-economic and political and cultural development - each one has a general humane right to build its own polyspherical society⁵. Inability or unwillingness of political leaders of a polyethnic country to reckon with this force is a factorial source of endless series of political revolutions in a country.

2. Social over-sphere. T. Hobbes defined civil society as a political society. It interacts with a state in governance, ensures civil peace, divides by political parties and social structures (unions) engaged in social control over a state power. Even those researchers who associated civil society primarily with private business activities and interest groups recognize the important role of political component of this activity. In totalitarian countries political activities experienced strict regulation and public sphere was limited to dominance of one “leading” party that represented political ideology of a government. Unlike totalitarian regimes, inherent (specific) attribute of traditional developed democracies is ideological and political pluralism. They allow harmonious interaction (coexistence) of social and political structures substantially different in their social disposition, interests and political preferences⁶.

Social over-sphere is, above all, an area of institutionalized dialogue, creation of stable and temporary associations and their use for individual and collective self-development. On the opinion of well-known domestic sociologists and political scientists Antonina Kolodii, voluntary public associations - economic, cultural, artistic, educational, charitable, and also political parties and movements (especially at a lower level or initial stages of its activities), independent media, all other hubs of formation of public opinion, social initiatives and people's will is civil society. Within civil society structures (associations, communities) is formed public virtue and civil position, expressed in the concept of social capital, which

¹ Филиппов, А.Ф. (1990). *Теннис Фердинанд*. Москва: Мысль, 346.

² Сорокин, П. (1992). *Моя философия – интегрализм*. Украина. Киев: СОЦИС, 10, 137–139.

³ Сорокин, П. (2001). Социализм и социалистическое равенство. Украина. Киев: СОЦИС, 5, 105–110.

⁴ Renner, K. (1899) *Synoptikus. Staat und Nation*. Wien, 69–70.

⁵ Варзар, І.М. (2009). Проблема співвідношення етноісторичної нації, політичної нації та політичного класу в історії політичної думки Європи Нового та Новітнього часів: теоретико-історіологічні синтези. *Україна. Київ: Політичні науки та методика викладання соціально-політичних дисциплін*, 1, 34–35.

⁶ Драч, М.І. (2006). Соціально-політична модернізація українського суспільства в перехідний період. Україна. Київ: *Мультиверсум. Філософський альманах*, 53, 98–110.

components are: 1) a network of horizontal links between equal and free individuals; 2) norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness; 3) skills of collective action; 4) a sense of involvement in public affairs, obligation and responsibility before others, i.e. citizenship in its non-political manifestations¹.

Social capital, crossing with the sphere of politics, transmits it to the sphere of political activity – not through some special mechanisms, but through people (sometimes through the same people, and sometimes – through other persons, formed in the same environment), attitudes acquired by them, values and patterns of behavior. Such feature of human behavior as citizenship forms upon condition of balanced functioning of two spheres. However, in a social sphere where people act as members of a community and a whole society it manifests as a social orientation and ability to interact, and in a political sphere, a person acquires political and legal status of a citizen, which means faithful implementation of required duties: to participate in formation of government, control it and influence policies it holds. Political citizenship is formalized, more regulated by a state and depends not only on social capital, but on legitimacy of a government and other political and legal factors².

The relationship between social and political spheres is based on the fact that individual, a person, interacting with others within civil society, changes and transfers its own new qualities to all other public institutions, which it has to deal with, including political. After all, there is no impenetrable wall between public and public-political life.

The basis of profound changes in relations between a state and civil society is a political trend of reducing conflict between them. According to M.V. Iliin and B.I. Koval this happens due to the change of their inner nature, when class character of a state and power nature of civil society transform in various systems with pluralism of interests³. The latter are analyzed in the context of communicative systems, i.e. political interactions of different difficulty levels. At the forefront is dialogue and understanding of interests that were not realized in theoretical system of concepts of class antagonisms, dictatorship and violence, traditional for industrial society. It is a balance of interests is the key to social and political stability in today's postmodern society.

According to an authoritative representative of the London School of Economics and Politics A. Giddens, in fact, in the context of globalization occurs wider attracting of masses into politics: a main channel for their activity become social movements and groups that highlight secondary for traditional parliamentary politics issues of environment, consumer rights, anonymous alcoholics and sexual minorities, protection of animals and others⁴. Such groups can not take the place of political parties, but they significantly affect articulation of interests and distribution of forces in civil society. They continue new political practices and new trends of political development.

Ethical and legal over-spheres. Politics and morality are key regulators of human life. Political component ensures organization, control, management, security, integration of society, relying on the system of government, public institutions, using administrative resources, law or coercion. Moral and ethical factors govern behavior and create conditions for their harmonious existence in society through such categories as good, justice, duty, honor, dignity and happiness. In the contradictions between politics and morality was born political ethics. It covers ethical aspects of political actions and decisions, forms and means of its implementation, thus playing a crucial role in legitimizing political power.

The starting element and the main object in studies of law - says L. Fuller - is not a legal norm, not a legal system, but legal relationship, that is one of the key elements by which operates any sphere, system or area, including political⁵. Law as one of the key regulators of social relations and also as an essential dimension of social life suffers direct and indirect impact of society, which is not only the subject of formation, establishment, functioning and development of social relations that are the subject of legal regulation, but is actively involved in all legal processes such as the development of law and law-making.

Today we live in a post-industrial society, which essential feature is increase of social mobility, stipulated by entry of society to the new stage of scientific and technological revolution (current

¹ Колодій, А. (2003). Сутність громадянського суспільства і механізми його впливу на політику: доповідь на заключній регіональній конференції проекту «Чемпіони громадянського суспільства». *Електронна бібліотека*. <<http://political-studies.com/?p=148>>.

² Kohen, Jean L. (1998). *Philosophy & Public Policy*, 18, 18.

³ Ильин, М.В. Две стороны медали: гражданское общество и государство (четвертая беседа цикла). *Електронна бібліотека*. <<http://www.politstudies.ru/fulltext/1992/1/18.htm>>.

⁴ Giddens, A. (2003). *Runaway World. How globalization is Reshaping our Lives*. Routledge.

⁵ Фуллер, Л. (2007). *Мораль права*. Москва: ИРИСЭН, 49.

information, telecommunication systems, continuous automation, robotics, etc.). We may observe so-called virtualization of spheres of human activity, which is possible due to development of information and communication technologies. Products and services partially move in virtual reality, but they can not be comprehended or touched. They ostensibly exist, but in material form they are not present, they begin to live in over-sphere which accumulates material and virtual activities. The latter is provided by communications, which, by definition of national researcher V. Dabizha are the result of multilevel symbiosis of human-technical systems, network systems, communications and movement processes anything and anyone in time and space, including transfer, distribution, reception and preservation of symbols of artificially-natural origin of all forms of life¹.

A new trend is weakening of vertical hierarchical structures in political life of “new democracies”, their relevance, openness, inclusiveness to horizontal network structures of communication and social control. That is why distribution of network structures of civil society in the context of global communications is a significant threat to traditional authoritarian government structures constructed with vertical hierarchical subordination. They reveal their ineffectiveness in the world of active communications, connected with electronic technologies. As D.M. Peskov rightly claims, information and communication technology is radically changing traditional understanding of politics as a set of power relations: political power fits into cultural codes through which politicians interact on a new information field; network organizations, structured with the help of the Internet based on cultural values, gradually occupy the niche of traditional political institutions, such as parties, trade unions and formal institutions of civil society². Respectively, political decisions can be taken by subjects of social and economic activities through codes that do not fit into traditional logic of forms and mechanisms of political influence. Therefore, transformation of political relations and institutions may obtain not inherent forms and be regulated not as much by legitimate decisions of national political institutions, but by factors of global nature. They reveal themselves in political field of national states as cultural and ethical standards in the form of new meanings and trends that national leaders do not understand immediately and systematically. The components of general communications are industry, special, technical and other communication flows (directions) of various spheres of human activity, including political, mass, scientific, social, management communications and their combinations and variations. For example, every political system, as every political force deploys its own network of political communication according to their capabilities, resources and needs.

So, summing up, we should note that interrelation of political sphere with other social spheres in circulation of social over-sphere is manifested in two aspects. On the one hand, policy is determined by economic, spiritual, political, cultural, ethnohistorical factors, but on the other hand, political sphere is able to influence these areas, to penetrate and interact with them. That happens owing to the fact that a political sphere is designed to:

1) provide conditions under which creation and appropriation of public values, produced within material, spiritual, cultural and other spheres, could be consistent with the interests of various social groups, implemented through power as a tool to distribute values in a society;

2) political sphere is present in all spheres of social life through its inherent regulatory functions.

Eventually, the degree and intensity of impact of political sphere at people's life (social over-sphere) in any country is conditioned by a type of society, a model of citizenship and a form of state in a country.

References

1. Timashova, V.M. (2014). Nadsfery i sfery v teoretychnii pryzhni zmistu politychnogo zhyttia supilstva yak systemy. Naukovyi tsasopys NPU imeni M. P. Dragomanova, vyp. 15, 78-84.
2. Vdovychyn, I., Ugryn, L., Shypunov, G. ta in. (2015). Novitnia politychna leksyka (neologizmy, okazionalizmy ta inchi novoutvory). Lviv: «Novyi Svit – 2000».
3. Smit, A. (2007). Issledovanie o prirode i prichinakh bogatstva narodov. Moskva: EKSMO.
4. Filippov, A. (1990). Tennis Ferdinand. V izd.: Sovremennaia zapadnaia sotsiologii. Slovar. Mpskva: Mysl.
5. Sorokin, P. (1992). Moia filosofii – integralizm. SOTSIS, 10, 137-139.
6. Sorokin, P. (2001). Sotsializm i sotsialisticheskoe ravenstvo. SOTSIS, 5, 105-110.
7. Renner, K. (1899). Synoptikus. Staat und Nation. Wien.

¹ Дабіжа, В. Сучасний науковий дискурс щодо визначення поняття «політичні комунікації». *Електронна бібліотека*. <<http://www.social-science.com.ua/>>.

² Песков, Д.Н. (2003). Інтернет-пространство: состояние премодеерна? *Україна: Поліс*, 5, 51.

8. Varzar, I.M. (2009). Problema spivvidnoshennia etnoistorychnoi nazii, politychnoi nazii ta politychnogo klasu v istorii politychnoi dumku Evropy Novogo ta Novitnogo chasu: teoretyko-istoriologichni syntezy. Naukovyi tsasopys NPU imeni M. P. Dragomanova, vyp. 1. (Seriia 22: «Politytsni nauky ta metodyka vykladannia sotsialno-politytsnykh dystsyplin»).
9. Drach, M.I. (2006). Sotsialno-politychna modernizatsiia ukrainskogo suspilstva v perekhidnyi period. Multyversum. Filosofskiyi almanakh. Kyiv: Tsentr dukhovnoyi kultury, 53, 98-110.
10. Kolodiyi, A. (2003). Sutnist gromadianskogo suspilstva i mekhanizmy yogo vpluvu na polituku: dopovid na zakliuchnyi regionalnyi konferentsii proektu «Chempiony gromadianskogo suspilstva». <<http://political-studies.com/?p=148>>.
11. Ilyin, M.V. (1991). Dve storonu medali: grazhdanskoe obshchestvo i gosudarstvo (chetvertaia beseda tsikla) / M. V. Ilyin, Polis. <<http://www.politstudies.ru/fulltext/1992/1/18.htm>>.
12. Giddens, A. (2003). Runaway World. How globalization is Reshaping our Lives. Routledge.
13. Fuller, L. (2007). Moral prava. Izd. 2-e pererab. i dop. Moskva: IRISEN.
14. Dabizha, V. (2012). Suchasnyi naukovui duskurs shchodo vyznachennia poniattia «politytsni komunikatsii. Ukr. nauk. zhurnal «Osvita regionu: Politologiiia. Psykhologiiia. Komunikatsii», 3. <<http://www.social-science.com.ua/>>.
15. Peskov, D.N. (2003). Internet-prostranstvo: sostoianie premoderna? Polis, 5.