**EPISTEMOLOGICAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY,
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES**

ISSN 2618-1274 (Print), ISSN [2618-1282](#) (Online)

Journal home page: <https://visnukpfs.dp.ua/index.php/PFS/index>

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

Олександр Сергійович Токовенко

Декан факультету суспільних наук і міжнародних відносин,
доктор філософських наук, професор,
Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара,
пр. Гагаріна 72, Дніпро, 49000, Україна

Email: kafpol@ukr.net,

Olexander Serghijovych Tokovenko

Dean of the Social Sciences and International Relations Faculty,
Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University,
72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro,
49010, Ukraine

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1721-2205>

Олексій Анатолійович Третяк

Завідувач кафедри політології,
Доктор політичних наук, професор,
Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара,
пр. Гагаріна 72, Дніпро, 49000, Україна

Email: alexsir25@ukr.net,

Oleksii Anatoliyovych Tretiak

Head of the Political Science Department
Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro,
49010, Ukraine

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2536-0611>

УДК 323.21

***PUBLIC SPHERE OF POLITICS AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY:
DEMARCATION CRITERIA***

Received 21 February 2020; revised 20 March 2020; accepted 10 April 2020

DOI: 10.15421/342025

Abstract

The prospects of development of modern political theory in the context of filling the new semantic values of concepts of political discourse, political communication and public political representation are considered. The network of newly established democratic institutions, which required firm definition, practicing public political debate and not distorted political communication defined. With the help of the comparative method, the common and different conceptual views of political debate in interpreting deliberative democracy and the public sphere of politics studied. The content of the concept of the public sphere of politics as a factor of coverage of the transition of democratic public institutions of transformational countries from the state of declarative to a state of sustainable democracy is discussed. Public sphere of politics as mainly unifying concept that determines the possibility of various aspects of joint interpretation of political realities and possibilities of the political participants' appearance for any topic studied. The subject areas of the concepts of deliberative politics and the public sphere of politics regarding the ways of personal and institutional self-presentation are determined. The specifics of the reflection of political conflict and political decisions within the limits of the values of the public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy are revealed. The features of common approaches to the interpretation of political pluralism and political competition in the semantic structures of the public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy are explored. It emphasizes the flexibility of the concept of the public sphere of politics as a concept that encompasses a large number of events and phenomena of political communication. The possibility of a non-idealist approach to public political presentations on the Internet is substantiated. The political meaning dimensions of political deliberation and political manifestation which differ in explanations background of individual behavior, based on the ancient principle of political pragmatism and defending of selfish interests considered. The explanatory potential of a deliberative policy and the public sphere of politics is singled out. The peculiarities of crossing the subject areas of the public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy in the context of the functioning of modern civil society are established.

***Key words:* deliberative democracy, public sphere of politics, public political presentation, political participation, political communication, publicity.**

Публічна сфера політики та деліберативна демократія: критерії демаркації

Анотація

Розглянуто перспективи розвитку сучасної політичної теорії в контексті розкриття нових смислових цінностей концепцій політичного дискурсу, політичної комунікації та публічного політичного представництва. Публічна сфера політики аналізується як переважно об'єднуючий концепт, що визначає можливість різних аспектів спільної інтерпретації політичних реалій та можливостей появи політичних учасників на будь-яку досліджувану тему. Визначено предметні області концепцій цілеспрямованої політики та публічної сфери політики щодо способів особистої та інституційної самопрезентації. Розкрито специфіку відображення політичного конфлікту та політичних рішень у межах цінностей публічної сфери політики та деліберативної демократії. Досліджено особливості спільних підходів до трактування політичного плюралізму та політичної конкуренції у смислових структурах публічної сфери політики та деліберативної демократії. У статті підкреслюється гнучкість концепції публічної сфери політики як концепції, яка охоплює велику кількість подій та явищ політичної комунікації. Обґрунтовано можливість неідеалістичного підходу до публічних політичних презентацій в Інтернеті. Встановлено особливості перетину предметних областей публічної сфери політики та деліберативної демократії в контексті функціонування сучасного громадянського суспільства.

Ключові слова: *деліберативна демократія, публічна сфера політики, публічно-політична презентація, політична участь, політична комунікація, публічність.*

Публичная сфера политики и делиберативная демократия: критерии демаркации

Аннотация

Рассмотрены перспективы развития современной политической теории в контексте раскрытия новых смысловых ценностей концепций политического дискурса, политической коммуникации и публичного политического представительства. Публичная сфера политики анализируется как преимущественно объединяющий концепт, который определяет возможность различных аспектов совместной интерпретации политических реалий и возможностей появления политических участников на любую изучаемую тему. Определены предметные области концепций целенаправленной политики и публичной сферы политики в отношении способов личной и институциональной самопрезентации. Раскрыта специфика отражения политического конфликта и политических решений в рамках ценностей публичной сферы политики и делиберативной демократии. Исследованы особенности общих подходов к трактовке политического плюрализма и политической конкуренции в смысловых структурах публичной сферы политики и делиберативной демократии. В статье подчеркивается гибкость концепции публичной сферы политики как концепции, которая охватывает большое количество событий и явлений политической коммуникации. Обоснована возможность неидеалистичного подхода к публичным политическим презентациям в Интернете. Установлены особенности пересечения предметных областей публичной сферы политики и делиберативной демократии в контексте функционирования современного гражданского общества.

Ключевые слова: *делиберативная демократия, публичная сфера политики, публично-политическая презентация, политическое участие, политическая коммуникация, публичность.*

The problem formulation

Contemporary political theory requires interdisciplinary concepts for compounding the phenomena of political communication, political discourse and public political representation with the institutional structure of the political system and decision-making system. The concepts of the public sphere and deliberative democracy reveal the political and social context of communicative activity in politics. Habermas' public sphere is the sphere of civic public intentions' expression to

social communication, social issues movement at the political level. Deliberative democracy appears as an alternative and projective measurement of the democratic decision-making scope. However, global Internet communications' nomination and citizens' involvement to remote, social and political discussions determines the value background of behavioral reactions on political events. Under these conditions, understanding of the deliberation in the political sense only as a part of democracy and the public sphere, solely

as evolutionary stage of civil society formation restricts the scientific research perspective in the field of political theory.

Public sphere of politics approbation as a new political theory concept, provides an overview of basic connotations of this term and finding of its equivalents in the political reality, and correlation with other political science terms and categories. Public sphere of politics does not yet have equivalents in classical theories. Narrowing of the public sphere to the political world or to the environment of political management, contradicts to universal pragmatics of Karl-Otto Apel and Jürgen Habermas discourse ethics. They pointed out, that the system, including the political, is limiting the man's life-world, while the public sphere is an environment of the expression of not distorted public communicative connections which regulate social and political life. However, to this thesis contradicts the practice of transition countries development in which civil society has not become a finally implemented project. Political elites do not have the skills of their public interests representation, and citizens are separated from the main channels of selfrepresenting. The network of newly established democratic institutions requires firm definition, practicing public political debate and not distorted political communication. It is the public sphere of politics as a new construct has to answer the question of how deliberative democracy corresponds to the current political process in developed democracies and transitional countries, and how the political publicity can promote transformation of the declarative and or formal democracy to sustainable one.

The publication's analysis

Contemporary researchers are actively studying the interdisciplinary significance of the concept and phenomena of the public sphere. Particular attention is paid to the processes of transforming the public sphere in the new conditions of the cybernetic and digital revolution. Also, the problem of classical concept of the public sphere deviations in the contemporary mediaization society realities is becoming widespread. In particular, Ancuta-Gabriela Tarta presents some featured theories and perspectives on the European public sphere, followed by the reflections

they generated [Tarta 2007]. Jürgen Habermas made a profound contribution on importance of communication through language. He stated, that German post-war political life prompted his involvement in favor of democracy. These personal experiences of German philosopher also shaped his understanding of the role of intellectuals in the public sphere [see: Gottfried, Hardy, Holbert, Winneg & Jamieson 2017]. Axel Bruns and Tim Highfield emphasized, that the mass media-dominated environment which it describes has given way to a considerably more fragmented and complex system of distinct and diverse, yet interconnected and overlapping publics that represent different themes, topics, and approaches to mediated communication [Bruns & Highfield 2016]. A further study of the political significance of the public sphere in its structural and substantive dimensions is needed. The aggregate phenomenon of a politics that is represented by the term «deliberative democracy» or «deliberative politics» should help to establish the correct meaning of the public sphere as a concept of contemporary political theory: is it advisable to use the term «political public sphere» or more appropriate is «public sphere of politics».

Purpose

The purpose of the article is to establish criteria for demarcation between concepts of the public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy in conceptual and institutional dimensions. This procedure is necessary not only to delineate the subject areas of both concepts, but also to focus research on more theoretical or more empirical approaches.

The main content of the article

The divergence between a public sphere of politics and deliberative politics (or deliberative democracy) disclosed in those essential features of the area, concepts which are delineated with demarcation line. Usually in contemporary political science researches one concept differs from another area of its definition does not embraces certain phenomena. In case of discussions' democracy the specifics of deliberative space are conceptual differences and the essential aspects of political activity, such as social interests, ideological concepts, and so on. Public sphere of politics for now is mainly unifying concept that

determines the possibility of various aspects of joint interpretation of political realities and possibilities of the political participants' appearance for any topic. Deliberation is a kind of discussion that involves decision making. Public sphere of politics focuses attention on the possibility of impartial and unbiased own position representation without regard to consensus or compromise result. Thus deliberative politics as well as public sphere tries to avoid the essential fundamental or conceptual antagonisms on activity level. As J. Dryzek considers, «how deliberative democracy can process what are arguably the toughest kinds of political issues, the mutually contradictory assertions of identity that define a divided society. The assertions in question might involve nationalism (Republicans and Unionists in Northern Ireland; any number of separatist movements), combinations of religious and ethnic conflicts (Palestinians versus Israelis), and religious versus secular forces (Islamic fundamentalism against Western liberalism on the global stage; Islamists versus secularists in Turkey and Algeria; Christian fundamentalists versus liberalism in the United States)» [Dryzek 2005: 219].

In the case of deliberative democracy contemporary scientists primarily focus attention on political competition and achieving of political results. In the case of the public sphere of politics, they are talking mostly about the potential possibility of communicative aggregation of the particular political point of view. Political debates under democracy conditions provide not only representation but are becoming also the way of self-manifestation and political subjects' appearance. The possibility to express themselves in political thinking makes an individual or institution a part of the limited political space, which includes only people, who have a certain level of political training and effectiveness. Public sphere of politics does not only covers the personal and institutional selfpresentation. Publicity, contrary to privacy, means in accordance with Hannah Arendt, the opening of their internal reasons to external world. Hence, the public sphere of politics, despite the thematic and institutional regulatory restrictions, is the only space in which a person or institution can declare itself as part of the political environment. In this regard, public sphere of

politics appears more as a scope of unrestricted subjectivity as each equally and infinitely present one's point of view. Political deliberation, meanwhile, covers only political statements that have the status and value to virtually planned political decisions. «I argue for a discursive democracy that can handle deep differences. The key involves partially decoupling the deliberative and decisional moments of democracy, locating deliberation in engagement of discourses in the public sphere at a distance from the sovereign state. I approach this argument by examining two very different responses to divided societies. The first is agonistic, seeking robust exchange across identities » says John Dryzek [Dryzek 2005: 220].

The demarcation between deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics passes in part of their mutual complementarity of the contemporary political science concepts. Within modern political science the seat of concept is still vacant, which would cover procedures for political communication and simultaneously ideological content of political messages, which are associated with all the previous experience of political and doctrinal justification. Deliberative politics and deliberative democracy are concepts of empirical political science studies that seek to identify the institutional roles of debate actors and on this basis to establish their importance to decision-making system. Public sphere of politics or political public sphere is a product of the social philosophy and political theory evolution that sought to conceptualize new discursive political relations that occur in conditions of unlimited liberal society's political democracy. On this basis, experts could argue that the area of deliberative politics concepts' meaning covers purposeful and formal political performances that have a functional nature. Meanwhile, public sphere of politics should satisfy those communicative expression of political speech that define individual or group presentation of in the political space. As J. Dryzek points out, «agonists believe deliberative democracy cannot deal with divisive issues because it is too constraining in the kind of communication it allows. Consociationalists believe deliberative democracy cannot deal with divisive issues because it is too open to diverse claims and

claimants. Deliberative democracy can be defended against both sides, but it has to take them seriously, and be prepared to take elements from each. On the face of it this ought to be impossible, given their diametric opposition» [Dryzek 2005: 223].

Expansion of subject area of both concepts can be implemented within the outline of consensus and conflict vision of politics. Finding a decision that will satisfy all groups involved in the political discussion, leads to the emergence of universalist projects and models, such as consociational democracy. However, antagonism and conflicts drives the critical review of policy issues. Public sphere of politics in this regard is more flexible concept, because the different points of view representation does not determine the outcome of discursive interaction, even in its ethical conditionality, as in the classic Habermas version.

Deliberative democracy, which primarily involves the institutional and power interactions' context and the importance of decision making leads to the idea of the necessity and the limitation of any political deliberations. Public sphere of politics does not define the limits and does not impose even imaginary restrictions for the process of human speech representation in politics, regardless of institutional affiliation. In this respect, consensus and conflict are equally likely in the public sphere of politics concept space. According to J. Dryzek, «the key is a differentiation of political sites within a society that agonists and consociationalists alike have not contemplated: the former because they address only politics in the abstract rather than its institutional specifics, the latter because they see only a politics tightly attached to the state. Deliberative democracy can process contentious issues in a politics of engagement in the public sphere, even if it has problems doing so when it comes to deliberation within the institutions of the state» [Dryzek 2003: 223].

Considering the demarcation between deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics we should avoid idealistic notions about both constructs. The reality of political deliberations determines the behavior of individuals as one that is consistent with the rules and procedures. The reality of political intentions public demonstrations which creates public sphere of politics

determines orientation to rational argument and the ethical attitude to the interlocutor. Deviations associated with information distortion, time, space and means of verbal expression manipulations, are normatively outside the conceptual assumptions of both subject areas. The possibility of violations of the democratic deliberations needs its own large-scale empirical evaluation, as well as its influence in the larger political system processes. Rational choice theory guidelines show that the theoretical assumptions about conflict behavior can not be justified by the statistics, which to some extent reflect reality [see: Dryzek & List 2004]. Thus political meaning dimensions of political deliberation and political manifestation may differ in explanations background of individual behavior, based on the ancient principle of political pragmatism and defending of selfish interests. As J. Dryzek and Ch. List. argue, «an empirical account of individual behaviour may (implicitly) affect the normative choice of minimal conditions on aggregation. For instance, if, empirically, human beings tend to distort information when expedient, we may require that aggregation mechanisms minimize people's incentives to manipulate information (an example of such a condition is strategy-proofness as discussed below). Such rational-choice-theoretic premises may or may not turn out to be empirically adequate. Our point is simply that social choice theory and rational choice theory should not be conflated» [Dryzek & List 2004: 3].

The distinction between a public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy disclosed on the base of basic approaches to deliberation in applied research. Political deliberation is not just a debate, and serves primarily an attempt of political action, which is the basis of activities institutionalized groups or governments. Possibility of democracy, based on the discussions, determined by the society's ability to solve political issues in this way. Political deliberation thus acquires the status of a tool for the policy and regulatory requirements improvement and citizens' political participation formation. Deliberative politics and deliberative democracy are the projective visions of politics in general, but in contrast to the public sphere, their foundations are beginning to be implemented in specific societies. According to

J. Dryzek, «although the effect of deliberation on the indices of single-peakedness was less marked than in the Texas polls, the Australian results remain encouraging because in a situation where substantial preference shifts occurred, and where a cycle over three options was a live possibility (the third option being the status quo), deliberation appears to have protected against a loss of structure» [Dryzek & List 2003: 22].

An instrumental understanding of deliberative democracy allows to understand the processes of political communication meaning in such a world, not only in terms of information transmission, but also in terms of communication process management. The information transferring from non-political institutions to political ones make deliberation broader phenomenon than just the transmission of information. However, outside deliberative process are staying discussions that arise in relationships of political authority. So deliberation may be carried out by equal subjects within the partnership negotiations, not vertical management. Public sphere of politics in this regard is more flexible concept that can provide a public manifestation of political interests at all levels, regardless of relationship to those or other political functions [see: Fuchs 2014]. However, the connective link between the political deliberation and public sphere of politics is democratic political environment, which does not provide for directive and ordering relationship between those who publicly speaks or performs debate that has political significance.

The realm, which essentially undermines the explanatory potential of deliberative democracy and the public sphere of politics is the realm of political conflict that participants can use. Tools of political action that do not fully comply with consideration of the common good, or ensuring the status quo, or do not have projective and idealistic in nature. Political pluralism as the field of political competition of ideas and programs is providing not only a status of universal uniting means for political speech and communicative interaction, but also a status of gaining competitive advantage factor. Electoral communication during campaigns are empirical evidences of action directed to their own political interest expression [see: Gaber 2007]. Under these conditions,

requirements of cooperation and constructive behavior are not possible, that narrows deliberative democracy subject scope. The competitive politics can be inscribed to the elements that explain the public sphere politics in static mode, as long as political actors expressing their will and trying to improve their situation does not destroy the relationship of mutual respect and trust.

Public sphere of politics spreading on related areas of social cohabitation is a mental experiment that can be attributed to political other public manifestations. Despite the rootedness of multiplicity of public spheres concepts in classical Habermas communication theory, a variety of public interest, which may somehow be related to the semantic field of politics is a promising concept. However, the interaction between the various meaning communities and also the divergence of their interests violate the unity of common public sphere of politics as such. It should be noted that public sphere of politics focuses on public displays associated with political infrastructure, political system institutions as a whole and their environment. To the above mentioned added a fundamental contradiction between the life world and the system expressed by J. Habermas, that does not fully implement public sphere expansion to other areas of public life.

Instrumental creation of sectoral public spheres is a reality in condition of cyber information society. Many types of human activity are taking public demonstration without any effort and aspirations from activities' subjects and manifested through technological nature of contemporary communication means. Rational and reasoned debate modus in each expert community related in major to the subject of publicity concentration in society [see: Gottfried, Hardy, Holbert, Winneg & Jamieson 2017]. Because of the flexibility of online networks political public as public sphere connections carrier may transfer to other public sphere areas of public and can involve them to the political meanings and vice versa. According to Kasun Ubayasiri, «despite the success of such projects that have successfully reignited greater public dialogue in existing democracies, greater challenges continue to remain unaddressed and hence unresolved in more volatile theatres of political conflict. In such theatres, where the

ideological gulf between opposing publics are greatest even cyber communities have failed to create public spheres which transcend these pre-existing boundaries of hatred and mistrust» [Ubayasiri 2012].

The strategy of political processes explanation in the field of communication, related not only to the actions of political actors, but also the nature of communication processes in the era of the Internet [see: Dahlgren 2005]. The impact on the voters' consciousness or on political and administrative decisions priorities include the ability unambiguous information perception and are building priorities within the meaning and coverage of those events. But consumer of the information in the presence of electronic media can make a choice between different channels, which to some extent reduces the possibility of authoritative information dissemination and information on behalf of ruling group. Under these circumstances, public sphere of politics will receive broad perspectives and would be closely connected to network structure of information and would create communication environment of society. As Jürgen Gerhards suggests, «the results indicate that internet communication is not more equal than communication in print media: we do not see a more extensive popular inclusion of societal actors, especially civil societal actors, on the web pages. In the internet, a small number of actors claim the bulk of standing for themselves, and, in this regard, communication online is even more one-sided than in the print media» [Gerhards 2009: 6].

Correlation between Internet and print media serves only as technical change of communication practices in society. However, politics provides the creation of political media, regardless of their technical nature. More important is the ability to perform the functions of political persuasion and information transmitting. In this situation, the political deliberation as major general social activity concedes in flexibility and explanatory capacity to the «public sphere of politics» concept, insofar as political media are the means of discussion only in the broad doctrinal or conceptual sense.

The term «deliberative democracy» that covers the involvement of the general public to pro-

active speech activity to some extent limited in its spread on factors of communicative intercourse that have openly interpersonal or domestic nature. When it comes to social media or social networks in politics, it should be told about the content of the various public spheres with political content. However, citizens' public self-expression through social networks and social media does not meet the classic paradigm of rationality and argumentative communication. As Jürgen Gerhards points out, «we found only minimal evidence to support the idea that the internet is a better communication space as compared to print media. In both media, communication is dominated by (bio- and natural) scientific actors; popular inclusion does not occur. Evaluations are largely one-sided and affirmative towards human genome research in both the print media and internet» [Gerhards 2009: 13].

The substantive basis of deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics closely related with the internal motivation of political actors, institutions, power bodies and individuals to voluntary political participation. Simultaneously, according to opinion polls proactive political participation inherent only to a small part of citizens. In this regard, since the time of the bourgeois revolution, the public, despite its liberal-mindedness, acts primarily as elitist creature [see: Habermas 2015]. Thus basically deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics are projects that have to be based on a certain part of the population engaged. The amount of public support for these projects requires further empirical studies that involve sociological and expert interviews. According to Zizi Papacharissi, «the idea of 'the public' is closely tied to democratic ideals that call for citizen participation in public affairs» [Papacharissi 2002: 10].

Elitism of political publicity and democratic deliberation can not be solved even with broad public access to political knowledge and electronic discussions in the Internet. As we know, expectations for the Internet as a real public sphere did not come true. Instead, the activities of political interest groups and political parties serves only to government removal from major population sections. Expert community acts as technology complement to the power information processing

and information production which puts forward a question of setting fair rules of the political game. The need for experience and community activists training in contemporary politics reveals the problem of forced elitism and small numbers of public sphere followers. As Z. Papacharissi argues, «these conceptualizations of the public were somewhat idealized. It is ironic that this pinnacle of democracy was rather undemocratic in its structure throughout the centuries, by not including women or people from lower social classes, a point acknowledged as such by Habermas himself» [Papacharissi 2002: 11].

The term «deliberative democracy» more than ever actualizes the content of broad public participation in decision-making. However, this system requires homogeneity of the population, as the bearer of rights and freedoms. Political absenteeism as unwillingness of the population to participate in the democratic political process and public debates, significantly limits the prospects for a real deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics implementation. Both concepts remain alternatives to the current political reality, positive scenarios that could lead to the improvement and transformation policies [see: Paige 2009]. The basis of the real implementation of the deliberative democracy and public sphere concepts consist of pragmatic perception of political discussions essential part of individuals and groups needs implementation.

Comprehension of explanatory potential of deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics related to possibilities of upgrading to political results achieving in the new technological environment. The very structure of the communication process varies because the citizens and political groups get remote access to information, with the possibility to exchange messages and more. The political debate as an area of participants' public manifestation shifts to cyberspace. Changes in political communication interaction occurs through the transition of the political public from real political space to the virtual. This problem determines the loss of local political debate places traditional meaning. Thus deliberative politics and public sphere of politics are losing traditional decision making function and the function political ideas and personal

preferences demonstration. As Mark Poster says, «the issue of the public sphere is at the heart of any reconceptualization of democracy. Contemporary social relations seem to be devoid of a basic level of interactive practice which, in the past, was the matrix of democratizing politics: loci such as the agora, the New England town hall, the village Church, the coffee house, the tavern, the public square, a convenient barn, a union hall, a park, a factory lunchroom, and even a street corner. Many of these places remain but no longer serve as organizing centers for political discussion and action. It appears that the media, especially television but also other forms of electronic communication isolate citizens from one another and substitute themselves for older spaces of politics» [Poster 2000: 403].

As the consequence of the individuals' political activity transfer to the Internet space (including political advertising and political manipulation activities), it becomes essential basis for political debate and public demonstrations decreases, while the meaning of public is increasing. It causes discussion about the compliance of existing communicative tools to classical practices of democratic political discussions that are existing since antiquity. Metaphorical compliance of modern democracy to ancient ideals at contemporary times has not only be under empirical question, but needs skeptical discussion within the theoretical traditions. The concept of political openness (publicity) does not fully meet to opposition of private – public and public – personal, in which politically biased and active people are traditionally described. The problem of compliance of political participation processes to political economy theories, which is revealing the motivational reasons for mass participation also requires its coverage.

The new framework of political reality for theoretical considerations of public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy is at the intersection of political public presentation and civil society conceptual content. Conceptualizing of public and self-organized public activity provides the possibility for both motivation for public political debates defining and the desire to complete the democratic debate with solution acceptable to all participants [see: Pirsoul

2017]. Civil society serves both as a group of associations that have a clear goal and a plan of action. At the same time, civil society unites not only politically-oriented organizations, but also a bunch of public interests representations that are not interested neither in decisions nor in public (cyber) self-presentation. Also, civil society, which is opposed to the state does not reflect the whole completeness of political discussions and publicity manifestations. As Terje Rasmussen points out, «civil society can be understood as the ensemble of self-organised and coordinated activity in organisations, associations, social movements and interest groups where members freely cooperate on equal grounds to publicly pursue aims of common or universal interest. The communicational dimension of the civil society can be viewed as a dimension of the public sphere» [Rasmussen 2014].

As a public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy seek to include in their subject area political-speech activity. The structure of political expressions that in some researches called «political discourse», recognizes the need to differentiate public statements and refer them to manifesting, communicative, discussive and deliberative. Intentional analysis of specific political statements and their distribution on subject areas is also important. As T. Rasmussen says, «how can we advance our thinking about the relationship between deliberative democracy and the Internet? If the research problem is not deliberative legitimation of politics per se, but rather the significance of Internet communication in the public sphere, we need to a) address local and global public spheres in addition to the national, b) address the literary/cultural public sphere in addition to the political, and c) address the communication that has indirect influence on the political system in addition the communication with direct influence» [Rasmussen 2014].

Thus, political communication interactions acquire its meaning within a certain

methodological scheme. Its structural elements are getting their meaning, depending on the position of researcher and interpretative tradition. Generally in some aspects the combination of deliberative democracy and public sphere of politics subject areas occurs, since a bunch of political communicativity manifestations determined as unlimited diversity. Deliberative debate and public manifestation can occur in the same, functional and regulatory dimension of the political world.

Conclusions

Therefore, explanatory capacity evaluation of public sphere of politics and deliberative democracy concepts in contexts of developed Western societies and transformation states leads to the conclusion that the two concepts have great capacity and potential for future political theoryzing. The first demarcation criterion based on considerations, that deliberative politics and deliberative democracy are concepts, that define the procedural process of political positions' diversity construction to a discussion and approval. The second demarcation criterion claims that public sphere of politics focuses attention on the presentation of the position itself and relevance of political meaning of public demonstrations. The third demarcation criterion marks politics as the space of competition and implementation of interests. It gets public nature in the institutionalization of democratic practices and public opinion, as politicians in transformative states are active agents of public and political interest representation. Their public appearances are becoming the basis for the environment formation, similar to bourgeois public sphere in early industrialization and modernity epoch. Thus deliberative democracy and the public sphere of politics describe different levels of political participation and political representation, adding system expression of politics and creating a vision for the future political assumptions about the political world.

References

- Bruns, A. & Highfield, T. *Is Habermas on Twitter? Social Media and the Public Sphere*. Retrieved from <http://snurb.info/files/2016/Is%20Habermas%20on%20Twitter.pdf>
- Dahlgren, P. (2005). The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation. *Political Communication*, 22(2), 147-162.

- Dryzek, J.S. & List, Ch. (2003). Social Choice Theory and Deliberative Democracy: A Reconciliation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 33,(1-Jan.), 1-28.
- Dryzek, J.S. & List, Ch. (2004). Social Choice Theory and Deliberative Democracy: A Response to Aldred. *British Journal of Political Science*, 34 (4-Oct.), 752-758.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2005). Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia. *Political Theory*, 33(2-Apr.), 218-242.
- Fuchs, Ch. (2014). *Social Media and the Public Sphere*. Retrieved from <http://www.triple-c.at/index.php/tripleC/article/view/552/668>
- Gaber, I. (2007). Too much of a good thing: the 'problem' of political communications in amass media democracy. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 219-234.
- Gerhards, J. (2009). Is the internet a better public sphere? Comparing old and new media in the US and Germany. *New Media & Society*, XX(X), 1-18.
- Gottfried, J. A., Hardy B. W., Holbert R. L., Winneg K. M. & Jamieson K. H. (2017). The Changing Nature of Political Debate Consumption: Social Media, Multitasking, and Knowledge Acquisition. *Political Communication*, 34, 172-199.
- Habermas, J. (2015). Public Space and Political Public Sphere The Biographical Roots of Two Motifs in My Thought. *Esprit*, 8(August-September), 12-25.
- Paige, A. (2009). *Identities in Transition: Developing Better Transitional Justice Initiatives in Divided Societies*. Research Unit International Center for Transitional Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Global-Divided-Societies-2009-English.pdf>
- Papacharissi, Z. (2002). The virtual sphere. The internet as a public sphere *New Media & Society*, 4(1), 9-27.
- Pirsoul, N. (2017). Reason, Deliberation, and Democracy in Divided Societies: Perspectives from the Jafari School of Thought. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 13(1). Article 6. Retrieved from <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol13/iss1/art6>
- Poster, M. (2000). CyberDemocracy: Internet and the Public Sphere. *American Cultural Studies* /Ed. by J.Harley, R.E. Pearson. Oxford University Press, 402-413.
- Rasmussen, T. (2014). *The Internet and the Political Public Sphere*. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/soc4.12228>
- Tarta, A.-G. (2007). *Clash of the European public spheres: offline versus online, and cultural versus political*. Retrieved from http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/cde/content/articles/conference/participant-papers/Clash_of_the_European_public_spheres_offline_versus_online_and_cultural_versus_political.pdf
- Ubayasiri, K. (2012). *Internet and the Public Sphere: A glimpse of YouTube*. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Professor-Ivor-Gaber-Extract-from-the-Political-Quarterly-exploring-the-paradox-of-liberal-democracy-part-2.pdf>