СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

O. A. TRETYAK[1*]

[1*]Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk National University (Dnipro), e-mail alexsir25@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0003-2536-0611

THE PUBLIC SPHERE OF POLITICS: THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL DIMENSION IN CONTEMPORARY COMMUNICATIVE THEORY

Introduction. According to Jürgen Habermas, a contradiction between the system and the life-world signifies a need for a concept that would describe the projective space of a relaxed and undistorted human communicative activity. Communicative action as a societal basis of the public sphere links this concept to the pragmatic principles of human existence in modern society. The public sphere is important in the age of the cyber revolution and the rule of networking technologies and it gets an anthropological dimension in its definition of the modern individual. Reviewed from the view of the interdisciplinary scientific community the public sphere as a dimension of human identity that is manifested in standardized terms of communicative interactions. The paper suggests that the public sphere has lost its conflict mode in respect to power and the tech-savvy social system. **Purpose.** The paper aims to establish the specifics of the anthropological interpretation of the public sphere in the contemporary philosophical tradition. **Methodology.** General scientific and special methods of philosophical research are used for conducting this study. The author has used the descriptive method to define the subject area of the anthropic measurement of the public sphere of politics. The method of logical synthesis allows to combine the abstract and specific content of the anthropological dimension of publicity. A retrospective analysis allows to determine the temporal peculiarities of the anthropic meaning of the public sphere. The comparative method gives an opportunity to compare the empirical manifestations of social and political publicity and compare anthropological effects of the media and interpersonal communication activities of modern people. **Theoretical basis and results**. The article examines the anthropological content of the public sphere of politics as one of the key concepts of communicative theory paying attention to the modification of the nature of publicity under the conditions of the cybernetic revolution. The author argues that the public sphere is not only a collection of self-presentations but also a set of messages of general significance, both textual and verbal. In this regard, the selection of news, of any importance, stands in one respect as a means of the worldview matching technique but also as the orientation amidst the unlimited information flow. The public sphere acts not just as a medium of verbal or textual self-expression of the individual but also as a dimension of human presence in the lives of others and its adequate perception. The more the public sphere stands away from the counter-factual image drawn in communicative theory, the more it loses its anthropological features and acquires the content of the technological and production network since a mode of communication is changed to the mode of information transmission. The paper establishes priorities of personality representation in the public sphere and examines the need and motives of communicative-pragmatic relationships between individuals. **Originality.** In the anthropological dimension the public sphere is a source of promising prospects and the formation of defining constraints. Publicity becomes the leading quality of the modern individual because of its need to be realized in communication practices. The networking nature of communication links enforces the modern individual to produce a certain image for self-presenting to society. **Conclusions** The article draws a conclusion about the directions of the public sphere transformation in a global perspective.

Key words: public sphere of politics; communicative theory; communicative pragmatics; distorted communication; anthropic dimension; perception of the other.

Introduction

The public sphere in the contemporary period is one of the universal concepts that explains the basics of the common human activity not only in the field of social communications but also on a larger scale of the culture of scientific activity. A relatively local definition of the term was associated with the receptions of the critical theory of the Frankfurt School and with attempts to create an alternative concept of technology-system constructions that developed in the philosophy of science from the mid-20th century. The contradiction between the system and the life-world defined and disclosed by German philosopher and sociologist Jurgen Habermas needed a concept that could describe a projective space of a relaxed and undistorted human activity that is of a social nature but is not subordinate to the governmental influence. Communicative action as a societal basis of the public sphere linked this concept to the pragmatic principles of human existence in modern society. However, the relatively local importance of the public sphere in the age of cyber revolution and the rule of networking technologies has taken the concept of the public sphere to the next level of meaning. At present the interdisciplinary scientific community sees the public sphere as one of the dimensions of human identity amidst standardized communicative interactions. Arguably, in the social sciences, the public sphere has lost its conflict mode in respect to power and the tech-savvy social system.

The well known debate between Jurgen Habermas and Michel Foucault on the state of the postmodern resulted in the perception of the public sphere as a real, embodied dimension of the modernization of interpersonal and group communication. The public sphere is internalized into different semantic concepts and becomes the basis for the explaination of social phenomena of varying depths. Nowdays the anthropological dimension of the public sphere is acquiring a significant urgency as the classical communication theory defined the debate and the discourse as the main means of people's expression in communicative space. The anthropic dimension of publicity stands as a conceptual alternative to the inclusion of the public sphere to various technological and system structures. The integration of the modern individual to interactive communication and the mediation of communicative practices with technological structures of artificial intelligence highlight the problem of consistency between the established notions about public communication activities and its actual state in a situation of mediated direct communication. This issue has a broader meaning as it helps to establish some benchmarks for the evolution of contemporary mankind on a global scale.

Contemporary philosophical research gives a wide range of political connotations in anthropology and the public sphere. In particular, its correlations are reflected in the field of applied anthropology [1], anthropology of postcolonialism [3], regional public spheres (such as a European public sphere) [4], in the display of tragic sequences of terrorist attacks [5], in constraints to public sphere activities [9], in a way of the functioning of media systems in today's world [13], and in the context of transborder public communications [15]. Despite the diversity of viewpoints, authors are aware of the crucial role the anthropological discourse plays in defining embodiments of public communication in special areas. Thus the problem of anthropological senses in the public sphere of politics requires additional study.

Purpose

The paper aims to establish the specific anthropological interpretation of the public sphere of politics in the contemporary philosophical tradition.

Methodology

General scientific and special methods of philosophical research are used for conducting this study. Through the descriptive method the subject area of the anthropic measurement of the public sphere of politics is defined. The method of logical synthesis allowed the author to combine the abstract and specific content of the anthropological dimension of publicity. Retrospective analysis permitted to determine the temporal peculiarities of the anthropic meaning of the public sphere. The comparative method gives an opportunity to compare empirical manifestations of social and political publicity, to compare the anthropological effects of the media and interpersonal communication activities.

Theoretical basis and results

In the context of contemporary communication theory, the anthropological meaning of the public sphere manifests itself in situations that are the

most meaningful to the modern individual. The interconnection between the material world and the linguistic-symbolic of knowledge became the basis for expression of the specificity and the condition of the modern individual. Anthropologism of communicative theory manifests itself in the emergence of considerations about the existing condition of people and its development in the near future. Paradigms of consciousness and being are combined with aspects of speech communication that covers the interpersonal and social level. The anthropological meaning of communication established in the discourse ethics determines the fate of mankind in the age of modern global changes. As Robert C. Ulin argues, «It is suggested that a metatheory grounded in history and responsive to the problematics of advanced capitalist society is the best means by which to bridge the impasse between political-economy and postmodern anthropology» [19].

The problem of the individual's perception of the world is revealed not only through self-representation in interindividual communication. Valid definitions and anthropological senses of contemporary times appear in the news discourse as the selection of the most significant events for the individual who becomes a consumer of information. In postmodern times, the public sphere acts not just as a set of individual presentations, but also as a set of verbal and textual messages of general significance (also see W. M. Reddy (1992) [16]). In this regard, the selection of news, of more or less importance, stands in one respect as a means of the worldview matching technique but also as the orientation amidst the unlimited information flow. The example of news production reveals that the public sphere is unable to function beyond technological limitations of the contemporary world. Moreover, the anthropological content of publicity is transformed through the nature of technical means of communication and transmission of information. According to empirical anthropologists Tom Van Hout and Geert Jacobs, «The reliance on sources in business news forces attention to issues of institutional and textual power, source-media interaction and agency. Who sets whose agenda? What type of interaction is there between source media and news media?» [6, p. 60].

The anthropological content of the public sphere connected primarily to communicative ac-

tivities is aimed at producing texts of general perception. Open public statements imply the commonality of senses and the presence in the common space of signs and concepts, which manifests itself in the standard methods of media correspondence (see E. W. Rothenbuhler, (2005)[17]). The author's principles for the formation of public texts develop general public importance thorugh emotional closeness and connection between individuals and the semantic agenda that is inherent in a particular social stratum or community. Through the ethical guidelines the public sphere transforms everyday communicative activities into ones of general significance. The transfer of human thoughts, attitudes, and preferences from the categories of the private to the public, determines the relevance of personal criteria for the perception of the world to the general public. The social and cultural basis of interpersonal communication at the public level is recognized as normative and inherent to all individuals of a certain community. The data of modern empirical research try to justify the interdependence of individual and universal motives for communication. Hout and Jacobs argue, «The point we are trying to make is not just that the notions of power, interaction and agency that we have discussed in the previous part can help guide our fieldwork on the way press releases are used by journalists, but that the results of our fieldwork can contribute to a better understanding of these issues within the broader theorizing on news access and news production» [6, p. 67].

Routine communication is an expression of its anthropological meaning. Realization of communication needs is the most obvious expression of human nature in communicative interactions. The ability to realize oneself in communication with other individuals is an indication of one's capability as a human being. However, the ability to present oneself as part of the general public determines the individual's significance as a constituent of a broader discussion on common problems and provision of support to some or others decisions, theses, and regulations that define the prospective existence of society. The public sphere acts not just as a medium of verbal or textual self-expression of the individual but also a dimention of human presence in the lives of others and its adequate perception. People's personal stories that get into the limelight through modern media and social networks acts as a factor of the anthropological sym-

bolization of the communicative process transforming the public communicative process into a large amount of unlimited space of identity recognition by others. The transformation of the personal into the public can reveal the inner world of the individual and, on the other hand, combine the common values and coordinates of social interaction. As Van and Jacobs point out, «It was shown that, in addition to having a textual function, preformulation is used socially to promote a news story during story meetings and that the reliance on press releases allows for a linear, routine writing process» [6, p. 78].

Public messages manifest not only the person's ability to communicate but also the establishment of a human being in a broader and universal context. The emergence of the public sphere is the evidence of a certain stage of society development in which public debates are not restricted accept anything other than force of a better argument (Jurgen Habermas). The closer to the real public sphere is an ideal model proposed by German philosopher K.-O. Apel, the more content is acquired by anthropological generalizations regarding the communication experience and communicative pragmatic of the mankind. The more the public sphere stands away from the countrfactual image drawn in communicative theory, the more it loses its anthropological features and acquires the content of the technological and production network since a mode of communication is changed to the mode of information transmission.

Articulation of the significance of the public sphere for modern philosophical anthropology is based not only on communicative pragmatics and personal principles of a person's public self-expression but also on differences between a modern civilization and racial divisions within humanity. The exposure of any socio-cultural group or civilization to public communication regulated by the discourse ethics and universal transident pragmatics can act as a criterion for a peculiar ranking of civilizations and their movement towards the standards of rational understanding and argumentation established in the contemporary world. Conversely, the concept of «communicative rationality» is unique to contemporary Western society [10] that has undergone a long period of secularization and development under the industrial revolution and sociopolitical modernity. In this connection, the compatibility of a particular geographical area

of today's world to the standards of rational and communicative publicity still remain open. According Paula Montero, professor of philosophy at University of São Paulo, "By positing that rationality thus understood is not a universal phenomenon, Habermas revisits a classical issue of anthropology: the commensurability of civilizations, an issue that has been central to debate in social science and philosophy since the 1960s" [11, p. 201].

The antropologization of cognition processes determines the possibility of choice and equality between social and cultural patterns of communication, hence the universality of the public sphere requires further coverage. The works of Habermas, Apel, and other representatives of communicative theory argue that rational and reasoned communication is the achievement of the whole mankind as well as the natural behavior of people who seek cooperation and regulation of their relations on the basis of generally accepted values (see [12]). In this regard, generalizations of an anthropological nature takes a new meaning, if one understands the nature of communication common to all people and desires of any person in the relationship with other individuals and society as a whole, to act not as a means but as a purpose. Also, the issue of the humanistic orientation of the anthropological paradigm in philosophical sciences becomes important, which will always be in contradiction with manifestations of materialism and objectivism. According to Montero, «The second issue refers to anthropological investigation itself: When anthropologists face a worldview that seems irrational to them (or that is not based on their own way of viewing the world), there is no other choice than trying to elucidate its meaning» [11, p. 201].

Contradictions between universal intentions of communicative theory and socio-cultural characteristics of todaay's world can be solved through inclusive understanding of rationality within the framework of communicative pragmatics. Respect for a person as a primary value determines the possibility of their participation in the extraordinary and everyday discourses on any level, provided they formulate their own positions and respect other participants of the discussion. Dialogue as a form of communication between two individuals represents a model of rational cooperation with an outcome that is acceptable to both parties. At that, the symbolic form of thought expression or participant's behavior are not decisive when the inter-

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

locutors understand each other. If the persons who communicate appeal not only to a secular experience but also to a spiritual one, the communicative action can be aimed at clarifying their positions and their mutual coordination. In this regard, Montero argues, «For Habermas rationality aimed at understanding encompasses propositions of practical, aesthetic, therapeutic, etc. character– suggests that religious language may be included in his discursive model of rationalization on two levels. This language, which is embedded in the modes of expression that characterize the life-world, is also, to a great extent, aimed at producing understanding concerning the common social world and the subjective experience of differences and identities» [11, p. 202].

Anthropological differences between people of different races and cultures in today's world are leveled out because of the spread of global culture all over the world. Hence, the experience of public communication (an example of which is the communication among UN representatives at international forums) makes it possible to overcome differences, to formulate appropriate rules of communication, and to achieve a common goal in case when representatives of different nations and races are results oriented. A certain characteristic is the debate within the framework of a political competition where decorative and rhetorical speech patterns and other extra-liguistic ways of persuasion affect the balance of rationality and credibility in the subject's of viewpoints. Manipulative and competitive aspects of the public self-presentation and public discussion can manifest not only in politics but also in other spheres of life. These manifestations are no less a sign of human nature than the desire for rational and regulated behavior (see S. Pink, S. Abram (2015) [13]). However, such behavior does not contradict the possibilities for a person in the public space of self-presentation and articulation of one's position if it is done with those means that do not harm the social environment. As Montero argues, «Although Habermas has not explored this possibility, his insight provides a foundation for an approach of the classical issue of the production of meaning in linguistic interactions» [11, p. 202].

Defending one's position in communicative interactions may depend not only on personal and cultural peculiarities but also on preferences claiming to be of universalist values. If a participant in a communicative discourse professes certain religious ideas or adheres to political or ideological doctrines, their position may be accepted not to the full extent and seem ambiguous for the rest of the community (see A. Irfan, (2016) [7]). Should the participant insist on their positions, the individual may engage in disputes and even conflicts with others. Heuristics as a method of communicative interaction does not fully meet the definition of a conversation aimed at cooperation. The presentation of religious preferences in a secular state often leads to a large-scale counter-multiculturalism policy that was actively introduced in Europe after World War II and provided an opportunity for the public representation of social and cultural characteristics. However, at this stage such public presentations encounter ambiguous perception from the rest of the population, especially when it refers to their perception of Islam in traditionally Christian societies (see [7]. Conversely, the public sphere is the space in which the security of public demonstrations removes a possible counteraction, except for cases of radicalism and extremism. A possibility of polylogue opens a new anthropological trait of a modern individual – the possibility of manifestation of one's identity without the oppression of the other's identity. According to Montero, "The concept of publicity will not be focused on so that we may analyze processes in which religion serves as a mediator between society and the state; it will be resorted to analytically in order to understand the way in which the present and virtual meanings of differences that circulate as possibilities in the horizon of the life-world are established, even if temporarily, through the mediation of religious categories in a configuration of identities gaining public visibility and expression" [10, p. 203]. Therefore, rethinking the value of the public sphere in the general cultural and social context is associated with the status of publicity, which is crucial for the communication and information age.

The bourgeois public, which entered into free and unlimited debates after the Second World War in the early 21st century became a network of individuals and groups that communicate in the Internet. In this regard, the practices of entertainment that characterize the behavior of cyberspace consumers cannot be attributed fully to the constitutive content of the public sphere in the classical sense of Habermas. For example, online gaming communities that are very common in today's world do

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

not deliberate social problems and do not make public statements, yet they maintain contact and interact with one another on a regular basis. Hence, the anthropological correction of the public sphere goes through the identification of practices, public discussions and communicative interactions that have social significance. In this context, Montero argued, «The re-reading of the notion of public sphere elaborated in [Habermas's] work in 1962 makes it possible to constitute as new objects of anthropological analysis, not only the objectification of pre-constructed religious identities, cultures, and beliefs that defend their (natural) rights in the political arena, but also the communicative flows from the life-world and the way they discursively establish identities, traditions, and beliefs» [11, p. 207]. Thus the shift of the emphasis in the meaning of the public sphere towards the plurality reveals a broad palette of anthropological meanings and needs of the public self-presentation of the modern individual.

The multiplicity of public spheres arises primarily from the possibility of pluralistic contacts and simultaneous membership of a person in many communities. Being geographically in a specific location, the modern individual can be an active member of many discursive spaces and act as an influential factor in many discussions. Throughout one's lifetime, a person can change contexts of public discussions and move to different semantic planes: from religious to professional. For this reason, the concentration of senses of publicity around political practices has being increasingly questioned. On the one hand, politics becomes a sphere of technocratic management that requires expert training, on the other hand, political discourse loses an imperious central position and focuses on issues of societal interests' advocacy at the political level. According to Montero, «Cultural controversies and negotiations between various publics concerning the validity of certain propositions occur and become visible in the public sphere» [11, p. 207].

The living conditions of the modern individual suggest that the transition of many private and individual issues to the public sphere spawned dozens of specialized discourses that relate to the problematic existence of certain groups on a global scale. Wars, revolutions, and natural disasters create a sudden change in the usual human environment [2]. Emergency situations shift normal public

presentation practicies and motivations of public communication. The process of making political decisions that require a large-scale discussion is becoming much narrower. Conversely, the discourse on negative anthropology can mobilize active speakers to enter various public spheres and they can inform their impressions from the deterioration of human conditions and contribute to the solution of urgent humanity problems by disseminating information about them. As Dennis Johannssen points out, «To speak only negatively about the human being means not to prescribe what it can or should be, but to account for what it lacks under the prevailing social conditions. Possible references for such philosophical work include deprivation, economic inequality, hardship and the like, which can be empirically analysed in the past and present» [8, p. 3].

The anthropological significance of the public sphere for the modern individual is not only in access to the opportunities to discuss, but also in the contemplation of problems of the modern individual based on the most comprehensive display of the positions and opinions. Public spheres of modernity are becoming centers of a large-scale reflection on the modern life and their comprehension by modern society. The public sphere as a communication space does not grant the status of openness and importance to many questions that are not important in the formal and regulatory respect. However, by the way of transmitting them and making them public one determines the level of problematicity of those issues in the world. According to Johannssen, «Sonnemann believes the ban on philosophical anthropology can and has to be more than normative. In his eyes, the assumption that man canachieve complete and conclusive self-knowledge is a logical error capable of proving theoretical anthropology's epistemological impossibility» [8, p. 7].

The public sphere is a key concept for solving the key problem of the modern individual and their status in information exchange and different levels of communication. Whithin the framework of publicity a person goes far beyond one's perception of the world trying to think in the categories of the entire society or community. Thus, the cultural characteristics of the emergent individual, who cannot be outside the communicative spaces, are formed. However, there remains the problem of external interference to organic communicative

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

spaces by administrative or political intentions that would use the communicative potential manipulatively. According to Eric C. Thompson, Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the National University of Singapore, «Although contemporary academic anthropology has drawn strong connections between the two, it remains the case that culture is more often than not used as a counterweight to politics–particularly progressive or reform politics. Politics is a field of struggle and change, but it is also tinged with suspicion and disdain» [18, p. 462]. While the anthropological dimension of the public sphere reveals its political essence, contemporary communicative theory provides reminiscences of the discoursive self-presentation of the early industrial age. Therefore, the contemporary philosophical tradition needs a wider interpretation of appropriate practices of public communication meaning.

Originality

Thus, in the anthropological dimension the public sphere is the source of promising prospects and the formation of defining restrictions. Publicity is becoming a top quality of the modern individual because of the need for its implementation in communication practices. The network nature of communicative ties makes the modern individual produce a certain image for self- presentation to society. Along with that, a situation of «quasi-presentation» occurs when the public is presented with some false issues instead of the real ones. Anonymity in the interactive area of the Internet undermines the possibility of important and socially significant discussions. In this regard, the importance of public human activity has not yet received its full anthropological formulation.

Conclusions

Thus the anthropic dimension of public openness gets manifested in two semantic directions: the needs for self-representation in the society of symbolic and communication competition and the needs for establishing connections with other indi-viduals, provided that traditional communication links significantly narrowed. The public self-representation has becomes the foundation for the individual; it requires the manifestation of those personal qualities that had not previously fallen within the competence of the person (including an ability to use technical devices, satisfying selfish needs and instant gratification, and overall living in the society of entertainment and consumption). The self-presentation in the public sphere is the basis for success, socialization and an increase in status in the social hierarchy.

Search for new contacts and cyber communications reveals the problem of dysfunction of social communicative practices not only at the public level but on the private and even intimate level. Understanding the other in communicative contacts is increasingly taking on the character of rationalization and cost-benefit analysis, that questions the comprehention of the interlocutor's personality and condition. Overall, it can be argued that the anthropological dimension of the public sphere in todat's world reveals aspects of manipulativeness and distortion of communicative intentions that distort the ethical clearness of interpersonal communication defined in the classical conceptions of communication theory by J. Habermas and K.-O. Apel. The anthropological dimension of the contemporary public sphere of politics emphasizes in a paradoxical way the impossibility of its realization in a real society. Besides, the real communication in the public sphere reveals the possibility to demonstrate reallife issues and priorities that concerne the modern individual. In this respect, the Internet and the cyber revolution can more widely present the issues that concern the majority of humanity in the online mode. This increases for large masses of people the possibility of participation in specific events, despite their remote location. The prospect of further consideration of the issues raised in this article is to examine the anthropic measurement of manipulative communication in the postmodern.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Applied Anthropology: Unexpected Spaces, Topics and Methods / edited by Sh. Nahm, C. H. Rinker. – Routledge, 2015. – 180 p.
2. Bazaluk, O. The Problem of War and Peace: a Historical and Philosophical Analysis / O. Bazaluk // Philosophy and Cosmology. – 2017. – Vol. 18. – P. 85–103.
3. Clammer, J. Decolonizing the Mind: Schwimmer, Habermas and the Anthropology of Postcolonialism / J. Clammer // Anthropologica. – 2008. – Vol. 50, № 1. – pp. 157–168.

4. Hann, C. Poznań Manifesto: for a public anthropology in the European public sphere / C. Hann // EASA News-letter. – 2009. – December. – pp. 6–9. Retrieved from:
http://www.easaonline.org/downloads/newsletters/easa_news_50.pdf.
5. Haugerud, A. Public Anthropology in 2015: Charlie Hebdo, Black Lives Matter, Migrants, and More / A. Haugerud // American Anthropologist. – 2015. – Vol. 118, Is. 3. – pp. 585–601.
6. Hout, Van T. News Production Theory And Practice. Fieldwork Notes On Power, Interaction And Agency / T. Van Hout, G. Jacobs // Pragmatics. – 2008. – № 18:1. – pp. 59–85.
7. Irfan, A. Between mourning and melancholia: Religion and politics in modern India / A. Ifran // Journal of Religious and Political Practice. – 2016. – Vol. 2, Is. 3. – pp. 348–357.
8. Johannssen, D. Toward a Negative Anthropology / D. Johannssen // Anthropology & Materialism. – 2013. – № 1. – pp. 1–14. doi: 10.4000/am.194. Date of Access July 26, 2017.
9. Marais, I. E. Constraints to public sphere activity in Joubert Park, Johannesburg / I. E. Maris // Anthropology Southern Africa. – 2016. – Vol. 39, Is. 3. – pp. 173–186. doi: 10.1080/23323256.2016.1206830.
10. Mead, M. Studying contemporary Western society: method and theory / M. Mead, W. O. Beeman. – New York : Berghahn Books, 2004.
11. Montero, P. Jürgen Habermas: Religion, Cultural Diversity and Publicity / P. Montero // Advances in Anthropology. – 2014. – Vol. 4, № 3. – pp. 199–208.
12. Eriksen, T. H. Norwegian Scholar Speaks «Anthropology in the Public Sphere» / T. N. Eriksen // UMassAmherts. – 2014. – December 8. – Retrived from: https://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/article/norwegian-scholar-speaks-'anthropology.
13. Pink, S. Media, anthropology and public engagement / S. Pink, S. Abram. – Oxford : Berghahn. Studies in public and applied anthropology.
14. Poznań Manifesto: for a public anthropology in the European public sphere. – Retrieved from: http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/faces/viewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=escidoc:922167.
15. Public Anthropology in a Borderless World / edited by S. Beck, C. A. Maida. – NY Berghan.
16. Reddy, W. M. Postmodernism and the Public Sphere: Implications for an Historical Ethnography / W. M. Reddy // Cultural Anthropology. – 1992. – Vol. 7, № 2. – pp. 135–168.
17. Media Anthropology / edited by E. W. Rothenbuhler, M. Coman. – Webster University, Texas A&M University, University of Bucharest.
18. Thompson, E. C. This Is Our Culture: Anthropology and the Public Sphere in Malaysia Culture and politics are too often thought of as entirely separate in Malaysia (and elsewhere) / E. C. Thompson // American Anthropologist. – 2010. – Vol. 112, Is. 3.– pp. 462–463.
19. Ulin, R. C. Critical Anthropology Twenty Years Later. Modernism and postmodernism in anthropology / R. C. Ulin // Critique of Anthropology. – 1991. – Vol. 11, Is. 1 – pp. 63–89.

О. А. ТРЕТЯК[1*]

[1*]Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара (Дніпро), ел. пошта alexsir25@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0003-2536-0611

ПУБЛІЧНА СФЕРА ПОЛІТИКИ: АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИЙ ВИМІР У СУЧАСНІЙ КОМУНІКАТИВНІЙ ТЕОРІЇ

Мета. Стаття спрямована на встановлення специфіки антропологічного тлумачення публічної сфери у сучасній філософській традиції. **Методологія.** У роботі застосовані загальнонаукові й спеціальні методи філософських досліджень. Шляхом використання дескриптивного методу вдалося виокремити предметну площину антропного виміру публічної сфери політики. Метод логічного синтезу дозволив поєднати абстрактний та конкретний зміст антропологічного виміру публічності. Ретроспективний аналіз дозволив визначити темпоральні особливості антропного значення публічної сфери. Компаративний метод надав можливість порівняти емпіричні прояви соціальної та політичної публічності, зіставити антропологічні наслідки медійної та інтерперсональної комунікаційної діяльності сучасної людини. **Теоретичний базис і результати.** У статті розглядається антропологічний зміст публічної сфери як одного з ключових понять комунікативної теорії, надається увага видозміні характеру публічності в умовах кібернетичної революції. Публічна сфера виступає не лише сукупністю індивідуальних презентацій, але й сукупністю повідомлень, текстуальних і вербальних, які мають загальну значущість. У зв'язку з цим, добір новин як більш, або менш

значущих, виступає з одного боку, або засобом корекції світосприйняття, а також орієнтації в умовах безмежності інформаційного потоку. Публічна сфера виступає не просто середовищем вербального або текстуального самовиразу індивіда, а також площиною присутності людини у житті інших та адекватного її сприйняття. Що більше публічна сфера віддаляється від контрфактичного образу, накресленого у комунікативній теорії, тим більше вона втрачає антропні риси і набуває змісту технологічної та виробничої мережі, оскільки модус спілкування змінюється на модус передавання інформації. Встановлюється пріоритети особистісної репрезентації людини у публічній сфері. Розглядається потреба і мотиви встановлення комунікативно-прагматичних зв'язків між окремими індивідами. **Новизна.** В антропологічному вимірі публічна сфера виступає джерелом багатообіцяючих перспектив та формування визначальних обмежень. Публічність стає провідною якістю сучасної людини через необхідність її реалізації у практиках спілкування. Мережний характер комунікаційних зв'язків змушує сучасну людину виробляти певний образ для презентації себе суспільству. **Висновки.** Робиться висновок про напрямки трансформації публічної сфери у глобальному вимірі.

Ключові слова: публічна сфера політики; комунікативна теорія; комунікативна прагматика; викривлена комунікація; антропний вимір; сприйняття іншого.

О. А. ТРЕТЯК[1*]

[1*]Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара (Днипро), эл. почта alexsir25@ukr.net
orcid.org/0000-0003-2536-0611

ПУБЛИЧНАЯ СФЕРА ПОЛИТИКИ: АНТРОПОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЯ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ ТЕОРИИ

Цель. Статья предполагает установление специфики антропологического толкования публичной сферы в современной философской традиции. **Методология**. В работе применены общенаучные и специальные методы философских исследований. Путем использования дескриптивного метода удалось выделить предметную плоскость антропного измерения публичной сферы политики. Метод логического синтеза позволил совместить абстрактное и конкретное содержание антропологического измерения публичности. Ретроспективный анализ позволил определить темпоральные особенности антропного значение публичной сферы. Компаративный метод дал возможность сравнить эмпирические проявления социальной и политической публичности, сопоставить антропологические последствия медийной и интерперсональной коммуникационной деятельности современного человека. **Теоретический базис и результаты.** В статье рассматривается антропологический смысл публичной сферы как одного из ключевых понятий коммуникативной теории, уделяется внимание видоизменению характера публичности в условиях кибернетической революции. Публичная сфера выступает не только совокупностью индивидуальных презентаций, но и совокупностью сообщений, текстовых и вербальных, которые имеют общую значимость. В связи с этим, подбор новостей как более или менее значимых, выступает, с одной стороны средством коррекции мировосприятия, а также ориентации в условиях безграничности информационного потока. Публичная сфера выступает не просто средой вербального или текстуального самовыражения индивида, а также плоскостью присутствия человека в жизни других и адекватного ее восприятия. Чем больше публичная сфера удаляется от контрфактического образа, намеченного в коммуникативной теории, тем больше она теряет антропные черты и приобретает содержание технологической и производственной сети, поскольку модус общения меняется на модус передачи информации. Устанавливаются приоритеты личностной репрезентации человека в публичной сфере. Рассматривается необходимость и мотивы установления коммуникативно-прагматических связей между отдельными индивидами. **Новизна.** В антропологическом измерении публичная сфера выступает источником многообещающих перспектив и формирования определяющих ограничений. Публичность становится ведущей качеством современного человека из-за необходимости реализации в практиках общения. Сетевой характер коммуникационных связей заставляет современного человека производить определенный образ для презентации себя обществу. **Выводы.** Делается вывод о направлениях трансформации публичной сферы в глобальном измерении.

Ключевые слова: публичная сфера политики; коммуникативная теория; коммуникативная прагматика; искаженная коммуникация; антропное измерение; восприятие другого.

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

REFERENCES

1. Nham, Sh., & Rinker, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Applied Anthropology: Unexpected Spaces, Topics and Methods.* Routledge. (In English)
2. Bazaluk, O. (2017). The Problem of War and Peace: a Historical and Philosophical Analysis. *Philosophy and Cosmology, 18,* 85-103. (In English)
3. Clammer, J. (2008). Decolonizing the Mind: Schwimmer, Habermas and the Anthropology of Postcolonialism. *Anthropologica, 50(1),* 157-168. (In English)
4. Hann, C. (2009). Poznań Manifesto: for a public anthropology in the European public sphere. *EASA Newsletter, December,* 6-9. Retrieved from: http://www.easaonline.org/downloads/newsletters/easa_news_50.pdf. (In English)
5. Haugerud, A. (2015). Public Anthropology in 2015: Charlie Hebdo, Black Lives Matter, Migrants, and More. *American Anthropologist, 118(3),* 585-601. (In English)
6. Hout, Van T. (2008). News Production Theory And Practice. Fieldwork Notes On Power, Interaction And Agency. *Pragmatics, 18:1,* 59-85. (In English)
7. Irfan, A. (2016). Between mourning and melancholia: Religion and politics in modern India. *Journal of Religious and Political Practice, 2 (3),* 348-357. (In English)
8. Johanssen, D. (2013). Toward a Negative Anthropology. *Anthropology & Materialism, 1,* 1-14. doi 10.4000/am.194. Date of Access: July 26, 2017. (In English)
9. Marais, I. E. (2016). Constraints to public sphere activity in Joubert Park, Johannesburg. *Anthropology Southern Africa, 39 (3),* 173-186. doi 10.1080/23323256.2016.1206830. (In English)
10. Mead, M. (2004). *Studying contemporary Western society: method and theory.* New York: Berghahn Books. (In English)
11. Montero, P. (2014). Jürgen Habermas: Religion, Cultural Diversity and Publicity. *Advances in Anthro-pology. 4(3),* 199-208. (In English)
12. Eriksen, T. H. (2014). Norwegian Scholar Speaks «Anthropology in the Public Sphere». *UMassAmherts, December 8.* Retrieved from https://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/article/norwegian-scholar-speaks-'anthropology. (In English)
13. Pink, S. (undated). *Media, anthropology and public engagement.* Oxford : Berghahn. Studies in public and applied anthropology. (In English)
14. Poznań Manifesto: for a public anthropology in the European public sphere. Retrieved from: http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/faces/viewItemOverviewPage.jsp?itemId=escidoc:922167. (In English)
15. Beck, S., & Maida, C. A. (Eds). (undated). *Public Anthropology in a Borderless World*. NY Berghan. (In English)
16. Reddy, W. M. (1992). Postmodernism and the Public Sphere: Implications for an Historical Ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology, 7(2),* 135-168. (In English)
17. Rothenbuhler, E. W., & Coman, M (Eds). (undated). *Media Anthropology*. Webster University, Texas A&M University, University of Bucharest. (In English)
18. Thompson, E. C. (2010). This Is Our Culture: Anthropology and the Public Sphere in Malaysia Culture and politics are too often thought of as entirely separate in Malaysia (and elsewhere). *American Anthropolo-gist, 112(3),* 462-463. (In English)
19. Ulin, R. C. (1991). Critical Anthropology Twenty Years Later. Modernism and postmodernism in anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology, 11(1),* 63-89. (In English)