

UDC 323.21(045)

M. Abysova

## PUBLIC SPHERE MEDIATIZATION

National Aviation University;

e-mail: maria.abysova@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-6461-7769

**Abstract.** *The article is devoted to the analysis of the public sphere of modern society as a complex and dynamic phenomenon of social and political interactions involved in the virtualization, mediatization and digitalization processes. The space of the digital public sphere, in contrast to the traditional public sphere one, is controlled by means of algorithms – hidden mechanisms integrated into many information platforms responsible for structuring of information on public platforms where people can discuss issues of concern. The arguments of techno-optimists and techno-pessimists regarding the effectiveness of digital activity and its risks in short-term, action-oriented practices and long-term perspectives are given. The search for consensus in the definition of digital activism makes the debate about its nature, harm and benefit to society of great current interest, encourages for the further study of the given problem.*

**Key words:** civil society, digital activism, new media, mediatization, public sphere.

## Introduction

In recent decades, the non-traditional concept of community has been increasingly articulated, associated neither with a common language, nor ethnic roots, nor cultural and historical traditions, rather with the concept of communication. Communication turns out to be the connecting tissue capable to unite different subjects into a single political community even in the face of the violent depressurization of traditional societies under the influence of globalization, the radicalization of extremist sentiments and the search for new forms of national identity. In this context, public communication acquires special significance as a tool for interaction and conflict resolution, as a basis for creating a political community. In this regard, it is important to investigate the media communication conditions in which different positions collide, the interlocutors-opponents perceive each other as an obstacle to the promotion of their projects and ideologies.

The aim of the study is to reveal the specifics of the public sphere being formed in modern media communications.

To achieve this goal it is necessary to perform the following research tasks:

1. To analyze the classical representation of the public sphere as a form of social and political participation of citizens.

2. Present the implementation of a public discussion in modern media communications.

## Research methods

The concept of public communication has appeared and firmly established itself in Western theories and practices for several decades thanks to world-known philosophers, sociologists, political scientists, cultural scientists (J. Rawls, J. Habermas, J. Boman, J. Cohen, A. Young, etc.), P. Lazarsfeld, G. Lasswell, W. Lippmann, G. Lang, K. Lang, D. Rushkoff and others have devoted their works to socio-cultural practices of constructing reality via media. Various problems related to the development, functioning and influence of media were considered by J. Baudrillard, N. Bolz, P. Bourdieu, D. Vattimo, P. Virilio, D. Gillmore, M. Castells, R. Capurro, N. Luhmann, M. McLuhan, Yo. Reichertz, G. Reingold, P. Sloterdijk, R. Hoggart and others.

## Research results

The term "public sphere" is necessary to describe the process of active and open participation of citizens in the

discussion of socially significant issues, the development and adoption of socially significant decisions.

This concept has been crystalized in the classical works, being a tradition nowadays. Among them, a special place belongs to I. Kant – the first thinker who made the concept of publicity an object of philosophical comprehension. The understanding of public space as the open space of public discussions, disputes which enables to express one's own opinion and present it to others for judgment is, associated with man, first of all, with his ability of critical judgment. The philosopher believes that it is necessary to abolish church and state paternalism in order to give people the freedom to use their own intellect. Before the age of Enlightenment, the mankind did not use its ability to think freely without outer guidance, being of minor age. The Age of Enlightenment became the key moment in the shift of the mankind to the reasonable ability of judgment inherent in man, the ability to use the mind independently, to make the surrounding reality an object of criticism, to be open to criticism and rethinking. Immaturity is not a lack of reason, but a lack of determination and courage to use it without guidance from someone else. Dare to know! (Sapere aude.) "Have the courage to use your own understanding," is therefore the motto of the Enlightenment (Кант, 2013: 501).

I. Kant distinguishes private and public use of reason: By "public use of one's reason" I mean that use which a man, as scholar, makes of it before the reading public. I call "private use" that use which a man makes of his reason in a civic post that has been entrusted to him. In some affairs affecting the interest of the community a certain [governmental] mechanism is necessary in which some members of the community remain passive. This creates an artificial unanimity which will serve the fulfillment of public objectives, or at least keep these objectives from being destroyed. Here arguing is not permitted: one must obey (Кант, 2013: 503). There are several important implications from these reflections regarding the definition of the public sphere. Firstly, the mind ceases to be only the private sphere of the individual, but becomes a functional element of the public space that performs a critical function. Secondly, the call to publicly use its own reason, which I. Kant reveals, is at the same time the beginning of a new stage in the development of participatory civic culture. A citizen of a society or a state is not just a subject conforming to the rules of a social contract, but also a subject of an active political position.

The concept of "public space" is the central one in Hannah Arendt's political philosophy, starting with "The

Origins of Totalitarianism" and "Vita activa" (Арендт, 2000). Firstly, the public space is an intersubjective space formed by people's communicative interactions. It is shared by all the participants, is not anyone's property and equally belongs to all of them. The public space is born if people, communicating and performing actions, interact with each other: "The presence of others who see what we see and hear what we hear assures us of the reality of the world and ourselves, and while the intimacy of a fully developed private life, such as had never been known before the rise of the modern age and the concomitant decline of the public realm, will always greatly intensify and enrich the whole scale of subjective emotions and private feelings, this intensification will always come to pass at the expense of the assurance of the reality of the world and men." (Арендт, 2000: 65). The public political space is characterized simultaneously by compatibility (being in relation to each other), equality (having the same rights) and difference (the ability to differ from each other). Secondly, the public space is a place where people openly express their opinions and want to be heard by others. The public space does not arise automatically wherever there are several people, and only for the reason that people are being capable of speaking and doing actions. On the contrary, even where it exists, the majority prefer to remain stay aside. Freedom manifests itself in public space. This is the place where power arises and judgments and actions are possible, since it is possible for the manifestation of human plurality. It is connecting and disconnecting at the same time, just as a table simultaneously separates and gathers those who are sitting at it (Арендт, 2000: 69).

However, it should be kept in mind that Hannah Arendt strictly separates the private and public spheres, clearly delimiting politics from all other areas of human existence. Unlike personal space, the public one is multiple, that is, it contains a large number of the most diverse, often contradictory points of view. It is the multiplicity that creates reality, which arises, on the contrary, in spite of all the differences in positions and the resulting multiplicity of aspects, it is still obvious that everyone is engaged in the same business. If this identity of the matter disintegrates and becomes already imperceptible, then no similarity of "human nature" and even more – no artificial conformism of mass society will prevent the disintegration of the common world into fragments (Арендт, 2000: 75). Only public space can guarantee what a pure private life can never.

The essence of the private is the absence of others. In private life, a person behaves as if no others existed, his actions in the private sphere have no meaning for the public sphere, and they do not concern anyone except the person himself (Арендт, 2000: 58). At the same time, private life provides a personal space, which is an opportunity to express oneself in the public space. Public and private spaces complement each other as integral parts of the living space as a whole.

In other works of Arendt, publicity, or rather, a dialogically developed public sphere, is a plurality of perspectives, an antipode of totalitarianism or monologic authoritarianism aimed at unifying public life. The paradox is that, being a measure of plurality, publicity is not a semblance of a mass society – precisely because it allows the collision of different, dissimilar, it creates conditions

for the manifestation of uniqueness of political subjects (Арендт, 2000: 55). Publicity, in its logic, does not allow society to merge and disintegrate, which equally distinguishes it from a mass or totalitarian society, on the one hand, and atomic fragmentation, on the other. Like I. Kant's, Arendt's publicity makes it possible to see and perceive different things, and in this sense is a condition for the possibility of human thinking and its particular modality – political thinking.

A German philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas projects Kant's idea of enlightened publicity onto modern democracies. In the logic of Jü. Habermas's historical reconstruction, the public sphere in the modern sense was born in the bourgeois houses of Germany, France and Great Britain in the 17-18th cc. Based on the historical experience of Western states, Jü. Habermas identifies three historical types of the public sphere: 1) the literary public sphere that emerged in the space of the first literary salons, 2) the political public sphere, the space of which the emergence of the first political actors independent of the will of the monarch and the church became possible, – representatives of the bourgeoisie, numerous civic associations and organizations, 3) the cultural public sphere, which swept the whole world in the 20th century and represented by information products of mass culture (Хабермас, 2016: 291).

Unlike I. Kant's definition, the public space characterized by Jü. Habermas is not only a condition for the possibility of criticism, but, foremost, a consensus of parties with different points of view. Jü. Habermas deduces that publicity is a litmus test for morality testing of political (i.e., affecting the interests of other people) actions. And this is an important step in the development of democratic regimes, for which publicity will play this very role. Although private interests and intentions can enter into conflicting contradictions, public behavior must be consistent and capable for universalization. According to the logic of Habermas, it should be universalizable in the language of communication, namely, it is assumed that people communicate with each other in the language of arguments, and do not resort to the logic of tradition, authority, or stable dogmatic ideas. So, from a historical excursion of the concept of publicity, Habermas passes to its normative ideal, which he will develop in his later works. These criteria are based on the principle of speech free from coercion and openness to criticism in the language of argument.

It is possible to highlight some common features the normative ideal of the public sphere is endowed with. Firstly, public sphere is a space where freedom of expression, criticism and discussion is possible. Secondly, it is a space that allows plurality and in this sense is a guarantee against monopolization of power. Thirdly, it is a space that promotes inclusiveness instead of inequality.

The pluralism of the public sphere, in which the state bureaucracy, limited by its powers; representatives of the business community defending their commercial interests; public actors operate, largely depends on the activity of individuals who act in addition to or beyond commercial interests or administrative rules, while exercising their rights to freedom of assembly and association, freedom of expression and freedom of the press.

In the 20th century, the liberal model of the public sphere turned to be the one which could not be applied in its pure form to the welfare state. Conflicts, previously concentrated in the private sphere, began to

be spread within the expanding public sphere. The public sphere, which was not originally supposed to act as a mediator to smooth out the contradictions between political, administrative and economic interest groups, has become an unexpectedly useful space of competition between private and state interests, the opposition of which reached the level of openly conflicting forms. At the same time, public and state actors are being regularly involved in public discussion on one or another significant issue with the help of publicly organized information platforms and institutions (traditional and new media) to transmit information and influence on those who receive it (numerous audiences of state and public institutions).

New ICTs are becoming one of the most effective tools for transforming the public sphere of modern society, increasingly faced with the ineffectiveness of democratic institutions mainly arranged during the industrial revolutions. Ideas regarding the development of new discourse spaces for citizens to express their opinions beyond state or corporate control are based on assumptions of deliberative democracy and demonstrate the strengthening of the positions of supporters of cyber democracy. Also, this position finds its continuation in the assumption that the Internet would contribute to the growth of democratic participation and strengthen the horizontal ties of people, since it provides greater freedom and flexibility for civil non-political activists, an access to new audiences, specialists, and becomes an effective channel for receiving and disseminating information, ruins the geographical and structural limitations of human communication and direct civic participation, collective action, expands the horizons of the culture of citizenship. The growing role of the Internet is a sparking debate about new forms of freedom in society (Герасимова, 2020: 8); citizen participation like signing online petitions and participating in online discussions (Hirzala and Zoonen, 2011), joining ad-hoc groups on social networks, reposting or posting links to materials on problematic topics (Theocharis, 2015). And in this regard, such concepts as "digital network participation", "digital activism" (Матвеева, 2018) or "media activism" (Миросниченко, 2013) are introduced. Despite ten-year development of such practices, the academic community continues arguing about their definitions. According to one of the existing scientific directions, the category of digital activism, which is defined as civic activity carried out through both stationary and mobile devices with access to the Internet, includes various manifestations of hacktivism (understood as electronic forms of civil disobedience); hacker attacks on websites, distribution of hashtags and Internet propaganda; changing the profile picture as a demonstration of support for an initiative; creating online petitions; publication of thematic posts in social networks; distributing graphics and videos in support of a campaign and others (Joyce, 2010).

Other researchers define digital activism as the use of all digital media for political purposes. Either way, online participation refers to "network media-based actions taken to energize social media to raise awareness of social or political issues, or to exert social and political pressure to address them" (Gerbaudo, 2012). Civil society activists use the Internet to disseminate

information to search for information and documents; as a recruiting mechanism, attracting new activists; as a communication tool with the target audience, as well as a space for coordinating activities and inter-group communication. Types of civic activities that are fully implemented on the Internet have appeared (for example, dispatch platforms for contacting authorities, help cards, fundraising, etc.). The Internet has created an environment for a variety of activist communities and projects that exist only in virtual form. They appear when another type of self-realization is impossible (high needs for anonymity, low ability to communicate personally, inability to find partners nearby, etc.).

K. Demakova and colleagues identified the following types of Internet sites (or services) for digital activism: (1) "complaints" services, ascr virtual public receptions; (2) fundraising services (crowdfunding platforms); (3) services for collecting open data; (4) services for coordinating activities (maps, guides, instructions, event calendars, etc.); (5) discussion services; (6) services of "civic entertainment": libraries, videos, clips, music on civic themes, etc. (Демакова и др., 2014: 153). L. Nikovskaya also sorts out volunteer services (Никовская, 2017: 31-37).

The development of modern social platforms has served as an impetus for the formation of a network community and the emergence of a new type of civil online applications based on the independent solution of a number of problems by civil society. Examples of such applications include [www.usahidi.com](http://www.usahidi.com), a free crowdsourcing platform for data collection, data visualization and interactive mapping, created in 2008 to collect data on hotbeds of violence in Kenya after the presidential election; or [www.standbytaskforce.org](http://www.standbytaskforce.org), a platform created in 2010 for voluntary online digital response to humanitarian crises, local emergencies, and global and local issues. The peculiarity of modern digital activism is that it often originates online and is implemented already offline.

As for the role of the Internet in street politics, the author of the term "twitter revolution", E. Morozov, who applied this concept to the riots in Moldova back in 2009, believes that discussions about the homology of the social network and protest are the subject of folk political science, mystifying the social potential of the Internet (Morozov, 2011). He criticizes the role of digital media as political instruments. M. Gladwell also believes that "the mobilization potential of social networks with their "weak connections" is not enough to bring people out onto the street and force them to take actions aimed at overthrowing the political regime" (Gladwell, 2010).

With the development of social networks, the problem of attention deficit has become more urgent. If subscribers are invited to several actions every day, asked to sign several petitions and make several reposts, it is quite difficult for them to seriously understand each of these actions and be involved in them. In such conditions, the success of a particular campaign directly depends on how selflessly and professionally the "root group" of the protest acts, how organized they can coordinate their actions, attract and retain supporters. Finally, sometimes in online campaigns it is difficult to assess the level of real support for a specific initiative, as well as to objectively look at the position of opponents, since often communication groups in social networks are made up exclusively of like-minded people and it can be quite difficult to get objective criticism.

However, communitarians have raised concerns that the cyberspace of democracy is inherently rooted in the global economy and world politics, providing various opportunities for corporate and government control over online communication. Cyberspace is viewed by many researchers as part of the globalization process, in the course of which the state interacts more and more with global actors (transnational corporations, global NGOs, etc.), regional actors (economic associations, etc.), as well as with increasingly mobile individuals as new global citizens, as carriers of new forms of sociality, which are formed at the junction of traditional forms of social interaction and new virtual communities. Nowadays, the Internet is becoming a commercial product, the access to which of various universities, research centers, government agencies and individuals determines the possibility of their participation in the virtual public sphere, and cyberspace has evolved towards an online market for goods and services provided by the state, commercial and individual. Moreover, the very interest in this or that event and its subsequent copying and replication, inclusion in information exchange and commodity circulation can be deliberately provoked, as a result of a specialized branch of the media industry and advertising technologies known as "event marketing".

On closer inspection, much of what is on the Internet can represent is the political activity of coordinated groups of consumers of mass culture products, mobilized in cyberspace to defend their interests, in particular, in the field of consumer protection, liberalization of tax policy and protection of personal data both in the peripheral countries, and in global politics (Ordenov, 2020: 81).

At the same time, governments are forced to respond to threats emerging in cyberspace, in particular, the threat of cyber terrorism. "Hence, in the nearest future the need in the single structure of an international network and common protocols (rules) of information environment operation will become the high priority objective of technology development" (Drotianko, Yahodzinskyi, 2019: 11). The imposed restrictions on content and access to it are met with predictable criticism from supporters of open data transmission on the network, who see in it rather an element of censorship and control over civil society. Filtering unwanted material on the network, restricting access to certain resources, creating a relatively autonomous national segment of the network can significantly limit the space of the public sphere. However, the economic benefit that is created on the basis of the functioning of information networks in the field of trade, in particular, in information services, as well as in finance and entertainment products of mass culture, does not completely limit the possibilities of cross-border communication in the network. Shifting responsibility on Internet providers and site owners to control the content of information on the network is also a partial solution to the problem, since the Internet is a globally distributed network of millions of communication nodes, therefore, in the event of pressure on one of its sectors, the remaining autonomous sectors will exert back pressure and strive to overcome limitations. Users can also connect directly to the ISP, bypassing the boundaries of censorship. Cyberlibertarians advocate the independence of cyberspace from government control, believing that network participants will be able to develop

their own rules and regulations based on various forms of self-government (Dahlberg, 2010).

As a result of the fact that interpersonal communications are increasingly moving into cyberspace, the state is creating more and more advanced technical capabilities to effectively track its content. An electronic freak show, representing a set of information and technical mechanisms for controlling the virtual public and private spheres, is able to monitor in real time the behavior of citizens on the Internet in both active and passive modes. The information collected allows to construct an individual profile or network identity for each specific user. This profile can have a direct impact on credit rating, immigration opportunities, employment prospects in the civil service, etc. The most significant result of this ability of the state is not that it is able to monitor the behavior of citizens, but that citizens themselves begin to change their behavior and conduct self-censorship, realizing the potential consequences of their online activity. Computer networks can work as "super-freak show" controlled by the state and large corporations, forcing the individual to act and think as they need to. For instance, if previously multiculturalism was one of the trend imposed on individuals, "transculture is a new model of cultural development main purpose of which is the human right to be free from one's own culture in which an individual was born and formed as a person" (Abysova & oth., 2019: 9412).

The media oriented to the public's attention in a certain direction, stimulate public interest, "warm up" it in the process of identifying everything bright, unusual through comparison with the ordinary and unremarkable. Thus, the mass media develop evaluation criteria for the general differentiation of "ordinary" and "extraordinary" in the structures of everyday life and, as a social institution, perform the function of a "machine of differences", which produces in the public consciousness the norms of classifying any occurring events and taxonomically arranging objects of the surrounding world in a certain order, subordinating them to a certain hierarchy.

The mass media are trying to take on the function of "guardians" of the established order, ordering the "raw material" of everyday life and putting "everything on the shelves" in accordance with their own ideas about what and how to organize in the semantic space of the symbolic universe. They strive to compile a kind of "universal catalog" of events, which could then become the basis of the "virtual archive" and not only cover and systematize everything that happened in the past, but would also make it possible to develop certain techniques / technologies for working with the accumulated material for their use in the future.

Within the framework of the "catalog" there is the thematic specification of media genres such as gossip, politics and business, crime, sports, science, etc., where events can appear as news and sensations, unverified rumors or confirmed facts, a case or an incident. But in any case, regardless of the specifics of the information passed and the assigned identification, they end up in the "archive" as a socially significant event that somehow left its "mark on history".

Therefore, there is nothing surprising in the fact that the "order of existence" in everyday life is perceived by individuals as something natural and "taken for granted",

the presence of which they simply do not notice, being completely immersed in it. "Everyday life, like any social structure, which is a set of situations, is" present due to its absence" – if we do not feel it, then we live in it" (Касавин и др., 2004: 250). It should be noted that in representation of event processes in the mass media, "any social tradition is shown by meanings that find their expression in the language of a heterogeneous and unambiguously non-specialized discourse. Institutional forms of social life in everyday practice do not exist separately from each other, but in one way or another they intersect, mediate each other and are generally served by a discourse that is structured and unstructured at the same time, concentrated and diffuse" (Богданов, 2001: 379-380). Thus, the presented media image of everyday life is dominated by a mixture of things that cannot be combined and are always separated from each other.

### Discussion

The author of the concept of virtual reality D. Lanier in the manifesto "You are not a gadget" stated that "social networks and blogs have led humanity down the wrong path; instead of creativity and individuality, superficial judgments, the speed of content creation and consumption are welcomed" (Ланир, 2011). The most popular media game strategies are:

- illustration of the real with imaginary, fantasy;
- an alternative representation of the already known situation, focused on its fictional presentation, implied giving roles, remarks and actions to the characters of the message at the behest of the journalist-creator;
- unexpected collision in reporting events that were previously considered independent;
- carrying out paradoxical, often shocking analogies from the sphere, contrasting politics and economics (everyday, intimate relationships, zoology, botany, characters of fiction, clichés of mass culture, etc.);
- the construction of a specific event "own" plot due to the accentuation of game techniques of fragments of the situation, important for the construction of their own concept, which often conflicts with the nature of the event itself;
- the nomination of their versions, fantasies, compensating for the lack of information;
- using new information only to update background knowledge, although it is based not so much on logical-conceptual connections as purely associative ones" (Сметанина, 2002: 189-190).

The techno-pessimists guess that the development of an online presence and online communities pulls us out of real forms of community, limits our opportunities for real friendship and solidarity (Keen, 2012). The opposite opinion is shared by numerous network optimists such as K. Anderson, D. Tapscott and K. Shirky (The Digital Divide, 2011: 354). Inspired by the humanistic and cognitive perspectives of the further development of the Internet, they believe that the media have been a key element of the protest movements in recent years. With the help of the media, these protest movements are being organized, managed, and publicized so that as many people as possible can learn about them.

There is the opinion that neither techno-pessimism nor techno-optimism has the right answer regarding activism and social media. This means that we should not reduce

our understanding of the Internet to just "good" (the path to freedom and emancipation) or "bad" (a means of control or domination). The Internet is the space of certain culture that largely predetermines the way of life, and cultural codes in the categories of which individuals think of themselves and the society as a whole. That is, digital devices allow and empower people to communicate and disseminate information, while activists develop specific practices in accordance with the peculiarities of data functioning of "technical artifacts" included in larger institutional mechanisms and civic culture.

### Conclusion

A comparative analysis of the classical concept of the public sphere and manifestations of public activity in modern culture is carried out. The virtual public sphere, a historically larger analogue of the literary salons of the XVIII c., is the space for intellectual discussion and public dialogue. In the conditions of electronic media functioning, any judgment has a chance to receive a mass public evaluation, which removes the boundary between private and public utterances, deprives the individual of the need to perform a transcendental act of entering public space. Modern discussion formats problematize the possibility of public communication in its classical completeness: the rational argumentation of the discussion is replaced by the emotionality of statements; due to the spontaneity and hypertextuality of communicative processes, the development of the discussion is impossible to trace. At the same time, the foundations of both the "classical" and the "new" public sphere define openness, freedom of speech and equality, and for the participants in the discussion the public sphere continues to retain the status of a significant value. However, there is a problem of functioning and management of the processes of the virtual public sphere, the scale and depth of which exceed the capabilities of any state or international institutions to regulate it.

### Literature

1. Abysova M., Antipova O., Pavlyshyn O., Bondar S. Nation's Historical Past under Multicultural Conditions. International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering. 2019. Vol. 8. Issue 4. P. 9409–9414. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.d9720.118419>. URL: <https://www.ijrte.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/v8i4/D9720118419.pdf>
2. Dahlberg L. Cyber-Libertarianism 2.0: A Discourse Theory/Critical Political Economy Examination. Cultural Politics. 2010. No. 6. P. 331–356.
3. Drotianko L., Yahodzinskiy S. Digitalization of Educational Environment: Tendencies and Perspectives // Вісник Національного авіаційного університету. Серія: Філософія. Культурологія. – 2020. – № 2 (30) С. 9–13.
4. Gerbaudo P. Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism. London : Pluto, 2012. URL: <http://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/30772>
5. Gladwell M. Small Change. Why the revolution will not be tweeted // The New Yorker. 27.09.2010. URL: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2010/10/04/small-change-malcolm-gladwell> (date accessed: 27.11.2019).
6. Hirzalla F., van Zoonen L. Beyond the Online/Offline Divide: How Youth's Online and Offline Civic Activities Converge. Social Science Computer Review. 2011. No. 29 (4). P. 481–498.
7. Joyce M. Digital Activism Decoded. The New Mechanics of Change. New York : Idebate Press, 2010. 240 p.
8. Keen A. Digital Vertigo: How Today's Online Social Revolution Is Dividing, Diminishing, and Disorienting Us. New York : St. Martin's Press, 2012. 256 p.
9. Morozov E. The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom. NY: Public Affairs, 2011. 448 p.

10. Ordenov S. Social Memory Transformations under the Conditions of Postmodern Society Mobilization // Вісник Національного авіаційного університету. Серія: Філософія. Культурологія. – 2020. – № 1 (31) С. 76–83.
11. The Digital Divide: Arguments for and Against Facebook, Google, Texting, and the Age of Social Networking. New York : Tarcher, 2011. 354 p.
12. Theocharis Y. The Conceptualization of Digitally Networked Participation. Social Media+Society. 2015. No. 2 (1). P. 1–14.
13. Арендт Х. Vita activa, или О деятельной жизни. СПб. : Алетейя, 2000. 437 с.
14. Богданов К. А. Повседневность и мифология: Исследования по семиотике фольклорной действительности. СПб. : Искусство-СПб, 2001. 437 с.
15. Герасимова Е. М. Доктрина реалізації свободи в демократичному суспільстві: ідеал і реальність // Вісник Національного авіаційного університету. Серія: Філософія. Культурологія. – 2020. – № 2 (32) С. 5–8.
16. Демакова К., Маковецкая С., Скрыкова Е. Неполитический активизм в России. Pro et Contra. 2014. Май–август. С. 148–163.
17. Кант И. Ответ на вопрос: Что такое Просвещение? Государство. Общество. Управление. М. : Альпина Паблшер, 2013. С. 501-509.
18. Касавин И. Т., Щавелев С. П. Анализ повседневности. М. : Канон+, 2004. 432 с.
19. Ланир Дж. Вы не гаджет. Манифест. М. : Corpus, 2011. 49 с. (Цит. по: Мартынов К. От слактивизма к республике. Почему интернет-революции становятся реальностью. Логос. 2012. № 2. С. 19–27).
20. Матвеева А. В. Особенности гражданского участия в условиях современного цифрового пространства. Форум молодых ученых. 2018. № 5–2 (21). С. 620–625.
21. Мирошниченко А. Интернет и эволюция медиаактивизма в России. Вестник Института Кеннана в России. 2013. Вып. 24. С. 74–84.
22. Никовская Л. И., Молокова М. А. Роль межсекторного партнерства в реализации потенциала социального государства в России. Власть. 2017. Т. 25. № 11. С. 31–37.
23. Сметанина С. И. Медиа-текст в системе культуры (динамические процессы в языке и стиле журналистики конца XX века) : монография. СПб. : Михайлова В. А., 2002. 383 с.
24. Хабермас Ю. Структурное изменение публичной сферы: исследование относительно категории буржуазного общества. М. : Весь мир, 2016. 344 с.
6. Drotianko, L., Yahodzinskiy, S. (2020). Digitalization of Educational Environment: Tendennicy and Perspectives. Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University, 2 (30): 9-13.
7. Gerbaudo, P. (2012). Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism. London: Pluto. Retrieved from <http://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/30772>.
8. Gladwell, M. (2010). Small Change. Why the revolution will not be tweeted // The New Yorker. 27.09.2010.
9. Herasymova, E. (2020). Doktryna realizatsii svobody v demokratychnomu suspilstvi: ideal i realnist [The Doctrine of the Realization of Freedom in a Democratic Society: Ideal and Reality]. Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University, 2 (30): 9-13 [in Ukrainian].
10. Hirzalla, F., & van Zoonen, L. (2011). Beyond the Online/Offline Divide: How Youth's Online and Offline Civic Activities Converge. Social Science Computer Review, 29(4), 481-498.
11. Joyce, M. (2010). Digital Activism Decoded. The New Mechanics of Change. New York: Idebate Press.
12. Kant, I. (2013). Otvet na vopros: Chto takoe Prosveshchenie? [The answer to the question: What is Enlightenment?]. Gosudarstvo. Obshchestvo. Upravlenie, State. Society. Control, 501-509. Moscow: Alpina Publisher [in Russian].
13. Kasavin, I.T., & Shchhavelev, S.P. (2004). Analiz povsednevnosti [Analysis of everyday life]. Moscow: Kanon+ [in Russian].
14. Keen, A. (2012). Digital Vertigo: How Today's Online Social Revolution Is Dividing, Diminishing, and Disorienting Us. New York: St. Martin's Press.
15. Khabermas, Yu. (2016). Strukturnoe izmenenie pbllichnoy sfery: issledovanie otnositelno kategorii burznuaznogo obshchestva [Structural Change in the Public Sphere: A Study on the Category of Bourgeois Society]. Moscow: Ves mir [in Russian].
16. Lanir, Dzn. (2011). Vy ne gadznet [You are not a gadget]. Manifest, Manifesto. Moscow: Corpus (Tsit. po: Martynov, K. (2011). Ot slaktivizma k respublike. Pochemu internet-revolutsii stanoviatia realnostiu [From Slaktivism to the Republic. Why Internet Revolutions Become Reality]. Logos, Logos, 2, 19-27 [in Russian].
17. Matveeva, A.V. (2018). Osobennosti grazhdanskogo uchastia v usloviakh sovremennogo tsifrovogo prostranstva [Features of civic participation in the modern digital space]. Forum molodykh uchenykh, Forum of Young Scientists, 5-2(21), 620-625 [in Russian].
18. Miroshnichenko, A. (2013). Internet i evolutsiia mediaaktivizma v Rossii [The Internet and the Evolution of Media Activism in Russia]. Vestnik Instituta Kennana v Rossii, Kennan Institute Russia Bulletin, 24, 74-84 [in Russian].
19. Morozov, E. (2011). The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom. NY: Public Affairs.
20. Nikovskaia, L.I., & Molokova, M.A. (2017). Rol mezhsektornogo partnerstva v realizatsii potentsiala sotsialnogo gosudarstva v Rossii [The role of intersectoral partnership in realizing the potential of the welfare state in Russia. Vlast, Power, 11(25), 31-37 [in Russian].
21. Ordenov, S. (2020). Social Memory Transformations under the Conditions of Postmodern Society Mobilization. Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University, 1 (31): 76-83.
22. Smetanina, S.I. (2002). Media-tekst v sisteme kultury (dinamicheskie protsessy v iazyke i stile znurnalistiki kontsa XX veka) [Media text in the system of culture (dynamic processes in the language and style of journalism at the end of the 20th century)]. SPb.: Mikhaylova V.A. [in Russian].
23. The Digital Divide: Arguments for and Against Facebook, Google, Texting, and the Age of Social Networking (2011). NY: Tarcher.
24. Theocharis, Y. (2015). The Conceptualization of Digitally Networked Participation. Social Media+Society, 2(1), 1-14.

**Абисова М. А.**

#### МЕДИАТИЗАЦИЯ ПУБЛИЧНОЙ СФЕРЫ

Публичная сфера современного общества представляет собой комплексное и динамичное явление, которое испытывает на себе процессы виртуализации, медиатизации и цифровизации. Интернет-пространство цифровой публичной сферы, в отличие от пространства традиционной публичной сферы, управляется посредством алгоритмов – скрытых механизмов, интегрированных во множество информационных платформ, на публичных площадках которых люди могут обсуждать волнующие их вопросы. Приведены аргументы техно-оптимистов и техно-пессимистов относительно эффективности цифрового участия и его рисков. Также указано на гражданское участие сетевых групп активистов как в тактико-ориентированных, так и стратегических практиках, требующих идти на высокие риски. Поиск консенсуса в определении цифрового активизма, по-прежнему актуализирует споры о его вреде и пользе для общества, открывает возможности для дальнейшего развития этой темы.

**Ключевые слова:** культура, гражданское общество, цифровой активизм, новые медиа, медиатизация, публичная сфера.

Абисова М. А.

### МЕДІАТИЗАЦІЯ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ СФЕРИ

**Вступ.** У сучасному світі все частіше артикулюється нетрадиційне поняття спільноти, пов'язане з поняттям комунікації. Комунікація виявляється тією сполучною тканиною, що об'єднує різних суб'єктів в єдину політичну спільноту. У цьому контексті публічна комунікація набуває особливої значущості як інструмент взаємодії та вирішення конфліктів, як підстава створення політичної спільноти. **Метою статті** є аналіз специфіки існування публічної сфери, що формується в сучасних медіакомунікаціях. Для реалізації даної мети необхідно вирішити такі дослідницькі завдання: здійснити аналіз класичного уявлення публічної сфери як форми суспільно-політичної участі громадян; представити проведення публічної комунікації в практиках нових медіа. **Методологія дослідження** публічної комунікації закладена у працях таких дослідників, як Дж. Ролз, Ю. Габермас, Дж. Боман, Дж. Коен, А. Янг та ін. Вони застосовують комунікативний підхід до дослідження політичної сфери та процесів, які супроводжують позиціонування індивіда та соціальних груп у межах соціально-політичного поля. **Результати дослідження.** Нормативний ідеал публічної сфери у доробку І. Канта, Х. Арендт та Ю. Габермаса представлений як простір, де можливо відкрите вираження своєї думки, критика і дискусія. Це – простір плюральності думок, що унеможлиблює монополізацію влади. Нарешті, це є простір, який забезпечує інклюзивність та рівність комунікантів. У публічній сфері постійно відбувається процес формування балансу інтересів різних суспільних акторів, тих вимог і підтримки, які вони готові надавати державним інститутам з метою вирішення значущих проблем публічної сфери. Практики неоліберальної модернізації в сучасному світі, постмодерністські тренди в політиці розмивають більш-менш точне визначення меж сфери діяльності державних інститутів та акторів громадянської сфери. Інтернет стає ареною протесту і громадянської мобілізації. Дослідники звертають увагу на нові форми медіаучасті громадян: підписання онлайн-петицій і онлайн-дискусій; вступ до ad-hoc групи в соціальних мережах; репости або розміщення посилань на матеріали з проблемних питань та ін. Дії в мережових медіа, названі активістськими, сприяють поширенню інформації, підвищенню обізнаності із соціальних та політичних проблем. Багато з них є паростками активності, що зароджується онлайн і далі реалізується в офлайн (наприклад, краудсорсінг). Але існують цифрові форми активізму, які повністю реалізуються в Інтернеті. Для реалізації таких практик розробляються спеціальні соціальні платформи і додатки, виникають спільноти так званих IT-волонтерів. **Обговорення.** Мережеві скептики заявляють, що соціальні мережі і блоги повели людство хибним шляхом: замість творчості та індивідуальності тут заохочуються поверхові судження, швидкість створення і споживання контенту на основі автоматизованих способів структурування інформації. Розвиток онлайн-присутності і онлайн-спільнот вириває індивіда з реальних форм спільноти, обмежує можливості в реальній соціальній взаємодії. Численні мережеві оптимісти, такі як К. Андерсон, Д. Тапскотт і К. Ширки, вважають, що медіа є ключовим елементом протестних рухів останніх років. За допомогою засобів медіа ці протестні рухи організовуються, висвітлюються, управлінням якомога більше людей змогли дізнатися про них. **Висновки.** Здійснено порівняльний аналіз класичного концепту публічної сфери і проявів громадської активності в сучасній культурі. Представляючи собою історично більш масштабний аналог літературних салонів XVIII століття, віртуальна публічна сфера як простір для інтелектуальної дискусії і суспільного діалогу відчуває дефіцит у сфері розробки адекватного алгоритму структурування та аналізу медіа-активності пересічних користувачів. В умовах функціонування електронних медіа зникає межа між приватним і публічним висловлюваннями, що позбавляє індивіда необхідності здійснювати трансцендентальний акт виходу в публічний простір, проблематизує можливість публічної сфери в її класичній повноті. Статус публічної сфери змінюється в бік множинності сенсів. Раціональну аргументацію дискусії змінює емоційність висловлювань; через спонтанність і гіпертекстуальність комунікативних процесів розвиток дискусії буває важко простежити. Звідси виникає питання про особливості функціонування та управління процесами віртуальної публічної сфери, масштаб і глибина якої можуть перевершувати можливості державних або міжнародних інститутів щодо її регулювання.

**Ключові слова:** культура, громадянське суспільство, цифровий активізм, нові медіа, медіатизація, публічна сфера.

УДК 101.2: 378.14.014.13

Н. Б. Адаменко

### КУРС ФІЛОСОФІЇ У ЗВО ТА МИСЛЕННЯ ЛЮДИНИ, НАЦІЛЕНЕ НА ЗРОСТАННЯ

Національний педагогічний університет імені М.П. Драгоманова  
n.b.adamenko@npu.edu.ua; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7887-2720>

**Анотація.** Стаття присвячена проблемі викладання філософії у закладах вищої освіти, окреслення її значення в університетському навчанні та сучасному суспільстві. Акцентовується увага на зміні статусу філософії в навчальному процесі та пошуку нових розумінь змісту та завдань програми курсу філософії для студентів. Аналізуються його потенційні можливості у становленні людини, здатної осмислювати себе і світ довкола себе як, зокрема точки входу в науку.

**Ключові слова:** викладання філософії, компетентнісний підхід, метамислення, мислення, націлене на розвиток, наукове дослідження, рефлексивне мислення, спільнота дослідників, філософія.

### Вступ

З прийняттям Закону України «Про вищу освіту» 1 липня 2014 року задекларовано запровадження нових засад функціонування системи вищої освіти. В його основу покладено ідею академічної, організаційної, кадрової й фінансової автономії – необхідну умову успішного розвитку університетів. Вдала її реалізація передбачала як формування нових нормативно-правових документів у сфері вищої освіти, так і здійснення перегляду чинних. Відтак, згідно з Наказом МОН України від 25 листопада 2014 року № 1392, втрапив чинність інший Наказ МОН України від 9 липня 2009 року № 642 «Про організацію вивчення гуманітарних дисциплін за вільним вибором студента». Це означало, зокрема, й анулювання встановленого ним пе-

реліку нормативних дисциплін гуманітарної та соціально-економічної підготовки для бакалаврів (спеціалістів медичного та ветеринарно-медичного спрямувань) усіх напрямів (спеціальностей та їх обсяги).

Дисципліна «Філософія» (3 кредити ЄКТС) значилася в такому переліку, отже, до кінця 2014/2015 навчального року ще залишалася обов'язковою для вивчення усіма студентами українських вишів. Надалі викладання філософії не скасовувалося, а стало справою вирішення самих університетів у межах автономії ЗВО. Природно, активно виникали професійні та загальносуспільні дискусії, які часто-густо переростали в дебати і суперечки навколо питання про користь і шкоду від філософії та її місце в університетських освітніх програмах. Так, філософ Є.Бистрицький