

Political Crisis: Conflict Between The Types Of Dimensions Of The Political

Yuliya Martynyak, PhD Candidate

The Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

doi: 10.19044/esj.2016.v12n14p91 [URL:http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n14p91](http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n14p91)

Abstract

In recent years, political crisis has aggravated especially in post-Soviet countries. One of the most important tasks in curbing this situation is by finding the appropriate tools for describing and explaining it. The main aim of this paper is to provide an approach to the political crisis in the light of the coexistence of different types of dimensions of the political. The methodological base of research in this context is the post-marxist theory of rupture (S. Zizek, A. Badiou A., J. Ahambnen), hegemony (A. Gramsci) and ahonizm (C. Mouffe), sociology of everyday life and frame analysis, discourse analysis, and the theory of linguistic determinism. In general, this analysis focuses on anthropological dimension (near the spatial and temporal). This is especially based on the the political subjectification, which forms three basic types of correlation of the political. Every type of correlation forms the symbolic and semantic field simultaneously. Thus, such an approach expands the model of interpretation of the political crisis. In addition, it also expands the political phenomenon particularly. It can be interpreted as a multivariance in the context of three types of dimensions of the political.

Keywords: The political, political subjectification, space of the political

Introduction

At the first glance, the question of political crisis in the post-Soviet states, might be a matter of the choice of either the West or the East cultural values. In fact, this question does not sound so simple, as we would have expected. It is a conflict between the attribute dimensions of the political both at the level of political practice and at the level of the theory of policy. Hence, this statement shows the difference between politics and the political. For example, ukrainian political theory and practice reduce politics usually in the spirit of rationalism to a set of defined schemes and procedures which are related to electoral choice, to the configuration of government

institutions, or to ethnic and national studies. Thus, if the scientists distinguish between politics and policy in the English, German, or French-speaking spaces, there is no such distinction in Ukraine and in the post-Soviet region in general. Research of non-empirical dimensions of policy in this context drifts between the end of history (F. Fukuyama), the end of politics (D. Carswell), the collapse of the "grand narrative" (J.F. Lyotard), and the melancholy for the lost transcendence (J. Baudrillard) that are related to the crisis of the boundaries, dimensions, and coordinate systems. The author aims at outlining the sphere of understanding the problems of political crises. However, this is done by understanding the correlation of the dimensions of the political crisis.

Methodological Aspects of Researching Political Crisis

The statements about the possibility of use of the predefined templates for restructuring of the sphere of policy (modernization projects) at a theoretical level are connected with problems of the shortcomings of the objectification, sociocentrism, and dominance of the technological over the social sector. What do we mean? C. Castoriadis points out that there is no place or point where we could look at the society or history from the outside. Also, there is no logically preceding observation point, which would give us the opportunity to bring out the theory and points. Thus, we could examine and contemplate society and history, state the stipulated need for their well-being, "construct" them, comprehend them, and display them with all integrity. Hence, any idea about society and history itself belongs to society and history (Castoriadis, 1999). It can be concluded after C. Lefort, that attempt to solely quantitative understanding of the policy/the political beyond the person of the researcher on one side and context of living conditions on the other side, is nothing but the shortcoming of the objectification of science (Lefort, 2000). The next problem is the problem of sociocentrism. However, C. Castoriadis interprets the phenomenon of sociocentrism as follows: "every society places a particular fact in the center of the world and looks at all the other facts from their point of view." (Castoriadis, 1999)

Subsequently, this fact in Ukrainian social science is regarded as, for example, ethnicity. The third problem is the dominance of the technological over the social sector. If this approach is justified in applied sciences (though problems of bioethics appear now, for example), many questions appear in the sphere of social research. It is obvious that both the ascertaining of pure empiricism and the reference to pure idealism turns out to be scientific fictions. For example, on two opposite poles, there is the idea that social media make history based on the example of Twitter revolutions (Shirky, 2009). Consequently, this gave the idea that Google is leading us to the

Middle Ages when texts are not read from beginning to end, and narrative or discourse idea is not understood. In return, the analogy is made with medieval compendium (Groys, 2014). Subsequently, the opinion of Raphael based on the analysis of the Second Philippine Revolution states that the statement about the ability of phones to form the political unity are generally the fantasy of middle class, attesting fetishisation of communications. Hence, these statements are based on a false premise about the erasing of existing class distinctions (Raphael, 2005). The reality is syncretic. Thereafter, the technological and the social system were mutually determined. These remarks state that the modernization of the political system, including the political system of Ukraine, cannot be solely reduced to neoinstitutionalism or westernization projects. The political and anthropological approaches were employed with the aim to help. The culture is at the center of the social and political relations based on the perspective of this approach. Therefore, it reproduces the way of social life and transforms it; takes root; and it became a common frame in understanding reality. The statement of J. Rancière is topical on this occasion. Hence, politics is inseparable from culture because either one or the other is working on the determination of a conceivable, visible, and an expressible idea (Rancière, 2003). A brief example is that finance and government which are facing a crucial problem in the interpretation of Western-style politics is regarded by other ethnic groups as follows. Firstly, the point of view, which would have provided the accumulation and preservation of wealth to the meaning of life, was regarded by Indians of Kwakiutl tribe to be madness. They amass wealth in order to destroy it. The desire for power and superiority would be regarded as madness by the Indians of the Zuni tribe. For instance, they beat someone until he agrees to become the head of the tribe (Castoriadis, 1999).

If the politics is associated with management, the political context of the research of the political appears at the crossing of the branches of political philosophy, social philosophy, and the philosophy of language. The methodological base of research in this context is post-marxist theory of the rupture (S. Zizek), hegemony (A. Gramsci), and agonism (C. Mouffe). In addition, it also includes the sociology of everyday life, frame analysis, discourse analysis, and the theory of linguistic determinism respectively. Thus, politics is always connected with hegemonic discourse on the subjects of politics (linguistic or symbolic). The political, as opposed to politics, is among other things. Also, the process of transforming the political discourse into the hegemonic discourse, in the broadest sense, is in a state between absence at the level of concept and naming. The value of social philosophy for research of the political can be determined in the light of the notion of biopolitics that was offered by G. Agamben. However, this means that politics increasingly disperses and penetrates into all things, and enters daily

occurrences (Agamben, 1998). Thus, it also touches the importance of the sociology of daily life and the theory of frames in order to study the political. It was interpreted by E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe, who are usually associated with post-marxism, as the postmetaphysical political theory of total emancipation. In this theory, the space for sense-making is a discursive field which is opposed to both holism and essentialism from the point of understanding of the political and the social (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). The question of subject/structure dichotomy disappears. Every object here is an object of discourse. Also, the concept of society in terms of the production of metapositions has been challenged. Instead of this, the political becomes determinative as the struggle in the sphere of the signified. Subsequently, in this context, it serves as the creation of the symbolic. In fact, it is about such property of the political which is regarded as contingency. Under such conditions, the "post" can be interpreted as a transition from the criticism of economy in the literal sense ("labor force", "capital", "finances" and "other") to the economy of the structure, desire, pleasure, language, text, symbol, and discourse. Consequently, the transition from the capitalist mode of production to the production of meanings and the structure of subjectivity, when understanding power as possession of resources, concedes power in the form of the reproduction of structures, influences, production of values, and communication (Engster, 2014). One of the main tenets in this context include: decentration and deconstruction of the subject which opposes itself to be unavailable. Hence, this unavailability is not only for object, but also for itself.

From Politics to the Political

The term "political" appeared for the first time in an article by C. Schmitt in 1927. This concept has not become widespread in Ukraine yet. The semantic meaning of the consideration of the construct of "politics – the political" is significant when the use of the adjective as the attribute or features of certain type of life replaces the noun as "thing-in-itself". No definition appears important, but the defining of dimensions of the political. Thus, these attributive features that can be determined in their totality as a form of the political expresses itself with the correlation and with the time-spatial conditions. Instead of this, the creation of the final concept of its outline appears not as objective, but hegemonic. This is because opposite assertion involves the process of falling into sociocentrism and illusion of retrospective rationalization. The political turns out to be something that outsteps, entrenched, and have a traditional and/or regulatory enshrined practice of cohabitation. In this sense, it is the opposite or the exception of the politics. From a methodological point of view, this exception can be illustrated in the post-marxism as the distinction between politics and the

political. In the theory of frames, it is regarded as the transition from one frame to another. Within the language determination, it is regarded as the correlation between the lacuna and naming. In general, everything expresses such a feature of the political as “limitariness”. The political is made explicit in the space of "between". However, the research of the aforementioned is possible through delineation, and the definition of limitariness as the condition of its existence. In this context, the limitariness of the political can be determined through the concept of event as was stated by A. Badiou. Further, it was ruptured by S. Zizek. Hence, this is regarded by G. Agamben as the state of emergency in the politics.

Attribute dimensions of the political include the space of the political, the time of the political, and the anthropological dimension of the political. Subsequently, J. Rancière talks about the “political” as the dichotomy between battleground and a tribune (Rancière, 2003). Also, Z. Bauman describes politics in the context of the new world disorder. Here, Clausewitz has a formula about the politics as the continuation of war is known, but in other ways, it turned backwards (Bauman, 2007). In fact, this stratification of the approaches to the political has a long base. It acts as the dialectic and there is a struggle between two metanarratives. In addition, it expresses itself in opposite to Hobbes’s "war of all against all" and Locke’s "good" human nature. In this context, O. Marchart distinguishes two lines of interpretation of the "political difference": associative and dissociative (Marchart, 2007).

Thus, the political is outlined in the following way: it is a condition of coexistence of individuals as "the language animals"; a space of rupture of the social sector, but it is not derived from it; and the space of "between", which is constantly reproduced through the presence of the concept "I" and "Other/Foreign" during the process of communicative discourses/frames. Consequently, these definition of the political de facto is defined by its spatial ("space of which is a space of rupture of the social, but it is not derived from it, the space of "between"), time (it is constantly reproduced), and anthropological (coexisting of individuals as "the language animals" because of the presence of "I" and "Other/Foreign") attributes. Consequently, the political in this context: 1) is a feature of cohabitation of individuals; 2) is not limited to the social, but its rupture; 2) establishes permanent “friend-enemy” interaction; 3) is expressed as a symbiosis of associative and dissociative approaches (between the war and a tribune); 4) is connected with a hegemonic form of social life (Martynyak, 2016).

The Political Subject and Political Subjectification

Anthropological dimension of the political appears constituting in relation to spatial and temporal dimensions. The policy has a deal with the politics or political subjects. However, this includes actors of the politics and

others. The individual in this context is involved in the sphere of politics areas in several dimensions. These dimension stems from the fact that it is the suffrage; delegates his own will and powers through the institution of elections; involves individuals in the political decision-making process; and the building of political institutions and both formal and informal relations between them. If the category of "politics" has to deal with political subject or the subject of politics, the issue of the political is a problem of political subjectification. Thus, the traditional approach to the phenomenon of the politics is derived from the definition of political subjectification as the ability to "create the policy, in particular, to participate in political life of the state, realizing own political interests, to cause important changes in political relations." (Poteriaiko, 2005)

On the other hand, it involves the process of acquiring the features of the political subject (political consciousness, the presence of political interests, internal organization for the achievement of political goals, political activity which is aimed at participating in political decision-making and monitoring their implementation)" (Poteriaiko, 2005).

The research of the subjectification was launched in western marxism and critical theory. Later on, it was launched in post-marxism. In post-marxism, attention is paid to the anthropological distinction due to the presence of gaps or ruptures of the social. Consequently, the interpretation of the subjectification in terms of distinguishing between "I - Other" can be found in M. Foucault. Here, the purpose of the work was not to analyze the phenomena of power, but to write the history of different modes of subjectification of person in western culture that will turn people into actors (Holenkov, 2007). For M. Foucault, there was no subject as universal form in the conditions. Here, the last is the consequence and the result of practices of liberation and subordination is not the substance or form of existence of the individual as a reasonable man, which is given priory. Based on his study, subjectification is the process through which we obtain the assembling of the subject, if to be more precise - subjectiveness. Thus, this will apparently serves as only one of the possibilities of organization with a certain identity. M. Foucault distinguishes the external and internal subjectification through the light of its formation in close connection with the process of objectification. This is seen when a key role belongs to "Other". Consequently, this is outlined by the scientist as an element that serves as a boundary or the limit.

The approach by Ch. Mouffe appears topical. For her, any identity can acquire meaning or concrete definition only through its exclusive relationships with others. Thus, to cut the long story short, creating of the identity "we" always requires construction of the identity "they" which is different from "we" (Mouffe, 2005). As a result, it always appears

unfinished. In the political context, due to the fact that identity is not natural and not pre-defined but socially and politically constructed, it is outlined through the creating of the borders by the government. Furthermore, Ch. Mouffe applies the concept of hegemonic strategy to characterize the identity when the space of the collective identity becomes the space of political struggle. However, such strategy seeks to establish detailed boundaries of identity, without which its other variations lose their sense (Mouffe, 2005). Considering the theory of hegemony by A. Gramsci, on which the theory by Ch. Mouffe is based, political subjectification passes through the process of its formation. This ranges from “naming” as an external condition of an attribute to the right of “establishing of hegemonic strategies” in the political dimension.

Subsequently, J. Rancière puts the question of political subjectification, and not simple subjectification. The scientist opines that there are groups in the society that are named. Nevertheless, they do not have the name. Also, the process of subjectification appears as the process of de-identification/declassification. The subject is kind of in-between, which is somewhat intermediate. Therefore, the logic of political subjectification is heterology for him. Also, the logic of the other which is both assertion and denial of identity and archaic conflict - permanent hatred of the "Other" - is based on the political (Rancière, 2003).

Thus, the political subjectification is a nontraditional process of becoming the subject of politics within a particular way of organizing social life (political regime). We interpreted it as a process of "naming" for those who appear not just in opposition to the subjects of politics, but who were generally beyond the hegemonic practices. Furthermore, they have the potency to install new or adjust existing hegemonic relations in the context of the changing of social organization.

At the beginning of the XXI century, we can define the approaches that have the potency of its own interpretation through the prism of political subjectification. Thus, there are some subjective figures of crisis (A. Negri and M. Hardt), the phenomenon of precariat (G. Standing), refugees (Z. Bauman), and excluded people (A. Badiou). However, A. Negri and M. Hardt, pointing the social and anthropological transformation under the influence of neo-liberalism, outline four new figures of subjectivity. These figures are: 1) owed (the hegemony of finances and banks); 2) medialized (control over information and communication networks); 3) secured (security and general emergency regimes); and 4) represented (depoliticized figures) (Hardt & Negri, 2001). The term "precariat" is used to define people with unstable employment and lifestyle. It also refers to properties of which in this context are reduced to the level of empty work. Regarding refugees, for Z. Bauman, they are referred to those who have been deprived of identity.

They are outlaws and are at the fence of the camp. They became impersonal crowd and they are deprived of having basic amenities; in addition, they are deprived of daily necessity which is part of their rights (Bauman, 2007). When A. Badiou talked about being excluded, he is referring to those people who appear beyond the real world. Identity for them is an abstract set of properties on which the invariance of some kind is built. Thus, it can be detected as static (different from the rest) or dynamic (thing which doesn't become distinctive) (Badiou, 2005). The place and role of these groups of the political subjectification were described successfully by C. Castoriadis (in the context of 1980). This is in terms of the collapse of the political heterology. He writes: «Thirty years ago, we were all "German Jews"; hence, we had “non-befitting” names in the political culture of the conflict. Today, we have "prestigious" names: we are Europeans and xenophobes. The collapse of the polymorphic political form and the collapse of otherness, “reserves a set” of new infrapolitical figure of “the other”. Objectively speaking, we have hardly more immigrants than it was thirty years ago. Subjectively, we have much more immigrants. The fact is that then they had different political name: they were proletarians. Subsequently, they have lost the name, which is referred to the political subjectification, and have kept only the “objective” name - the name of identity. And the other, which has no other name, becomes the pure object of hatred and rejection in such cases» (Castoriadis, 1999).

Types of Correlation of the Dimensions of the Political

According to the dimensions of the political, we distinguish between three types of correlation, within which political subjectification can appear: 1) "territory – eternal recurrence - I- Foreign"; 2) "place - linearity - I-Other"; and 3) "space of flows - fragmentariness - I-not-I". The first type can be defined by the notion of A. Gramsci known as "antagonism". The second can be defined by the concept of Ch. Mouffe "agonism". The third can be defined by the wording of S. Zizek that the “Big Other” no longer exists. Therefore, the space of the political correlating with the space of the politics, social space, territorial dimension, and virtual/media space is outlined by us in this context. Hence, this is as follows: territory - place – flow. Consequently, the temporal dimensions of the political which is followed by Z. Bauman are outlined as follows: eternal recurrence - linearity – fragmentariness. Additionally, the anthropological dimensions are defined respectively as "I-Foreign", "I-Other", and "I-not-I" (Martynyak, 2016).

The first type of correlation shows the characteristic of traditional societies. However, Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe marks them as archaic societies with cyclic temporality (Lacoue-Labarthe & Nancy, 1997). Temporal dimension here entails the physical dimensions of time known as

cyclic recurrence. Spatial dimension is territorial. However, the limitariness of the political coincides with the territorial boundaries. Also, everything which is located within the boundaries is identified with "we". Everything which is located beyond this border is identified with "Foreign". Furthermore, walls, ditches and stockade, marked the boundary between "we" and "they", "orderliness" and "savageness", "peace" and "war". In other words, enemies were those who were on the other side of the fence and who were not allowed to overcome it (Bauman, 2007). Territorial and cyclical dimensions of the political life mean that politics always operates with material things. However, it is interpreted in this context as the sphere of the distribution and redistribution of resources. Belonging to a territory does not just shape its identity, but it is the prerequisite needed. In this context, the state during the process of making policy never faces "that which did not exist before". Instead of this, when the political expresses itself as rupture, it is sufficient for the state to find analogies during the process of political decision-making which appeals to the past. This condition appears as a condition of repetition. Therefore, a ruler simultaneously represents both a figure of real power and a figure of symbolic authority.

The second type of correlation shows the characteristic for the so-called statistical societies. Hence, it is all about something that was pointed out by K. Marx and G. Simmel as the spread of the market economy in the new fields of social life. This meant that everyday experience is increasingly exposed to quantitative measurement (McQuire, 2008). S. McQuire outlines that the possibility to turn night into day with one turn of the switch seemed as an irrefutable proof of the superiority of our time on the past. However, this is the most convincing evidence of the ability of technological progress to subdue even the basic daily rhythms of nature. This electric landscape, even more than the new electrified factories, served as the cultural soil where modernism grew (McQuire, 2008). Here, the dimension of space of the political is not territoriality. However, the place is a definite point of space (not necessarily geographical). In this place, we can draw the line of the being of the social groups from the territorial state to the state of population. Consequently, this situation becomes possible with the development of cities that become the centers of the political. Temporal dimension of the politics in this context is directly related to rationality. This is not a repetition, but a progress. In this respect, quantitative indicators become the measurements of the activity of the state. Also, the statistics tries to replace the cultural framework of the politics. Actually in this dimension, the question of interconnection is resolved. Under the influence of the changing of the conditions of social life, politics is considered as an instrumental sphere in

close correlation with the economy. It is about the fact that J. Rancière means "from ontology to the corporation" (Rancière, 2003).

The third type of correlation of dimensions of the political acts in the spirit of postmodern is connected with the implosion. This is through the prism of the development of virtual space. The question on the need for interaction with "Other" is substituted with the permanent need of finding your own "I". Subsequently, the temporal dimension appears in the formula "here and now" as a permanent fragmentariness. A modern world is a world of introspection and contemplation. As a result, people loathe themselves harder than they dislike others. In an era of ubiquitous media, not only home boundaries become more permeable, but national borders too. As a result, cultural identity is defined to a lesser extent by an "imagined community". This community is related to the geographical boundaries of the national territory. Increasingly, it resembles a mosaic pattern. These are contours of which are lined with areas of satellite broadcasting and flows of digital crossing communications. The space of the political is separated completely from the material dimension. Instead of this, it appears in the virtual and media dimensions. According to M. Castells, the space of stream which dominates over historically determined space of places appears (Castells, 2009). The individual in this space is not just represented, but he represents himself through the fear of not to be seen. In place of the dichotomy, "We - Foreign" and "We – Others", the dichotomy "I-not-I" comes. Here, the reflection on the place of "other/foreign" gives way to self-reflection. The thesis "geography disappeared" is distributed. The category of time is again distinguished instead of Time-Space. In addition, scientists pay more attention to Time-Speed. Actually, G. Agamben indicated the total politicization in this context (Agamben, 1998).

Political Crisis in Ukraine – XIX or XXI Century

The end of politics, rumors of which are spreading everywhere today, is usually described as the end of a specified period. J. Rancière stated that this period, however, differs itself by well-known regime on the use of time and the regime of promise (Rancière, 2003). According to the scientist, the period between the nineteenth and twenty-first century was the time designed to complete the revolution. The destruction of the royal mode of politics and the destruction of the revolutionary image of this destruction was ensured, in order to finally come to a homogeneous time (Rancière, 2003). Was it successful? With all certainty, we can say no. Is this possible? With all certainty, we can say no too. Consequently, C. Geertz stated that the cultural diversity from which "moral issue" are derived and which existed previously primarily among societies, increasingly appears within them. In addition, social and cultural boundaries coincide not so often (Geertz, 2001).

Therefore, each type of correlation of dimensions of the political does not disappear. They do not only completely replace each other, but they are intertwined into various forms of interdependence and interobjection. Each type of correlation also reveals itself in two forms - associative and dissociative. Each type of correlation of the political creates the symbolic. In other words, it stands in complex relations of mutual influence and interdependence. Therefore, this creates a corresponding political culture. As M. Castells supposed, the space of the upper tier is usually connected with the global communication and extensive network of exchange. Thus, this is opened to messages and experiences that cover the whole world. At the other end of the spectrum, separate LANs were situated. They are often focused on ethnic grounds that rely on its identity as the most valuable resource to protect not only their own interests, but also their existence. Moreover, urban residents of the lower level are bound to be local, but real forces which create the circumstances in which we all now exist, are rotating in the global space. On the other hand, our institutions of the political activity are mostly tied to land (Castels, 2009).

One of the many reasons for the crisis of the contemporary politics (not only that of Ukraine or the former Soviet Union, but that of the EU as shown by recent events) is the interpretation of a type of correlation of dimensions of the political as the only correct and the only hegemonic. A striking example of the hegemony of the first type of correlation is the Russian Federation. If the European community chooses the direction of "never again", Russian Federation chooses a "fair" and "good" war as a dialectical opposite of "bad" war. Thus, it is based on a dichotomous construct "I-Foreign". This happens when lines of the rupture of the political pass on territorial lines and the project of the political is presented as the project of revival of the great past. Hence, this facilitates the rediscovering of analogies. For example, where the second type of correlation is hegemonic, suitable description is that description which was offered to the USA by P. Brokner. For him, America is a project. Europe has a history, but America is the history. Therefore, if North Americans do not cease to strive to colonize the territory of the future which always escapes from them, then the Europeans have already lost all trust in the power of time (Bruckner, 2010). Example of the third type is Europe. Furthermore, P. Brokner indicates a secret desire of Europe to get out of history. For him, Europe has not believed in evil already. It has only misunderstanding which must be resolved by arrangements – we are actually talking about something that is indicated by Ch. Mouffe, who criticizes liberal democracy for blindness and unwillingness to see antagonism as the condition of coexistence.

Ukraine, as a young state, does not have its hegemonic political culture. Hence, each type of correlation of dimensions of the political is

semi-hegemonic. That is, we are not even talking about the fact that there is need to find mechanisms for the co-existence of different types of correlation of the political. We are talking about the fact that each type of correlation should be recognized as such in Ukraine. The geopolitical situation deepens the crisis more dramatically when the country appears closed between countries. Here, different types of correlation of the political are hegemonic: the EU-states on one hand and Russian Federation on the other hand. Within the general frustration against the background of these factors, Ukrainian society repeatedly fails in finding a good king. As noted by J. Rancière, limit for the administrators of enjoyment is the difficulty in managing two or three interrelated feelings. Thus, these feelings are not so easily quantifiable and indexable. They include frustration, fear, and hatred. This impossibility facilitates the intervention of the archaic figure, figure of a good king and a democratic king, who is able to combine two gestures in one (Rancière, 2003).

Conclusion

The contemporary political crisis (in particular, in Ukraine and post-Soviet countries) in this context is not primarily associated with changes of government entities. It does not demand the quantitative reorganization of the political system, nor the accession to an intergovernmental association. Thus, these requirements are derivative. It is about the crisis of the coexistence of three types of interpretation of the political. Here, the representatives of each type at the level of the state claim to be exclusive hegemony. Thus, there is no common cultural and symbolic field of opportunity of these types for interaction and mutual development. Moreover, recent events in the EU has witnessed that this issue is not only the problem of Ukraine or the former Soviet countries. We have to remember that if the politics deals with the political subjects, the political would deal with the political subjectification. Hence, this is regarded as the potency to modify the hegemonic forms of life of various groups. In the context of the political subjectification, Ukrainian parties and right-wing groups defined the process of conducting the policy in the first type of correlation of the dimensions of the political - "territory – eternal recurrence – I-Foreign". The second type of correlation of the political is related to the development of middle class. In addition, the third type is connected with the development of creative class (in the associative dimension). The first type of rhetoric is made around the theme of ethnicity; the second is made around the development of business and investment; and the third is made around the horizontal relations, ecological, gender problems, and others. However, each of these themes can be developed only in correlation with other themes, and it does not deny them. Moreover, the question of the correlation of different

types of dimensions of the political in one space is an issue that is already extremely acute in the modern world. Today, our objective is to be able to combine these types of correlation. Thus, this is done by considering various phenomena of the politics not in the conditions of invariance, but multivariance.

References:

- Agamben (1998). *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Badiou (2005). *Le Siècle*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bauman (2007). *Liquid Times: Living in the Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman (2013). *Nevelyke dopovnennia do dovhoi sotsialnoi istorii chasu*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://zbruc.eu/node/12643>
- Bruckner (2010). *The Tyranny of Guilt: An Essay on Western Masochism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Castells (2009). *The Power of Identity, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. II*. Cambridge, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Castoriadis (1999). *L'institution imaginaire de la societe*. Paris: Seuil.
- Engster (2014) *Post-Marxismus Zur Kritik der Politischen Ontologie*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://phase-zwei.org/hefte/artikel/post-marxismus-429/>
- Geertz (2001). *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Grojs (2014). *Vse menjaetsja, no u nas net oshhushhenija peremen*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://slon.ru/biz/1202091/>
- Hardt & Negri (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Holenkov (2007). *Poniatye subʒektyvatsyy Myshelia Fuko*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://www.phil63.ru/ponyatie-subektivatsii-mishelya-fuko>
- Laclau & Mouffe (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London and New York: Verso.
- Lacoue-Labarthe & Nancy (1997). *Retreating the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefort (2000). *Writing: The Political Test*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Marchart (2007). *Post-Foundational Political Thought: Political Difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Martynyak Yu. *Typy koreliatsii vymiriv politychnoho*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://gileya.org/index.php?ng=library&cont=long&id=130>
- McQuire (2008). *The media city: Media, Architecture and Urban Space*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore: SAGE Publications.

- Mouffe (2005). *On the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Poteriaiko (2005). *Osoblyvosti politychnoi subiektyvatsii natsionalnykh menshyn v Ukraini*. Free edition. Retrieved from: <http://disser.com.ua/content/144146.html>
- Rancière (2003). *Aux bords du politique*. Paris: Folio.
- Raphael (2005). *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Technics of Translation in the Spanish Philippines*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Shirky (2009). *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. Penguin Books.