

**Viktoria Timashova, PhD in Law**

*National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine*

## **SELF-ORGANIZATION AND SELF-REGULATION AS ABILITY AND FUNCTION OF THE POLITICAL SPHERE OF LIFE**

Political sphere is considered by analogy with Plato's metaphor, which represents a state similar to a living organism. Considering complexity of processes occurring in living organisms, in modern times a tool for opening and explanation of nature of the political sphere in which a state is a major political institution, is a departure from one-sided, linear scenario offered by synergetics. This article determines that operation of open dynamic systems, which the political sphere is, can be provided by self-organization similar to the same processes that occur in living organisms. It is shown that the process of self-regulation as a function of the political sphere of society can be considered by analogy with the social sphere, with the help of: 1) principles; 2) categories; 3) laws. These three factors can determine the overall content of self-regulation of the political sphere, its features, stability of structures, their immutability and mobility, interconnection with other structures and phenomena (regulation, organization) and their relationship. The author proved that from the system perspective, structure and process are combined by a function, which is fully consistent with structuring of the political sphere, which exists with help of triadic interaction between political relations, political institutions and political ideology.

**Key words:** political sphere, self-organization, self-regulation, synergetics, function, structure, political process.

Plato in his times said that a state is just an enormous human; but Aristotle approached this Plato's metaphor closely to the real analogy – a state is considered to be an organism, similar to an enormous human. And as far as a human is a social being, it is not just similar to a living organism, it is a living organism<sup>1</sup>.

When it comes to the sphere of public life, it is appropriate to refer to so-called "*Dao*" by Lao Tzu (VI-V century BC) as a general idea of regularity and its implementation, which has character of global reasonableness, and outwardly is reflected in organization of being and consistency of its change. Therefore, everything that a person does, sees and understands as existent and real - is *Dao*. Lao Tzu said that "*Dao* is incorporeal and devoid of form", but it can be cognized only imagining it in the form of a sphere. "Sphere of *Dao* is a vicious circle in which countless number of similar things is inscribed"<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the concept of "sphere" appeared to describe all imaginable areas and cases of vital functions in any country. Lao Tzu summed up his concept: "through one country you may cognize the Universe"<sup>3</sup>.

Nowadays, a sphere is defined as sociological realm of life in which people decide their current and future needs and interests. Being of a person - social reality is a layered structure. It consists of numerous spheres and areas that are self-governed by certain rules and regulations of social life, which - in turn - is continuously created and perfected in multiple-governmental repetitions, reformations and are the property of several generations of people. This social reality is largely dependent on the political sphere of being of socialized people, and therefore, it is natural that the idea of a social organism was first applied to the study of the political sphere.

The means of disclosure and explanation of the nature of the political sphere in modern times is a departure from one-sided, linear science scenario offered by synergetics. Nonlinear nature is inherent to the political sphere of society; that according to scientists, to some extent, limits the use of a systematic

<sup>1</sup> Ковалевский, М.М. (1910). *Социология*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография М. М. Стасюлевича, 205.

<sup>2</sup> Антология мировой философии: в 4-х т. (1969). Т. 1: *Философия Древности и Средневековья*. Ч. 1. Москва: Мысль, 182.

<sup>3</sup> Антология мировой философии: в 4-х т. (1969). Т. 1: *Философия Древности и Средневековья*. Ч. 1. Москва: Мысль, 187.

approach. But at the same time, the political sphere still has its structure (architectonics), which in political science is seen as a political system, that it is a systemic reality with a number of components, related elements and connections between them, that are difficult to simultaneously consider because any, even the most perfect model, is always limited compared to life processes of society<sup>1</sup>.

T. Parsons believed that social systems are "open" systems, in a state of constant interchange on inputs and outputs to the environment. In addition, they are differentiated into various subsystems, which are also constantly involved in interchange and integration. According to T. Parsons' approach, society should be considered as a complex social system, consisting of relatively autonomous units (subsystems that are just systems, but at lower levels). By the way, he insisted on importance to distinguish primarily structural and functional categories: the first give an understanding of society in its static equilibrium state, the second consider society in terms of dynamics and changes in society<sup>2</sup>.

The political sphere is a subsystem in relation to social sphere or social supra-sphere - expanse of social and collective living, which firstly met their average, everyday needs and interests connected with consumption, which is one of the fundamentals of individual and social being. These average, everyday needs define life of society (social organism), allowing you to distinguish areas of public life, based on the basic human needs. Various authors distinguish different areas, which, in their view, meet the most essential needs of a person. We share the opinion of I.M. Varzar who justified the existence of five spheres (according to basic human needs). These are economic, spiritual, political, cultural and ethno-historical spheres. According to I.M. Varzar each of these areas has typical essential structure (it was discussed in works of T. Parsons), and it consists of three blocks: 1) social relations of people about the most important things in a particular area (in the political sphere these are relationship in power, state government, civil liberties, administrative and legal system, and so on); 2) ideal views of people on their relations about the most important things in a particular area (in the political sphere these are political consciousness, political rights, political culture and political ethics, political values, and so on); 3) social institutions created by people in order to consolidate, to fix their perfect ideas about the most important things in a particular area<sup>3</sup>. According to I.M. Varzar, the political sphere and political system, which is structured personification of the political sphere, are paired concepts. This means that the political sphere and political system and other subsystems, branches, regions, areas have three main interrelated and integrated components: 1) relationships, 2) institutions created on their basis and 3) ideology (program, strategy, vision of further development).

The abovementioned continues the idea of T. Parsons that any socio-political, economic, cultural phenomenon may be described as a kind of social action system (in our case - the political sphere of public life). Such system can always be divided into parts or smaller subsystems. If this division may be continued long enough, it eventually can get what is called an elementary action, which is the smallest unit of a system that makes sense within a particular system action. This unit, in the sense of T. Parsons turns out to be a constituent element of the action. In full form a unit includes a number of specific items, such as a specific goal, specific conditions, specific means, one or more rules that govern the choice of means to achieve the goal. In our view and in line of the sphere theory of I.M. Varzar, political relations are the smallest unit of the political sphere of society, emphasized by T. Parsons, as far as they contain a purpose, specific conditions and regulatory content that is either already exists or which still need to work out.

Functioning of open dynamic systems, such as the political sphere, is provided by self-organization similar to the same processes that occur in functioning of living organisms. Self-organization can be defined as a function of a system and as its characteristics. The ambiguity of interpretation of this concept in scientific literature is confirmation to it. Thus, V. Arshinov, known for his consistent synergetic studies, argues that self-organization is emergence of spatial-temporal structures in complex nonlinear systems that are far from equilibrium conditions, but near the particular critical points (so-called bifurcation points), in which behavior of a system and its structure become unstable, and therefore under the most insignificant impact it can dramatically change its condition<sup>4</sup>. In the philosophical dictionary, edited by V. Shynkaruk, self-organization was described as a system's ability to independently maintain or improve the level of its

<sup>1</sup> Тімашова, В.М. (2014). Надсфери і сфери в теоретичній призмі змісту політичного життя суспільства як системи Україна. *Політичні науки та методика викладання соціально-політичних дисциплін*, 15, 76.

<sup>2</sup> Парсонс, Т. (1998). *Система современных обществ*. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 17–22.

<sup>3</sup> Варзар, І.М. (2011). *Політична етнологія*. Київ: ДП «Вид. дім «Персонал»», 56–57.

<sup>4</sup> Аршинов, В.И. (1997). *Синергетика*. Москва: Прогресс, 164.

organization by changing internal and external conditions of its existence, considering past experience, with the aim to preserve its integrity, increase resistance, ensure proper functioning or development<sup>1</sup>.

G. Nesterenko believes that crucial ideas that should be taken into account in ascertaining the nature of self-organization are such specific features of this process as: 1) internal source and security of resources and forces of a system without external interference; 2) periodic emergence of local ordering; 3) magnitude of self-organizing process, i.e. seizing an entire system and the ability to change its quality status. These provisions are fully imposed on the political sphere of society in which a state is the primary political institution. An inside source and system element - is power, power relations on separation of powers and distribution of authorities; resources, which belong to a state are material values, necessary for social production and consumption, capital, land, minerals. Resources can be: social, whose carrier is a person, have the ability to raise social status or rank or position in the social structure; power resources - weaponry and an apparatus of physical coercion, people specially prepared for this; demographic - is, in fact, people - universal resource that creates other resources, such as legal, information and so on. G. Nesterenko thus believes that neglecting of any features in some studies often leads to narrowing of the concept of "self-organization", resulting misunderstanding with self-regulation, self-reproducing or self-ordering concepts<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, scientific literature quite often equates self-organization and self-regulation. However, according to the authors of the monograph edited by V.P. Beh<sup>3</sup>, self-organization can be defined as the ability of a system, its characteristics, but self-regulation is a function of a system that provides self-organization of the latter. That is, self-regulation is a function that helps a system to respond to changes in order to ensure its proper functioning or development.

Considering self-regulation as a function of self-regulated systems, scientists rely on earlier studies of this problem, including the theory of functionalism. Back in the nineteenth century the studies of one of its founders H. Spencer considered components of society, their growing interdependence, which creates a need for a "regulatory system" that would control the actions of these units and ensure coordination. "In a state, as in a living body, regulatory system inevitably arises ... When forming a strong community ... appear higher regulating centers and subordinate centers, senior centers are beginning to expand and become more complex". According to Herbert Spencer, on the early stage of social evolution regulation is required in relation to environment when there is spontaneous adjustment of parts to each other. In the further evolution spontaneity of regulation was replaced by management systems that carry out internal regulation and social control, which form the basis for division of society into types<sup>4</sup>.

Distinguishing types of societies (simple, complex, double complexity, triple complexity), H. Spencer shared them by sophistication of the political sphere. Thus, simple types of society were divided into those with a leader; those in which a leader appears sporadically; those with an unstable leadership; and those who have stable leadership. Societies based on different degrees of difficulty are classified, in addition, by the type of internal regulation, when there is harmony in existence of relatively weak and vague system of internal regulation; but there is compulsory and centralized control during military relations. Thus, in the theory of H. Spencer regulation actually acts as a system function required for evolution of society, and with its further development turns into a control system, that is seen as a part of a whole. The function (lat. *functio* - implementation, realization) is anything that can be found out about a system without addressing its internal content. The authors of the abovementioned monograph define function as a new action, activity, operation, and as ability to act, a role, value, attribute, duty, competence, dependence of one value from another, problems of domestic content that has changed<sup>5</sup>.

Self-regulation as a function of the political sphere of society can be considered similar to the social sphere through: 1) principles (the principle of universal connection and the principle of development through contradictions); 2) categories (essence and phenomenon, single, special, general, form and meaning, cause and effect, necessity and chance, possibility and reality); and 3) laws of dialectics (the law

<sup>1</sup> *Філософський словник* (1986). Київ: Голов. ред. УРЕ, 596.

<sup>2</sup> Нестеренко, Г.О. (2007). *Українська політична нація: самоорганізаційні засади становлення*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 94–95.

<sup>3</sup> Бех, В.П., Крохмаль, Н.В., Нестеренко, Г.О. (2010). *Саморегуляція соціального організму країни*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова.

<sup>4</sup> Бех, В.П., Крохмаль, Н.В., Нестеренко, Г.О. (2010). *Саморегуляція соціального організму країни*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 53.

<sup>5</sup> Бех В. П., Крохмаль Н. В., Нестеренко Г. О. (2010). *Саморегуляція соціального організму країни*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 101.

of mutual transition of quantitative changes to qualitative, the law of unity and struggle of opposites; denial law) and the principles of synergetics (self-organization, self-reproduction, resonant effect, constant fluctuations, bifurcations, multivariate development, nonlinearity, constructive chaos, entropy corridor, attractors, cooperative effects, mode of aggravation, etc.). With their help we can determine overall content of self-regulation of the political sphere, its characteristics, resistance of structures, their immutability and mobility, relationship with other structures and phenomena (regulation, organization) and their correlation, volatility and continuous development of self-regulation in its historical incarnations; i.e. based on dialectics and synergetics we can create a full picture of action of self-regulation in a social body of a country, and therefore in its political sphere. A state, which is the main institution in the political sphere and a political system of society, is often described as a regulatory system that provides subordination of complex set of distinctive parts that constitute it. Among them are political regimes as a set of methods by which the state exercises its functions with inherent bodies (parliament, presidency institution, etc.) that form different types of states.

Depending on the ratio between institutional and self-organizing tendencies, and specifically which component is dominant - similar to the existing classification of political regimes - all social systems can be divided into authoritarian and democratic. Moreover, we should recognize constructiveness of idea of providing these characteristics with categorical values, when the subjects of research are the most general laws of social systems, peculiarities of ratio between individual parts and the whole, levels of organization, system and the environment, forward and backward linkages etc<sup>1</sup>.

Moreover, synergetics as a powerful scientific field studies self-organized systems, which have a function of self-regulation as ability of the whole in relation to its parts. Synergetics examines phenomena of self-organization from the standpoint of thermodynamics. Its objects are effects of joint actions of interconnected elements, remote from equilibrium that actively exchange of matter, energy and information with the environment.

Sometimes, in modern scientific sources there are doubts about legitimacy of social synergetics at all, especially due to the fact that it has borrowed much from natural sciences. But if we consider the political sphere of life, which is an integral component (subsystem) of a social supra-sphere, availability of self-organizing and self-regulating effects of joint triad action of the main components is apparent - relations, institutions, ideology, and their concomitant attributes (political consciousness, political ethics, political culture, political rights and so on) which actively exchange substance (material resources), energy (human resources) and ideology (which is formed by interaction of communication and information). The subject of synergetics, as it was stressed by G. Nesterenko<sup>2</sup>, are not physical, chemical, biological or social sites, but formation of a system as such. Thus, synergetics reflects system's ability to maintain the integrity and the ability to evolve, responding internal and external influences. In response to such impacts the processes of regulation changes takes place in the system, starting first of all in the political sphere, so they are called self-regulated.

If for relatively simple, historically first social systems such as clan or tribe, as well as in specific relatively closed systems as army, authoritarian model of self- organizations/organizations can be very effective and even under certain conditions - only possible way to perform their functions for ethnic communities (such as Ukraine) has a clear advantage democratic way. However, not only the complexity of social systems in modern conditions makes obsolete authoritarian way of life, but also the quantity and quality of global problems, which can be solved only by democratic way through usual dynamic links and powerful creative stimuli<sup>3</sup>.

If we continue to examine social life from the standpoint of the sphere theory, i.e. integrated interaction of key spheres that provide basic human needs, the philosophy argues that social life is the formation that takes place at the macro level, but it has a "triune" causal conditionality. The source of his trigger mechanism is hidden in micro-level processes (in the political sphere and any area it is a level of relations); so social life arises and operates at a macro level (for the political sphere and other areas it is creation and functioning of institutions); and its destination to the Universe or its application as an

<sup>1</sup> Бородкин, В.В. (1990). Противоречия и два способа организации социальных систем. *Самоорганизация: кооперативные процессы в природе и обществе*, 1, 81.

<sup>2</sup> Нестеренко, Г.О. (2007). *Українська політична нація: самоорганізаційні засади становлення*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 91–92.

<sup>3</sup> Нестеренко, Г.О. (2007). *Українська політична нація: самоорганізаційні засади становлення*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 100-101.



immanent factor of Universe's movement, should be sought at mega-level, namely in interconnection of tangible and intangible areas (for example, the economic and spiritual). This is an accepted fact that society is the only system which operation and development transmits not only matter, energy and information, but, by the expression of K. Marx, "crystals of social substance", "clots of human labor devoid of differences"<sup>1</sup>, embodied in products of labor, and thus non-material, but nevertheless tangible social relations are reproduced.

Considering the abovementioned investigations, when analyzing phenomena of self-organization and self-regulation of social body of a country, which important component is the political sphere of society, it is appropriate, as V. Taran writes, to do it in multidimensional, multivariate plane "as far as hypertrophy of any single aspect essentially restricts the definition of ideology, leads to conservative-dogmatic approach in its understanding"<sup>2</sup>. This principle is stipulated by complexity of social life and increasing openness and nonlinearity of social systems. The profound and radical changes take place in all spheres of social, economic and cultural life of modern society, including political, but they do not fit into traditional schemes of explanation and understanding of social phenomena.

So, summing up, we suggest the following conclusions:

1. The concepts of self-organization and self-regulation are inherent to complex, dynamic, open systems, which include political system that is structured personification of the political sphere; during their operation and development these systems complicate their structure and create new forms and so on. Thus, under self-organization we understand the system's ability to independently maintain, reproduce or improve the level of organization in changing internal and external conditions of existence, considering past experience, with the aim to preserve its integrity, increase resistance, ensure proper functioning or development. Self-regulation serves as the function of complex dynamic open systems, providing order in self-organizing opportunities of a system in time and space. The latter is also identified with regulation and is ability of a system to respond to external stimuli through spontaneous processes within a system.

2. From a system perspective, structure and process are combined by the concept of function; this, in our opinion, is fully consistent with structuring of the political sphere, which exists using triadic interaction of political relations, political institutions and political ideology. This interaction takes place in a form of political process, which is influenced by many related factors of the political sphere such as political consciousness, political ethics, political rights, political culture and many others; this list is not exhaustive.

3. Such factors as: 1) a significant self-organizing and organizing potential of the political sphere, which allows (in comparison with other areas) to implement teleological function as the basis of political process is the phenomenon of power; 2) exposure to various external and internal stimuli that provoke change in the political sphere in time and define open (mostly) and dynamic nature of the political sphere; 3) nonlinearity of the political sphere, is stipulated by presence of stable and unstable stationary conditions, which allow applying conceptual potential of synergetics in the political sphere, which in turn creates the phenomenon of complex and diverse behavior that does not fit into a single theoretical framework that is unpredictable in certain periods of time.

## References

1. Antologiya mirovoy filosofii: V 4-h t. (1969) [Anthology of World Philosophy: 4 vol.]. T. 1: *Filosofiya Drevnosti i Srednevekovya. Ch. 1* [Vol. 1: Philosophy of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. - Part 1.]. Moscow: Myisl. [in Russian].
2. Arshinov, V. I. (1997). *Sinergetika* [Synergetics]. Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
3. Bekh, V.P., Krokmal, N.V., Nesterenko, H.O. (2010). *Samorehuliatyia sotsialnoho orhanizmu krainy* [Self-regulation of the social organism of a country]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova, 91–92. [in Ukrainian].
4. Borodkin, V.V. (1990). *Protivorechiya i dva sposoba organizatsii sotsialnyih sistem* [Contradictions and two ways of organizing social systems]. Moscow: *Samoorganizatsiya: kooperativnyie protsessy v prirode i obschestve, 1*, 81. [in Russian].
5. *Filosofskiy slovnyk* [Philosophical Dictionary] (1986). Kyiv: Holov. red. URE, 596. [in Ukrainian].
6. Kovalevskiy, M. (1910). *Sotsiologiya* [Sociology]. Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya M. Stasyulevicha. [in Russian].
7. Marks, K. (1960). *Protsess proizvodstva kapitala* [The process of production of capital]. Moscow: Politizdat. [in Russian].

<sup>1</sup> Маркс, К. (1960). *Процесс производства капитала*. Москва: Политиздат, 36.

<sup>2</sup> Таран, В.О. (2000). *Ідеологія перехідного суспільства: (соціально-філософський аналіз ідеологічного процесу в пострадянській Україні)*. Запоріжжя: Запорізький юрид. ін-т МВС України, 35.

8. Nesterenko, H. O. (2007). *Ukrainska politychna natsiia: samoorhanizatsiini zasady stanovlennia* [Ukrainian political nation: self-organizing principles of formation]. – Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova, 91–92. [in Ukrainian].
9. Parsons, T. (1998). *Sistema sovremennyh obschestv* [The system of modern societies]. Moscow: Aspekt Press. [in Russian].
10. Taran, V.O. (2000). *Ideologiia perehidnogo suspilstva: (sotsialno-filosofskiy analiz Ideologichnogo protsesu v postradyanskiy Ukraini)* [Ideology of transitional society: (Socio-philosophical analysis of ideological process in post-Soviet Ukraine)]. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizkiy yurid. In-t MVS Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian].
11. Timashova, V.M. (2014). Nadsfery i sfery v teoretychnii pryvzi zmistu politychnoho zhyttia suspilstva yak systemy [Supra-areas and areas in theoretical prism of the content of political life of society as a system]. *Politychni nauky ta metodyka vykladannia sotsialno-politychnykh dystsyplin* [Political science and methods of teaching social and political subjects], 15, 76. [in Ukrainian].
12. Varzar, I. M. (2011). *Politychna etnolohiia* [Political ethnology]. Kyiv: DP «Vyd. dim «Personal»», 56–57. [in Ukrainian].