THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF LAW AND POLITICS

Bohdan Ferens

Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine,
Chief consultant, Secretariat of the Committee on European Integration
of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

POLITICAL SPACE OF THE EU. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The article is devoted to the important issue of the theoretical conceptualization of the EU political space. The space of socio-political interaction is complicated, the principles and mechanisms are changing, and the role of information influence on social and political behavior, on social consciousness is intensified. There is a necessity to understand the causes of diversity, firstly, based on the theoretical framework in the field of functioning and development of political interactions. Analyzing the different types of theoretical approaches, we determined the basic trends and interconnections that directly impact the understanding of such a new phenomenon as the political space and its connections with the dynamics of integration inside and outside the EU.

Keywords: political space, transnationalization, EU, political system, political orientation, democratic institutions, integration.

Analysis of the current global changes cannot carry out without taking into account the various theoretical and methodological approaches in the conceptualization of the political space. In this regard, it is important to take into account the system / system-historical approach, institutionalism, constructivism, and communicative approach. Particular attention should be paid to organizational theory and transnationalism since these theoretical paradigms make it possible to study the specifics of the formation and transformation of the European political space with its national party systems, supranational institutional superstructures, regional integration projects, and cross-border cooperation.

The systematic approach has become relevant in the theory of international relations since the mid-50s of the twentieth century, firstly, thanks to the achievements of scientific and technological progress. Precisely, a lack of a sound theoretical basis that would allow us to verify the empirical evidence prevented the balanced assessment of global political transformations to be properly conducted. Using of the system approach allows us to consider the object of study as an integral set of elements in the context of relationships between them. It is possible to consider the system at the same time as a whole, and as a subsystem of add-ons due to the integrity. The definition of criteria for hierarchy, which can be observed at least in the ratio of two elements, allows us to trace the level of subordination. Especially this form of interaction is reflected in the functioning of organizations consisting of managers and managed subsystems.

Another important tool for a systematic approach is structuring. In particular, the process of functioning of the system is primarily due to the properties of the structure itself, and not of its individual elements.

It is also worth considering the conditions that influenced the formation of the system, the stages of its development, the current state and possible perspectives in the future. To do this, it is necessary to apply a system-historical approach. It was designed to reveal a variety of relationships that take place both within the object under study and in its interaction with the environment at different stages of its development.

There is a claim that proponents of realism and neo-realism also use the category of "political space" in their research, but identify it with the political system[1].

---

[1] Ferguson, Y.H., Jones, Barry R.J. (2002). *Political space: The Frontiers of Change and Governance in a Globalizing World,* 46-48.

To consider the above-mentioned, political space can be stated as a place where force is concentrated, and spatial perception is used to determine its functioning and organization.

Realists are able to see in the political space the real length of the territory to which extends historically conditioned political system or its political influence. Political space fulfills three functions: 1) the preconditions of political life; 2) the goals of political activity of states (geopolitics); 3) the ecological environment of the existence and development of various forms of political life. Therefore, some researchers believe that one of the prerequisites for the victory of democracy in Western Europe was the spatial openness of the borders of European states.

It is also useful to apply the theory of multilevel governance, the individual elements of which are traced in western studies (multi-level governance 12). Multi-level governance is defined as "a complex political process that combines sub-state, state and supranational levels, as well as the activities of governmental and non-governmental actors"[1]. The theory of multilevel governance postulates the identity of approaches to the study of political relations at each territorial-political level, but suggests differences in these approaches, depending on the qualitative specificity of each level. The theory of international relations, within this approach, can be considered as part of the general theory of multilevel governance, where the object of research serves the global political system and relations between national states[2].

This theory is intended, first, to help understand the complex multidimensional political space that exists in the European Union. The stimulus of its development was the need for the conceptualization of relations between states within the framework of the European Union, taking into account the complex internal political context of most states. In contrast, the blurring of interstate barriers, there is an intensification of regionalism, which is reflected in the desire to preserve its identity.

Political institutions and political communities are considered along with the political systems at each level. Triad "institute – system – community" is investigated with anchoring to a place, a certain localization. Integration of rather disparate approaches is possible due to the use of concepts of space, vertical hierarchy and systematic approach, which can be applied to the following levels:

Concepts of the development of "horizontal" levels:
– global political system;
– national political system;
– regional political system;
– local political system.

Concepts of relations between territorial levels:
– between global and national systems;
– between national and subnational (regional and / or local) systems;
– between regional and local systems.

Consideration of the political system in the context of the spatial approach is the probability of facing the need to address the problems of territorial levels and geographical boundaries. At first glance, the territory can easily be recognized as a political system, especially if we associate systems and institutions. The formal legal approach allows considering any internally structured territory as a system because its structure appears at the expense of only an internal administrative system and a distinction from other similar in terms of the level of territories. However, the generally accepted multilevel administrative-territorial division does not make by itself territory systems. It must be ensured that the territory is capable to function as a system.

The system approach is largely due to just criticism in modern political science. At the same time, as shows the analysis of sources, critics do not deny the very existence of political systems. Rather, they tend to distance themselves from naturalism and structuralism, considering political systems as one of the structures[3].

Structuralism is oriented, first, to the identification of stable and orderly phenomena, which have the property of repetition and form the structures of social life. Dilemma of the relationship between structure and agent, which is known in the social sciences as a whole, and in political science, in particular, is solved in favor of an impersonal structure.

[1] Heywood, A. (2005). *Politics*. Palgrave. Second Edition. Unity. Moscow, 126.

[2] Туровский, Р.Ф. (2007). *Центр и регионы: проблемы политических отношений*. Москва: Издательский дом ГУ ВШЭ, 51.

[3] Туровский, Р.Ф. (2007). *Центр и регионы: проблемы политических отношений*. Москва: Издательский дом ГУ ВШЭ, 51.

K. Hay divides political theories into two groups: structuralist (in which important structure and context) and intentionalist, or voluntarist (in which important agent is "live" actor). Both approaches in their extreme variants deliberately simplify social reality, each in its own form. Structuralism underestimates the actors that do not pay attention to the subjectivization of processes, while forming a rather false perception of the subtle role of actors, leveling behavioral political influence.

Criticism of structuralism has led to another extreme, when the motivation, emotions, and self-consciousness of actors who are able to assess their motives, are at the forefront, but usually act at their own discretion.

The opposite vision of the role of personality in political processes exists in supporters of constructivism. They use the notion of space, showing interest in the personality and identity problems, and believe that "as a social entity, space is formed by models of exchange in social life, the formation of civil society and models of social solidarity. A sense of identity is a factor that is based on these processes and, in turn, strengthens their territorial attachment"[1].

Constructivists, whose field of study are international relations, emphasize the social nature of these special relations. Thus, there are processes of interaction of agents (actors) that create social reality: only through the interaction of agents creates, reproduces and transforms the international system in the focus of the American theorist-constructivist Alexander Wendt[2].

However, the knowledge of the phenomenon of political space cannot occur without taking into account other theoretical and methodological approaches. In particular, the category of identity appears in supporters of the communicative approach, which is partly based on the ideas of P. Bourdieu.

The space of socio-political interaction is complicated, the principles and mechanisms change, the role of information influence on social and political behavior, on social consciousness is intensified. There is a need to understand the causes of diversity, first, social character, in the field of functioning and development of political interactions.

Communication is a necessary component, which is intended to establish contacts and ensure the interaction of all segments and levels of political space. In the practical sense, it`s the communicative relationship that plays the role of stabilizing elements that provide the political space with the ability to preserve integrity and order. There is an acquisition of properties for self-organization, which can serve as a protection against unfavorable conditions of development.

One of the first persons who proposed to consider the political system as an information and communication environment was K. Deutsch. Within developing of the communicative theory of the nation, K. Deutsch drew special attention to such a sign of the communicative process as complementarity. "The community," he said, "which makes it possible for a common history to lead to the accumulation of shared experiences, is a community of complementary communicative habits and means"[3].

A rather interesting approach in the understanding of communicative ties suggested the founder of cybernetics N. Wiener, who saw in the notion of "message" the quality of the basic structure of the unit of communicative flows. This point of view is due to the fact that, according to the cell theory (most plants and animals consist of units – cells that possess many properties of independent living organisms), the stability of cell structures and their modifications depend on the complexity and content of the interrelationships and information exchange between them[4].

However, returning to considerations regarding the conceptualization of political space, it is necessary to take into account the existence in the minds of people who have been assimilated in the course of socialization, norms and behavioral rules in the context of political activity, ways of mental perception of political culture, and constructed political hierarchy. According to G. Pushkareva, "Differences in the position of the individual in the system of political relations provide political space with multidimensionality: political stratification defines its vertical cut, and the differentiation of political positions – cut horizontal"[5]. The application of an institutional approach facilitates the perception of

[1] Китинг, М. (2003). Новый регионализм в Западной Европе. *Логос, 6 (40),* 73.

[2] Wendt, A. (1999). Social theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; In: *The Agent – Structure Problem in International Relations theory. Source: International Organization, Vol. 41, No 3,* 335-370.

[3] Дойч, К. (2000). Народи, нації та комунікація. *Націоналізм: Антологія.* Київ: Смолоскип, 546-566.

[4] Винер, Н. (2011). *Кибернетика и общество.* Москва: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1958.

[5] Пушкарева, Г.В. (2011). Политические идентичности и политическое пространство. Политическая идентичность и политика идентичности. В 2 т. *Т. 2. Идентичность и социально- политические изменения в XXI веке.* Москва: Российская политическая энциклопедия (РОССПЭН), 106.

political space by the category of political governance. Institutional theory has its origins since the formation of sociology and associated with the distinction of the "social institution" as the main element of practical reality and theoretical construct.

"Institutionalization" should be understood as the formation of new institutions, legal and organizational consolidation of certain public relations. And the institutional approach should be interpreted as a methodology of scientific knowledge and practical activity, which examines the mechanisms of interaction and communication of subjects of social relations, evaluates their behavior in the implementation of norms (formal and informal) and gives an assessment of the effectiveness of structures (institutions). It is also worthwhile in this context to harmonize the notions of "institutions" and "organizations", which eliminates the question of the difference between the relevant approaches in the study of social processes. Thus, during a certain period of their development, institutions are separated from organizations (institutions), since the latter are social forms, in which, in the end, certain institutions are consolidated and implemented. Thus, organizations in a certain sense are the product of the activity of institutes. Such a distinction makes it possible to clearly distinguish between two scientific approaches during the research: organizational and institutional. The latter is defined as a general method of public administration research, which, by focusing on the structural and functional principles of building executive power systems and the formal and legal characteristics of the political system, enables one to explore the interdependence and interconnection between changes in the institutional structures of state administration and the content of state policy[1].

Along with discussions among scientists on whether the institutional environment is something external to management or that is not at all influenced by the state, it is advisable to have an alternative approach in which the management phenomenon itself is viewed through the prism of social institutions. Thus, the institutional approach as providing new opportunities for cognition becomes relevant both for the scientific analysis of state-management relations and for the practical realization of the functions of political governance as an institutional complex[2]. There is also a somewhat critical assessment in relation to the institutional approach, which is not fully focused on microanalysis and socio-cultural aspects.

The concept of institutes as "cognitive schemes," that is, the mental models by which actors perceive and interpret the world around, are best suited to study the political space using the institutional approach: Cognitive schemes are deeply rooted in the consciousness of members of a social group, perceived as something undoubtedly, obviously, is self-evident. Because they are shared by members of the social group, it allows the latter to engage in regular interaction[3]. However, in the applied analysis, political institutions are considered more broadly: both as organizations that construct rules and norms, and as institutional practices. It is precisely neo-institutionalism, especially in such areas as historical, sociological and discursive, overcoming the rigid opposition of the organization and mental phenomena.

For a deeper understanding of the functioning of organizational structures in the spatial dimension, it is advisable to consider the organizational theory as conceptualizing organizations as a social environment. An organization is a social entity that functions within certain limits, guided by the purpose and principles of internal administration. The study of various manifestations of socio-political human life in the prism of the organizational theory requires an analysis of the factors directly affecting it. It is necessary to identify the main motives of actors, the behavior of which depends on the level of interaction between them. The most important elements in such section are the internal structure, hierarchy, political culture, interaction of internal and external character.

The basis of the classical theory of organization is based on the results of the research A. Fayol and M. Weber. They tried to highlight the general characteristics and patterns of management of any organization. For the purpose of their research, they set the allocation of "universal management principles", which can be used to ensure the success of the organization.

The most clearly behavioral approach in the organization's theory was formulated in the writings of Professor Michigan University R. Lickert. Studying the results of many large business organizations in order to clarify issues that make their work more effective, he concluded that organizations that were

[1] Малиновський, В.Я. (2005). *Словник термінів і понять з державного управління*. Київ: Атіка, 240.

[2] Ільченко, Н.М. (2010). *Методологія дослідження проблем державного управління: інституційний підхід*. *УГК 35, 2*. <http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/apdu/2011-1/doc/1/06.pdf>.

[3] Панов, П.В. (2011). *Институты, идентичности, практики: теоретическая модель политического порядка*. Москва: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 51.

oriented towards a bureaucratic model were less effective than organizations that paid more attention to the creation of working groups, behavioral and social aspects of the activities of organizations.

Modern organizational theory is characterized by focusing on the organization as an open system, which interacts on a permanent basis with the external environment. Survival and prosperity largely depend on the effective adaptation of the organization to the external environment, which is to obtain the necessary resources to eliminate external threats.

The key elements of the organizational theory are such categories as an organization, organizational field and organizational paradigm. States remain key players in the political process, but in today's conditions, this paradigm does not provide an adequate understanding of the transformations that are taking place in the world. Organization at this stage is more appropriate to consider as a complex of relationships between individuals[1].

According to the researcher I. Prokhorenko, the organizational theory allows typologizing of the international organizations and organizational fields of global governance, revealing the course of structuring the fields, establishing the subjects of structuring, the type and configuration of the interactions of participants within the fields. Application of the managerial concept in the context of the functioning of international organizations increases the understanding of the nature of public space, whose prism addresses issues of paramount importance.

The organizational field is essentially somewhat different from the traditional hierarchical organization. Therefore, I. Prokhorenko's hypothesis that the European Union is more appropriate to consider the organizational field of a number of participating states rather than a traditional hierarchical organization is useful and also helps to explore the nature of the functioning of closed forums of global governance of such like G7, G20.

However, within the framework of the topic of the dissertation work, it is also necessary to determine which interaction is intended to contribute to the formation of common political space between the different institutional forms in its nature. The theoretical approach that was developed by researchers Di Maggio and U. Pauel makes it possible to find out that the process of institutional structuring of the organizational field takes place in four directions: the expansion of the interaction between organizations in the field; the emergence of rigidly determined inter-organizational structures of domination and models of the coalition; increasing of the information load to which organizations in the field must withstand; development of mutual awareness among participants of organizations involved in joint actions[2].

Interestingly, however, organizations are not limited in their ability to change their goals and objectives, to introduce new practices. New organizations can enter the organizational field. But in the long run, organizational actors create an environment that limits their ability to further develop. Organizations included in the organizational field over time become similar in structure and essence.

Thus, the importance of connectedness (the existence of formal and informal transactions and relationships between organizations on a regular basis) and structural equivalence (the similarity of the positions of organizations in the network structure) are of paramount importance in the idea of the field.

We can stand out the dominant organization (or organizations) in the organizational field, field actors who have different forces and therefore different social status in this field, share consensus on the collective strategic direction of action, that is, agree on the principal issues, acting on the basis of agreed positions, adhere to its practice of general norms, principles, standards and rules of conduct[3].

Usually, organizational fields are spaces of communication, actions and interactions. They appear not only as a horizontal cross-sectional relationship between several or many organizations, but also as separate organizations, which can be organizational fields, but in a vertical extent[4].

It is worth to recall the category of organizational paradigm, which has become more prominent in its use in political science. This paradigm gives undoubted advantages in the study of new influential non-traditional actors in world politics – institutes and forums of global governance, regional integration associations, transnational partnerships in the form of free trade zones. It can also explore the process of institutionalization and the dynamics of development, the problem of adapting international actors to a new reality, the integration of states into the global political space.

---

[1] Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. 5th ed. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. P. 16.

[2] DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review, Vol. 48, No 2*, 147.

[3] Fligstein, N., McAdam, D.A. (2012). *Theory of fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11.

[4] Fligstein, N., McAdam, D.A. (2012). *Theory of fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 22-26.

The growing role of non-state entities, the spread of migratory flows, the virtualization of political life, which is reproduced on the Internet and expanding the national boundaries of communication, form a new reality that needs an adequate scientific knowledge. Supporters of transnationalism best explain the phenomenon of global interpenetration. There is a request for fresh ideas related to the departure from the classical perception of the nation-centric political picture of the world, was mentioned in the late 60's and 70's that of the twentieth century. American scholars J. Nye and R. Keohane made this freshness in the theoretical discourse of international relations researchers, also called the third "great controversy" of supporters of realism and their critics who professed approaches that are more liberal. In their work "Transnational Relations and World Politics", which was published in 1971, they first proposed the conceptualization of transnational and global interactions that are not limited to national boundaries.

The general idea is that, despite the fact that, nevertheless, the leading role of states in building international cooperation, a large part of the interconnections relate to non-governmental actors such as international organizations, transnational corporations, regional entities and mass media. The new format of global multilevel communication ultimately affects the positions and internal policies of states[1].

The proponents of transnationalism, like the realists, singled out the role of states that are important actors in the international system, but argue that the growing economic and political interdependence has reduced the ability of these very states to fully control their own destiny[2].

Another interesting observation is the strengthening of intergovernmental cooperation through the dissemination of approved rules and procedures for the adoption of certain decisions, which are governed by non-governmental institutions. The main vocation of these institutions is to reduce competition and confrontation between states and, if necessary, to take preventive measures. Some issues of the global agenda can only be solved by combining joint efforts, and sometimes it`s necessary to give up the delegation of powers to supranational education.

It is precisely the proponents of transnationalism that most often use the category of political space to understand complex geopolitical transformations without limiting itself to mere territorial bindings.

Transnationalism in general is characterized by numerous connections and interactions that binds not only institutions but also individuals through the borders of national states. Today, countless systems of relations, exchange and mobility are operating intensively and in real time, being widespread around the world. New technologies, especially those related to telecommunications, serve to connect such networks. Despite long distances and despite the existence of borders (and all laws, rules and national peculiarities), intensification of involvement in this process is not quite typical forms of associations, such as international trade union associations or ramified networks of various political foundations.

In some cases, transnational forms and processes serve to accelerate or strengthen the historical patterns of activity, in others – represent, perhaps, new forms of human interaction. Transnational practices and their sequential configurations of power form the world of the XXI century[3].

There are several examples from the book "Transnational Relations and World Politics" for a more simplified understanding of transnationalization in action. Transnational relations increase the level of perception of one society with another, thus changing the relations between governments. This point of view can be illustrated by two examples, one from the field of international trade and finance, and others – from the field of the global system of mass communication.

As business decision-making and banking activities go beyond national jurisdiction, small changes in one country's policies can have serious implications for the international system.

Due to the global system of mass communication, different groups belonging to different societies, such as radicals, military, ethnic minorities, have the opportunity to observe the behavior of each other and, if necessary, behave in a similar way.

Interestingly, more than 40 years ago, J. Nay and E. Keohane made an assumption that is becoming more and more relevant every day – "the scale and speed of the spread of transnational ties is the product of the global telecommunication network."

[1] Nye, J.S., Jr., Keohane, R.O. (1971). Transnational relations and world politics: introduction. *International Organization*, *Vol. 25, No 3*, 329-349.

[2] Holsti, O.R. (1997). Theories of International Relations and foreign policy: realism and its challengers. In: Kegley Ch.W., Jr. (ed.). *Controversies in international relations theory: realism and the neoliberal challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 35, 43.

[3] Kaiser, W, Starie, P. (2009). *Transnational European Union: towards a common political space*. Abingdon. Routledge.

Transnational organizations can also cultivate a new attitude, creating myths, symbols and norms to ensure the legitimacy of their activities or trying to influence the formation of new meanings.

The transnational approach also explains the various forms and practices of intercultural interaction that passes past or through national, state, territorial, and political boundaries. It is the study of intercultural communications and interactions of this nature that allows us to form an idea of the socio-cultural phenomenon of transnationalism, which is embodied in new cultural practices, the search for the identity of new agents of political transformation.

Therefore, it is most expedient to understand the political space of the European Union as a complex system of connections that are established between the participants of political life and take the form of a multidimensional unit. The described theoretical and methodological approaches suggest that the use of the chosen category in the analysis of political processes in the EU is useful for determination this spatial configuration in connection with different forms of stable relationships between people and political institutions, between individual and collective actors as well as understanding the multi-level governance.

References:

1. Doich, K. (2000). Narody, naciji ta komunikaciya [People, nations and communication]. Nationalism: Antpology. Kyiv: Smoloskip. [In Ukrainian].
2. DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review, Vol. 48, No 2*. [in English].
3. Ferguson, Y.H., Jones, Barry R.J. (2002). *Political space: The Frontiers of Change and Governance in a Globalizing World*. [in English].
4. Fligstein, N., McAdam, D.A. (2012). *Theory of fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
5. Heywood, A. (2005). *Politics*. Palgrave. Second Edition. Unity. Moscow. [in English].
6. Holsti, O.R. (1997). Theories of International Relations and foreign policy: realism and its challengers. IKegley Ch.W., Jr. (ed.). *Controversies in international relations theory: realism and the neoliberal challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. [in English].
7. Ilchenko, N.M. (2010). Metodologija doslidzhennija problem derzhavnogo upravlinnja: institucijnyi pidhid [Methodology of research problems of state government: institutional access]. *UGK 35*. <http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/apdu/2011-1/doc/1/06.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
8. Kaiser, W, Starie, P. (2009). *Transnational European Union: towards a common political space*. Abingdon. Routledge. [in English].
9. Kiting, M. (2003). Novij regionalizm v Zapadnoj Evrope [The New Regionalism in Western Europe]. *Logos* [Logos], *no. 6 (40)*, 73. [in Russian].
10. Malynovskij, V.Ja. (2005). *Slovnyk terminiv i ponjat derzhavnogo upravlinnja* [Dictionary of terms and meanings of state government]. Kyiv: Atika. [in Ukrainian].
11. Nye, J.S., Keohane, R.O. (1971). Transnational relations and world politics: introduction. *International Organization, Vol. 25, No 3*, 329-349. [in English].
12. Panov, P.V. (2011). *Instituty, identichnosti, praktiki: teoreticheskaya modelj politicheskogo poryadka* [Institutions, identities, practices: theoretical model of political order]. Moscow: Rossijskaja politicheskaja enciklopedija. [in Russian].
13. Pushkareva, G.B. (2011). Politicheskie identichnosti i politicheskoe prostranstvo. Politicheskaja identichnost´ i politika identichnosti [Political identities and political area. Political identity and politic of identities]: *v. t. T. 2. Identichnostj i social´no-politicheskie izmenenija v XXI veke* [Identity in social-political changes in XXI century]. Moscow: Rossijskaya politicheskaya jenciklopediya. [in Russian].
14. Turovskij, R.F. (2007). *Centr i regeiony: promblemy politicheskih otnoshenij* [Center and regions: the problems of political relations]. Moscow: Izdatel´skij dom GU VSHJE. [in Russian].
15. Viner, N. (1958). *Kibernetika i obschestvo* [Cybernetics and society]. Moscow: Izd-vo inostr. lit-ry. [in Russian].
16. Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. The Agent – Structure Problem in International Relations theory. *International Organization, Vol. 41, No 3*, 335-370. [in English].
17. Yukl, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. 5th ed. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. [in English].