Aesthetics and Politics: the Main Models of Relations in the Modern Political World

Dmytro Shevchuk, Kateryna Shevchuk

Abstract: The paper examines the relationship between aesthetics and politics. In modern humanities, we can find few conceptions of this relationship. These conceptions are not only part of political philosophy or political theory, but also a methodological instrument for analyzing modern politics and aesthetics. They provide an opportunity to understand both the features of contemporary politics and the state of modern aesthetic theory in light of the significant changes that have affected both of these spheres. This article analyzes the main models of the relation between aesthetics and politics. We intend to explore the conception of an aesthetic representation by Frank Ankersmit, the conception of aesthetics as politics by Jacques Rancière, and the conception of the emancipation of society by Gianni Vattimo.

Keywords: aesthetics, aesthetical representation, distribution of sensuality, emancipation, politics, political world.

Introduction

The famous fresco *The Allegory of Good and Bad Government*, by Ambrogio Lorenzetti, from Siena's Palazzo Pubblico, shows two governments: on the one side, the republic, where people are feeling free and the community is developing; on the other side, tyranny, where people live in fear. This work of art aims to show the possible results of politics. Additionally, it warns people. Therefore, works of art play not only an aesthetic role, but also a particular political role. We could label a lot of works of art similarly. Among them, the most famous are *Liberty Leading the People* by Eugène Delacroix, *Guernica* by Pablo Picasso, and *Premonition of Civil War* by Salvador Dali, just to list a few. The political and cultural history of the 20th century presents such phenomena as Situationist International (founded by Guy Debord), which closely intertwined politics and art. This shows that the connection between art, aesthetics, and politics is extremely tight. Also, we can find that politics does not use only pure rationality, but it refers to some artistic instruments and phenomena, such as performance and carnivalization (Shevchuk and Karpovets 2020).

Several philosophers have already studied the problem of the political aspect of aesthetics. There are classic works such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Politics and the Arts: Letter to M. D'Alembert on the Theater*, Friedrich Schiller's *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, and Theodor W. Adorno's *Aesthetics and Politics*, Terry Eagleton's *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. From different positions and

various aspects, the role of art in politics and the influence of aesthetic experience on the perception of political events has been explored.

We can distinguish several conceptions of relations between politics and aesthetics in contemporary humanities. These conceptions are not only part of political philosophy or political theory, but also a methodological instrument for analyzing modern politics and aesthetics. They provide an opportunity to understand both the features of contemporary politics and the state of modern aesthetic theory in light of the significant changes that have affected both of these spheres.

This article analyzes the main models of the relation between aesthetics and politics. We intend to explore the conception of an aesthetic representation by Frank Ankersmit, the conception of aesthetics as politics by Jacques Rancière, and the conception of the emancipation of society by Gianni Vattimo.

Aesthetical Politics and Political Representation

The first model of interaction between politics and aesthetics is the correlation of political and aesthetic representation. The result of such a correlation is the idea of an aesthetic state. The premise of this idea is Schiller's philosophy, which distinguishes between three types of state – a dynamic state, an ethical state, and an aesthetic state. Only the last of these three motivates us to abide by the moral law; thus, it best fits with integrity and commonwealth. Schiller writes: "The dynamic state can only make society simply possible by subduing nature through nature; the moral (ethical) state can only make it morally necessary by submitting the individual's will to the general will. The aesthetic state alone can make it real because it carries out the will of all through the nature of the individual." (Schiller, Letter XXVII, 43) Thus, the idea of an aesthetic state is guided by the ideal of classical political philosophy, which implies an inextricable link between human nature and the political community. And the community must then make possible the realization of a free person through politics.

At the same time, the conception of an aesthetic state aims to replace ethics with aesthetics as a source for political philosophy. Therefore, in this case, we encounter a revision of political philosophy, a rethinking of its principles and ways of understanding political reality.

The conception of aesthetic politics is presented most clearly in the works of Franklin Ankersmit. He observes that, traditionally, the problems of politics, state, and society were considered in the light of two questions: "What is?" and "What should be?". In this case, aesthetics was rarely considered a political philosophy partner.

The concept of representation is central to aesthetic politics. Within the framework of this conception, the nature of political representation as the core of any policy is studied. But we should also compare the political representation with the aesthetic representation of reality. The concept of representation has begun to play an essential role in modern political philosophy. Representation is

associated with three functions – power, cognition, and manifestation. In the political realm, representation relates to the mechanism of creating the unity of people based on their plurality. In addition, it acts as a form of collective subjectivity. In the contemporary political world, the issue of representation is particularly relevant. It is connected with the theory of democracy, when, through democratic elections, the representation of the will of the people is carried out by elected representatives. At the same time, the contemporary political world needs to revise the representation mechanism, since we can observe a crisis in implementing this mechanism in today's democracies. The reason for this crisis is that the implementation of simulacra in the political world makes doubt and uncertainty the basis for representation. Also, we could observe the formation of a post-ideological or even post-political paradigm. Therefore, the attempt to correlate political representation with aesthetic representation aims to preserve and update the idea of democratic politics.

Ankersmit uses the concept of representation in the meaning formed from the beginning of the 18th century. At that time, the problem of representation was related to the issue of when and in what circumstances the government and its decisions reflected the spirit of the people. Therefore, it can be argued that the principles of modern democracy were already forming in this period.

Analyzing the discussion about representation in contemporary political philosophy, Ankersmit distinguished two opposing positions. The first position is called the mimetic representation theory. According to this position, the representation of the people should be reflected as accurately as possible. The second position is defined as the theory of aesthetic representation. It implies a less precise reflection of the people, a mimetic representation. Ankersmit writes: "According to this theory, the difference between the representative and the person represented, the absence of identity of the representative and the person represented, is an unavoidable difference between a painted portrait and the person portrayed." (Ankersmit 1996, 28)

Mimetic representation has a close connection with modern philosophy. In particular, it presents the similarity of Cartesian rationalism and dualism in the aspect of the link between thought and action. Ankersmit argues that mimetic representation is based on the idea that political representation should always be perfect mimesis or an exact copy of the reality that appears. However, such an idea is false, because we have an unnecessary mechanism complicating political reality. According to Ankersmit, "[…] if the representation has to be the represented's indiscernible twin, we could just as well do with represented reality alone and abandon representation as a dangerous and useless detour. Put differently, the mimetic theory of (political) representation is, in fact, not a theory of representation at all, but a theory *against* representation." (Ankersmit 1996, 44)

The political representation must present what is absent. In other words, the institution that implements the representation presents the thoughts, positions, values, and actions of absent people. Thus, the reality of the will, which

is present in one element (in a liberal democracy, it is the people), is provided in another element (e.g., parliament). The presence of the missing is also provided with an aesthetic representation. Therefore, in the case of politics and aesthetics, we have a mechanism for proposing a substitution, which creates the illusion of reality being excellent. According to Ankersmit, the difference between representation and the represented element becomes the source and condition of aesthetic experience. The conception of an aesthetic state requires the rejection of a mimetic representation: "We have to reject mimetic political representation not so much because it shows certain theoretical shortcomings, but [...] simply because it is not a theory of political representation at all. We can only talk about representation when there is a difference – and *not* an identity – between the representative and the person represented." (Ankersmit 1996, 46)

Moreover, Ankersmit argues that the political reality is created through representation. Political reality does not have the identity of the representative and the represented person. Therefore, we have no reason to state the identity of the will. Ankersmit defines the political reality created by aesthetic representation as political power. The difference between the representative and the represented person is that there is an aesthetic essence that forms the preconditions for the legitimacy of political power. At the same time, the legitimacy of power acquires two aspects: on the one hand, the power formed through representation is legitimate; on the other hand, the power used inappropriately in connection with the representation can be overthrown legitimately.

For Ankersmit, representation is not an instrument for solving the practical problem of gathering all citizens together. It should not be replaced by direct democracy. In this conception of the aesthetic state, representation is a necessary and unified constitutional procedure for creating political power. The aesthetic representation provides the preconditions for solving complex social and political problems. Ankersmit is convinced that, without representation (in particular, aesthetic representation), society enters into chaos wherein people find themselves powerless to change anything.

Mimetic representation leads to a merger of power and society. For this merger, power begins to adapt to the social context fully. The danger inherent in this merger can be the birth of totalitarianism.

Ankersmit reaches two essential conclusions in the analysis of the representation problem. The first conclusion is that aesthetic representation is evident in politics. It is recognizable and understandable to people. Instead, the mimetic representation tends to become invisible and ceases to be fully controlled. As Ankersmit writes, aesthetic representation "[...] keeps alive at all levels, from the mind of the individual citizen to the collective 'mind' of the representative institutions, the desire to control and to check collective power. Mimetic representation paralyzes political control; aesthetic representation stimulates it while simultaneously creating political power. Hence only aesthetic representation enables us to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of tyranny and

impotence." (Ankersmit 1996, 55) The second conclusion is that the individual becomes a citizen through aesthetic representation. It is explained by the fact that an individual who lives in a political world without representation or with a mimetic representation does not need to go beyond his limits and look at the political order from a different perspective. According to Ankersmit, the mimetic representation promotes the creation of a political order in which no one needs to comprehend the meeting with the other person. The individual has a feeling of complete fusion with the team. And only the aesthetic representation allows the individual to become a political subject ('political life' or *bios politikos*).

The Politics and Changes in Aesthetics

The second model of relations between aesthetics and politics deals with the idea of a change of art and aesthetics in modern conditions. This model assumes that art must withstand the existing practices of domination. Thus, art is political because it shows the 'stigmata of enslavement.'

This model is mainly associated with the political philosophy of Jacques Rancière. He aims to trace and reproduce the logic of the 'aesthetic' relationship between art and politics. Appeal to the problem of politicizing an artistic image is a prerequisite for determining the political role of imagination. In Rancière's writings, we can find the concept of the aesthetic in two meanings. On the one hand, the aesthetic has a relatively broad meaning; it outlines a system that emanates from a specific sensibility associated with political cases. This meaning emphasizes that politics always represents a conflict. On the other hand, the aesthetic has a narrower meaning and concerns certain artistic practices through which special modalities of thought are manifested. One of the most important concepts of the political philosophy of J. Rancière is the concept of distribution (partage). It denotes ordering and divisions that are not exposed by power relations.

In the case of Rancière, we have an original comprehension of aesthetics. However, it could be compared with the ideas of other philosophers, for example, Immanuel Kant. This issue has been analyzed by Katharine Wolfe. She writes:

> ...Rancière claims the relation aesthetics bears to politics is analogous to the relation Kant's a priori forms bear to sense experience. Just as these a priori forms determine the organization of human experience and provide its conditions, aesthetics comes in various structural systems that serve both to condition the shared world of our daily experience and to partition that world and delimit the positions one might occupy within it. Politics is not reducible to this partitioning of the sensible on the condition of aesthetic systems, yet it is conditioned by aesthetics, just as sense experience is conditioned by the a priori, according to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, insofar as it requires the partitions of the sensible as its space of disruption. (2006)

Rancière states that art and politics are not two realities that arise as separate fields in relation to one another, and about which we have questions and

doubts if they should be combined. Politics and art are, in fact, two forms of distribution of sensuality, which are associated with a certain type of identification. According to Rancière, art is not politics if it refers to feelings or messages that it can carry. It can also not be interpreted as politics in terms of how the social structure is represented and the conflicts and identities of social groups. Art appears as politics through its distance in relation to its functions. In other words, it is connected with politics through the distribution of material and symbolic spheres of social reality.

In Rancière's works, the division between autonomous art and heteronomy (between art for the sake of art and art serving politics, between museum art and the street art) is denied. Such an opposition is rejected by the aesthetic art order, which establishes a link between forms of art identification and forms of political community. Also, it removes the question of contrasting the 'purity of art' and its politicization.

However, in trying to find the reason for the politicization of art, Rancière pays attention to the phenomenon of aesthetic metapolitics. In the order of aesthetic metapolitics, we have a kind of paradox: art becomes art in authentic meaning as much as it is non-art. This paradox means that art itself opposes the art, which realizes the politics. Rancière emphasizes that art has never been closed to itself and has a very wide field of application in a variety of spheres of life. Identification of artistic practices has always opened up such forms of thought that linked them with other forms of experience. The aesthetics is paying attention to this unifying character of art. Because of this, aesthetics will provoke hostility among those who would have liked art and philosophy, philosophy and politics to be separated from each other (Rancière 2007, 67). Rancière demonstrates that such seemingly incompatible discourses, on the aesthetic, which postulate the autonomy of self-identified art, and the political, which sees in art only one form of collective experience, are based on the same way of thinking, which can be reconstructed.

Politics and aesthetics are closely linked. If it is a matter of aesthetics to establish a relationship between what can be seen and what is said, then politics establishes a relationship between what is being done and what can be done.

Politics, as Rancière states, is connected with the way of capturing space and possession of time. In turn, He defines aesthetics as a connecting of ways of action, forms of visibility of these ways of action and ways of understanding their relationships, including some idea of the effectiveness of thought. In other words, aesthetics is a system of a priori forms that define what is revealed in the sensitivity. Also, aesthetics is a division of time, space, that which is visible and invisible, language and noise. At the same time, it defines the place and purpose of politics as a form of experience (Rancière 2007, 70).

As a result, the political realm is formulated by usipoliticsng aesthetic categories. In this case, it is not about the politicization of art, nor about the aestheticization of politics. However, the specifics of aesthetic thinking suggest

models that are suitable for comprehension of politics, because, in aesthetics, the mechanisms of division are more advanced. Politics, as Rancière argues, begins when the distribution of sensibilities is questionable, that is when it becomes the basis for struggle.

The key concept of Rancière's philosophy is the 'aesthetic regime of art.' He deduces three important aspects of the regime of art: the ethical mode of effective speech (according to Plato), the depiction mode of theatrical play (according to Aristotle), the aesthetic mode of writing (according to Kant and German romantics). Rancière notes that, in the history of Western culture, we can find a transition from a 'mimetic' (or 'poetic') to an 'expressive' (or 'aesthetic') artistic system. As the result of such a transition, the task of creativity is not the reproduction of reality by artistic means and codes, but the creation of reality manifested through the conscious/unconscious sensibility of works (Rancière 2007, 79-83). The ability of art to create reality is a precondition for the creation of a policy of aesthetics that changes the political world. The aesthetics of the last two centuries is not a discipline that has the subject of the property of artistic practices or taste as a basis for judgments. It is a continuous mode of art identification, which also implies the mode of thinking. Rancière states that there is no art in itself: it is not enough to assert that this is 'art' based on the reality that we have artists or musicians, actors or dancers, or people who love to watch them, and listen to them. Their performances have to be the object of views that distinguish their special field of activity; we need judgments that argue for their peculiarity, as well as institutions that give a 'flesh' to the art (Rancière 2002, 18).

The aesthetic regime of art is a network of new relationships between 'art' and 'life'. It has created a place for artistic inventions and a sphere for mutations of the usual everyday forms of perception and sensitivity. However, this mode is not a simple consequence of external transformations. This regime has its own rationality, which is different than the rationality that emerged from philosophical discourses. The aesthetic regime separated the artistic works of art from the rules of representation, enabling the free expression of the artist and a greater internalization of the criteria for creation. However, this freedom must combine works with the forces that put in them the feature of other things: 'the breath of society,' 'the life of speech,' 'the deposition of matter,' 'the unconscious work of thought.' (Rancière 2002, 19)

The aesthetic regime equated the power of art with the immediacy of sensual presence. Its forcefulness brings into the very life of works of art the endless and alienated work of criticism. Also, it facilitated the launching of works of art into a moving process of staging various rewritings and transformations. As Rancière states, the aesthetic regime confirmed the autonomy of art and multiplied the discovery of unknown beauty in the objects of everyday existence, which erased the distinction between forms of artistic and commercial or collective life (Rancière 2007, 79-83).

We should also consider that Rancière pays attention to a so-called 'ethical turn' in aesthetics and politics. This issue was analyzed in his book *Malaise dans l'esthétique* (published in English as *Aesthetics and Its Discontents*). Rancière tries to present equivalent models in contemporary art and modern politics.

In general, Rancière criticizes such a term as 'ethics.' In his opinion, it is a sphere of indistinguishability between the norm and fact. Thus, it fundamentally differs from the politics, that distinguishes between violence, morals, and law. The modern political community is increasingly migrating towards a community of ethics. In such a society, there is no exclusion and no place for conflict. An example of such an apolitical society is depicted by Lars von Trier in the film *Dogville* (the story of a foreign woman who tries to establish relations with the town's inhabitants by serving them, but subsequently hides when they persecute her). In an ethical society, the absolute rights of the disenfranchised (refugees, repressed, etc.) can only be provided by someone else. This is what the global law of the Other affirms.

In the aesthetic paradigm, the 'ethical turn' is traced in the fact that the 'unrepresentable' becomes a major category, which follows from the indistinction between the 'existing' and the 'proper.' Rancière writes: "the unrepresentable, which is the central category of the ethical turn in aesthetic reflection, is also a category that produces an indistinction between right and fact, occupying the same place in the aesthetic reflection that terror does on the political plane." (Rancière 2009, 123)

According to Rancière, contemporary art is transformed into an ethical domain, and the work of art is no longer subject to moral law, nor to the laws of sensitivity, but to the law of heteronomy, where the commandment coincides with the facts of reality. In such a way, there is a transformation of modernism into ethical modernism, which does not cause the emancipation of society. Rancière refuses to accept the concept of 'postmodernism' and talks about the transformation of contemporary art as a manifestation of the contradictions of modernism. Thus, the ethical turn changes the timing, which previously, in modernism, aimed at the emancipation of society, flowing towards the future revolution. Now the timing comes from an event that has already taken place. As an example of such an event, Rancière recalls the Holocaust.

We should also pay attention to the fact that Rancière criticizes the attempts by some modern philosophers to reduce works of art to some kind of intelligent machines, appealing not to the aesthetic categories, but to external discourses. Such discourses do not have anything in common with art. Therefore, they put a modern aesthetic theory in a paradoxical situation. As an example, Rancière names such works as Jean-Marie Scheffer's *Adieu à l'esthétique*, Alain Badiou's *Petit manuel d'inesthétique*, Jean-François Lyotard's *L'Inhumain*.

Unlike these theories, Rancière criticizes the notion of aesthetics as a discourse and defines it as a historically determined regime of separation of art from the fact that there is no art. The philosopher denies the need for a farewell

to aesthetics, because, as he says, the refusal of aesthetics leads to its dissolution and the dissolution of the politics associated with it in the general ethical realm.

Aesthetics and Emancipation of Society

The third model of relations between politics and aesthetics, which we'd like to present, is connected with the idea of social emancipation. The emancipatory potential of aesthetics is manifested through the political as an imaginary, which closely connects with fantasy. Fantasy acquires a special political significance since it can be defined as imagination that produces images in a free way. This definition is based on the Kantian concept of fantasy, which he presents in the work *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*. According to Kant, the comprehension of imagination with its special forms can be realized on the basis of the distinction between two types of imagination – productive and reproductive. Reproductive imagination acquires social and political significance by means of preserving and legitimizing the actual order of the political world. Productive imagination may be seen as providing the means for the emancipation of the individual, which is realized, for example, by aesthetics and art's social and political function. In this aspect, aesthetics and art provide the means for implementing a policy aimed at establishing authentic political dimensions. Herbert Marcuse writes about aesthetics as an instrument for the liberation of the human being: "the foundation of aesthetics as an independent discipline counteracts the repressive rule of reason: the efforts to demonstrate the central position of the aesthetic function and to establish it as an existential category invoke the inherent truth values of the senses against their deprivation under the prevailing reality principle." (Marcuse 1974, 181) Aesthetics and art implement a new principle of reality. This principle forms the basis of politics, which, in contrast to the order of reason, seeks to establish an order of sensuality. The approval of this new order is intended to liberate feelings from the pressure of civilization (to a certain extent, we can interpret it as one aspect of the liberation of human nature from the dominance of civilization, which has an instrumentalist character). It is implemented not by repressive means, but by means of a game impulse. An example of aesthetic politics is the political project of the Great Refusal, developed by Marcuse. This project refers to fantasy as a political mean: "Phantasy is cognitive in so far as it preserves the truth of the Great Refusal, or, positively, in so far as it protects, against all reason, the aspirations for the integral fulfillment of man and nature which are repressed by reason." (Marcuse 1974, 160) The emancipatory essence of politics based on imagination (fantasy) is due to the fact that the productive imaginary does not reveal strict attachments to the being having the ability to create its relationship to reality.

The emancipatory potential of aesthetics and its political role can become evident in a critique of modern mass media society. Gianni Vattimo emphasizes that critical sociology pays attention to equalizing the masses, manipulating public opinion, and forming totalitarianism. Still, these things are not inevitable

consequences of the overarching domination of mass communication. In the modern political world, there is a need to oppose the tendencies of the universalization of domination due to the boundless influence of mass media. We should also state that mass media provides special mobility and ephemerality for experience, weakening the perception of reality. It is necessary to compare such tendencies with some features of aesthetical experience, for example, ambiguity and fragility. Vattimo draws attention to the fact that the experience of ambiguity is constitutive for art. This property turns art into a source of creativity and freedom in the world of universal communication.

In this context, we should notice that Vattimo criticizes the philosophical position of Jürgen Habermas, who tries to renew Kantian aesthetics and defend the Enlightenment. Vattimo believes that the position of Habermas does not capture and does not appreciate many phenomena of the mass 'aesthetic' culture. A more adequate interpretation of the new form of aesthetic experience is the philosophical hermeneutics of H.-G. Gadamer. He states that the experience of beauty is characterized by the community's consent about what constitutes beauty in relationship to the division of beautiful objects into natural objects or objects of art (Gadamer 1986, 9).

We want to add that the most appropriate contribution to the modern aesthetical experience in its fullest expression is the aesthetic conception of the Polish philosopher Mieczyslaw Wallis. He is convinced of the existence of different but equally valuable works of art, as well as various types of aesthetic experiences – the experience of beauty, of the ugly, of the sublime, etc. He also distinguishes between the various types of aesthetic subjects. Moreover, Wallis focuses on the existence of various types of aesthetic values. All of this testifies to the artistic and aesthetic pluralism of his conception of aesthetics (Wallis 1972, 3). Wallis's concept of aesthetic subjects is much wider than only the world of works of art. For Wallis, things and phenomena of nature, human actions and communities, ourselves as objects of aesthetic knowledge, products of technology, scientific and philosophical doctrines, etc. – all are a part of the world of aesthetic objects.

In the article *The Changes in Art and the Changes in Aesthetics*, Wallis states the need to revise the traditional concept of the work of art in its confrontational engagement with the works of contemporary art. Wallis argues that aesthetics requires new concepts and research approaches. One of them may be the concept of 'open work' proposed by Umberto Eco, who wrote of the existence of many incomplete interpretations, of which none has a privileged meaning.

In this way, the program of pluralistic aesthetics is established. This aesthetics is open to new phenomena in art, which perceives and interprets reality differently, has a different semantic structure, and evolves from a different existential background. Such an aesthetics is conscious of the fact that in the human world everything is changing, and that from time to time there are new types of art, new directions, and artistic manifestations. 'Open' aesthetics should not be allowed to build closed systems of art or aesthetic values. On the contrary,

it must be flexible and ready at any moment to take into account the emergence of new artistic phenomena or newly discovered or re-interpreted artistic works of the past, and realize the constant revision of its principles. Wallis is convinced that this the aesthetics of the future.

This conception of aesthetics is fully in line with the ideas of Vattimo, who observes that modern mass culture did not make the aesthetic experience vanish, thereby homologizing its 'beauty.' On the contrary, we can observe the diversity of the 'beautiful,' giving voice to not only different cultures, the presence of which becomes more and more visible and significant, but also to the very subsystems of which western culture itself is composed. Vattimo writes: "the utopia of an aesthetic rehabilitation of existence through a unification of the beautiful and the everyday has come to an end in parallel with the end of the revolutionary utopia of the sixties, and for the same reasons, namely the explosion of systematicity and the unintelligibility of unilinear history." (Vattimo 1992, 67) According to Vattimo, the changes that have taken place in the field of aesthetic experience and in the relations between aesthetics and everyday life are related to the manifestation of the phenomenon of mass aesthetic experience, which is the discovery of a voice by numerous systems of social recognition and various self-expressing communities. Thus, the essence of the aesthetic experience acquires a political significance and forms the preconditions of emancipation. It acquires a new meaning, wherein 'beauty' is the experience of the community, while at the same time the community really becomes 'universal' and 'free' as it creates an irreversible process of social development and pluralization.

Deploying aesthetic experience as an experience of a free community, unlike aesthetic experience, which focuses on the evaluation of structures, is possible only in the world of universal systems of thinking. Thus, the realization of aesthetic utopia is possible only as heterotopy. The perception of beauty as an act of recognition of patterns on the basis of the world and communities becomes possible only at a time when we are facing the multiplicity of these worlds and communities (Vattimo 1992, 69).

Among a large number of modern studies of the impact of media on the formation of a new type of society, the conception of Vattimo appears as a rather original and, above all, an optimistic project. Without neglecting a number of problems and negative effects of the media`s influence on the political world, which is emphasized by many researchers, Vattimo seeks to present it as an opportunity for our emancipation from mass media society. The positive aspect of this concept of the relation between aesthetics and politics lies in the reality that we are opening new opportunities for the realization of freedom in the political world, in spite of the dominant rhetoric about the total loss of ideals, metaphysical landmarks, and identities.

Dmytro Shevchuk, Kateryna Shevchuk

Conclusion

Summing up, we should say that there are two main aspects of the relationship between the aesthetic experience and the political sphere, that is reflected in the three models analyzed. The first concerns the establishment of political order. We should state that the political order is maintained not only in formal regulations, but also through the formation of certain ideas and beliefs. Therefore, *the political* manifests itself as an imaginary. A human being begins to perceive and evaluate events in the political world from the perspective of imaginary structures. Thus, aesthetic experience, which is connected to imagination, can be a component of imaginary structures that are associated with the understanding of political phenomena by human beings. This first aspect concerns the desire to ensure the legitimacy of the political order through the establishment and justification of political representation. Also, in today's political world, we can find attempts to renew or revive a modern democratic project. This renewal needs to happen through rethinking the principle of political representation. Political representation, which reproduces the precise presence and causes institution-duplication only, is replaced by a political representation based on the principles of aesthetics, wherein the presentation of reality implies freedom, as well as the plurality of positions.

The second aspect of the connection of aesthetic experience with political experience concerns the search for a change in the political order or certain dimensions of it. Such a strategy is based on the criticism of the current state of politics. It is a question of overcoming the negative tendencies in the development of the modern political world, which enslaves man and distorts the authentic dimensions of the human being as *bios politikos*. The aesthetic experience, which relies on the freedom of creativity and the potential of art, appears to be one of revolutionary means. Thus, the specific policy of aesthetics, which is focused on reformatting the attitude of man to politics, is realized. In this way, a new political meaning will be attained, capable of establishing the authentic dimensions of the political world.

In general, aesthetics and politics are not far from one another. The reference to aesthetics gives a new perspective on political analysis, which allows us to better understand the possibilities of implementing democratic principles or emancipated projects in the modern political world.

References

Ankersmit, Frank R. 1996. *Aesthetic Politics: Political Philosophy Beyond Fact and Value*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1986. *The Relevance of the Beautiful and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marcuse, Herbert. 1974. *Eros and Civilization. A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rancière, Jacques. 2002. "Le ressentiment anti-esthetique." *Magazine litteraire* 414: 18-19.

_____. 2007. *Dzielenie postrzeganego. Estetyka i polityka*. Kraków: Ha!art.

_____. 2009. *Aesthetics and Its Discontents*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schiller, Friedrich von. *Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Available at: http://public-library.uk/ebooks/55/76.pdf.

Shevchuk, Dmytro, and Maksym Karpovets. 2020. "The Performative Practices in Politics: The Ukrainian Maidan and Its Carnivalization." *Symposion. Theoretical and Applied Inquiries in Philosophy and Social Sciences* 7 (1): 85-97.

Vattimo, Gianni. 1992. *The Transparent Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wallis, Mieczyłsaw. 1972. „Przemiany w sztuce i przemiany w estetyce." *Studia Filozoficzne* 83 (10): 3-18.

Wolfe, Katharine. 2006. "From Aesthetics to Politics: Rancière, Kant and Deleuze." *Contemporary Aesthetics* 4 (1). Available at: https://digitalcommons.risd.edu/liberalarts_contempaesthetics/vol4/iss1/12/.