

ANTI- DIPLOMACY AND CIVIC EXISTENCE: HOW TO REINVIGORATE THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN A DEMOCRACY?

Stanisław Kowalczyk

Ph.D. in political science, University of Warsaw, Poland

Abstract

In contemporary democracies, the public sphere is often overshadowed by diplomatic maneuvers and political spectacle, leading to a decline in civic engagement and a sense of disconnectedness among citizens. "Unveiling the Civic Tapestry: Reigniting Democracy through Active Engagement" explores the critical need to reinvigorate the public sphere by fostering genuine civic participation and dialogue. This paper examines strategies to empower citizens, promote inclusivity, and enhance democratic governance through grassroots initiatives, digital platforms, and community-driven projects. By unveiling the intricate threads of the civic tapestry, this study advocates for a renewed commitment to civic engagement as the cornerstone of a vibrant democracy.

Keywords Civic engagement, democracy, public sphere, grassroots initiatives, inclusivity, digital platforms, community-driven projects, democratic governance.

INTRODUCTION

The assertion that democracy is currently in crisis at the beginning of the 21st century actually has become a catchphrase. The gradual deterioration of the public sphere goes hand in hand with a low level of confidence in both the institutions and the political elites. Both democratic theorists and political elites' responses to this crisis appear to ignore the real causes and, most importantly, remain extremely conservative. Any proposed institutional changes are mostly cosmetic and do not change the system's core. Democracy does not require a refresher; rather, it requires a comprehensive reconstruction that involves adapting institutional infrastructure to a brand-new population and world. However, what is required is an analysis that will go beyond the institutional aspect of POLITICS and will not confine its conclusions and recommendations to the idea of system reform. Because the distrust is not so much about representative democracy and

the current political elites as it is about POLITICS as a whole, which is more like a theater of illusion or a soap opera aimed at stirring emotions and is no longer understandable to most citizens, the changes must not be superficial. The elites view it as a cynical game rather than a means of articulating and harmonizing social interests.

NEOLIBERAL DEPOLITICIZATION POLICY

The data showing a decline in citizens' interest in POLITICS, their level of political participation, and their formal membership in political parties cannot be used to fully comprehend the nature of the change. Collin Hay looked at how a set of neoliberal ideas hurt politicians' definitions of POLITICS and how people think about POLITICS. The public's perception is that everyone, including politicians, acts out of rationally understood self-interest and simply tries to get as much of it as possible. POLITICS has been subordinated to economically

understood rationality, and as a result, it has been de facto depoliticized. Undermining beliefs about the unselfish motivations of politicians also significantly contributed to a significant drop in trust in the state as an institutional system of representation of social interests.

POLITICS, on the other hand, is the capacity to act and think through a situation in which real collective or social choice is at stake. In this way, POLITICS is everywhere we are dealing with co-shaping our destiny rather than determining it, and the issue is not limited to the individual. As a result, everything outside of our control falls under the category of non-POLITICS. Politicization is the process by which a problem is made the subject of discussion, decision, and action, rather than just speculation. Depoliticization, then again, is the converse cycle, that is to say, matters that were already a subject of decision, stop being the subject of thought and are viewed as last and determined. Expanding Feed's depoliticization idea, Laura Jenkins characterized Political issues as an imaginative, vague interaction that is characteristically complicated in nature, and its members allude to various qualities and have, no less than possibly, the capacity to challenge the laid out request.

POLITICS cannot exist without a genuine possibility—or even a belief in the possibility of changing the existing order—of action that is marked by randomness but is a reflective game between the omnipresent relations of power and freedom in collective life.⁵ POLITICS is the capacity for change and, by extension, for action. POLITICS exists wherever our actions have an impact on other people. However, individuals may use different social strategies to acknowledge or deny the possibility of realizing their own will. Therefore, in the broadest sense of the term, "politization," it would entail exposing and questioning what is taken for granted, either morally or politically without alternatives. Depoliticization is a strategy based on fatalism and determinism, which limit human ability to act, choose, and change the world as it is. As a result, certain orders are presented as scientifically justified and unquestionable. The denial of impartiality and neutrality is presented as

particularize. To counter-propose a vision of an organization of a society that is free from political interests, a negative image of POLITICS is created by presenting it as the source of the ideological deformation of the world's image.

Therefore, depoliticization practices can be justified as liberating from particularizes rather than as destroying diversity or limiting alternatives. As a result of the depoliticization of difference, POLITICS has been replaced by one in which, regardless of our particular motivations, there is only one correct solution presented with no alternatives. As a result, the purpose of politicization would be to oppose dominance in an environment where power relations are obstructed or subject to depoliticization, which prevents the formulation and emergence of an alternative.

ANTI-POLITICS AS A CHALLENGE

At the beginning of the 20th century, democracy had to deal with a growing lack of trust in politicians and political institutions. Formal POLITICS is increasingly seen as a pointless spectacle run by public relations professionals. While it may be impressive, formal POLITICS is not politically effective from a citizen's perspective and, more importantly, it is dysfunctional from the system as a whole. They are no longer able to mobilize citizens because political parties no longer resemble corporations that are more concerned with the interests of their own members than public entities that are truly concerned with the interests of various social groups; and political organizations no longer have the authority to represent them. Political scientists have coined the term "Anti-political culture" to describe a completely new phenomenon that has emerged alongside citizens' growing sense of political alienation. A lack of trust in formal POLITICS leads to demands to directly influence public affairs through referendums, petitions, and civic budgets. Naturally, this can be interpreted as an effort to establish competitive articulation channels as an alternative to discredited party POLITICS. It is, without a doubt, evidence of civic commitment, but it is also a demonstration of the system's need for adequate institutional changes. According to Hay

and Stoker, there are a number of reasons why contemporary political elites do not fully comprehend the scope, depth, and nature of the disease with which modern democracy is struggling. First, the elites themselves are unaware of how much of a contributor they are to the crisis in democratic POLITICS. Because their electoral fortunes depend on it, their representatives are more likely to exploit the Anti-political culture than to oppose it. Many times, it is even possible to draw the conclusion that they have lost faith in the social utility of POLITICS, which contributes to the acceptance of making many important decisions outside of their control. It isn't really to be expected that the residents whom they purportedly address have additionally quit trusting in it. The switching of this interaction would require restoring collective types of independent direction. This makes sense as long as citizens feel they have a say in the decisions they care about, which can re-energize their desire to participate in public life.

The first and most important step in reviving POLITICS (re-politicization) is to oppose the de-politicization of public spheres that are already dominated by professionals, managers, and experts rather than democratically elected representatives. Second, institutions and organizations with important political roles are frequently not included in the proposed and implemented systemic changes; additionally, political parties, non-Political organizations, and the media as a whole are a component of the issue and must be viewed as such. Thirdly, in order to deal with the multi-level nature of the modern world and the associated management requirements, revitalized POLITICS must be organized significantly better than it is currently. At the national level, decentralization cannot imply independence and the development of a unique system. While our political debates and institutions have stubbornly remained national, POLITICS has become more transnational than ever.

In conclusion, we are able to confirm that, despite the well-documented low level of political commitment among citizens and growing dissatisfaction with POLITICS, we do not truly comprehend the causes of this situation. We do not fully comprehend the source of the citizens'

negative perception of POLITICS, which is frequently viewed as an elite cynical game. The issue of altering citizens' perceptions must be seriously addressed in any strategy to revitalize POLITICS. We understand what types of political movement individuals take part in and what elements drive this action. We can provide a wealth of empirical data on topics like voter turnout and election outcomes, but political science—and social science as a whole—has trouble explaining how citizens lost comprehension of POLITICS in the early 21st century.

POLITICAL INDIVIDUALISM IN PRACTICE

Neoliberal Political issues aren't rehearsed through ideological groups, on the grounds that the choice making process with respect to society has been taken out from majority rule bodies. It is not forged in the public process of agreeing on different points of view and reasons; rather, it is based on activity generated around individual cases that can be solved in the same way as a mathematical equation. Traditional democratic systems and methods of political participation are also not compatible with this new POLITICS. Today's civic activism is becoming increasingly anarchic and viral. It further strengthens the cracks in the political landscape and can be described as a diffuse model of political individualism. A significant Anti-political stance has been adopted by all major political parties. Politicians imitate the vitality of the political scene by attacking one another and focusing constantly on the lives of their opponents. However, they also undermine mutual trust, which undermines the foundations upon which the public sphere is built. Because it mobilizes against competitors whose harmful activities must be restricted in the interests of society as a whole, this type of political rivalry continues to be socio-technically effective. However, at the same time, it reinforces society's belief that no one can be trusted.

At the same time, institutions and agencies that aren't elected get the power to make decisions for the public, which makes people's lack of faith in the political system even worse. Politicians deliberately remove "POLITICS from POLITICS," which lowers our expectations in this regard. They outsource decision-making to non-elected but top-

down bodies with a neoliberal view of POLITICS and the belief that they have no real influence. This has serious implications for how such decisions are then publicly accounted for. Politicians, as Lord Falconer explains, delegate decision-making to others because they don't believe they can already govern themselves effectively and, most importantly, that they are acting in the public's best interest.⁹ We can view such actions as an expression of the belief that there is no real influence on the political decision-making process. Sadly, this does not go hand-in-hand with an awareness of the socially perilous consequences of spreading such a mindset, which results in the destruction of the public sphere.

Assuming that lawmakers are subject to strong vested parties, which prompts their actual crippling, they can all things considered, because of present day media, recreate their impact on dynamic cycles in the open arena. In order to self-promoter, politicians contribute to the reproduction of a system that does not actually help the political representation of social interests. Instead, it promotes solutions to a problem that are presented as effective in terms of economics, but in reality, they serve the interests of symbiotically connected dominant groups. This activity can even be considered particularly harmful. Populists use the detachment of political elites from the needs of the "people" to argue that party leaders are guided by their own interests rather than those of society in their decisions and actions. POLITICS is portrayed negatively as a result of this. This view is further supported by the belief that the majority of politicians lack the expertise and competence necessary to effectively control the formulation and implementation of particular policies; as well as the unjustifiable cost of their insistence on maintaining an outdated, ineffective bureaucracy. It is difficult to demonstrate that the modern political class is more focused on its own motivations and actions on its own self-interest, but the irony is that this is a common political view, on which the modern depoliticization trend appears to rest. In this view, POLITICS is a pathogen for which depoliticization is an Antidote. As decision-making has been delegated to independent bodies, POLITICS has become

depoliticized, with the majority of decisions largely hidden from effective public scrutiny. As new actors and challenges emerge, the decision-making processes have become more complicated. Increasingly, political rivalry is being condensed to the level of a beauty contest between candidates, who no longer make reference to substantive political arguments or political beliefs in order to differentiate themselves. The public sphere must be recreated if POLITICS is to be revived. In Antis, one of the fundamental issues is that significant political decision-making has been delegated to non-elected organizations that are not accountable to the public. As a result, the adopted solutions lack democratic political legitimacy and citizens are unable to publicly voice their concerns about issues. The major inquiry then, at that point, remains: How could the political elites have co-created such a derogatory image of themselves? Naturally, they cannot be held directly accountable for it. However, they have made a significant contribution to that by adopting the worldview that is influenced by public choice theory and states that political actors' pursuit of narrowly and selfishly understood short-term profit is the essence of democratic POLITICS. When viewed from this perspective, POLITICS should be restricted because it serves no public interest. Ironically, we will support the transfer of decisions concerning us to external bodies in the name of the public interest if we believe in it. It is only that, en route, we likewise lose effect on the approach molding process. Without any real democratic control, the decisions are made. Additionally, it has significant repercussions for our democratic political culture, regardless of whether we agree with them. If politicians themselves consider POLITICS to be a disease for which depoliticization is the cure, it shouldn't come as a surprise that ordinary people stop being interested in it and even have a negative perception of it. It is even more understandable that as the sociopolitical system becomes more complex, the less they understand it and do not know where important decisions are made; they also believe that politicians themselves are simply more susceptible to corruption.

Anti-POLITICS culture has been significantly

influenced by the widespread belief that politicians prioritize party interests and media spectacle over socially useful activities. Despite the fact that the ongoing retaliatory attacks serve to discredit POLITICS in the eyes of voters, they unquestionably contribute to the formation of political capital—both for individuals and for parties. Minority groups are no longer able to rely on adequate articulation because political campaigns that are tailored to the median voter have reduced their presence and their interests in the political sphere. In addition, the majority of citizens view politicians and POLITICS through the lens of the media rather than through the experience of direct contact. It is paradoxical that the emergence of 24/7 media and social media did not raise people's political awareness because the quality of the information provided significantly decreased as a result of the pursuit of profit and customers. As a result, the mass audience was given precedence over the form and content of the media message. Because of this demand, we receive a satirical portrayal of POLITICS that is simplified and emphasizes its negative aspects. Citizens' political cynicism grows as a result of focusing on this aspect of politicians' work. The modern man is less of a citizen who understands the collective nature of POLITICS and more of a consumer who is focused on satisfying his narrowly understood, selfish interests.

Under the pressure of competition and the desire for financial gain, the media lower their standards and unite into international media conglomerates. In a time when the media have become the primary source of political information, the quality of news coverage is deteriorating, resulting in messages that are distorted and simplified while the complexity of POLITICS grows. The distinction between the message and the commentary also disappears in tandem with this. Feeling focused media promote a culture of hatred, and writers frequently construct their situation Artery to the lawmakers whom they depict in a pessimistic light, like hoodlums who should be continually observed and kept a watchful eye on. Last but not least, the media reinforces the idea that POLITICS is a marketplace and that citizens have a right to be angry when their expectations are not met; or as a sporting competition ground with a single winner.

How does this relate to POLITICS, which is seen as a complicated decision-making process that takes into account a variety of perspectives, motivations, and expectations? It has no resemblance whatsoever to a debate that is understood to be a public reflection of sane citizens. Market expectations for products are generally not the same as those in the open arena. Rather than participation and shared responsibility, demanding attitudes prevail. Our modern dissatisfaction with POLITICS is largely attributable to our artificially raised, unrealistic, and exaggerated expectations of what we are entitled to expect as consumers. Consumers make their decisions based on straightforward logic. They can shop elsewhere if a store does not carry what they expect or they dislike the store. We can only change the course of events in POLITICS by acting and speaking. This lets us talk about our fears and try to understand other people. Sadly, this means that participation and exit costs are significantly higher than on the market. Most people don't like to put in a lot of effort for a small reward. A common strategy for overcoming challenging circumstances is to shift responsibility onto others. POLITICS is about more than just being able to express one's views; expressing one's opinions is only the beginning. It is likewise the craft of paying attention to other people. POLITICS is more like an agora than a market, where subjective beliefs and reasons must be accepted by everyone, so it cannot be reduced to the purchase of goods by individual consumers. The process of coming up with a collective solution to particular issues is called POLITICS. It is difficult, but it is also the most enriching human experience because it requires going above and beyond one's own self-interest.

CITIZENSHIP IN THE WORLD OF ANTI-POLITICS

The degree of disappointment with how the framework functions in the ongoing institutional shape keeps on developing. Some attribute the problem to politicians and how the political system works. In fact, ordinary people are becoming less and less interested in the world around them and less socially and politically involved, while politicians are becoming more and more detached from the problems of ordinary people. Others

blame the citizens for resigning and not participating in the political debate and changes. Part of the reason why people are becoming dissatisfied with formal POLITICS is that people don't understand how POLITICS work and how they are explained in discussions about democracy. This is in part because public discourse portrays POLITICS as a space for satisfying individual needs rather than socially determined choices and decisions. Party membership also falls as confidence in the political elite and institutions declines. The latter widens the scope of action for professionals such as spin doctors, campaign specialists, and others who treat citizens as passive observers who should be mobilized as necessary in response to the shifting circumstances. This issue affects not only political parties but also non-Political organizations, which rely on professional campaign organizers rather than a large membership. Citizens are also addressed here because they are the audience that media campaigns most frequently target and who, at best, are expected to sign a letter or take part in a planned demonstration. Instead of sending a profound, analytical message, simple messages are sent. The occasional participation of a larger number of citizens in an organized "event," such as a protest or rally, is required. This kind of involvement is more of a way of life and a public declaration than a serious, conscious one in the political debate. Our involvement is fleeting, scattered, and superficial. Political participation is uncoordinated consumer activity.

However, political alienation can manifest in a variety of ways and in a variety of settings. Even though not all European countries exhibit such a persistent tendency, the average participation rate in European elections is lower than it was even a few dozen years ago. Citizens who are raised in an environment of distrust of politicians, skepticism regarding democratic institutions and dissatisfaction with the operation of democratic processes withdraw from voting. The decline in membership in political parties is another sign of alienation. They are now more like a hostage to a system in which they don't have a lot of influence on POLITICS. Utilizing the available marketing tools, they place a greater emphasis on self-

promotional activities. Citizens are no longer mobilized by ideologies but rather by campaigns on specific issues, and only in limited forms like a boycott, petition, or March. As a result, they are no longer institutions of mass participation and involvement. Such shallow and, most importantly, momentary responsibility makes a minor difference and leaves a somewhat disheartening preference for legislative issues. Over the long haul, this is incredibly unfavorable to a majority rule POLITICS, as it isn't helpful for building an open arena open to all individuals and perspectives.

The fact that unconsolidated democracies are not the only ones experiencing a decline in confidence in political elites and solutions demonstrates that the problem is a disease of political understanding and practice rather than a problem of old and new democracies being divided. The political system as a whole exhibits the signs of this disease, not just at the level of the political party or POLITICS. The media perpetuates the perception that POLITICS is a so-called functional activity rather than an idle and unproductive competition by focusing on the negative aspects of the governing process. Today, POLITICS is not respected because it is linked to using public office for private gain. The value of POLITICS has been significantly diminished in the social sphere. It's connected to an activity that doesn't make anyone proud; instead, one feels embarrassed about it.

People have actually been removed from the decision-making processes on matters that concern them, regardless of whether we consider this to be the result of imposing business logic on political activity or more of an incomprehensible persistence in a national and local corseting of POLITICS in the face of economic globalization. Because it satisfies the preferences of potential customers, whom the media must strive for in order to survive, they present us with a deformed and cognitively simplified image of POLITICS in their struggle for the customer. As a result, POLITICS has come to be associated with party marketing and self-service activities. At the same time, under the pressure of complicity, the media have lowered their standards and narrowed their perspective to the point where they no longer serve as educational resources. They focused on what

would bring them a specific benefit in the form of ratings and profits rather than the essence of POLITICS—the possibility of confronting diverse points of view and ideas and the process of negotiating, agreeing, and making sometimes very difficult choices in certain circumstances.

The blend of this large number of elements is helpful for the rise of a political culture in light of a doubt of lawmakers and legislative issues overall. People don't take their civic duties seriously enough as a result. There has emerged a society of individualists who are so preoccupied with themselves that they not only fail to recognize the significance of participating in the community but also appear to want to lose this ability. Naturally, one could respond that politicians have always lied and that money has always been a big part of POLITICS. However, it appears that the mind and the decline of civic practices are more to blame for the current disease of democratic POLITICS. The virus of self-realization has infected POLITICS. Every person's purpose in life is precisely self-realization, which is expressed through the art of making individual choices and absolutizing a single perspective, according to the prevalent myth of our time. With such naive understanding of individualism, POLITICS, whose essence lies in the art of collective decision-making and harmonizing various voices, is impossible. Because they do not comprehend the fundamental nature of POLITICS, people drift away from it and become dissatisfied with their actions. The consumer's perspective does not provide an answer to the question: how to accommodate an irreconcilable circumstance, or individual cases? Market logic and political logic remain distinct. POLITICS is about resolving conflicts. Simply putting your will into action does not suffice. You also need to be able to hear other voices and take them into account when making decisions that are mutually agreeable.

The horizon of POLITICS is set by communication skills, not by casting a single vote, as self-interest necessitates, despite appearances, others' understanding. At each and every stage of the political process, communication is essential. POLITICS begins when it will is expressed, not when it ends. In the meantime, everyday people lose sight of the purpose of participating in public

activities. They are unaware that POLITICS has its own internal logic and is not governed by an invisible hand. POLITICS has its own grammar, and the public sphere has its own specificity. The majority of those involved in POLITICS must possess the necessary knowledge and expertise for a rational model to function. If not, there is a real chance that they will fall victim to manipulation, even by a small group.

POLITICS includes resistance in a complex social world. It empowers the introduction of elective answers for social issues and makes space for splits the difference. All of this, however, necessitates the existence of an appropriate institutional foundation that will guarantee the provision of appropriate information and highlight the range of choices that are available. The citizen must first choose who or what to cast their vote for before the voice can be considered a powerful tool in democratic POLITICS. This necessitates not only the ability to listen, which is extremely important, but also access to information regarding issues that are being resolved. Disinformation and fake news are becoming a problem in today's globalized world. Even though it's hard to talk about democracy falling apart, the issues listed above are a warning that should be taken seriously.

Consider whether to establish new political institutions that will limit the influence of business groups on POLITICS while expanding and diversifying the participation of citizens in public life, or how to revive civic spirit and rebuild civic culture. A greater degree of citizen participation in the political decision-making process would not only result in effective empowerment but also educational benefits, as it would help citizens comprehend the fundamental difference between consumer choices and collective decision-making. The trap of consumer thinking is that it maintains a negative image of POLITICS because it views individual choices as the only way to express oneself. TV debates and academic commentaries, among other forms of coordinated civic education activities, are necessary to alter this picture. We must redefine what citizenship means and create a new public space.

CONCLUSION

The widespread negative image of POLITICS is a reaction to how it is practiced, not a negation, as it might appear at first. We disagree with each other, which is why POLITICS is a thing. POLITICS is a decision between opposing values, interests, and points of view. It frequently necessitates the use of inherently limited resources that no one accepts. Because it is a group decision-making process, everyone must be concerned about the outcome. Today's large, interconnected, and diverse societies present a challenge for POLITICS. It is intended to reflect our collective will, which is difficult to pinpoint, changes over time, and necessitates submission once expressed at the level of a specific decision.

Our political institutions and debates have remained stubbornly national in their substance and content, despite the fact that our policies are becoming increasingly transnational in nature—both in the sense that the issues that motivate us politically must increasingly be dealt with at the supranational level if they are to be effectively resolved and in the sense that domestic processes of political deliberation must take into account the broader transnational context in which they find themselves. This maladjustment is a very serious issue in practice. We face increased cognitive and political demands as a result of social and economic shifts that, whether we like it or not, are becoming increasingly multilayered and, as a result, increasingly complex. The often-unintended interactions between strategies implemented by entities at various levels of multi-level POLITICS are the source of the globalized world we live in. Identifying key decision-makers and reconstructing political decision-making processes, let alone democratic control, is extremely challenging. Depoliticization is necessary because globalization has almost become synonymous with political surrender, which explains the significance of this. Lawmakers allude to outside requirements in any event, when they appreciate considerable political independence, developing the feeling of their own and social feebleness as opposed to regarding it as a test. Steering in the face of complexity is an important part of modern political management.

Despite the fact that our conventional conceptions of democratic thought do not correspond to this reality, they must serve as a foundation for the creation of new institutional solutions. These adjustments must not only affect the institutional sphere but also the way POLITICS is perceived and the rules that govern it.

A democratic ideology is necessary for popular POLITICS because it makes it possible to express its complexity in a way that is understandable—albeit at the expense of diminishing and distorting its image. We encourage people to participate in a variety of ways by bringing POLITICS closer to them, which affect its increasing complexity and opaqueness. As a result, inclusiveness may paradoxically ultimately undermine democratic POLITICS. To put it another way, the paradox is that while democracy, with its claims of inclusivity, needs to be understandable to the masses, the ideology that aims to bridge the gap between people and POLITICS misrepresents (and cannot avoid misrepresenting) how democratic POLITICS must work. POLITICS is democratic when public decisions are the result of a complicated process involving a variety of actors, both institutional and non-institutional, who represent the broadest possible range of views and interests. We can only do this in order to challenge the monopoly of power and regain faith in POLITICS and democracy.

All universalistic cases can by and by, best case scenario, become an instrument of persecution. Top-characterized and forced rules of consideration in vote based system can effectively combine the current power relations. To speak with one another by any means, individuals should accept uniformity and correspondence. To see each other as co-chiefs and city-harmonies, they should not just treat others as equivalent and similarly skilled; yet additionally attribute similar epistemic status to their situations as their own. Although they should assume mutual equality and competence, people should not assume that they are equal in reality or have the same level of communication skill. Despite their abstract appearance, these guidelines ought to apply to each and every public dialogue partner. Therefore, developing a set of rules that allow for the establishment of deliberative forums that are open

to a variety of values, opinions, and communication styles, as well as citizens who are competent in this regard, is an extremely significant practical challenge for democracy in the twenty-first century. The degree to which the political system has structures that enable it to conduct real, inclusive, and politically binding debates is known as deliberative competence. There is no ready-made institutional solution that would guarantee the fulfillment of these conditions. This can be accomplished through a variety of institutional configurations and by referring to the political experiences of a specific society; any attempt to constrain a complex communication practice is simply unauthorized usurpation.

REFERENCE

1. Canovan M., "Polityka dla ludzi. Populizm jako ideologia demokracji", in Y. Meny et al. (eds.), *Demokracja w obliczu populizmu*, Warszawa 2007.
2. Dryzek J., "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 42, no. 11 (2009),
3. Hay C., Stoker G., "Revitalising POLITICS: Have We Lost the Plot?", *Representation*, vol. 45, no. 3 (2009),
4. Hay C., *Why We Hate POLITICS*, Cambridge 2007.
5. Jenkins L., "The Difference Genealogy Makes: Strategies for Politicisation or How to Extend Capacities for Autonomy", *Political Studies*, vol. 59, no. 1,
6. Karwat M., *O karykaturze polityki*, Warszawa 2012.
7. Stoker G., "POLITICS in Mass Democracies: Destined to Disappoint?", *Representation*, vol. 42, no. 3 (2006),