

**THE GENESIS OF POWER:
THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY IN THE MODERN WORLD**

Natalia OTRESHKO¹, Hanna CHMIL¹, Valerii BITAIEV², Nadiia KORABLIOVA³, Nataliia ZHUKOVA⁴

¹Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

²National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

³V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

⁴National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”, Kyiv, Ukraine

Abstract: *The phenomenon of power accompanies the whole history of mankind. In any protosocial community, at the level of biological packs, power is expressed in the distribution of dominance-subordination relations between biological individuals. Such a distribution in biology is due to the need for the pack to survive, to fit into the changing ecosystem conditions. In the course of the study, the characteristics of ideological discourse in industrial social space, the distinguishing features of a totalitarian ideological discourse, the modern form of ideology – the invisible ideology of postmodernism – have been analysed. It was concluded that the two leading principles of postmodernism – tolerance and hedonism today are faced with a new traditionalism or rather a new archaic mass consciousness. As a result of this clash, most likely, a new form of ideological discourse will appear, more severe than postmodernism and more rationally justified than nationalism or religious fundamentalism.*

Keywords: post-social community, political regime, authority, totalitarian discourse.

The phenomenon of power accompanies the whole history of mankind. In any protosocial community, at the level of biological packs, power is expressed in the distribution of dominance-subordination relations between biological individuals. Such a distribution in biology is due to the need for the pack to survive, to fit into the changing ecosystem conditions. If to take the theory of survival of the fittest as the basis for explaining these processes, it is natural that the “struggle for power” is perceived by the researcher as a selection mechanism that allows the pack to get rid of poorly adapted individuals and continue the genus to those who are currently most adapted to existing conditions.

But if to try to determine the peculiarity of power in social relations, it is seen that it has never been based on physical violence alone. The superiority of even the most confident in his power leader required legitimisation – i.e. support of the symbolic, verbalised through verbal discourse, some justification based on a higher, transcendental order. The

organisation of human life and culture is associated with a feature of the very existence of human. He lost the original unity with nature inherent in animal existence. If animals are guided by instincts, some bioprograms of actions, which in many ways leads them to automatism, then a person is deprived of such strict predetermination. On the one hand, this provides him with freedom of choice, on the other hand, dooms to the feeling of a lost paradise, the search for unity with the world. "Man's birth as man means the beginning of his emergence from his natural home, the beginning of the severance of his natural ties"¹.

There are several ways to achieve this unity. The first way: to find unity with the world, obeying an individual person, group, organisation, God. Another way to overcome isolation is in the opposite direction: a person can try to achieve unity with the world with the help of power over it, turning others into a part of himself, going beyond his individual existence.

The simplest form of natural blood connections that provide a person with a sense of rooting and belonging to something. The family and clan, and later the state, nation or church, assume the functions that the mother herself initially performed for her child. "The family and the clan, and later on the state, nation or church, assume the same function which the individual mother had originally for the child. The individual leans on them, feels rooted in them, has his sense of identity as a part of them, and not as an individual apart from them"². Later, in the patriarchal culture, the image of the mother is generally squeezed out to the periphery, and, as E. Fromm writes about Freud's analysis of this phenomenon, "Thus Freud gives the father the place which in reality is that of the mother, and degrades the mother into the object of sexual lust. The goddess is transformed into the prostitute, the father elevated to the central figure of the universe"³. In this case, Freud reproduces the long-existing patriarchal image of power.

People want to obey the established order of relations, this is a manifestation of a subconscious desire to streamline the world, including the social. Power is a certain guarantee of order, therefore obedience to power is inherent in human social nature. Hence the definition of dominance according to Weber – "the probability that certain specific commands (or al commands) will be obeyed by a given group of persons." This possibility cannot be essentially power. This is a sign of the existence

¹ E. Fromm, *The sane society*, Routledge Classic, London, New York, 2002.

² *Ibidem*, 2002.

³ *Ibidem*, 2002.

of authority – the highest type of power that does not need to use force to maintain itself. In the case of a pure type of justified and legitimised power-authority, the opposition never leaves the realm of possibility, i.e. does not go over to active actions, does not manifest itself in the real sphere.

As soon as the opposition is articulated – the power loses its advantage and ceases to be a power-authority, it becomes a weaker form of power, which is forced to use violence to justify it⁴. Violence is the limit of the authority of power, an indicator of its powerlessness. Hence, pure power-authority initially excludes the use of force. Power is initially legitimate, i.e. recognised, non-recognition of power is its destruction. Power from here is always accompanied by the risk of losing it. Therefore, the government so needs justification, it needs a search for the “cause”, “foundation”, “justification” of power over other people⁵.

Analysis of the conceptual framework of the study

There are two main approaches to understanding authority. The first approach represents authority as the right to rule⁶. Authority is considered as a property (belonging) of the law, status, institution, position in society. People have authority because they occupy some place or post in a particular system. In this sense, authority does not belong to the people themselves, as subjects of action, but to their position, status. T. Hobbes defined such authority as follows: “The right to commit an action is called authority and sometimes power. Therefore, authority always means the right to commit an action”⁷. This approach characterises authority as authority de jure.

Another approach considers authority as stemming from knowledge, skill, expertise, or some other qualities that the subject possesses. The opinions and orders of those with such authority are correct, reasonable, weighty, etc.; people obey them as true, by virtue of

⁴ Cf. Gulzhan Isatayeva, Umirali Turyskulov, Zhuparkul Auelbekova, Sandugash Kaldykozova, Ziliha Miyatbekova, Kyzdarkul Kasenova, „The Brisk Financing of Education: University Education and State Matching Funds Programs in International Comparison,” in *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 332.

⁵ R. Dodonov, “Crisis, war or conflict – how to correctly named the events in Eastern Ukraine?” in *Skhid*, 2015, vol. 2, no. 134, p. 107-112. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2015.2\(134\).40199](http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2015.2(134).40199)

⁶ A.V. Kostruba, “The notion and attributes of right – terminating legal facts”, in *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 2019, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 254-262.

⁷ T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

their source (“trust without discussion”). “The deciding factor is who owns the order; in comparison, the content of the order is in some ways secondary”⁸. Here authority is denoted and explained as authority de facto.

These classical philosophical concepts of authority as a kind of static, self-justified and unchanging phenomenon are largely opposed by A. Kojève’s dynamic concept of power, which introduced Hegel to the 20th century French philosophy and thereby laid the foundations of many modern postmodern theories of power and ideologies⁹.

A. Kojève offers the concept of dual ontology. The first kind of being is being devoid of negativity. This is nature, which is completely positive, since it is aimed at reproduction, in it “nothing is lost, nothing is created.” In nature, the identity of things is preserved, nothing claims in it to change the established order. Human actions break the natural identity of things to themselves, as they establish connections with nothing, strive to go beyond what already exists, and thereby, by destroying create new opportunities. So in the second reality – the being of human actions or history – the dialectic of the rupture of being manifests itself, which through negativity creates a new order. Hence: real changes are possible only in history, in nature, all processes are cyclical¹⁰.

From the point of view of A. Kojève, the existence of the subject is always inevitably associated with the transformation of reality either through direct action or through cognition¹¹. Such a transformation means a gap in the former reality, which always means not only achievements, but also losses – not a single gap can pass painlessly. “From now on, the status of the subject appears as a situation in danger, which can always be won by newcomers, and which must be protected from outsiders”¹². The subject of the action is unconditionally aggressive towards reality, asserting its version in return for the previous one. When there is no such aggressiveness, there is no certainty in the correctness of one’s business and philosophy, then the story ends, there are no more actions. There is only a blurry reality of the game, where everything is relative, where there is no more violence, but there are no great achievements. The story ends, according to A. Kojève, since all the great scenarios of social life have been

⁸ J. Friedman, “Being in the World: Globalization and Localization”, in *Theory, Culture & Society*, 1990, vol. 7, no. 2-3, p. 311-328.

⁹ A. Kojève, *The Notion of Authority (A Brief Presentation)*, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

¹⁰ A. Kojève, *The Notion of Authority (A Brief Presentation)*, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

¹¹ D. Pylypenko, “Editorial”, in *Astra Salvensis*, 2019, vol. 7, p. 9-10.

¹² V. Descombes, *Modern french philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980.

exhausted. All that remains is the game according to already known rules, which means that there is no need for real human action¹³.

But so far not all scenarios have been played, the leader of power (he is the subject) is endowed with freedom of action, he is conscious, active by nature. Imperious action is the only true action in A. Kojeve's concept of power. The attributes of the action are: awareness of motives, the proposed project of the results, feedback of the evaluation of the results of the action with self-reflection about the reaction of the audience. But the main attribute of power action is a change in reality without changes in the subject of the action. In this model, there is no feedback, only the subject of true power, who, thanks to the strength of internal self-control and full awareness, is able to carry out this type of activity. In this case, power appears as the possession of certain properties, abilities of the subject. Power here has a meaning directly related to possession and will as an ability. The subject is able to commit, perform one or another action¹⁴.

Another form of power (power over someone) is exercised as a relationship of domination and subordination. In such relationships, A. Kojeve distinguishes four types of power:

1. The power of the father over the child, the power of tradition, the power of the dead.

2. The power of the master over the slave, the power of the winner, the power of a man over a woman, the power of a military man over a civilian, the power of a nobleman over a commoner

3. The power of the leader over the crowd: the power of a superior over the lower, the power of a teacher over a student, the power of a scientist, the power of a soothsayer, a prophet

4. The power of a judge: the power of an arbitrator, the power of a controller, censor, the power of a confessor, the power of a fair or honest person¹⁵.

The power of the Father over his children can be compared with the scholastic or theocratic rationale for the transfer of power. Power passes from the Father to the Son as an inheritance, and before that the Son must obey and honour the power of the Father.

Hegelian theory, according to Kojeve, best describes the relationship between the Master and the Slave. Dominance of this kind is born in the struggle for "recognition", in a mortal duel. Two opponents

¹³ A. Kojeve, *The Notion of Authority (A Brief Presentation)*, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, 2014.

¹⁵ A. Kojeve, *The Notion of Authority (A Brief Presentation)*, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

want to be recognised in their human reality, in their human dignity. The future Master passes the test of Fight and Risk, while the future Slave is not able to overcome his fear (animal fear of death). In order to survive, he yields, he recognises himself defeated, recognises the superiority of the winner and submits to him as a Slave to his Master. Thus is born the Power of the Master over the Slave¹⁶. Aristotle, at first glance, also describes the relationship between the Lord and the Slave, but in a different way. The Master has the right to Power over the Slave because he is able to anticipate, while the Slave is only able to register his immediate needs and is directed only by them. In this case, A. Kojeve believes, this is more of a justification for the Leader's power over his unit.

In turn, Plato in the best way, according to A. Kojeve, describes the power of the Judge, because, based on his concept of an ideal state, all power should be based on justice. All other forms of power are illegal. They act as examples of pseudo-power. Any power that is not based on justice is not power in the proper sense of the word. It is held only by force ("terror")¹⁷.

Power, from the point of view of A. Kojeve, can manifest itself (become a phenomenon) only in a world with a temporary structure. Time has the value of power in all its three modes. The past: "it is always "respectable", touching is already "blasphemy", ignoring is "inhumane." "The antiquity of the clan, of the state itself brings not only fame, but a very real foundation of power." The "Man of the Future" has power for the reason that he has got "everything ahead." The projects of the leaders in essence represent the power of the future over the present. Exalting the future over the past and present leads to the justification of the power of the Leader, as one who offers and implements in reality a new universal project for the whole society. But the present also has power. People do not want to lag behind their time. The tremendous and tyrannical power of fashion, imitation of its patterns is the power of the present, real. The present, A. Kojeve believes, personifies reality as opposed to "poetic unreality of the past" and "utopian unreality of the future"¹⁸.

But, as already mentioned, any power in human society needs legitimisation, confirmation of its authority. This discourse of substantiating and support of the power for a long time eluded the attention of researchers, since their own theoretical prerequisites for all research practice were inscribed in it. This discourse justifying power is

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, 2014.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 2014.

¹⁸ A. Kojeve, *The Notion of Authority (A Brief Presentation)*, Verso, London, New York, 2014.

not something separate, something independent, it is not a social order of power for intellectuals. It should be considered as an integral part of a wider system – what, for example, M. Foucault called the “episteme”. All codes, all discourses of knowledge that exist in a certain historical era are inscribed in this episteme. The change of at least three epistemes in the history of European thinking is a sign of a global transition in the processes of the evolution of collective consciousness, since in other cultural civilizations the code remains almost unchanged. Consequently, the peculiarity of European civilization, its uniqueness can be determined precisely by analysing the stages of this transition.

According to Foucault, the first episteme corresponds to the image of a power legally justified – a reference to the highest authority. Such authority can be God, the law of succession, power, sanctified by the church. In these cases, the source of power is transcendental; it is beyond the boundaries of social and cultural relations between people. The authority of such a power is undeniable as long as people continue to believe in a transcendental, higher reality, but it is lost if there is no more faith. Which, in fact, happened in history when the liberal-democratic power came to replace the feudal, inherited power¹⁹.

The following two types of power find their detailed consideration in the lectures of M. Foucault²⁰. At the dawn of the industrial society, a new type of power appears: disciplinary power, power inscribed in the body through many practices under the control of disciplinary institutions: school, family, church, public opinion. Physicality, the last bastion of intimacy, is proclaimed socially conditioned. Disciplinary power is being transformed in the Western type of society into biopower – power over mortality and fertility, control over pathologies. Biopower is already interested in the subject-genus, and not in the subject-individual. Hence the role of the social sciences of sociology in the history of the formation of such a discourse of power is increasing. The invention of sociality occurs especially in mass types of societies, where the necessity for control over the population, rationing the distribution of resources between more

¹⁹ R.A. Abramov, R.T. Mukhaev, M.S. Sokolov, “To a question about the criteria and parameters of the effectiveness of the government in democratic countries”, in *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 2016, vol. 7, no. 6, p. 1248-1262.

²⁰ M. Foucault, *It is necessary to protect society*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2005; M. Foucault, *The birth of biopolitics*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2010; M. Foucault, *Security, territory, population*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2011; M. Yampolsky, “Physiology of the symbolic”, in: *The Return of Leviathan: Political Theology, Representation of Power, and the End of the Old Regime*, Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, Moscow, 2004; S. Zizek, *The sublime object of ideology*, Khudozhestvennyy zhurnal, Moscow, 1999.

important and less important groups from the point of view of biopower increases. Both disciplinary society and biopower are based on the principle of the effectiveness of the population, its economic feasibility. Obedience to power alone is no longer enough; a skilled workforce is needed that can independently carry out the tasks necessary for the power. The control over the population is becoming more subtle; it is shifting from the realm of transcendence and unconditional authority to the consciousness and subconscious of people. Thus, control inevitably becomes self-control over one's body, practices, health and effective work for the benefit of society, part of the ideology of industrial society^{21,22}.

Ideology as a form of knowledge has always occupied a special position in the social and humanitarian sciences. Most often, in the Western critical theory of society, ideology was opposed to the scientific view of social reality. The concept of ideology was associated by left-radical researchers with the idea of bias of social knowledge by power structures. It was about contrasting the scientific picture of the social world, formed by independent researchers, and the ideological, i.e. a false, distorted picture, formed in the interests of the power elite and political structures. This view of ideology as a form of false consciousness was formed back in classical Marxism and was later used in the 60s of the 20th century by critical social theory. However, ideology can also be considered in a broader context – in this case, it becomes a discourse about sociality, formed in an industrial and post-industrial social space. This approach can be seen in the works of modern researchers of the discourse of power and ideology in industrial and post-industrial societies^{23,24}.

Features of ideological discourse in the industrial social space

The social arises in its pure form when access to a transcendental source of power disappears or hides – social space closes on itself. Hence,

²¹ D. Ushakov, I. Elokhova, E. Kozonogova, "Post industrialization prospects in the dynamics of socioeconomic transformations: Cluster approach", in *International Journal of Ecological Economics and Statistics*, 2017, vol. 38, no. 2, p. 23-32.

²² H.T. Van, I. Onyusheva, D. Ushakov, R. Santhanakrishnan, Impedimental policies impacting shrinking world solar industry eco-economic development, in *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 2018, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 21-27.

²³ K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007; J. Rancier, *On the edge of the political*, Praxis, Moscow, 2006.

²⁴ V. Dubinina, "Conceptualization of the rhetoric's teaching traditions in the post-industrial society (using USA as an example)", in *Skhid*, 2014, vol. 2, no. 128, p. 131-136. <http://skhid.kubg.edu.ua/article/view/24647>

the religious worldview is replaced by an ideological one. The uniqueness of the social is in the fact that it is clarified from itself, without using an appeal to higher powers. The justification of the actions of the authorities in the social world is based only on legal laws before which everyone is equal, and the laws of the effectiveness of actions, their expediency. Modern society is formed as a bewitched reality without God, where in place of religion as the holding power of society, ideology comes. The rationale and clarification of the ideological discourse called to engage in social and humanitarian sciences. This inevitably leads to a change in the nature of power – power becomes decentralised and closely linked to the power of expert discourse.

The industrial social space, which was forming in the New Age in Western Europe and later in the USA, was a more dynamic space than medieval. According to K. Lefort, in all pre-industrial societies the mode of production is conservative; “under capitalism, an ideology is conservative, obliged to conceal a revolution living in the mode of production”²⁵. The changes associated with the industrial revolution are accompanied by changes in the field of social knowledge. If in the Middle Ages ideology was associated with sacred church knowledge, the source of power was defined as transcendental and sociality was interpreted as the world of earthly power, subordinate to the power of the highest Divine principle, but in an industrial society the picture of the social world is changing. Under the influence of the secularisation process, sociality is bewitched, the source of power is placed not outside, but inside the social space, and various social forces are involved in the process of constant struggle for power. Hence, the industrial social space is already initially heterogeneous and dynamic, since it is divided by the lines of the struggle for various types of power – economic, political, symbolic. To unite such a dynamic and heterogeneous social space, an ideological discourse is formed, in which various pictures of the social world coexist: conservative, liberal, socialist, anarchist. The differentiation of the social is accompanied by the division of the field of ideology, which no longer focuses in one place or at the same pole, but spreads throughout the entire social space²⁶. The main function of ideological discourse in industrial social space is the function of hiding social differences, the formation of a single picture of industrial society, where there is a place to meet the needs of all social groups based on free economic competition.

²⁵ K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007.

²⁶ T. Portnova, “Genre and style interaction in solutions staged ballets of the nineteenth, twentieth centuries”, in *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 689-694.

Such a difficult task of creating a justification of the social order universal for all groups of society gives rise to several specific features of the classical industrial discourse of ideology. Firstly, the ideological discourse carries out its project of creating a homogeneous social field, taking on the burden of issues (in order to neutralise them) arising depending on the differentiation of social space. “Different layers, each, depending on the conditions in which they are placed, and depending on their group interests, have to speak a language that serves to “rationality”²⁷ and “real”, used to conceal any cracks in space and time, resulting in ensuring complementarity of representations in a certain era”²⁸.

Secondly, an attempt to fill the gaps in the general discourse, always subordinate to the problem of the inability to control what constitutes social reality, forces ideologists to turn to logically incompatible schemes to substantiate the order of power, which is clear not only to them, but also to the educated public. It is very difficult, without relying on the divine, unconditional authority of the authorities, to explain why in a society of abundance too few people can freely use its fruits.

In the dynamic social space of the struggle of group interests for ideology, it is extremely difficult to obscure the real division of society. This can only happen through the formation of a certain rationalised picture of the social world, when this picture is presented as the very essence of social reality, forms its universal meaning for all social groups²⁹. It is necessary to create some kind of illusory but extremely plausible picture of the social world of universal prosperity and well-being.

If in religion the image of the One is transcendental and, therefore, does not need additional substantiation, then ideology, on the contrary, needs its own rationalisation. From this the hypothesis can be formulated that the discourse of the socio-humanitarian corpus of knowledge that arose at the end of the 19th century was connected with the ideological, was intended to become its rational expression and self-reflection of society. Without a scientific analysis, the ideological discourse of an industrial society could not test its connection with an ever-changing social

²⁷ K. Pavlov-Pinus, “The meaning and conditions of possibility of autonomous rationality”, in *Philosophical Problems of Information Technologies and Cyberspace*, 2018, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 50-71. 10.17726/phillT.2018.2.15.4

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 2007. Cf. T. Portnova, “Genre and style interaction in solutions staged ballets of the nineteenth, twentieth centuries”, in *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 691.

²⁹ T.V. Portnova, “Principles and opportunities of the study of pictorial heritage in the practice of choreographic education”, in *Journal of Siberian Federal University – Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2018, vol. 11, no. 12, p. 2043-2055.

reality, which threatened to lose competitiveness in the symbolic field of struggle with other ideological discourses.

If to consider ideology as an alternative to a holistic picture of the world, created by a religious type of knowledge, then such a system of ideas rests on itself, checks and substantiates itself. Transcendence as going beyond everyday reality is replaced by a search for ideals within the social itself. A feature of ideological discourse is the retention of a universal meaning within itself, which allows and even in some cases involves a regular exchange between action and thinking. If in the religious practice of Christianity the action most often has an individual meaning and is associated with purification and approaching spiritual perfection, then in ideological practice the action is endowed with a collective meaning, the idea of sacrifice for the sake of a better, more just social world is embedded in it to varying degrees.

From conservatism to anarchism, the same model is preserved in ideological discourse: a corpus of prescriptions is erected, the use of which is a condition of knowledge and action. Thus, the discourse on the social is affirmed as a universal discourse. It always builds a picture of the social world from the standpoint of higher ideals, thereby assuming that these ideals never come to life, but they create the phenomenon of utopia³⁰, an image of a just society that should be sought. Representatives of the intellectual elite, forming ideological discourse, initially put themselves in the position of teachers and prophets, bearers and preachers of the rules of a just social world for all layers of industrial society.

Through all ideological variables, the idea of a teacher and a keeper of public relations, which are fragile, is preserved. Social separation is hidden by the following trick: the establishment of distinction between order and disorder, organised sociality and anarchy. This difference even can be found in T. Hobbes' "Leviathan", when the war of all against all is opposed as a natural state to the state of a social contract that forms the basis for state power³¹.

This difference did not have a significant status in the religious picture of the world, when from a different, transcendental space, the sinful, earthly world of sociality was endowed with a higher sacred meaning. Hence, any authority, if it did not come from God or his intermediaries, was unclean and cursed. The destruction of the religious picture of the world, the creation of ideological discourse for a dynamic

³⁰ D. Pylypenko, "Utopia in the world political-legal theory and practice", in *Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 2018, vol. 23, no. 82, p. 14.

³¹ T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

industrial social space led inevitably to confusion. The single sacred meaning of sociality is replaced by the struggle for the symbolic legitimation of the picture of the social world between the various ideologies of the industrial era. Such a struggle is based not only on criticism of the ideology of opponents, but also on the requirement of constant clarification of their own positions. Although any ideological discourse pretends to be obvious and generally accepted knowledge, on the other hand, the ideological discourse initially contains a requirement to periodically ascertain the basis of basic ideas and to connect them with reality. Such an operation involves recognising the difference between what exists and what is said. “A discourse knows itself as a discourse and is content to present itself that way. Since at the same time it maintains fiction that it owns its origins and its own space”³².

Summarising a brief description of the ideological discourse of the era of classical industrialism, it should be noted that it was characterised by internal discord and inconsistency, which, on the one hand, made it possible to change the picture of the social world depending on changing circumstances, when the ruling elite passed from the ideals of conservatism to liberalism and democracy. But, on the other hand, such a combination of heterogeneous systems of symbols and ideals in one symbolic field created a situation of symbolic chaos from which two possible solutions emerged in the 20th century – totalitarianism and postmodernism.

The authors try to analyse and compare the features of totalitarian and postmodern ideological discourses. When comparing them with the classic industrial type of discourse, its contradictions and problem areas, which still remain unsolvable, will become apparent.

Distinctive features of a totalitarian ideological discourse

The ideologists of totalitarianism tried to get rid of the contradictions accumulated in the ideological discourse of classical industrialism. It can be said that in many respects the appeal of the totalitarian ideology of the 20th century was due to people's fatigue from life in the unreasonable, excessively rational world of apparent freedom of choice. One of the tasks of the ideologists of totalitarian discourse was to complete the process of darkening the formation of the social, which began in bourgeois ideology.

³² K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007.

In industrial society, the power of ideological representation is supported by the constant postponement of a “decision”, the transfer of contradiction under the guise of a rearrangement of the discourse. The change of power of political parties, their various projects and platforms, in fact, was necessary as a screen for the real processes of power work. Totalitarianism rejects these games of democracy. Under totalitarianism, there is a crude assertion of the identity of representation and reality. Totalitarian discourse does not seek rational arguments and consistency with reality, in contrast to the industrial one. Under totalitarianism, ideological discourse replaces and supplants social reality, or rather, cancels it.

“Totalitarianism is an attempt to enclose a social space in itself, proceeding from the imaginary centre from which it is formed, an attempt to achieve here and now the coincidence of being and phenomenon”³³. In classical industrial discourse, such a coincidence is impossible, just as the coincidence of reality with the ideals of democracy and social justice is impossible. Under totalitarianism, a divided, social space of ideological discourse is replaced by a total, undivided social. The inhuman discourse of the universal is proclaimed, in which all social and personal contradictions are erased.

For the first time, the theory of organisation has found its embodiment in the tectology of A. Bogdanov as the quintessence of the principles of organisation that are widespread throughout the world. The proximity of totalitarianism with philosophy by Hegel’s history is also understandable, since there is also the idea of anonymity and grandeur of knowledge, which does not have a specific medium – the subject. In both cases, the idea of Reason is proclaimed as the centre, from where the logic of development of the whole society comes from. Under totalitarianism, the imperative of organisation permeates all spheres of society. This discourse is structured in such a way that anonymous knowledge governs the thinking and practice of all members of society. The leader is only the personification of this anonymous authority, his determination to follow the ideals proper and creates his sacredness in the eyes of others. In a totalitarian society, there should be nothing superfluous, inappropriate. Therefore, a totalitarian ideology rejects any deviation as dysfunctionality in the system. The organisation of the totalitarian system is determined by its focus on the centre where knowledge and power are stored (in the Soviet system, this centre was ideological knowledge formed by Marxist-

³³ K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007.

Leninist philosophers, hence such close attention to philosophy as ideology and the persecution of dissidents as apostates).

Description of the modern form of ideology-the invisible ideology of postmodernism

All the same intention – to clarify the idea of homogeneity and the unification of sociality, which is found in the totalitarian ideological discourse, is characteristic to a certain extent of the modern form of postmodern ideology. If in totalitarian ideology discourse is declared reality, then in postmodernism, on the contrary, reality becomes discourse. Postmodernism in ideology tries to fulfil two tasks. Firstly, to hide the distance between representation and reality, which was the main problem for the ideologists of industrial society. Secondly, to refuse to complete the presentation in the form of totalitarianism. In postmodernism, an image of discourse without borders arises and develops, in which everything becomes transparent. In such a world, the subject finds himself in a constant circulation of information. “It is clear that such a discourse will pretend to ignore all prohibitions; since it covers the entire social field, it eliminates all the distances that the discourse of bourgeois ideology has established”³⁴.

Postmodernist discourse differs from totalitarian discourse in that it allows its speakers to speak, rather than restricting of a word. In contrast to totalitarianism, in postmodernism there is no closeness of information, or rather, it is not necessary. Constantly updated topics, the infinity of speech merge into a single information stream, where it is very difficult to catch real knowledge. In this situation, “not knowing” means “not coinciding with the spirit of the times”, not coinciding with the social being that reveals itself. A quick change of news topics and images on the screen of gadgets leads to the fact that awareness replaces the process of cognition. From knowledge, the moment of reflection and understanding of the situation is increasingly excluded.

The discourse of universal information exchange without boundaries and differences in social status is complemented by a discourse

³⁴ K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007.

of expert knowledge^{35,36,37}. In the media, experts from various fields of science share their versions of the development of the universe, human, society, speak out about current political events. Thus, the idea of objectivity of such popular-scientific knowledge and its domination over the knowledge of all other communication participants is introduced into the general informational background. The discourse of expert knowledge is a discourse formed by people with diplomas, ranks, academic degrees, i.e. sufficient symbolic capital so that their statements are endowed with the highest status of objectivity in the field of universal communication. In the postmodern ideological discourse, the image of a society divided into social statuses depending on property and political capital is being replaced by the image of a society where the boundaries of groups in the general field of communication are indistinguishable. The end of political and ideology from the point of view of the tradition of social class antagonisms is announced. Postmodern ideological discourse does not speak an exalted syllable, like classical ideology. It pretends that “it disseminates information for everyone, portrays itself as a continuous dialogue and thus seizes the gap between itself and the Other in order to find a place for this gap in its space”³⁸.

Among other things, postmodernism goes well with the ideology of consumption. A peculiar artificial world of fictions³⁹ is being formed, where a person no longer sees a reflection of his actions or images, he sees only a symbolic expression in the form of different signs of his real being⁴⁰. This is not just an alienation from oneself described in early Marxism, it is a constant production of ever new symbolic realities, multiplying thanks to modern means of transmitting information. A grandiose illusion is

³⁵ P. Kretov, O. Kretova, “Philosophy of information, project of narrative ontology and modern picture of the world”, in *Philosophical Problems of Information Technologies and Cyberspace*, 2018, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 51-72. DOI 10.17726/philIT.2018.1.4

³⁶ S. Murinska, O. Aleksandrova, R. Dodonov, “Information warfare: future challenges of Latvia and Ukraine”, in *Skbid*, 2018, vol. 5, no. 157, p. 66-72. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2018.5\(157\).148661](http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2018.5(157).148661)

³⁷ T.V. Portnova, “Practices and methods for actualization of the scientific information in art excursions (Excursions and cultural heritage in the contemporary world)”, in *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 2016, vol. 11, no. 14, p. 6690-6696.

³⁸ K. Lefort, *Forms of history: essays on political anthropology*, Nauka, St. Petersburg, 2007.

³⁹ R.B. Kamaeva, “National cultural specifics of representing dialecticisms in the fiction work translation”, in *Life Science Journal*, 2014, vol. 11, no. 10, p. 653-656.

⁴⁰ K. Rayhert, “The philosophy of artificial consciousness in the first season of TV series ‘Westworld’”, in *Skbid*, 2017, vol. 5, no. 151, p. 88-92. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.5\(151\).117438](http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.5(151).117438).

being created of “a world whose space is open to all routes, where everything, if only there is a means for this, is understandable; where the vision of objects, their manipulation, and their movement are freely repeated through tools and seem to fit in with a completely visible, completely manipulated, completely explored”⁴¹.

At the same time, at the end of the 20th century, the society of global communication networks is facing anti-globalism trends. The global nature of communication, provided by new technological capabilities for transmitting information, is limited by trends in the localisation of social spaces⁴². New traditionalism is particularly attractive against the backdrop of an ever-changing field of communication discourse with ideas of tolerance and multiculturalism. In modern ideology, they are successfully opposed by the ideas of cultural, ethnic, national, racial exclusivity and identity. These ideas, which were initially included in the general field of the ideological discourse of industrial society, are at first quite loyal and rational, and today they sometimes acquire the features of “vicious cohesion around the passion of the exclusive Unified One”⁴³.

Conclusions

The main difference between the ideology of modern society and religion is that the meaning of being in the religious picture of the world is placed outside the brackets of social reality is transcendental. In the ideological picture of the world, the meaning of being is immanent to sociality, which in this case acts as a closed world, which has no way out to transcendence.

The process of understanding formed in the ideological field of symbolic systems, rational criticism of their own foundations allows the ideological discourse of industrial society to correspond to the dynamics of social space, satisfying the interests of carriers of various social and cultural identities. But in the classical discourse of ideology, the image of sociality is unstable and vague, it can acquire the features of civil society as a space of freedom of speech and expression, it can acquire the features of anarchism or socialism. Hence, two alternatives to such a vague and contradictory ideological discourse are formed – totalitarian and

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, 2007.

⁴² A.V. Alekseev, A.V. Lenets, “Directive abbreviations as a component of modern virtual communication (as exemplified in English and German languages)”, in *Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 2017, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 98-110.

⁴³ J. Rancier, *On the edge of the political*, Praxis, Moscow, 2006.

postmodern discourse. Their similarity is in an attempt to create a holistic image of sociality without internal social contradictions.

The totalitarian discourse closes sociality around one idea. In this case, in the ideological centre, of social reality there are carriers and custodians of a single truth for all, the remaining social layers are placed on the principle of approaching or moving away from a true idea. The obvious drawbacks of such a discourse are the ban on self-expression and freedom of speech, as well as the ban on conflicts within the ruling elite, which should be presented in the face of other social groups as a single, united around the idea of the centre.

In this regard, postmodern discourse acts more efficiently, creating its own image of a holistic, consistent sociality. This image appears as a field of open global communication without territorial boundaries and social restrictions. One of the few barriers to entering this field of communication is recognised as a restriction in access to information and knowledge, which can be partially removed by constantly improving the level of education and professional qualification of the actors in communication. The two leading principles of postmodernism – tolerance and hedonism today are faced with a new traditionalism or rather a new antiquity of mass consciousness. As a result of this clash, most likely, a new form of ideological discourse will appear, more severe than postmodernism and more rationally justified than nationalism or religious fundamentalism.