

**FORMATION OF LITERARY APPROACH TO THE
CREATIVE HERITAGE OF THOMAS MORE IN THE
ANALOGICAL GENRE**

**Izolda BELTADZE¹, Shota RODINADZE²,
Marina JINCHARADZE¹**

¹Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology, Batumi Shota
Rustaveli State University, Batumi, Georgia

²Department of European Studies, Batumi Shota Rustaveli State
University, Batumi, Georgia

Abstract: *The relevance of the work is determined by the fact that the legacy of T. Mora is distinguished as the basis for constructing existing ideas about the possibility of a utopian society, Utopia is created on the basis of the principles of rationality, it is an ideal, constructed by the human mind system of its relations with other people. Nevertheless, on the other hand, utopia cannot be fully comprehended by the human mind, because individual mechanisms of its functioning are overlooked, and some concepts, such as happiness, are captured on an intuitive level. The novelty of the study is determined by the fact that the authors reveal the principles that rationalism in politics in utopia occurs at two levels: ontological and epistemological. In this regard, rationality in utopia is approaching its utilitarian and pragmatic understanding. The authors show that it is necessary to pay attention primarily to the fact that human rationality is limited, and the rationality of utopia (in its ontological manifestation) is absolute. In this regard, the creative heritage of T. Mora is proposed to be considered through modern theories of the development of society. The article notes that such a vastness of utopia in the end becomes one of the reasons for the impossibility of putting it into practice. The practical significance of the study is determined by the fact that the possibility of creating and forming a holistic picture of utopian development based on the analysis of the literary heritage of T. Mora is revealed in the framework of modern socio-political concepts.*

Keywords: Thomas More, utopia, ontology, epistemology, political theory of the ideal.

In 1516, Thomas More published his work *Utopia*. For the first time in the history of world social and political thought, a person systematically described the ideal of a political system and designated its status as an unattainable goal of social progress. From then until now, people continue to strive for the ideal, despite the dangers that it lurks in itself. The latter are related to the protection mechanism that the human psyche imposes – the fear of the unknown, which can be much worse than everything that a person already knows¹. Later, dystopia is built around this mechanism. Of course, it is impossible to deny that a theoretical and worldview

¹ A.C. Dinerstein, “Denaturalising society: concrete utopia and the prefigurative critique of political economy”, in A.C. Dinerstein (Ed.), *Social Sciences for an Other Politics: Women Theorizing Without Parachutes*, Springer International Publishing, New York, 2016, p. 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47776-3_4.

understanding of the ideal of the political system was characteristic of world political thought long before the emergence of utopia. Moreover, even with the advent of utopia, not every reflection on an ideal political system can be called utopia². Actually, one of the problems for modern political science is the transfer of the category of “utopia” to the everyday level of consciousness and simplification of its understanding³.

In order to determine the essence of utopia, it is important to define what we consider utopia. Thus, a philosophical encyclopaedic dictionary provides the following definition: a concept to sign a description of an imaginary/ideal social structure, as well as works containing relevant plans for a social transformation⁴. In another dictionary, utopia is defined as a model of a certain fictional society, which, however, is based on certain real social structures, as the embodiment of a social ideal⁵. That is, the ideal is one of the components of utopia, they define it as a genre, while it is not worth identifying the ideal with utopia, which sometimes takes place. The point is that the ideal itself, like utopia, is unattainable, but, given the practice of building all the impossible projects of utopia in political discourse since the twentieth century, utopia begins to be equated with the ideal⁶.

Utopia is a synthetic, even more syncretic system, in it are inseparable cultural, political and social, private and public, and the like. At the same time, in our opinion, the political essence is that which was laid down in utopia at the time of its emergence as a genre⁷. This is not only about the fact that utopia was created as a “mirror for monarchs”

² D. Pylypenko, “Utopia in the world political-legal theory and practice”, in *Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 2018, vol. 23, no. 82, p. 14.

³ M. Robson, “Writing contexts in William Roper’s life of Thomas More”, in W. Gould, T.F. Staley (Eds.), *Writing the Lives of Writers*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 1998, p. 79-89. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26548-0_6.

⁴ A. Akkerman, “Philosophical urbanism from Thomas more to Walter Benjamin”, in *Phenomenology of the Winter-City: Myth in the Rise and Decline of Built Environments*, Springer International Publishing, New York, 2016, p. 127-137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26701-2_10.

⁵ T.V. Portnova, “Genre art system: Experience of a comparative analysis of theatre (ballet, opera) and pictorial arts”, in *Ponte*, 2017, vol. 73, no. 8, p. 194-211.

⁶ D. Thomas, “Experiences on the road to object utopia”, in M. Tokoro, R. Pareschi (Eds.), *ECOOP’95 – Object-Oriented Programming, 9th European Conference, Aarhus, Denmark, August 7–11*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, 1995.

⁷ M.Wynne-Davies, “Though a temporall man, yet your very spirituall father”: The roper/basset line and the lives of Thomas More”, in *Women Writers and Familial Discourse in the English Renaissance: Relative Values*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 007, p. 12-26. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230592940_2.

that was able to show the rulers of modernity their mistakes. In this case, T. More should write a dystopia, an ideal parody of English society and the English royal court. But he describes (to the problem of descriptiveness and the interpretation of utopia only as a combination of institutions constructed in a certain way we will turn later) an ideal society, which is impossible to put into practice. It is no accident that it is Utopia, a place that does not exist.

That is, T. More does not give clues as to the institutions from which to build an ideal society, or the problems of institutions are not so important, basic for an ideal society. But more important are not the institutions, but the principles, in particular, the basic principle of politics – the principle of anthropocentrism⁸. The return to human is promoted by T. More, publishing Utopia as a political treatise, a work in which politics exists for human, but not human for politics. Utopia was intended to reveal, to pay attention to the correct policy, aimed at a person, fixated on a person and functioning for the good of a person. This gives us reason to argue that utopia was created as an alternative political theory, the political theory of the ideal. Despite the fact that utopia does not claim to be scientific, it is it that forms the concept of ideal in politics in the form in which we have it now⁹. The problems of the ideal structure were addressed even before the emergence of utopia, but T. More does not offer an ideal system, not an ideal state, but an ideal system, which involves not only institutions, but values and principles¹⁰.

Literature review

Utopia unbelievable combines dynamics and statics. In no case the Utopian political system can be called absolutely static; moreover, in our opinion, not a single political system can be considered completely static¹¹.

⁸ I. Kamps, M.L. Smith, “Utopian ecocriticism: naturalizing nature in Thomas More’s utopia”, in T. Hallock, I. Kamps, K.L. Raber (Eds.), *Early Modern Ecostudies: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*, Palgrave Macmillan US, London, 2008, p. 115-129. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230617940_7.

⁹ T.V. Portnova, I.V. Portnova, “Art review as the main component of forming eco-synergetic culture in the course of conducting guided tours related to the art heritage”, in *Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences*, 2016, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 2112-2117.

¹⁰ T. Portnova, “Artistic heritage of V. Nijinsky”, in *Information (Japan)*, 2017, vol. 20, no. 7, p. 4775-4782.

¹¹ J. Yates, “Humanist habitats; or, “eating well” with Thomas More’s utopia”, in M. Floyd-Wilson, G.A. Sullivan (Eds.), *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*,

Despite the fact that utopia is a perfect political system, there is still room for development in it. The actual is a process. It represents a widely ramified mediation between the present, the finite world and, most importantly, the possible future, and it is the connection with the future that is the factor that ensures the dynamism of the political system of utopia. In this case, we are talking about the fact that maintaining the political system of utopia in a state of perfection does not at all mean the immutability of political institutions¹².

It is worth noting that the latter in utopia do not have an absolutely clear expression. Yes, T. More draws attention to this, characterising utopia as a framework in which space is created for the formation of other, more detailed models of society¹³. Individuals have the opportunity to unite and organise themselves to realise their own ideals, and the task of utopia in this case is to create the necessary conditions for this. To this end, political institutions form utopias on the one hand, as extremely detailed, on the other, as maximally simplified. As a result, a space is formed in which free people voluntarily unite to try to realise their own ideal of a good life in an ideal society, that is, the inevitability of the emergence of utopias within utopias is declared¹⁴. Actually, in this we see the political development of utopia or the dynamism of a utopian political system. Thus, utopia is stable, its institutions are invariable and unshakable, but the utopian political system is able to develop in a state of stability, respectively, to develop the idea of the ideal. The latter, in fact, is connected with the rationalistic foundations of utopia as a phenomenon in political theory¹⁵.

Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 2007, p. 187-209.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230593022_12.

¹² O. Grkadziel, "Early modern travel writing and Thomas More's utopia: an attempt at literary interpretation", in J. Fabiszak, E. Urbaniak-Rybicka, B. Wolski (Eds.), *Crossroads in Literature and Culture*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, 2013, p. 399-410.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21994-8_36.

¹³ A. Peterson, "Dialoguing with a satirist: the translations of Lucian by Desiderius Erasmus and Thomas More", in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 2018. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12138-018-0487-5>.

¹⁴ K.F. Morrison, "Know thyself" and Christian art: the dispute between William Tyndale and Thomas More", in S. Hayes-Healy (Ed.), *Medieval Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Jeremy DuQuesnay Adams*, Palgrave Macmillan US, London, 2005, p. 249-273.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-10718-3_13.

¹⁵ T.V. Portnova, "Historical aspects of project technologies development and opportunities for their use in scenic arts", in *Space and Culture, India*, 2018, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 48-56.

Reduction to the absolute is a habitual practice for utopia, in fact, utopia is the political theory of the absolute, a model built on the exaggeration of some features of the political system and the understatement, even the exclusion of others. One such absolute trait is rationality, which is so absolute that it reaches absurdity¹⁶. In our opinion, the genre features of utopia are particularly clearly defined with an emphasis on its rationality, about which, in particular, T. More writes a lot¹⁷. He, in fact, breeds rationality as one of the basic signs of utopia, with scientificness, emphasising that utopia cannot and should not be scientifically substantiated. It is such an appeal to the rationality of utopia that allows us to disagree with the position of the beginning of utopia as a genre from Plato and insist on the need to distinguish between utopia and utopianism¹⁸. This refers not only to the rationality of the utopian system, but also to the absolute rationality of the citizens of the utopian state, which appears within the era of the New Time and becomes dominant precisely in connection with the growing rationality in the New Time¹⁹. Utopia rejects the irrational, it tries to exclude it from the field of human life, which can be seen in other political concepts of the New Age.

At the same time, the ideal as a system proposed by T. More has a rational-irrational character and is integral in this anti-irrationality. If the ideal socio-political constructs of the Christian era were explained by religious dogmas, then the ideal, as utopia depicts it, is repelled from secular political theory. The basis of the irrational component of the ideal of utopia is faith in a person, which has replaced faith in God. This is not about atheism at all, but rather the opposite: utopia offers the human mind as an object of faith, while not abandoning religion as an institution²⁰.

¹⁶ J. Edwards, *Conclusion: the radical attitude and utopia. in the radical attitude and modern political theory*, London, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 2007, p. 183-184. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230800908_8.

¹⁷ C. Ferns, "Utopia, anti-utopia and science fiction", in A. Sawyer, P. Wright (Eds.), *Teaching Science Fiction*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 2011, p. 55-71. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230300392_4.

¹⁸ K. Bayertz, "From utopia to science? The development of socialist theory between utopia and science", in E. Mendelsohn, H. Nowotny (Eds.), *Nineteen Eighty-Four: Science Between Utopia and Dystopia*, Springer Netherlands, Netherlands, 1984, p. 93-110. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6340-5_5.

¹⁹ M. Yar, "Virtual utopias and the imaginary of the internet", in *The Cultural Imaginary of the Internet: Virtual Utopias and Dystopias*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 2014, p. 27-46. Available: https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137436696_3.

²⁰ H.D.L. Vervliet, "Thomas Morus, utopia Leuven, dirk martens, 1516 [Nk 1550]", in H.D.L. Vervliet (Ed.), *Post-Incunabula en Hun Uitgevers in de Lage Landen*, Springer

When analysing the transformation in the philosophical discourse of the Renaissance, one should pay attention to two trends: on the one hand, the anthropocentric orientation of the representatives of the humanistic direction, and on the other, the idea of the position of a human among the representatives of the reform movement. In utopia, these two opposing trends are harmoniously combined, and although the dominance of humanism, which will be discussed later, is quite noticeable, the features of the reformist trend are also an important factor²¹. Thus, representatives of the Reformation express the thesis of the low importance of human, his powerlessness before the power of sin, and his inability to moral perfection. And if a person in the views of the reformers is entrusted to God, then in a utopia a person relies on a state that he himself created²². This speaks of the utopian interpretation of human as a completely rational being and praise of his mind, the creation of which is an ideal state – utopia, however, on the other hand, there is recognition of the need for a person to rely not only on himself and his mind. True, paradoxically, in our opinion, the very manifestation of these traits, despite the fact that the founder of utopia as a genre T. More was an opponent of the Reformation.

At the same time, T. More could not help but recognise the problems that existed in Europe, which was only moving away from medieval models of governance and worldview. Otherwise, why would he devote the whole first section of the analysis of contemporary English society, even rather to his criticism, albeit in a somewhat veiled form, which does not surprise given the proximity of T. More to the English throne and the open danger of open criticism of Tudor politics²³. One way or another, it cannot be denied that, even considering the Reformation a heresy, T. More agreed with the justice of certain postulates of the reformers, in particular those relating to religious arbitrariness.

Netherlands, Netherlands, 1978, p. 174-175. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-8828-6_82.

²¹ T. Sweet, “Would Thomas More have wanted to go to mars? Colonial promotion and bio-power”, in T. Hallock, I. Kamps, K.L. Raber (Eds.), *Early Modern Ecostudies: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*, Palgrave Macmillan US, London, 2008, p. 269-289. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230617940_16.

²² J.C. Davis, “Thomas more’s utopia: sources, legacy and interpretation”, in *Alternative Worlds Imagined, 1500-1700: Essays on Radicalism, Utopianism and Reality*, Springer International Publishing, New York, 2017a, p. 173-196. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62232-3_8.

²³ C. Elgöl, “Up to date as long as retranslated: Thomas More’s utopia in Turkish”, in Ö. Berk Albachten, Sehnaz Tahir Gürçauglar (Eds.), *Studies from a Retranslation Culture: The Turkish Context*, Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2019, p. 117-136. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7314-5_8.

In addition, utopia as a theoretical model is a combination of two other conflicting processes: detailing and generalisation. To begin with, detailing: utopia builds a rather detailed model of the ideal order: it outlines a framework going beyond which means giving up the ideal. That is why the utopians describe the ideal in detail, covering all spheres, from the organisation of state power to leisure, family and childbirth. In the end, all these areas will be controlled by the state, so their description is necessary²⁴.

On the other hand, a generalisation: utopia only builds a framework, without going beyond which society can actually choose different development vectors²⁵. Indeed, not a single Utopian actually claims that all individuals in his society lead exactly the same life, devote the same time to the same activities²⁶. That is, even though the utopians do not recognise individualism as such, they do not exclude individual characteristics realising that to depict a truly ideal device, they must either take into account the characteristics and needs of each person, or not take them into account at all. It is these two processes that are the basis of the so-called framework concept of T. More's utopia.

Since T. More, the ideal has been closely linked with progress, so the first inevitably means the second. Progress in this case is characterised as an extremely positive phenomenon, and only the realities of the 20th century make pay attention to its potential negative aspects. The same applies to utopia, which, even though its institutional composition has the appearance of a democratic system, at the level of norms and principles of functioning, turns out to be a totalitarian state²⁷. Perhaps T. More did not see any negatives in the totalitarian system, but the practice of the functioning of totalitarian regimes in European countries in the 20th century gives impetus to the development of a new genre – dystopia, that is, the political theory of the anti-ideal.

²⁴ E. Semple, “Transgressive normality and normal transgression in sir Thomas More”, in R. Loughnane, E. Semple (Eds.), *Staged Normality in Shakespeare's England*, Springer International Publishing, London, 2019, p. 151-171. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00892-5_7.

²⁵ K.R. Nurgali, “Representation of ancient times in Kazakh historical novel”, in *Life Science Journal*, 2013, vol. 10, no. 11, p. 298-301.

²⁶ J.C. Davis, “Goodbye to utopia: Thomas More's utopian conclusion”, in *Alternative Worlds Imagined, 1500-1700: Essays on Radicalism, Utopianism and Reality*, Springer International Publishing, London, 2017b, p. 197-204. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62232-3_9.

²⁷ 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.

Materials and methods

Certainly, utopia, being a detailed model of an ideal political system, is a theoretical construct. All researchers agree on this, no matter what methodological position they adopt. However, in our opinion, another point is also important: utopia is a very specific place at a particular time. That is, despite its purely theoretical nature, utopia is a real, absolutely familiar form of political existence, albeit outside of our time and space.

Rationality is the foundation of utopia. So system-forming that it could be considered a key feature. However, even though the political system of utopia is entirely based on rationality, even though it is absolute, a complete exclusion of irrationality is still impossible, since this would mean the exclusion of part of the human mind. The subconscious component of the “I”, in particular, which is responsible for fears and emotions. At the same time, utopia itself cannot allow the existence of the real irrational, although it cannot destroy it. It is worth mentioning the syncretism of utopia²⁸, however, in the context of the implementation of the principles of rationalism at the ontological level, the syncretism of rationalism and irrationalism as two principles, from which utopia is simultaneously obtained, is also important for us. This is precisely the way out of the situation of presence-absence of the irrational in utopia: it is present in the rational, is included in it and is inseparable from it.

For utopia, politics is a natural state of human being. Outside of the state, and therefore outside of politics, there is nothing, and a person is inevitably a political actor insofar as he cannot exist outside the political sphere, as, indeed, is everything in utopia. In the end, dystopia reproduces a similar situation, thus illustrating the negative aspects of a person's political de-subjectivity and the formation of an ideal society, which corresponds to a consumer society. Politics becomes comprehensive and absolute, representing communication, relationships that manifest themselves at three main levels: human-society, human-state and human-human.

The pursuit of an ideal has a twofold character, rational-irrational. A purely pragmatic beginning is rational in this case – the desire to live in a better political system is not for the sake of perfection. Utopia as an ideal system provides not only happiness for each of its citizens, but also the provision of all its needs. That is, it is about the utilitarian nature of utopia:

²⁸ O. Stovpets, “Chinese legal-philosophic syncretism and its influence to value orientations of the Chinese society”, in *Skebid*, 2019, vol. 1, no. 159, p. 55-60. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1\(159\).157856](http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1(159).157856)

a person, entering into a political relationship and forming a state, expects to satisfy his own needs, which will ensure him a decent existence. In this way, the concept of happiness is rationalised in utopia, as measured by indicators of necessity and need. This means that the pragmatic side of politics in utopia is being formed: the state and the person are mutually beneficial (the state is beneficial for human from the social and economic side, but a human for the state from political support perspective).

Results and discussion

The irrational side of politics originates from the causes of the formation of utopia in itself. The concept of an ideal state is a kind of refuge that a man of the Renaissance seeks when the shift in speculative accents begins. This is displayed in the concept. A society dominating a person and a totalitarian state are mechanisms not of oppression of a person, but of his defence, creating the most comfortable environment for him. On the one hand, a person feels the need to shift responsibility for making significant decisions to other actors, because he is not ready for this, on the other hand, he needs certainty in his life. Certainty in this case is the main and most reliable guarantee of social comfort.

The rationale for the existence of an ideal state, and therefore politics, is a rational citizen, and the assumption that such a thing can exist is irrational in itself. One way or another, the rationality of any person is limited, and its activity will be tinged with irrational ones until emotions are ruled out. The latter, which is quite obvious, narrows a person as a subject and, in the end, completely dehumanises, turning it into a mechanism necessary for the life of the system. In addition, in both the institutional and the procedural sense, rationality brought to the extreme can be stated: the entire political system of the state, can and should be called ideal, built in the most reasonable way. The most reasonable, which is interesting, is in this case the application of the principle of harmony with nature, that is, it is in nature that a person draws wisdom that helps to perfectly organise his socio-political life. And yet, she is guided not only by rational aspirations of the greatest benefit for herself, but also by the desire to communicate, participate in politics and realise through her, which likens him to Aristotle, who is a political being by nature, that is, finds himself in communication²⁹.

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.

Thus, the foundations of the existence of politics in a utopia in the form in which we know about it are human needs as a rational component and emotions, in particular fear as irrational. The very emergence of utopia is a symbol of faith in the human mind, which constructs an ideal political system, especially considering that only God possessed such ability in the Middle Ages. But the emergence of dystopia is a symbol of the statement of irrationality, individualism as signs of the philosophy of the new era. However, for one and for the other, the base, on which the relations of politics arise, are constituted and institutionalised, remains unchanged. The closeness of political being to rationality determines a certain paradox of the political system of utopia and dystopia. This is especially noticeable in the latter, where the paradox is a special technique that allows, as if under a magnifying glass, to examine all the flaws of an ideal society³⁰. The authors have already paid attention to the role of a rational citizen for the institutionalisation of utopia. Its rationality is measured mainly by the ability to assess the possible benefits, that is, what it can get from the state, making certain efforts.

Actually, in our opinion, the concept of rational choice can be applied to a citizen of an ideal state in utopia: a person acts in such a way that he can get as much benefit as possible with minimal loss of resources. The only problem is that all people in utopia act according to one scheme and they all see the maximum benefit in one: the creation of a state in which, by applying equal efforts in the form of labour, people will receive equal benefits in the form of material wealth. In general, the wording resembles a well-known principle: from each according to his capabilities, to each according to his needs. Utopia defines a list of traits that should be inherent in the ideal citizen, that is, clearly defines the specifics of the ideal citizen in his relations with the state and society.

Moreover, such characteristics are predominantly functional and do not characterise a person in relation to herself, but only as an element of the system. In particular, the Utopians attribute to the ideal citizen hard work, a willingness to work for the good of their state and society as a whole, love for the motherland, respect for human life, a high sense of justice, and so on. All these qualities are necessary for a successful life of a citizen within the framework of the system and their support of this system. Thus, in T. More's Utopia for life in a system of absolute equality and the rejection of excessive abundance, the emphasis is on the fact that the Utopians did not value expensive clothes at all, neglected silk, and

³⁰ T. Portnova, "Genre and style interaction in solutions staged ballets of the nineteenth, twentieth centuries", in *Astra Salvensis*, 2018, vol. 6, no. 12, p. 689-694.

considered having gold even a shame. It is interesting that each of these traits, of course, will have a rational explanation, moreover, a logical one. For example, love of the homeland or willingness to work for the good of society can be measured in terms of protecting an ideal state in which a person feels comfortable.

Dystopia reduces patriotism inherent in utopia to fanaticism, and undemanding – to the perception of the needs imposed by the system. That is, the ideal citizen of dystopia, on the one hand, is absolutely rational, but, on the other hand, does not critically evaluate those products of the system that should make him happy. At the same time, we get a completely different form of happiness – associated with the satisfaction of the so-called “false needs”, which T. More defines as “euphoria in conditions of misfortune”. In fact, it is about satisfying needs, which brings happiness to the public majority, even if such happiness is demonstrative and unreal, which should lead the whole society to the idea that receiving the same good will make everyone happy. In this case, we can talk about the transition of the collective spirit into mass psychology.

Instead, the concept of homo consumens should be applied to the ideal citizen of dystopia. A person’s willingness to consume the benefits that the system offers him is a prerequisite for the existence of a political system, because this is the only way to protect a person from being interested in politics. This is the main task of the authorities in dystopia. Self-support of the system is possible only under such conditions, which may seem somewhat cruel to us, but in reality a person is inclined to ask himself the question: what will most choose more likely: freedom or comfort? And does she answer herself honestly? In an ontological sense, the following principles of rationalism can be distinguished: utility; happiness; the common good.

Among the principles of rationalism at the ontological level, the principle of utility is basic and system-forming. It, on the one hand, is the simplest and most understandable, on the other – the undoubted basis for the implementation of principles of a higher level, for example, happiness or the common good. Naturally, the very concept of utility makes us turn to utilitarianism – a political theory that emerges from this concept. It is appropriate to use the definition – the principle of utility, the authors call such a principle that approves or does not approve any action, depending on whether it has (as it seems to us) the desire to increase or decrease the happiness of the party whose interest is being dealt with, which in our opinion, is quite comprehensive and explains the very essence of the utility principle, without resorting to unnecessary detail.

For utopia, bilateral utility is relevant, which, however, tends to develop into one-sided utility. The point is that, as a person should benefit the state, so the state should benefit a person, it is on this that the existence of an ideal state of universal good is based. At the same time, the state exists with a single purpose: the happiness of every person and the whole society, therefore, the benefit to the state invariably means the benefit to a person. It is expected that the situation in dystopia, where the state turns into self-worth, takes on a mirror appearance. Understanding as the value of politics, and in particular – political power, and in the sense of value – goals, that is, the goals of political activity – is exactly what allows dystopias to demonstrate the inhumanity of the totalitarian regime at its very basis. That is, cruel examples of the past are not needed for this, just understanding the foundations of the existence of a totalitarian regime is enough.

Just as utopia justifies the existence of totalitarianism for the good of human, so dystopia (totalitarianism) condemns it. Of course, in both cases, it is about uncompromisingness and the rejection of any possible excuses of the condemned. However, in two things, utopia and dystopia inevitably converge. Firstly, the state should be useful to humans. This utility has different goals and different motives, but it is an indisputable element of the organisation of the political system. Secondly, the basis of utility for each person is manageability. Actually, we emphasise the latter, taking into account the specifics of the organisation of the management system. The maximum of rationality in making political decisions is the main principle of construction. Only if utopia offers an appeal to the elite – the best, most talented representatives of society (in the end, the meritocracy will turn to this, and we see its utopianism in this), then the dystopia is disappointed in human rationality and begins to return to the ideas of the final liberation of human from politics. The elite is gradually being supplanted, replaced by a machine, artificial intelligence, which should not and cannot inherently have irrational³¹³².

The usefulness of controllability is primarily the lack of the need for a person to worry about what is difficult, unpleasant and makes him spend his own time. Even despite the fact that T. More describes his system as

³¹ R. Klymenko, “The philosophical analysis of phenomenon of machine learning”, in *Philosophical Problems of Information Technologies and Cyberspace*, 2018, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 37-50. DOI 10.17726/philIT.2018.1.3

³² K. Rayhert, “The philosophical issues of the idea of conscious machines”, in *Skhid*, 2018, vol. 6, no. 152, p. 104-107. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.6\(152\).122367](http://dx.doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.6(152).122367)

typically democratic or close to democratic (at least according to the scheme of organisation of state power), this is where controllability takes place. At the same time, T. More understood a certain degree of the psychological basis of human existence, although he did not determine it. So, the desire to be useful can be correlated with the desire for self-fulfilment identified much later. It is the recognition on the part of society, human's abilities and his achievements, that is one of the indicators of self-realisation, which T. More actually fits into the relations of power: a person agrees to the honour and duty of power, because it means recognition.

Returning to rationality, we note that from it the understanding of the essence and specifics of the functioning of an ideal state proceeds. Given that people, and therefore society, are rational, they must understand that the state is ideal, that is, to embrace this property with the mind, and not with sensation. One could say that even here the irrational remains rejected, but it is more correct to formulate as: here the irrational is discarded in the first place. Because the very existence of the state depends only on whether its citizens perceive it useful. That is, an ideal state actually comes down to an optimal one, but not in terms of the functioning of political institutions and processes, but rather in terms of the sensation and understanding of its usefulness by each individual citizen. We consider this approach to be very progressive for the beginning of the 16th century, since it is based on subjectivity and individualism, which for a long time will not occupy a dominant position in political science. And let utopia level a person as a subject of politics, transferring public life to the jurisdiction of the most talented (useful to society), but its assessment remains important.

It is here, in our opinion, that it is worth returning to the topic of utilitarianism, in which we see the implementation of the principle of utopianism. That is, utilitarianism is largely derived from utopia, it is close to utopia in matters of building an optimal state based on the principle of utility, which will mean ensuring the happiness of the maximum number of members of society. True, utilitarianism removes the aspect of impracticability (general happiness in the conditions of the existence of the most effective institutions), which does not allow to call it utopia. Dystopia, given its typically post-modern format, rejects the utility aspect, viewing it as a negative phenomenon in the context of modern values. Actually, values become the cause of scrapping, changing priorities and transferring utility to the plane with a negative sign. The reason for this shift is the dehumanisation of man in a consumer society and the facilitation of human life due to material and technical progress.

For himself, a person sees utility in convenience, that is, in removing the maximum number of elements that make his life difficult. In dystopia, the main motive for human activity is to simplify life for themselves and for others, since anti-utopian society involves mutually beneficial exchange as the basis of life in society. That is, motivation still remains somewhat selfish, although when we talk about utopia or dystopia, we mean mainly the absolute superiority of society over human. The latter is embodied in the superiority of public interests, to which there is a rational explanation: the interests of each person are included in the interests of society, if these interests are rational and primary. In this case, a person is not interested in politics, because he realises that his interests will be respected. Moreover, in addition to agreeing with the thesis regarding universal human egoism, the authors consider it necessary, as already mentioned, to converge on the position of universal human laziness. This is what makes a person step back from political life and return to political participation only when the course pursued by the authorities does not meet his interests.

It is clear that in dystopia this is impossible. Therefore, a person agrees to be governed, for him it is even more useful than being able to influence political life, because by his intervention a person who has neither managerial talent nor the necessary knowledge and resources can only bring the political system out of balance which is so necessary for an ideal state. In the context of utility, it is also worth emphasising the role theory of behaviour, which is very clearly seen in both utopia and dystopia. The fulfilment of a certain clearly defined role is the use of certain clichés of behaviour, patterns applicable in each individual situation. However, the ideal state assumes a significant part of the functions that a person usually performs in everyday life. So, the roles are levelled, mainly related to the private life of a person, for example, the roles of parents and children.

It will not be a mistake to say that an ideal state leaves only one role for a person: the role of a citizen. The latter includes both political and economic aspects, since, as has already been mentioned, in utopia and dystopia there is a fusion of politics and economy, mainly due to the elimination of private property and the fulfilment by the state of basic economic functions, the absence of a market and market mechanisms. That is, a person can only function, not having a chance to interfere in political life. The basis of his activity remains the economic aspect, to meet the immediate needs of the whole society (including his own, given the specifics of the distributional justice of an ideal state), he is engaged in one

type of economic activity that he succeeds most³³. Of course, not considering those whose activities consist in the implementation of managerial functions. That is, a person's usefulness in utopia or dystopia is identical to the justice of Plato, where everyone is engaged in what corresponds to his talents and abilities, that is, what brings more benefit to society.

Returning to the specifics of the emergence of utopia, it is needed note that, being a whole product of the Renaissance, it reflects the general trends of its time, the main of which is a return to the ideals, including political ones, of Antiquity and their rethinking³⁴. It is from here that all the basic elements of utopia come from – typically aristocratic rule (focused on the “aristocracy of the spirit” rather than the aristocracy of blood), the idea of happiness, the prevalence of the public over the personal and, most importantly, the principle of the common good. In utopia, the latter has dual meanings: as a blessing to every person, the sum of which is society, and as the ultimate goal of the existence of a political system.

Everything is clear with the first interpretation, because in this case the common good is the manifestation of the principle of happiness in relation to each member of society. However, if the second interpretation did not exist, the authors would, firstly, not have to single out the principles of the common good, and secondly, there would be no problem of confronting individual interests and the good of the whole society. That is, it would not be necessary to separately mean that the life of one person, although it is valuable, does not have the same value as the quiet existence of the whole society. It looks as if utopia is oriented towards maintaining the status quo at all costs, even if human lives are at that cost. And this, despite the fact that it is precisely human, who utopia proclaims as an invaluable measure of all social life.

From this follows understanding of the common good as the ultimate goal of the existence of a political system. This goal is an unreachable single human mind and actually means a higher purpose. Do not forget that the first Utopians do not exclude the role of religion, in particular T. More was a famous opponent of the Reformation in England and a convinced Catholic. In our opinion, such an open religious

³³ V.A. Gnevasheva, “The specifics of the economic activity of modern Russian corporations”, in *Espacios*, 2019, vol. 40, no. 4, p. 21.

³⁴ S. Kulikov, “Interpretation of gnostic late antique texts as key to the uncommon principles for creation of modern programming”, in *Philosophical Problems of Information Technologies and Cyberspace*, 2018, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 22–36. DOI 10.17726/philIT.2018.1.2

orientation is due to the fact that Western civilisation is based on several principles, one of which is religion, and even more so – Christianity. The cradle of Western civilisation was Ancient Greece, however, without a doubt, the Christian church itself presented its final form and modern form. Utopians do not abandon religiosity, even though Utopia is formed as a secular political theory. Christianity is genetically embedded in Western civilisation, because it has aspired to it since its inception. That is why utopia remains within the framework of religious doctrine, although religion often takes on a different form.

The idea of a higher, common good, which will ensure the continuity of social development, the continuity of the historical tradition and the stability of the political system, is a kind of God's plan. In this context, the common good appears not only as a principle of organising a political system for the sake of all citizens of an ideal state, but also as a futurological orientation to the infinity of this state in space and time, because the example of utopia is considered by the authors of the corresponding concepts as a form in accordance with which politics should be organised, and as a model to strive for. That is, utopia is both the end of history and the path to it. Unlike all other concepts that regard the goals of political development as the end of history, utopia presents a situation in which political development does not stop even when the end of history is reached.

Despite the fact that utopia is already an ideal political system for any citizen, mainly due to what can make everyone happy, it continues to improve. The authors connect this moment with T. More's theory of utopia: taking into account the elements of generalisation and detail characteristic of utopia in order to remain an ideal political system for every citizen, utopia must be dynamic. That is why detailing concerns those areas that are easy to generalise (for example, material well-being), and generalisation is present in those areas where the desire for individuality is manifested faster and more clearly (leisure, in particular).

It is worth noting that the common good is the highest principle of the organisation of political life, all-encompassing and universal. We define the common good as the principle of organising social life, which implies the achievement of optimal and important goals for the whole society. And for utopia and dystopia, the primary element of the common good is the maintenance of the existing social system and the preservation of the state. That is, a necessary condition for the common good is maintaining the balance of the political system. In this regard, it is often

(erroneously, in our opinion) considered that the political system of utopia is deprived of such an important attribute as political development.

On the one hand, the thesis of the absence of political development in utopia may even seem justified. If the political system is perfect and, moreover, is constantly in a state of equilibrium, it has neither a purpose nor resources for development. That is, there are no internal contradictions between the desired and the real, which would serve as an impetus for development. Moreover, human is also perfect both morally and physically (a peculiar realisation of the ancient Greek principle of *kalokagathos* in its utopian interpretation), therefore his own internal aspirations and motives cannot cause shifts in the political system. In addition, it was mentioned earlier that in a utopia a person has no will to power, he perceives it as honour, service, duty, opportunity to be useful.

At the same time, utopia is not a simplified linear model that takes into account the satisfaction of basic human needs, but a space for imagination, creation and arrangement of human life in accordance with their own desires. Despite its frankly totalitarian character, utopia acts according to the principle of “what is not forbidden is allowed” and never – in connection with the opposite. Desiring submission (and agreeing to it), a person receives almost unlimited freedom to develop, without prejudice to his development of the whole society. This is the common good. That is, the state is the personification of the common good. Moreover, as in all totalitarian regimes, and in utopia and dystopia, the state is so merged with society that the good for society is identified with the good for the state. Obviously, given that the existence of the state is impossible without society, the assertion that social differentiation inevitably leads to the creation of the state is also true. However, in no regime there is such a pronounced interdependence between society and the state.

In the case of utopia, it is about dependence. If the totalitarian regimes of Europe of the 20th century were characterised by a clear dominance of the latter with the help of ideological propaganda, then in utopia it is even worth talking more about the dominance of society over the state. And not only because society is primary, and people themselves, with their support, actually agree to the existence of the state. The main reason is that in utopia, man is the goal, not the means. Utopia is characterised by the absence of propaganda as such; there is no need for such an instrument at all. A person, being quite rational, himself understands the need for state support. That is, the question of managing the masses does not arise, because the person himself in utopia is not a

mass type person. In general, the concept of mass cannot be applied to utopia, in utopia there is no mass, only society as a rational integrity and man as a rational unit.

Change comes only with the creation of dystopia, which responds to negative trends that appear in political theories of the twentieth century. Despite the fact that the main goal of dystopia is the desire to demonstrate the negative aspects and impact of totalitarianism on a person, all humanistic aspects of totalitarianism of utopia are levelled. The rationality of a person changes to the psychology of consumption and decision-making for reasons of his own benefit, which is measured not only and not so much by material well-being, but also by a developed entertainment industry, the purpose of which is to fill a person's free time (so that he suddenly does not start thinking of nothing to do). At the same time, propaganda is also developing with the entertainment industry, which should ensure demand for the already created proposal of ways of spending free time approved by the state.

No less important in this context is the change in the value orientations of the average person. The dystopian society is a mass society, which means that the person in it obeys the laws of mass psychology. For his conviction, not only propaganda is effective, but also other tools, for example, advertising and fashion. Typically, the consumer nature of human behaviour determines the occurrence of a state of suggestibility in him. Another reason for this condition is a change in the temporal dimension of human life. Despite the fact that material and technical progress and the development of medicine contribute to the growth of human life, he nevertheless experiences a constant lack of time. That is, the pace of life is growing, because a person is forced to adapt to a world that is changing faster and faster. The lack of time and life at an accelerated pace is reflected in a person's ability to analyse large flows of information. Or even sooner – on his desire to spend his time on it. Understanding at the same time his inability to influence most events, a person chooses passive consumption of information, aimless absorption of as large volumes as possible³⁵.

That is why in dystopia, the common good takes a different form, turning into the possibility of a carefree existence without the need to make decisions independently. For this, a totalitarian state is needed, the purpose of which is to approve and ensure such a way of life that will bring

³⁵ K.R. Nurgali, K.M. Baytanasova, J.K. Kishkenbaeva, "Author's role in the literary field by the example of Kazakh literature", in *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 2013, vol. 25, no. 9, p. 1290-1294.

a person maximum pleasure, accepted and promoted by the state. At the same time, unlike utopia, a person no longer has space for self-development, but rather, judging by books about dystopia, for degradation and self-destruction. The state offers him this space in various areas of entertainment, encouraging a hedonistic way of life, and mandatory work for a person is a source of happiness (self-realisation) in utopias, turns into a guarantee of receiving a reward in the form of a position in society, and as a result of this state – the possibility of receiving entertainment and pleasure. Moreover, the common good is centred round the preservation of the state and the alienation of human from politics. The influence of a person on an ideal state is seen as destructive rather than constructive, being ignorant of politics, an ordinary citizen should not participate in governance.

Thus, in the ontological plane, the principles of rationalism mean a rational organisation of the political system in such a way that every citizen will consider it optimal. In general, in the utopian and dystopian theories, three principles of rationalism can be distinguished: utility, happiness and the common good, each of which is a logical continuation of the previous one and can only be realised when it is implemented. The difference in the implementation of the principles of rationalism in the ontological plane is associated with the specifics of the value system, which defines utopia and dystopia. At the same time, the mechanisms and forms of the relationship between human and the state, which are determined through the implementation of the principles of rationalism, are also different.

The equal significance of the lives of different individuals grows into the fact that utopia emphasises equality, which is qualitatively new compared to what was declared in previous eras. For T. More, people are equal by nature, and this equality is transferred to social relations. Subsequently, this option of equality is reflected in liberal theories and theories of democracy. Equality in classical utopias also embraces the equal development opportunities of each individual, including the possibility of gaining a place in the power elite, which depends solely on abilities. The ideal state, under the influence of utopia, turns into a state of general equality, and exactly in classical utopias the first tendencies of equalising men and women appear. So T. More on this issue gives women even more freedom – they can be officials and clergy.

Under the influence of utopia, the coordinate system itself is transformed, in which a person is considered: now we can talk about him in the categories of equality and self-worth. This is noticeable in the further development of political thought. Even though a person is important to

utopia precisely as part of society, its importance is growing compared with other historical eras. The specificity of utopia is that it “upholds a different system of social and legal values – this is, first and foremost, equality and justice, which are carried out subject to mandatory material (and sometimes spiritual, cultural), status equalisation. It is such a value system that determines the coordinates in which a person exists.

The restriction of ownership entails the manifestation of the totalitarian features of the political regime, however, even in this case it does not act for self-reproduction, but to ensure the highest public good, which is the happiness of all citizens. As a result, we get a regime that can be called humanistic totalitarianism: despite the fact that a person is completely subordinate to the state and society and must build his activities in accordance with common interests, his happiness is still the purpose of the existence of just such a socio-political system. That is, despite the mechanisms for achieving the goal, utopia is a society that would guarantee an ideal existence to everyone, and therefore any means in utopia are justified by the goal of the existence of an ideal society and the existence of an ideal society as the goal of political development.

The totalitarian or semi-totalitarian character of an ideal state is mainly dictated by the political realities of the time in which utopias arise. In this case, it involves not so much complete control over a person for the sake of control itself, but rather for his own sake. The point is that such control is necessary in order to protect people from people. Although utopia declares the value of a person as such, the mechanisms of his protection at the institutional level have not yet been worked out, so they are replaced by total control by the state and society. The problem of utopia is that it strives for an ideal life, forced goodness, rationalisation of human tragedy without a real transformation of man and the world. That is, a person remains capable of speaking out against the system and crimes against another person.