

Anastasiia Kalinina

National University "Jdesa Law Academy"

INFLUENCE OF THE MASSIVIZATION PROCESSES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN TOTALITARIAN TRENDS

This paper analyzes and covers how the massivization of society and of culture, and the processes of massivization in general, results the totalitarization of political regime. Also the concepts and theoretical features of "mass society" and "mass culture" are revealed. Author considered the views of different scientists to the theory and for origin of mass society which enable to trace its evolution and adaptation processes for the conditions of modernity. The explorations of national and foreign scholars which studied the problems of the essence of massivization are analyzed. The special attention is concentrated on the problem of formation of mass society in the modern conditions of human development, because massivization, in all of its forms helps to create the conditions which are necessary to establish the totalitarian regime in the state.

Key words: massivization, totalitarization, mass culture, massivization process, political regime

The modern world is characterized by the process of massivization of society, which supposedly started in the end of the XIX century. The determining factor of this phenomenon is the increasing of mass role in cultural, spiritual and political life of society.

In its turn, the XX century was a century of crises in economic, political, social and cultural spheres. Union of these crises led to two world wars, revolutions, change of the globe map on which totalitarian states have appeared, and to emergence of mass culture which has become a certain form of manifestation of this crises.

Interest to the phenomenon of mass culture appeared long time ago; and today there are a lot of researches, theories and concepts of "mass culture". Authors of the most of them are inclined to consider it to be a particular social phenomenon with its own genesis, specificity and development trends.

The nature of mass society is characterized by commonness of consciousness for masses i.e. mass consciousness. Mass consciousness is formed through imposing of stereotyped thinking and behavior models by a manipulator.

In its turn, the actuality of the article is in the fact that according to the most of researchers, formation of a mass society and mass culture are not utterly spontaneous processes, they are quite substantive and complicated social phenomena influencing directly on the trends of development of a society and state in general; and these trends influence the way of development and destination of a society: either it will reach liberalization or totalitarianism.

The aim of the paper is to understand the essence of totalitarian trends in the context of modernity; to analyze the influence of processes of massivization of society on these tendencies, and as a result omnipresent development of mass culture.

The first attempts to comprehend this phenomenon are connected with the researches conducted by G. Lebon and G. Tard who associated the issue of mass culture with the appearance of mass society. This was highlighted by H. Arendt, the central issue of her scientific research was exactly the phenomenon of mass society as a forerunner for development of totalitarianism. Today scientists haven't yet achieved consensus for evaluation of these phenomena. Some scholars consider them utterly negative phenomena; in particular, representatives of the Frankfurt school such as T. Adorno, E. Fromm, M. Horkheimer, H. Marcuze who made an accent on some negative moments that appear in conditions of mass society in economics, politics and, as a result, in spiritual life.

The second half of the XX century is characterized by appearance of a great number of works mainly by West European scientists such as H. Arendt, D. Bell, E. Kanetti, G. Lebon, P. Lazarsfeld, L. Lovental, D. Macdonald, K. Manheim, A. Moravia, S. Moskovichi, J. Ortega-y-Gasset, B. Rosenberg, G. Sorel, A. Toffler, G. Fridman, Z. Freud, E. Fromm, R. Hogart, O. Spengler, T. Elit, C. Jung, K. Jaspers, and other scientists that highlighted the issue of appearance of mass culture in a different way.

Some aspects of the phenomenon of massivization and mass as its product were highlighted in researches of P. Gurevich, P. Zaharov, A. Koliev, A. Kosarev, G. Oboturova, V. Polosin, G. Pocheptsov, etc.

Speaking about researching of masses in the second half of the XX century we proceed from the fact that many of these issues have already been discussed, but since the 30's of the XX century they have acquired not only particular significance but a new aspect. Presenting modern interpretations of mass and their role in life of society, scientists, as a rule, point out two main issues that determine the exploration of the mass role in a society. These are the issues of "mass society" and "totalitarianism".

In accordance with stated above, it is worthwhile to define what mass society is. We may suggest the following definition of this notion: mass society is a standardized society, or it is a society where standard reigns.

The appearance and development of the mass type of society is furthered by a diversity of factors, but main role belongs to scientific technical progress and development of mass media, as its integral part, which actively use growing possibilities of multimedia and communication technologies. As a result the latter take the leading role in spreading of all kinds of information and formation of so called mass culture. K. Jaspers was aware of such course of events. He believed that the mankind is on the verge of a new "axial period", the first one in history, when the globe will be united by the net of telecommunications. This can turn out to be a critical point in a spiritual development of the mankind.

Along with scientific and technical progress and development of mass media, mass production and mass consuming come out in a great scale, which leads to a certain standardization of needs and means of their satisfaction. "Masses appear where people are deprived of their true face, roots and soil, where they became ruled and interchangeable. All this happen as a result of technical development and is reaching increased intensity in its following features: [...] compulsory, senseless work; entertainment as a filling of leisure time; life as a permanent nervous tension..."¹. Hence the dominance of mass, according to K. Jaspers, is a phenomenon of the contemporary world; moreover, it is typical for all states with a high technical development.

Herewith totalitarianism may be interpreted as a reaction of "a mass person" to political, social and economic crises: revolutions, civil wars, lingering armed conflicts, economical crises. These phenomena, as a rule, are accompanied by a mass marginalization of population, i.e. by appearance of a great number of people "threw out" of their social groups (class, professional, family, national ones, etc.). It is worthwhile to note that marginalization is individual's being out of his/her social group, and break with group sociocultural norms, which are caused by some circumstances (e.g., migration, urbanization, decrease in living standards, etc.). The result of a collapse of traditional structures is the appearance of atomized (with weakened social links) people who are a convenient object for manipulation. Atomized mass is most vulnerable to watchwords of totalitarian leaders who offer a new consolidating base – an ideology which creates an illusion of union of an individual to a class, race or to the state. Unfortunately, an example of an exactly such "reaction" from population may be observed in contemporary Russia, where massivization of society has reached its critical point; and openly authoritarian regime of the president V. Putin is acquiring features of classical totalitarianism.

This fact may be explained by a historical example of emergence of totalitarian parties in European states of the XX century, the latter having aimed predominantly at seizure of power. They aspired to receive a support of as greater masses as possible; and population, as a result of wars and crises, were requiring changes of social and economic conditions and supported radical ideologies because of consequences of rapid historical changes. Exactly these ideas, formed by that time in mass consciousness, were offered by extreme left and extreme right parties whose rise to power depended on their ability to understand not only mass needs but also psychological peculiarities of atomized individuals².

In this case K. Manheim's point of view is regarded actual. According to K. Manheim, ideologies play a tremendous role in mass society, but their simultaneous existence entails "crisis of evaluations". The latter looks as follows: historical religious and moral unity that had served as an integrating force of the medieval society was substituted by secularized systems of liberalism and socialism. And before everybody understood that the future depended on the struggle between these two points of view, a new ideological

¹ Ясперс, К. (1991). *Смысл и назначение истории*. Москва: Политиздат, 143.

² Токарева, В.И. (1998). Социальный менеджмент: об историческом опыте управления в тоталитарных режимах. *Вестник Донецкой государственной академии управления*, 2, 85.

system has appeared – the system of “universal fascism”, so different from others that the internal difference between these two has disappeared¹.

Besides, it is also necessary to draw attention to mass culture as a particular phenomenon objectively begotten by the processes of industrialization, and nowadays is developed under the effect of transit of a developed society to postindustrial, informational culture. The essence of mass culture reflects objective laws of development of many, especially West European, peoples of the latest centuries when traditional culture turned out unable to function in respect of large-scale associations of people (e.g., residents of megalopolis) and to particular subjects of cultural practice².

Modernization is producing new forms of accustoming of an individual (exactly individual, but not personality) to sociocultural practice, causing the diverse manifestations of mass culture in various spheres of activity. Thus, mass secondary school has been formed in the process of children’s socialization; mass media have developed in the sphere of cultural communications; mass movements and parties have appeared in political life; mass consumer needs and prestige services standards have appeared in consumption of gifts of life, spending leisure time.

Products of mass culture are manufactured by professional specialists in the sphere of consumer needs, science, education, politics, mass arts, and also advertisement which mostly plays a decisive role in choosing one or other product or service. Spreading all over the world these products as a rule don’t bear mastery, developing basis and artistic value that folk traditional culture is usually endowed with. Many of them are deprived of any ethnic features at all. In development of modern mass culture such fundamentals as commercial purposes and orientation at creation of goods, services, artistic values directed for standardized tastes may be pointed out. Mass, or popular, culture doesn’t express any exquisite tastes of aristocracy or spiritual search of people. The time of its impetuous distribution is the middle of the XX century when mass media (radio, printing press, television, recording and tape-recorders) penetrated into most states of the world and became available to representatives of all social strata. Mass culture may be international and national³. Pop music and circus are some examples of mass culture. They are understandable and available to all ages, all strata of population regardless of the level of education. Mass culture is associated with unification, standardization of the spiritual in the personality and society.

Modern technique and technologies, computers have created a tightly interconnected but interchangeable world which can simplify fulfilling of wishes and demands of a person again due to their standardization. For some members of society, computer and the net world has virtually completely replaced reality, it was particularly brightly manifested after creation of social network having no age limit, have replaced living communication and promoting spread of any information.

Herewith all possibilities of informational progress of the XXI century allow government via television, press and the Internet to use modern psychological impact aimed at zombification and suppressing of person’s will, controlling of thoughts, political views and behavior.

All this takes place simultaneously with attempts to establish tight control over mass media and to introduce unspoken caste social system.

Hence, mass society became possible because within one generation there a transition from the culture of word to the culture of “visual images” (radio, comics, placards, television, etc.) has been made. S. Moskovichi in his work “The epoch of the crowd” emphasizes that typography has created a base for critical thinking⁴. Modern mass media is a technical base for automatic, non-critical and very often dependent thinking. As far as the work of S. Moskovichi was published in 1981 it should be added that nowadays we deal with the epoch of computerizing and the Internet wiping off all space boundaries that leads to globalization and speeds it up. He draws particular attention to the fact that mass consciousness is not just exposed to unprecedented manipulation, in many respects it is determined by myths, different beliefs, secular but not just traditional religions. The measure of manipulation itself in many respects is determined by an increased power and possibilities of governmental machine. According to his viewpoint

¹ Мангейм, К. (1994). *Диагноз нашего времени*. Москва: Юрист, 289.

² Кириллов, И. (2005). *Массовое сознание. Структура. Генезис. Сущностные характеристики*. Томск, 66.

³ Джокадзе, И. (2007). Массовое общество и демократический тоталитаризм: свобода без выбора. *Литературно-философский журнал: Логос*, 1(59).

<http://www.ruthenia.ru/logos/number/2001_5_6/04.htm> (2014, November, 7).

⁴ Московичи, С. (1996). *Век толп*. Москва: Центр психологии и психотерапии, 90.

we deal with the strategy of mass hypnosis and collective suggestion. Hypnosis is extracted from the sphere of medicine and introduced into social sphere, into culture as a paradigm of normal relations¹.

At the same time we should not only focus on informational power, its decisive influence on massivization of society and development of mass culture; it is also necessary to note a radically changed system of economic life.

Use of new technologies in manufacturing allows to produce cheaper goods that are often of a higher quality that makes it more competitive. But introducing of new technologies into manufacturing demands financial expenses, which is only possible for rather big corporations, and this irreversibly leads to monopolization of the market.

Modern manufacturing in many respects finds itself aimed at producing of mass standardized goods. Thereafter consuming e.g. clothes, leisure, medicine, public transportation also becomes standardized. Standardization and unification become features of education and arts. Any activity turns into a certain conveyor. People start feeling themselves identical; artists and politicians look the same; and those who strikingly stand out of the crowd are considered odd.

Speaking about a successful economic development it is worthwhile to note that it may take place in terms quite different from the western interpretation of democracy. In fact, the one-party governing with a “strong leader”, censure in mass media, spreading of ideology of “national unity”, prosecution of the otherwise-minded and protesters, the state system of educating conformists loyal to authorities and herewith the “Open Door” policy for transnational corporations and all possible privileges for private business. All this in different degree and combination is typical for such states as Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea and Japan, and since the time of Deng Xiaoping many features of this model were adopted by China.

“Asian economic miracle” is provided, on the one hand, with cheapening of labor force by means of physical and political suppress of workers movement, and on the other hand, with intensification of labor with some measures of social paternalism and corporative morals contributing to massivization (e.g., Confucian traditions typical for the region).

Massivization of society is aggravated in the time of great social tension created by current social contradictions in economical, national-ethnic and political spheres. All this takes place in terms of weakness of institutes of population’s social defense. Under such conditions advantages of freedom become worthless under the burden of responsibility, which as an example can be observed in modern Ukraine.

Modern totalitarian trends emanate not only from a state, they are traced in limitation of the choice and censure in hypermarkets, in dependence of doctors and patients on pharmaceutical and insurance companies, in standardization in the system of education, in growth of the prison-manufacturing complex, in bureaucracy and disrespect for a consumer in commercial and state institutions.

In a mass society every individual is just a “small screw”, “atom”, and this eventually leads to growth of authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes.

References

1. Dzhokadze, I. (2007). Massovoe obshchestvo i demokraticeskij totalitarizm: svoboda bez vybora. *Literaturno-filosofskij zhurnal: Logos*, 1(59). <http://www.ruthenia.ru/logos/number/2001_5_6/04.htm> (2014, November, 7).
2. Jaspers, K. (1991). *Smysl i naznachenie istorii*. Moskva: Politizdat.
3. Kirillov, I. (2005). *Massovoe soznanie. Struktura. Genezis. Sushchnostnye kharakteristiki*. Tomsk.
4. Mangejm, K. (1994). *Diagnoz nashogo vremeni*. Moskva: Jurist.
5. Moskovichi, S. (1996). *Vek tolp*. Moskva: Centr psikhologii i psikhoterapii.
6. Moskovichi, S. (1998). *Psikhologija mass*. Moskva: Bakhrakh.
7. Tokareva, V.I. (1998). Social'nyj menedzhment: ob istoricheskom opyte upravlenija v totalitarnykh rezhimakh. *Vestnik Doneckoj gosudarstvennoj akademii upravlenija*, 2.

¹ Московици, С. (1998). *Психология масс*. Москва: Бахрах, 82.