

**Oleksandra Stebelska, PhD in Philosophy**

**Liubov Ukhach**

*Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine*

## **INTERPRETATION OF THE CATEGORIES “FREEDOM” AND “CONTROL” IN THE MODERN WORLD**

This article deals with the analysis of the concept of “freedom” and the comprehension of the possibilities of its existence within the society of total control. As a result of the critical analysis it is claimed that the phenomenon of control covers all spheres of human activity, but freedom finds the field of its manifestation and is the potency of a person that needs constant updating and realization. Otherwise a man will not be able to form as a Personality and to get engaged in adequate communicative practices with other people. Alongside with these issues, the authors also draw attention to the correlation of such concepts as “freedom and arbitrariness”, “freedom and power”, try to detail each of them, promoting their deeper understanding.

**Keywords:** freedom, control, power, arbitrariness, personality, communication.

**Formulation of the problem.** Modern society is characterized by significant social, economic, political and cultural changes. High-speed processes of globalization which change the look of humanity in general cover practically all spheres of life. The globalization processes receive an ambiguous treatment. On the one hand, globalization fixes important moments of unity and interconnection of certain branches of economy and culture of different countries of the world, promotes the creation of a single economic, financial and cultural field, promotes development of competition and rivalry, introduction of state-of-the art technologies, intensive dialogue between different cultures, nations and ethnic groups. On the other hand they (processes) have negative consequences: impoverishment of the population, constant progress of highly developed countries as a counterbalance to regress of provincial regions, obliteration of differences in cultures and loss of national identity, and thus intensification of nationalistic movements and protests. Globalization has led not only to spreading state-of-the art technologies but to high-speed dissemination of information. Modern society is an informational society characterized by fast production and transferring information. Information starts to dominate the world. The complication of our life results not only in the ability of every person to realize oneself, the ability to change the place of residence, the country, the culture and the religion, they also bring about the intensification of the control of our lives by power structures. This desire in itself is not something negative. We all live in a society and realize the necessity of certain control and organization of our lives. Though this desire often exceeds the limits, the tendency that allow numerous researchers suggest that we live in the era of total control. That is why the problem of freedom, its ability to exist, roots of origin, etc. stimulates researchers' interest. To the author's mind the problem is complicated by the research in the field of science. Modern physiologists put our consciousness in dependence on neurophysiological processes, and representatives of the theory of artificial intelligence try to recreate mental activity on the basis of research, thereby denying the substantiality and uniqueness of our consciousness. Therefore, it is not surprising that a human poses the question: am I free? Isn't my existence a result of certain physical processes or various manipulations, are we not just puppets in the hands of unknown forces? All these contemplations suggested the authors the idea of the present research.

Therefore **the purpose** of this research is to identify and justify the phenomenon of control in a society, to analyze the relationship between control and freedom in the life of a modern person, to identify the roots, limits and opportunities of freedom, to analyze the correlations “freedom – arbitrariness” and “freedom – power”

**Development of issues under research.** This topic was of great concern to many philosophers, from the era of antiquity till present time. Today it is difficult to mention all the researchers, but it should be noted that there is thorough development of the problem of freedom by B. Spinoza, by representatives of the German classical philosophy (I. Kant, J. Fichte, F. Schelling, G. W. F. Hegel), by existentialists J-P. Sartre and K. Jaspers, by the followers of the personality theory of M. Berdiaev and M. Losky,

by neofreudists, in particular, E. Fromm. Despite the fact that the philosophers showed various aspects of the understanding of freedom, they are united by a positive understanding of it: not as freedom-from, but as freedom-for. Understanding freedom through its political and economic manifestations can be seen in the writings of F. Hayek and M. Friedman. In the modern philosophy H. Arendt, M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno, H. Marcuse, Y. Habermas, M. Foucault, T. Ball dedicated a number of pages of their works to the problem of the relationship of freedom and power. G. Deleuze and J. Baudrillard raised the question of the formation of a personality in a society of total control.

**Presenting the main material.** In the process of development and changes in all spheres of human life, the administrative bodies, power structures that take control of our lives become complicated too. It is not surprising that G. Deleuze calls our society a society of control, which has replaced disciplinary societies<sup>1</sup>. A social system consists of four main areas: economic, political, social and spiritual, and the policy of domination is manifested in each of them.

It may seem that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the world economy has passed into a phase of domination of a market economy. However, the market economy also faces a number of financial, environmental and food issues. In addition, with the development of a market economy a number of enterprises are able to fully capture the market as a result of intense competition, in other words, to monopolize it. For more than a century the problem of monopolization of economic life has caused sharp controversy and discussions of economists. After all, there is no unambiguous view of whether monopolization is really such a destructive phenomenon. Monopolization has its advantages and disadvantages. The fact that the products of the monopolists are of the higher quality, which makes it possible to seize power and control of the market, can be attributed to the advantages. Monopolies have more resources and opportunities for any innovations and new technologies. From this point of view, the process of monopolization is absolutely logical and consistent, it is even beneficial, to some extent, to the society, which aims at the development and production of increasingly high-quality products. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to destroy monopolies. However, monopolies also have certain disadvantages. In particular, monopolization processes lead to such a large-scale market control which practically undermines and destroys competition. Monopolies can artificially overestimate the prices of their products, that causes the impoverishment of the population. Monopolies are capable of deliberate distorting of information about the cost of products, blocking the normal functioning of the market. "All that prevents prices to freely reflect the supply and demand of the market, impedes the process of transferring accurate information. One of the examples is the private monopoly, that is, the exercise of control by one manufacturer or association of producers over some specific goods. Monopolies do not interfere with the communication of information by means of prices, but they distort the information communicated"<sup>2</sup>. In addition, strengthening of monopolies leads to strengthening of their political power and possibility of capturing it. As a result, monopolists can, at their own discretion, use their resources without taking care of the needs of society. We may encounter a situation when a society will work for the benefit of the monopolies but not monopolies benefit a society. Investigating the influence of the economic life on all the other spheres of our life, F. Hayek wrote that "the power governing economic activity will control not only the material aspects of life. It is in charge of the distribution of the limited funds necessary to achieve any of our goals. And whoever this supreme controller would be if he had the funds available, he would have to decide which goals were worthy of realization and which were not"<sup>3</sup>. Thus monopoly can become that supreme controller. In particular, the phenomenon of lobbying, which means the certain influence of non-state representatives on the adoption and approval of laws in the monopolies' interests, is widespread.

Control and domination permeate the entire political life of a society. Unfortunately, it is not a secret to anyone that not always the best sons of mankind are coming to power. The politician is involved in a game that, as a rule, has no rules, and is willing to do anything to achieve the goal. Acting like this, he transcends all the moral limits and sacrifices the moral values: the purpose justifies the means. And the goal is actually the achievement of power. But over who? The elite and intellectuals are beyond his interests, because of their diverse views and tastes, it is more difficult to organize them under the aegis of a politician, to achieve their unanimity. So the goal becomes the stratum of the population, which has a lower intellectual and moral level, has rougher taste and is guided by instincts. They are people

<sup>1</sup> Делёз, Ж. Общество контроля. *Электронная библиотека irms.ru*. <<http://www.irms.ru/delez.html>> (2017, October, 22).

<sup>2</sup> Фридмен, М., Хайек, Ф. (2003). *О свободе*. Москва: «Социум», «Три квадрата», 39.

<sup>3</sup> Хайек, Ф. (2005). *Дорога к рабству*. Москва: Новое издательство, 106.

of the crowd, the masses that are easy to manipulate and manage. They are the people to whom the words of politicians who are not interested in the truth are first and foremost addressed. Any discussion turns into a spoken and semantic game, the true meaning is obscured. There is a simulation of the crisis of the political sphere, which results in the formation of such a hyperreality, which has nothing to do with the present state of affairs. Thus the politician is given a possibility of manipulating and influencing the masses of the population and using their votes in his interests. As a result, J. Baudrillard once called the war in the Persian Gulf simulacrum, since we almost do not have access to objective reality<sup>1</sup>. It is nothing but logical to ask a question: do we know what's going on in the world? Do not we live in a matrix? Manipulative practices applied to our consciousness are quite common. The representatives of the Frankfurt school raised this question, believing that the personality is alienated, he is under the influence of those power structures that dominate and thus subjugate the personality. Mass media structures use thoroughly developed methodology and techniques in order to gain mass support. It is noticeable to the naked eye that politicians belonging to different political camps do not neglect them. Authorities are changing, but the methods remain the same. T. Adorno in the "Research of Authoritarian Personality" classified and structured these methods<sup>2</sup>. Pre-election campaigns remind wild frenzy, during which candidates for positions use a variety of ways (and "dirty" among them), trying to capture the audience's attention. Often, the technique of "washing dirty linen" distracts the attention of the masses from really important things, such as candidates' programs. In this regard, there are questions about the justification and adequacy of the democratic system that prevails in most modern countries. Even Plato made certain judgments about the shortcomings of the democratic regime in the eighth book of his "The Republic". It is indicative that listing the weaknesses of the democratic system, namely: consumerism, selfishness, the unwillingness of citizens to adhere to the laws, he notes that "excessive freedom for an individual and for a state turns into nothing else, but in excessive slavery"<sup>3</sup>. The philosopher managed to clearly articulate those "diseases" of a democratic system. On the one hand, democracy offers different alternatives of its development. On the other hand, they cause chaos and confusion. Not for the first time, we are confronted with the diversity of parties and candidates, which complicates the process of choosing and defining a clear position. Therefore, not those politicians who really deserve it come into power but those who are able to exercise influence on us. In addition T. Adorno noticed that often radically – minded forces screen behind democracy to achieve their own goals. "Democratic mask" is one of these tricks<sup>4</sup>. Criticizing democracy for the sake of democracy itself, these forces use it to seize power and impose their own regime. Democracy and its ideals are converted into a modest coin. Therefore, the issue of the compliance of our democratic principles with the realities that we face in real world is still relevant.

The phenomenon of control also covers the social and spiritual spheres of society. This subject was raised by the author in one of her articles<sup>5</sup>. The modern world is characterized by the fact that the situation of the Other is leveled off. We do not record the Other as Equal to Us. The reason lies in the selfishness of a person who exalts himself, in fact, "I", forgetting that he is surrounded by Others. Others are just a means to meet our needs. Our "I" is outgrowing to such extent that it seeks to eliminate anything Not-like-me, subordinate it, capture it, impose his own views and type of thinking. We cease to perceive everything that does not fit into our coordinate system, falling into a situation of indifference as a "no-difference". However, in this process, we destroy not only the Other but also ourselves. As a result, we face a phenomenon of a disembodied mass, which becomes the focus of research for many scientists like Z. Freud, E. Fromm, H. Ortega y Gasset, J. Baudrillard, Y. Evola. Since mass is the result of a violation of adequate communicative practices, it is easy to control it satisfying its requirements. Therefore, it is no wonder that Z. Freud noted that mass – is a step back in human progress, because a person as a part of mass turns into a barbarian, which begins to be guided by his own instincts. "It is extremely easy to persuade a mass, it is gullible, deprived of criticism, it believes in everything. Mass thinks in images which create

<sup>1</sup> Бодрийяр, Ж. (2016). *Дух терроризма. Войны в заливе не было*. Москва: РИПОЛ классик.

<sup>2</sup> Адорно, Т. Исследование авторитарной личности. *Электронная библиотека gumer.info*. <[http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/index.php](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/index.php)> (2017, October, 22).

<sup>3</sup> Платон (2007). *Государство*, 3, (с. 415). Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петерб. ун-та; «Изд-во Олега Абышко».

<sup>4</sup> Адорно, Т. Исследование авторитарной личности. *Электронная библиотека gumer.info*. <[http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/31.php](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/31.php)> (2017, October, 22)

<sup>5</sup> Стебельська, О. (2017). Байдужість як вияв кризових процесів у духовному житті суспільства. *Evropsky filosoficky a historicky diskurz*, 1, 144-149.

one another in the same way as they appear in the individual's state of daydreaming. They can not be judged by any intelligent instance by analogy with reality. The feelings of the mass are always very simple and excessive. Therefore, the mass knows no doubts or hesitations"<sup>1</sup>. Within the limits of mass everything automatically loses its originality and uniqueness. The masses have never been interested in the truth, which is an empty sound for them. They want only "bread and circuses". The masses require to be treated with force and violence. They want to be possessed. Accordingly, society becomes a system of domination, in which everyone takes his place, plays his role and has his own functions. The question of dependence of our consciousness on the system was raised in such films as "Gattaca", "Snowden", "Sphere", "Equilibrium", where the producers raised the issue of the dependence of human consciousness on those socio-cultural conditions and situations in which a person lives. The mass is inert, incapable of critical thinking, analysis, and perspective vision, so it is used for the realization of private goals. Political battles are just one of the options for such an impact.

Advertising in the modern world has taken such powerful positions that no one doubts the power of its influence. Every day, television thrusts the best in manufactures' opinion products and goods on its audience. We do not even notice that when we go to a supermarket, we buy those products that manufacturers and advertisers urge us to buy. Therefore, it is not surprising that from time to time society is agitated by some novelties that are being spread instantly, and looks like a kind of hysteria: spinners, pokemon-go, the latest Iphone model, flashmob. Being under the influence of constant messaging, we lose our freedom. The worst thing is that a person is voluntarily subjected to such manipulations with his mentality, since such life is much easier and deprived of responsibility for his own choices. Freedom is now a burden for a person, it will not keep in tune with a person's life. For example, there are several techniques used by manufacturers and advertisers:

- most of people, protecting their right for a "free" choice, forget that the choice is limited to pre-selected options. Producers of goods give people only an illusion of free choice, protecting their own interests;
- we all seek for social approval. However, the mechanism for obtaining social approval is controlled by technology companies<sup>2</sup>

Science also tries to keep everything "under control", too. It is no wonder that Y. Habermas thinks that science, technology and ideology that dominates people's minds are in parallel. Science is based on the desire to conquer nature, and then – the man. The same is true of culture. We observe a process of an emasculation of culture, aimed at satisfying the most primitive human desires. Radio, cinema, art is the most ordinary business that produces primitive products aimed at shocking the public and affecting its perception. "They call themselves the industry, and made known sums of their general directors income eliminate any doubt that the public has a need in such kind of ultimate products"<sup>3</sup>. The powerfulness of the industry completely subdues a personality. Everyone is a cogwheel of the system of "gigantic economic machinery", which always keeps one in stress.

"From any film, from any radiobroadcast, it can be drawn that a social effect, can not be attributed to anybody individually, but only to all together"<sup>4</sup>. The cultural industry is such an entertaining business that dominates the masses, but it dominates indirectly giving them what they want<sup>5</sup>.

Such a system correlates with our mentality, which also becomes systemic, clear, rational and...totalitarian. Our mentality is a mentality of domination, which is regressive in its essence. We are trying to impose our ideas, thoughts, beliefs, ideals, ideologies on other people, leaving the right to be pre-eminent to ourselves.

This situation was appreciated by Z. Freud from the point of view of psychoanalysis. Culture uses an inherent person's energy to create certain means and mechanisms to protect the man from suffering.

<sup>1</sup> Фрейд, З. Массовая психология и анализ человеческого «Я». *Электронная библиотека nv-shulenina.narod.ru*. <[http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd\\_zigmund\\_massovaya\\_psihologiya\\_i\\_analiz\\_chelovecheskogo\\_ya.pdf](http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd_zigmund_massovaya_psihologiya_i_analiz_chelovecheskogo_ya.pdf)> (2017, october, 23)

<sup>2</sup> Харрис, Т. Как технологии овладевают нашими умами. *Электронная библиотека apparat.cc*. <<https://apparat.cc/human/how-technology-hijacks-our-minds/>> (2017, September, 20)

<sup>3</sup> Хоркхаймер, М., Адорно, Т. (1997). *Диалектика Просвещения: Филос. Фрагменты*. Москва: Медиум, 150.

<sup>4</sup> Хоркхаймер, М., Адорно, Т. (1997). *Диалектика Просвещения: Филос. Фрагменты*. Москва: Медиум, 158.

<sup>5</sup> Хоркхаймер, М., Адорно, Т. (1997). *Диалектика Просвещения: Филос. Фрагменты*. Москва: Медиум, 170.

However, it restricts people into a continuous manifestation of their own desires and instant satisfaction of their own needs. Culture always acts through the control and limitation of our internal impulses and instincts and directs them into the right path. And no one is able to change this situation. On the other hand, these restrictions are often excessive, causing the neuroticism of human civilization. Therefore, Freud only hopes: “I want to think that there should be some sort of rearrangement of human society, after which the sources of dissatisfaction with culture are exhausted, the culture stops coercing and suppressing desires, so that people won’t suffer hardships of psychic discord, but will be able to engage in procuring good and enjoy it. It would be a golden age...”<sup>1</sup>

In connection with above mentioned it is logical to ask a question: what is the point of all the reasoning about freedom? Does a man possess freedom? If so, what is its place in our lives? And if not, do not we live in hyperreality?

To begin with, it is necessary to determine the meaning of the term “freedom”. The word “freedom” has an Indo-European basis and comes from the words s (u) e-bho-, s (u) o-bho. An Old Slavic word *собъство*, denoting communion *was formed* on the basis of these words. Therefore, it can be argued that the idea of belonging to a collective, to one’s kinship group, nation, and ethnic group was always associated with the notion of freedom<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, a person who can be called a free person is one who is among his kin, the one who got familiarized, developed his environment, and “fits” in the community of people. Thus understanding of freedom as independence and autonomy is not entirely adequate, since freedom is first and foremost linked with unity, harmony with the whole world, familiarizing with everything, under the condition that such interaction is productive and effective. Personality as its part becomes a full value part of a single whole<sup>3</sup>. This freedom is completely opposed to arbitrariness, because arbitrariness is the ability of a person to take care only of himself. A person does only what satisfies his own needs without considering Others. Arbitrariness is destructive in nature, as it causes the collapse of adequate communicative practices and undermines the healthy functioning of society. In addition, it involves a person’s dependence on her emotional state, subjugation to inner passions and instincts. While freedom is associated with the ability of inner control of actions on the basis of a meaningful approach and analysis of real world situations encountered by a person; it involves responsibility for one’s own actions, focused considering the rights and needs of other people, their thoughts and desires. Such an understanding of freedom is fully consistent with the classical approach to its comprehension. I. Kant wrote: “... But what else can freedom of the will be, if not an autonomy, that is, the will is the law to itself?”<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, philosophers understood freedom as a recognized necessity, because freedom is always realized within the limits of necessities. Despite numerous negative examples where people are put in dependence on external factors, we should say that freedom is an inherent concept of a human. In the course of the development of civilization there are a lot of examples of a human’s free self-realization. It manifests itself in the situations when a person is able to resist the system and, using his inner energy and strength, to make his own choices that would contribute to the development of the Whole. Whatever restrictions a person would encounter (and they will always be!), he has an opportunity to express his opinion about a particular situation. Perhaps we can not change the situation, but we are able to change the attitude towards it. Freedom means “not to be afraid of men or gods; not to desire either shameful or unnecessary; to become an absolute master of oneself. Because to belong to oneself is an invaluable good”<sup>5</sup>. Even when there is a limited number of alternatives to a particular action, a person is able to choose none or find another way to solve the problem. The human is doomed to freedom<sup>6</sup>. Even the fact that we are able to realize the problematic nature of the existence of freedom in our world shows that there is a reflection, and hence the potency of freedom. The situation looks as though we “kick” freedom out behind the door and it “slips” in through the window. A striking example is a personality of Oscar Schindler, a German industrialist who, during the Second World War, saved about 1200 Jews, giving them jobs at his factories in Poland and Czech

<sup>1</sup> Фрейд, З. Будущее одной иллюзии. *Электронная библиотека nv-shulenina.narod.ru*.

<[http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd\\_zigmund\\_budushee\\_odnoy\\_illyuzii.pdf](http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd_zigmund_budushee_odnoy_illyuzii.pdf)> (2017, September, 20).

<sup>2</sup> Черных, П.Я. (1994). *Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка*, 2. Москва: Рус. Яз, 148.

<sup>3</sup> Богачков, Е.В. Этимология и корневое значение слова «свобода». *Электронная библиотека trinitas.ru*.

<<http://www.trinitas.ru/rus/doc/0216/004a/02160001.htm>> (2017, October, 22).

<sup>4</sup> Кант, И. (1994). *Основоположения метафизики нравов*, 4. Москва: «Чоро», 225.

<sup>5</sup> Сенека. Письма к Луцилию. *Электронная библиотека psylib.ukrweb.net*.

<<http://www.psylib.ukrweb.net/books/senek03/txt075.htm>> (2017, October, 23).

<sup>6</sup> Сартр, Ж.-П. (2000). *Бытие и ничто: опыт феноменологической онтологии*. Москва: Республика, 159.

Republic. Subsequently, his life story was described in the book “The Ark of Schindler” and in its screen version “Schindler’s List”. His actions testify to the powerful strength of the spirit of a person, a person who did not dance to the tune of the system and was able to resist, courageously and without hesitation. Another example is a well-known activity of Mahatma Gandhi, who actively applied the policy of non-violence, breaking the established stereotypes of the struggle. In the author’s opinion, even S. Milgrem’s experiment is illustrative of the phenomenon of freedom. Under the terms of the experiment, volunteers were divided into two groups: “students” and “teachers”. The “students” had to learn the words from the provided list. The “teachers” also checked how well the “students” learned them and punished for every error with electric current, increasing its tension for each subsequent wrong answer. The results of the experiment shocked the scientists, because most of the “teachers” were ready to hurt their wards, performing the task of the experimenter. According to S. Milgrem, “the experiment shows how deeply rooted is a person’s inclination to submit to the authorities and how easy it is to force a person to submit, even if he understands that his humility inflicts harm on another person”<sup>1</sup>. It becomes clear why authorities are so easy to achieve the obedience from the ordinary citizens. This experiment is paradoxical, because, on the one hand, it proves that people are not able to think independently and are ready to submit to authority, on the other hand, according to the results of the experiment, there was a group of people who, in the process of conducting it, though at a later stage, still refused to participate in the experiment. So, it shows that all the same people possess a potential of freedom, which like a spark illuminates and comprehends their existence. The task of the person is to actualize his own capabilities. The same as a person is born only as a biological organism, and in the course of life, he must assert his right to be called a Personality, in the same way a person must enjoy freedom as a potential of his life. To live exercising freedom requires courage and patience, qualities that few people possess.

*Only that one is worthy of life and freedom,  
Who every day goes to fight for them*

Goethe

The violations and dehumanization of communicative practices in modern society were investigated by Y. Habermas. In his work “Science and Technology as “Ideology”, he expresses his ideas about the role of technology and science in our lives, which have been transformed into an ideology<sup>2</sup>. The place of previous ideologies based on meeting the needs of classes, has been taken by the ideology of personal interest, comfort, market and goal-orientedness. There was a rupture of morality with other spheres of our lives, which led to the integration of a man into self-regulated systems such as “man-machine”<sup>3</sup>. Among the negative effects of such excessive rationalization and too much science in life Y. Habermas highlights the disappearance of morality as the basis of interpersonal relations. In such a situation, it is extremely difficult to implement freedom, because any communication becomes a process of domination and subordination, and exploitation. We are probably dealing with arbitrariness. In the philosopher’s opinion only communication can become the link that can tie the torn ends of our lives. “Communication as an activity, mediated by symbols, is based on strict norms recognized by the community of people living together and communicating with each other”<sup>4</sup>. But such communication requires a powerful internal person’s effort, the courage to withstand the obstacles that we are faced with, the eradication of selfishness and the ability to realize oneself in the community with Others. This certainly requires a change in our consciousness and a complete reformatting of the existing society, which is not a matter of one generation. Y. Habermas speaks of the necessity to establish a new type of rationality, which would include:

- reduction of the degree of repression and implementing tolerance in interpersonal relations;
- reduction of cruelty in behavior;
- approaching the type of behavioral control that internalizes the role distance and its flexible use, but at the same time allows the reflection on existing norms<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Милграм, С. (2000). *Эксперимент в социальной психологии*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство «Питер», 157.

<sup>2</sup> Хабермас, Ю. (2007). *Техника и наука как «идеология»*. Москва: Праксис.

<sup>3</sup> Хабермас, Ю. (2007). *Техника и наука как «идеология»*. Москва: Праксис, 109.

<sup>4</sup> Марков, Б. (2001). Мораль и разум. *Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие*. Санкт-Петербург: «Наука», 296.

<sup>5</sup> Хабермас, Ю. (2007). *Техника и наука как «идеология»*. Москва: Праксис, 111.

The problem of freedom in the modern world goes hand in hand with the problem of power. In the ordinary sense, we are accustomed to perceive the authorities and their representatives as somewhat negative, as those that restrict human rights and freedoms. In this case, power appears as a desire to own someone / something. Indeed, sometimes representatives of power structures use the powers they are given to achieve their own interests. However, to what extent is such understanding of power complete and exhausted? Is the concept of power incompatible with the concept of freedom? Some researchers, namely J. Habermas, H. Arendt, M. Foucault and T. Ball, believe that the concept of power is somewhat wider. First of all, power also assumes the process of organizing people, their unity in order to achieve a certain goal. Therefore, power does not belong to someone specific, but arises in the sphere of publicity. "...But nobody owns power, it arises among people when they act together, and disappears as soon as they dissipate"<sup>1</sup>. Power provides for activities with Others. Accordingly, power contradicts the violence. Then, when state authorities begin to apply violence of any degree, from manipulation to brutal force, they thus demonstrate the loss of power and the lack of control over the situation. Therefore, power in its essence appears as somewhat constructive, violence is destructive. Power is primarily the ability to persuade, to win one round. "The power to persuade is perhaps the unique aspect of the broader sphere of power that homo sapiens possesses along with other beings – the ability to communicate by means of language, symbols and signs. Communication is created and supported by human communities...The power is generated, if only and when only people communicate with each other and interact in those or other common activities"<sup>2</sup>. And it is only during such a communicative process the formation of a community that functions not on the basis of coercion and violence, but on the principles of voluntary consent and consolidation of people aimed at achieving common goal takes place. Therefore, power is not an obstacle to the manifestation of freedom, but rather a stage to its manifestation. Foucault adheres to such views, too. He clearly understands that power permeates all spheres of the life of society. But "power is designed in the first place to produce potential, to make it grow and to organize it, rather than to put barriers to it, to force it to submit, or to destroy it"<sup>3</sup>. Foucault also realizes that power forms us through a variety of keys of influence. This influence does not transform the object of influence into a puppet, but forces it to withstand the authorities, to interpret the orders and instructions coming from the authorities and to develop the own position and strategy of action. It is in the confrontation between individuality and power that a person is able to be born again, to identify himself. Therefore, the analysis of power by M. Foucault is inextricably linked to the seizure of freedom, which has an ontological status<sup>4</sup>. "Power as a pure limit, outlined for freedom, is, at least in our society, the general form of its admissibility"<sup>5</sup>.

**Conclusions.** Thus we can sum up all of the above:

- The society we live in is, indeed, a society of total control, which manifests itself in all spheres of society's life: economic, political, social and spiritual. The philosophy of domination and control blocks the normal formation of a personality and the formation of healthy communicative practices;
- However, even in a society of total control there is a place for freedom. There is a certain gap in human existence, as a result of which a person is able to withstand those dominant processes that can undermine a formation of a personality. A person can resist the system, identifying himself as an autonomous subject. Freedom is a person's internal potency that needs constant updating and realization;
- Freedom in its essence opposes arbitrariness as a destructive manifestation of human will and involves recognition of the Other, cooperation and interaction with Others in a single public field. Freedom appears as a recognized necessity;
- The notion of freedom is complemented by the notion of power. Power is not looked at through the prism of domination and violence, but through the interaction of people who are united in order to achieve a certain goal. Power and violence contradict each other, because violence itself signals the loss of power and authority. Therefore, power, on the contrary, is able to coexist with freedom and open new horizons and perspectives for human actions and interactions;

<sup>1</sup> Арендт Х. (2000). *Vita activa, или О деятельной жизни*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 265.

<sup>2</sup> Болл, Т. (1993). *Власть. Полис. Политические исследования*, 5, 39.

<sup>3</sup> Фуко, М. (1996). *Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет*. Москва: Касталь, 240.

<sup>4</sup> Курочкина, Л.Я., Первушина, В.Н. Концепция власти М. Фуко. *Электронная библиотека cyberleninka.ru*. <<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/kontseptsiya-vlasti-m-fuko>> (2017, October, 23)

<sup>5</sup> Фуко, М. (1996). *Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет*. Москва: Касталь, 186.

- Further human development requires the change of human consciousness, the transformation of human culture, the release of human abilities and potentials for the sake of the formation and development of a Personality.

### References:

1. Deljoz, Zh. Obshchestvo kontrolja [Society of Control]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka irms.ru* [Electronic library irms.ru]. <<http://www.irms.ru/delez.html>> (2017, October, 22) [in Russian].
2. Fridmen, M., Hajek, F. (2003). *O svobode* [On freedom]. Moscow: "Socium", "Tri kvadrata", 39 [in Russian].
3. Hajek, F. (2005). *Doroga k rabstvu* [The Road to Slavery]. Moscow: Novoe izdatel'stvo, 106 [in Russian].
4. Bodrijar, Zh. (2016). *Duh terrorizma. Vojny v zalive ne bylo* [The spirit of terrorism. There was no war in the Gulf]. Moscow: RIPOL klassik [in Russian].
5. Adorno, T. Issledovanie avtoritarnoj lichnosti [The study of an authoritarian personality]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka gumer.info* [Electronic library gumer.info]. <[http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/index.php](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/index.php)> (2017, October, 22) [in Russian].
6. Platon (2007). *Gosudarstvo* [The Republic], 3. Saint Petersburg.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta; "Izd-vo Olega Abyshko" [in Russian].
7. Adorno, T. Issledovanie avtoritarnoj lichnosti [The study of an authoritarian personality]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka gumer.info* [Electronic library gumer.info]. <[http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/31.php](http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/Adorno/31.php)> (2017, October, 22) [in Russian].
8. Stebelska, O. (2017). *Bayduzhist yak vvyav kryzovykh protsesiv u dukhovnomu zhytti suspilstva* [Indifference as an expression of a crisis processes in the spiritual life of society]. *Evropejsky filosoficky i istorichny diskurz* [The European philosophical and historical discourse], no. 1, 144-149 [in Ukrainian].
9. Frejd, Z. Massovaja psihologija i analiz chelovecheskogo Ja [Mass psychology and analysis of the human I]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka nv-shulenina.narod.ru* [Electronic library nv-shulenina.narod.ru]. <[http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd\\_zigmund\\_massovaya\\_psihologiya\\_i\\_analiz\\_chelovecheskogo\\_ia.pdf](http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd_zigmund_massovaya_psihologiya_i_analiz_chelovecheskogo_ia.pdf)> (2017, October 23) [in Russian]
10. Harris, T. Kak tehnologii ovladevajut nashimi umami [How technology take possession of our minds]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka apparat.cc.* [Electronic library apparat.cc.]. <<https://apparat.cc/human/how-technology-hijacks-our-minds/>> (2017, September, 20) [in Russian].
11. Horkhajmer, M., Adorno, T. (1997). *Dialektika Prosveshhenija: Filos. Fragmenty* [Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments]. Moscow: Medium [in Russian].
12. Frejd, Z. Budushhee odnoj illuzii [The future of one illusion]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka nv-shulenina.narod.ru* [Electronic library nv-shulenina.narod.ru]. <[http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd\\_zigmund\\_budushee\\_odnoy\\_illyuzii.pdf](http://nv-shulenina.narod.ru/freyd_zigmund_budushee_odnoy_illyuzii.pdf)> (2017, September, 20) [in Russian].
13. Chernyh, P.Ja. *Istoriko-jetimologicheskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka* [Historical and etymological dictionary of the modern Russian language], no. 2. Moscow: Rus. Jaz. [in Russian].
14. Bogachkov, E.V. Jetimologija i kornevoe znachenie slova svoboda [The etymology and root meaning of the word freedom]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka trinitas.ru* [Electronic library trinitas.ru]. <<http://www.trinitas.ru/rus/doc/0216/004a/02160001.htm>> (2017, October, 22) [in Russian].
15. Kant, I. (1994). *Osnovopolozhenija metafiziki nravov* [Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals], no. 4. Moscow: Choro [in Russian].
16. Seneka. Pis'ma k Luciliju [The letters to Lucilius]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka psylib.ukrweb.net* [Electronic library psylib.ukrweb.net]. <<http://www.psylib.ukrweb.net/books/senek03/txt075.htm>> (2017, October, 23) [in Russian].
17. Sartr, Zh.-P. (2000). *Bytie i nichto: opyt fenomenologicheskoy ontologii* [Being and Nothingness: the experience of Phenomenological Ontology]. Moscow: Respublika, 159 [in Russian].
18. Milgram, S. (2000). *Jeksperiment v social'noj psihologii* [Experiment in social psychology]. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Piter, 157 [in Russian].
19. Habermas Ju. (2007). *Tehnika i nauka kak ideologija* [Technology and science as an ideology]. Moscow: Praksis [in Russian].
20. Markov, B. (2001). *Moral' i razum. Moral'noe soznanie i kommunikativnoe dejstvie* [The moral and mind. The Moral consciousness and communicative action]. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 296 [in Russian].
21. Arendt, H. (2000). *Vita activa, ili O dejatel'noj zhizni* [Vita Activa or the Active Life]. Saint Petersburg: Aletejja, 265 [in Russian].
22. Boll, T. (1993). *Vlast' [Power]. Polis. Politicheskie issledovanija [The city-state. Political researchings], no. 5, 39* [in Russian].
23. Fuko, M. (1996). *Volja k istine: po tu storonu znaniya, vlasti i seksual'nosti. Raboty raznyh let* [The will to truth: beyond knowledge, power and sexuality. Works of different years]. Moscow: Kastal', 240 [in Russian].
24. Kurochkina, L.Ja., Pervushina, V.N. *Koncepcija vlasti M. Fuko* [The concept of power M. Foucault]. *Jelektronnaja biblioteka cyberleninka.ru.* [Electronic library cyberleninka.ru] <<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/kontsepsiya-vlasti-m-fuko>> (2017, October, 23) [in Russian].