

СОЦІАЛЬНІ СТРУКТУРИ, СОЦІАЛЬНІ ІНСТИТУТИ, СОЦІАЛЬНІ ВІДНОСИНИ

УДК 316.2/316.75-321

© Oksana Dokash
(Chernivtsi)

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF TOTALITARISM PHENOMENON: MAIN APPROACHES AND INTERPRETATION

The article analyzes the main theoretical and methodological approaches to the definition of the concept of totalitarianism. The following manifestations are defined: totalitarianism as a political regime, which denotes receptions, means and methods of exercising power; as a historical form of the social existence of certain states in certain periods of the twentieth century; as a type of political consciousness, culture and behavior. The application of the political and cultural approach to the study of the phenomenon of totalitarianism was substantiated, which allowed to determine the influence of the latter's features on the formation of the basic elements of political culture, political consciousness. It is argued that the use of a politico-cultural approach allows for the integration of other approaches and enriches scientific knowledge, heuristic possibilities of research issues.

Keywords: totalitarianism, political regime, political consciousness, political culture, ideology, state, political behavior, conformism.

Degree of development and problem statement. The genesis of the concept of totalitarianism in Western social sciences dates back to the 1930s-mid-1950's. It is worth noting that at the beginning of the problem of totalitarianism, mainly emigrants from Russia (M. Berdyaev, P. Struve, G. Fedotov) or Germany (F. Borkenau, etc.). Because of the narrowness of the source base, people who were not in a totalitarian environment could hardly understand how the Soviet or fascist economy, political and social systems were capable of functioning.

The purpose of our scientific research is to analyze the process of conceptualization of totalitarianism and the tendencies of its reflection in the modern political and cultural space.

Conceptualization of the phenomenon of totalitarianism in foreign political science has opened a new field of research for fundamental studies of political, cultural and ideological issues undertaken by G. Almond, T. Adorno, H. Arendt, R. Aron, S. Berstein, Zb. Brzezinski, F. Borkenau, M. Jilas, K. Deutsch, A. Inkeles, R. Lowenthal, C. Milgram, J. Moore, K. Popper, T. Rigby, R. Tucker, F. von Hayek, K. Friedrich, L. Shapiro and others.

Presenting main material. In the 1930's, attempts at purely psychological conceptualization of the issues of totalitarianism were made in the West. In particular, the mechanisms of conformal behavior, the analysis of the prerequisites for the emergence of new types of dictatorships in connection with the processes of modernization were proposed by W. Reich and E. Fromm, who actually acted as the founder of the psychological or psychosocial interpretation of totalitarianism. His main idea was that without taking into account the psychological aspects of human behavior and, more broadly, the life of society, it is impossible to adequately understand modern political processes, in particular, the process of becoming a Nazi regime in Germany.

According to E. Haines, fascism (characterized by the lack of personal freedom, legal tyranny, cult of leader and violence) emerged as a result of all the previous development of European civilization of the new time, which literally provoked the emergence of neurotic reactions and mental pathologies, which determined the emergence of so-called unproductive human orientations [23, p. 219]. Among them - a peculiar syndrome of escape from freedom, this found a vivid manifestation in the totalitarian movements of the first half of the XX century. However, the weakest place of this concept was its excessive one-sidedness and obvious reductionism.

Nevertheless, such an argument was the impetus for the development of so-called sociological research of authoritarian personality, which is reflected in the writings of T. Adorno [10].

A distinctive feature of the research of the 1930's was the attempts to identify the structural and functional community of totalitarian dictatorships on the basis of a comparative study of fascism, Nazism and communism. The most popular among them was the study of F. Borkenau, which in many respects reproduced the thesis K. Hayes, according to which totalitarianism was regarded as «an uprising against the whole historical civilization of the West» [7, p. 94]. The main core of the study was that in spite of the obvious, at first glance, differences in the origin and professed ideologies, totalitarian regimes (for example, in Germany and the USSR) are essentially monotonous. They are based on the denial of liberal democracy in the field of politics and free market relations in the economy. The totalitarian regime in both the Nazi and communist hypostases is undoubtedly despotic autocracy. That is why the two regimes are particularly similar in the political sphere, the basic rule of which is the principle of fuhrership and advanced to the forefront of the concept of leadership - the unlimited dominance of the leader and his led party over all spheres of life of the state and society [37].

At the same time, F. Borkenau emphasized the degree of state interference in economic life as an important, if not decisive, indicator of totalitarianism. As a result, communism was declared «the purest and most logical form of totalitarianism», while it was noted that «there is practically no difference in principles between Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia, although there is no doubt a difference in the degree of their realization» [5, p. 14].

If Russian researchers were involved in the analysis of totalitarianism in the 1920s-1930s, then the most fruitful period of socio-philosophical comprehension of this political, economic, and the like. the phenomenon in the West fell for the years of the Second World War. The most striking figures of this period are undoubtedly F. von Hayek and K. Popper, whose works «The Road to Slavery» and «Open Society and its Enemies» are considered the classic of Western totalitarianism. However, an essential disadvantage of this conceptualization of the problem was the artificial dichotomization and opposition of the «open» and «closed» societies. Such an interpretation left many possibilities for various interpretations of totalitarianism as one of the historical forms of despotism - from Marxist schemes that interpreted totalitarianism as an option for the Asian method of production (K. Wittfogel, «Eastern Despotism»), to functionalist, which equated it with the autocracy (J. B. Moore etc.).

F. A. Hayek focused mainly on the economic and related ethical problems of a modern capitalist society, as well as on options for solving these issues within the framework of a totalitarian state. He linked the genius of totalitarianism with anti-liberal (first of all, socialist) political movements of the late XIX - early XX centuries, who denied the absolute value of the human personality and regarded man as a moment in the movement for a certain collective purpose. According to F. Hayek «the flourishing of fascism and Nazism was not a reaction to the socialist tendencies of the previous period, but is an inevitable continuation and development of these trends» [9, p. 12]. He referred to the basic principles of totalitarianism: absolute economic and political centralization; subjectivism and voluntarism in making managerial decisions, based on political motivation; policy nature of economic management.

The definitive definition of totalitarianism is not given in the well-known study of K. Popper's «Open Society and its Enemies». The fact is that in the preface to his work, K. Popper axiomatically states that «European civilization «open society», which frees the critical abilities of a person) was born on the basis of historical data only recently - in Athens at the time of Pericles. Its appearance was due to a profound transformation of tribal or «closed society» [8, p. 29]. In addition, the author argues that the modern so-called totalitarianism belongs to a tradition that is as old or as young as our own civilization itself.

The notion of a totalitarian dictatorship as an analogue of the ancient despotic regimes was substantially altered by H. Arendt in her most famous work «The Sources of Totalitarianism» [2; 12]. Totalitarianism in the interpretation of H. Arendt appeared as a by-product of the European

thinkers described by the constellation (from H. Ortega-i-Gasset to M. Berdyaev) «mass rebellion» and their active invasion of politics.

H. Arendt, through a combination of socio-psychological and socio-political methods within the framework of a single narrative design, managed to find a link between a totalitarian organization and an unstructured human mass. It turned out to be a totalitarian movement inspired by an ideology that is more likely to affect the instincts thrown out of the horizons of human life than on its mind.

According to H. Arendt, the uniqueness of the totalitarian regime was, in spite of all the horrors of concentration camps and openly demonstrated disregard for formal law, he enjoyed extensive support for atomic masses. In this connection, H. Arendt singled out a special type of iniquity inherent in totalitarian regimes. The point here is not that, as L. Shapiro pointed out, the total lawlessness of this regime is trying to disguise under the guise of constitutionalism. Just a totalitarian regime does not attach importance to the formal legality [39, p. 24]. However, the paradox lies in the fact that at the same time it is not completely arbitrary. As H. Arendt noted, «the totalitarian regime only freely rejects all positive laws that they are, at best, derived from the universal laws of Nature or History, whose observance of iron is the basis of totalitarian ideology and is almost the main meaning of the existence of a totalitarian state» [12, p. 22]. H. Arendt noted the amazing ability of the totalitarian regime to reject the previously proclaimed obligations, to oblivion of party programs stems from this ability of totalitarian ideology to concentrate all the thoughts of their followers on the tasks of the millennial significance. Mass indoctrination turns them into blind instruments of history or fate, whose activities (which they would not commit terrible crimes) are under the cover of immutable laws, whether laws of class or racial struggle.

H. Arendt first accentuated on yet another feature of the totalitarian system - a fundamentally new correlation of concepts in the dichotomous bond of the party-state. If, in the traditional autocracy or authoritarian regime, the main instrument of political domination is the state that acts as the nucleus of the political system, then totalitarianism in this respect is a kind of exception. The state loses a significant share of its own importance, because it is used by the party only as an external facade, first of all, for the representation in the external non-totalitarian world. And behind this facade there are real values - the party and the repressive organs. Moreover, the role of secret police goes far beyond maintaining the status quo in traditional despotisms. It becomes an important, if not decisive, tool in the revolutionary process of creating a «new man» and building a new social order. And the significance of all-pervading party superstructures, their functional load and real power are left far behind by state institutions [15]. That is precisely why it is fairly legitimate to talk about totalitarian systems about the domination of the party in the bundle of the party-state and even about the absorption by the party of state institutions.

However, the research fails on the schematic design of the features of the source base, which was based on the scheme with the leader and the totalitarian movement in the center of events. But the debate about how from time to time can be considered a regime of totalitarian USSR was actively conducted in subsequent years [21, p. 295; 43; 46-48] and there was no consensus.

The study of A. Inkeles was an example of an attempt at a comprehensive analysis that combines the foundations of functionalist and behaviorist approaches. The main themes of his research devoted to the problems of totalitarianism were the problems of becoming a psychological type of totalitarian personality, as well as the role and function of ideology. According to A. Inkeles, the system-forming factor in the process of formation and development of the totalitarian regime is the «mystical abstract goal», which forms the core of a totalitarian ideology, whose service becomes the fate of not only the masses of the population, but also the totalitarian leader. Thus, a totalitarian one can not be considered any dictator, but only one who is sure that he has discovered a certain inherent law of social development («the inherent law of social development ... mastering which is considered by them as an imperative, which dictates a certain set actions on his part and at the same time serves as a guarantee of «correctness» of these actions»), who are guided in their actions by «a specific higher purpose» [26, p. 88]. A state in this case is considered by the dictator only as a means to achieve this goal.

The advantages of the proposed model by A. Inkeles are convincing, but their apparent shortcomings were later no less apparent. First, the author paid enough attention to the psychoanalytic conceptualization of the problem. Hence the appearance of the main features of totalitarian social organization of explicitly social and even socio-psychological but rather individual (and generally quite controversial) features, such as the sublimation of sexual disorders leaders in samples of political activity [22, p. 101]. Secondly, after 1953, the «crisis of inheritance» and the disappearance of the political arena of the figure of a totalitarian leader dissolved the axis that made the model proposed by A. Inkeles functional. As a result, the model has lost its inherent internal logic, which is also closely linked into a single unit of such components as ideology, leader, subordination, and totalitarian terror, mass.

C. Friedrich and Zb. Brzezinski continued the formation of the concept of totalitarianism in the mid-1950's. Brzezinski, who conceptualized totalitarianism as a political phenomenon, is inextricably linked with the European civilization of modern times. The preconditions for the formation of totalitarian dictatorships also included the emergence of such a lever of influence on socio-political and social development, as political parties, such an instrument of institutionalization of political interests and speculative theoretical constructs, as ideology, and such kind of political domination as charismatic leadership.

Zb. Brzezinski states that «The purpose of the totalitarian revolution is to disperse existing social units and to replace the plurality of social groups with a homogeneous and unanimous society, set up by the patterns of totalitarian ideology. The power of the totalitarian regime is based not on the shaky balance of the existing social forces, but on the revolutionary pressure of its fanatical supporters who ... mobilize the masses with promises (appeal) of a better future or by force» [4, p. 84]. As the basic characteristics inherent in all totalitarian dictatorships, the authors highlighted: 1. Ideology covering all vital aspects of human existence and which is supposedly respected by the entire population; this ideology is focused on a certain perfect final state of society. 2. A single mass party led by one man whose core is an indivisible ideology; a party that either stands above a bureaucratic state organization or is inextricably linked with it. 3. The system of terrorist police control, which supports the party and simultaneously oversees it in the interests of its leaders, systematically using modern science and, in particular, psychology. 4. Technologically conditioned and full control of the party over mass communication. 5. Similar, almost complete, control over effective means of armed struggle. 6. Centralized control and management of the entire economy through bureaucratic coordination of its previously independent components, as a rule, extends to most other non-governmental organizations and groups [21, pp. 9-10]. Moreover, according to the authors, only a combination of the whole set of above-mentioned features allowed to characterize one or another dictatorship as a totalitarian one. In general, the emergence of syndrome from 6 points (six-point syndrome) has become a significant step forward in the formation of the concept of totalitarianism. C. Friedrich, who formulated 5 out of 6 of these points in 1953, managed to formalize what dozens of researchers have unsuccessfully debated over the previous quarter century.

At the same time, the rather high degree of generalization and undeveloped by the mid-1950's categorical apparatus operated by the authors made the syndrome somewhat vulnerable to criticism. A wave of critical remarks has caused its descriptive excess. Among the critics of the descriptive nature of the syndrome was (oddly enough) and co-author of the study Zb. Brzezinski, who in 1956 proposed the actual definition of the essence of totalitarianism [18, p. 168], the final version of which was as follows: «Totalitarianism is a system in which technically advanced instruments of political power, without any restrictions, have centralized leadership of the elite movement the purpose of which is the implementation of a totalitarian social revolution, which includes the change of people themselves on the basis of arbitrary ideological assumptions propagated by the authorities, in an atmosphere of forcibly supported unanimity of the entire population». Finally, the authors could not make, on the basis of their own conception, any predictions about the development of totalitarian states in terms of strengthening or, conversely, democratization of the regime.

Already the second half of the 1950's was marked by the emergence of more expressive forecasts of the development of totalitarian regimes, primarily in the USSR. J. B. Moore, who pointed out the combination of three foundations in the Soviet regime - traditional, rational and terrorist, noted that «the regime over time should become more and more traditional and rational» [31, p. 447]. Traditional in the sense of some return to the national and cultural heritage that was belittled by that time, and because of the tendency towards bureaucratization and inherent in all industrial societies to maximize profits and make managerial decisions (which have undergone a technical examination and are not voluntarist), the immanent desire to produce as much as possible more and as cheaply as possible, while paying less attention to ideology.

One of the new definitions of totalitarianism was proposed by R. Aron. A well-known French researcher, noting that, like all social phenomena, the phenomenon of totalitarianism, depending on the viewpoint of an observer, may receive the most varied definitions, but pointed out five of its main features: 1) the monopoly right of one party to political activity; 2) an ideology that obtains the status of a single authority, and in the future - an official state truth; 3) the use of all means of persuasion from force influence to indoctrination with the help of mass media, which are under negligent control, to spread this ideology; 4) subordination to the state of most varieties of economic and professional activities; 5) politicization and ideologization of all spheres of human life and all its violations and, as a final chord, terror, both police and ideological [3, p. 230-231].

In 1968, the «Encyclopedia of Social Sciences» appeared the definition of the famous American researcher H. Spiro, which was no less descriptive than Friedrich's syndrome. To the defining features of totalitarianism H. Spiro referred: 1) the attachment to one, positively formulated goal (industrialization, racial domination, etc.); 2) unpredictability and uncertainty arising from permanent procedural fluctuations; 3) widespread use of organized violence by military or paramilitary forces and secret police; 4) efforts to subordinate or eliminate organizations or associations unrepresentative to the regime; 5) the desire to achieve universal participation of the population in public organizations, united for the sole purpose; 6) the universalization of the goal in the direction of change of all mankind in the image and likeness of the totalitarian system itself [41, p. 108].

It is worth not neglecting L. Shapiro's contribution to the development of the problem of totalitarianism, which consisted of a clear differentiation between the «main features» and «pillars» of totalitarianism. To the list of main features L. Shapiro proposed the presence of a leader (leader); subordination to him lawful order; control over personal morals; permanent mobilization of citizens; legitimacy, based on mass support [39, p. 18], while the ideology, the party and the administrative mechanism of the state served as support for the regime. However, the reasons for such differentiation were not completely clarified by the author.

Finally, another well-known definition of totalitarianism was given by J. Linz, which resulted in the distinction between totalitarian regimes and authoritarian ones. According to Linz, authoritarian regimes were based on limited pluralism and apathy of the masses of the population [29, p. 191].

Studies in the general theory of systems, W. Cannon and L. Bertalanffy, had a tremendous influence on T. Parsons and a number of other representatives of theoretical sociology, and then indirectly on G. Almond, D. Easton, W. Mitchell and a whole number of other well-known American political scientists. Using the methodology of systematic research in political science has opened new opportunities in terms of compatibility of research results, analysis of political structures and processes in different countries of the world.

From the point of view of the supporters of this concept, the political system is an ordered set of interactions, politically interacting roles and functions. Thus, D. Easton emphasized that in a broad sense, the study of political life, in contrast to the economic, religious and other aspects of society, can only make sense if the object of study is a set of interactions from individual individuals or organized groups. It is «interactions that act as the basic element of analysis» [20, p. 49].

Entropic tendencies of such systems, discovered by the father of cybernetics N. Wiener, for a long time did not make themselves known about totalitarian political systems, which prompted Western authors to improve the methods of modeling. The emphasis was placed on the structure and direction

of information flows, the intensity of political communication and the scale of information exchange [27, 35, 42]. But in this case, the authors had to admit the limited methodology of systematic research and return to the analysis of political structures and the mechanism for the adoption of political decisions. Particularly important was the aspect of studying the mechanism of «delay» in the adoption of certain decisions inherent in any political system and one that is particularly strong in the conditions of strict centralization, inherent in totalitarianism.

K. Deutsch, proceeding from the theory of games and cybernetic methods, emphasized that in conditions of continuous growth of information flows it is technically impossible to carry out more or less effective management of a single center and predicted the inevitability of changes in the system in the near future. Moreover, the nature of the changes in the system was in direct dependence on the degree of its adaptability and could acquire forms of redistribution of power resources and powers, with emphasis on decentralization or the inevitable collapse of the totalitarian system, «which has no immunity against decay and disintegration» [19, p. 115].

In the framework of the psychological approach, ideas developed in Freudian and behavioral schools were proposed in the 1930's. The focus of the socio-psychological and political science concepts bordering on them remained the problem of motivating the activity of both an individual and large masses of people. In particular, the search for «unproductive orientations» of the human person (E. Fromm, N. Leites, etc.) or syndromes («syndrome of swaddling» / swaddling syndrome of J. Gorer) remained popular. After the Second World War was replaced by the Cold War, attempts were made to use the methods of psycho-cultural analysis (in fact, the analysis of culture always remained only an appendix to the methods of psychoanalysis) to penetrate the particular style of thinking and behavior of the representatives of the Soviet communist elite. Representatives of this area of research came to the conclusion that the basis of all inherent «Russian» national-psychological peculiarities is the practice of babbling babies. The procedure of wrapping in the diapers in childhood inflicted so profound mental trauma on each Russian and, at the same time, accustomed to violence against the personality that, as they matured, they showed signs of almost limitless tolerance, which alternated with flashes of an absolutely unbridled anger directed, as a rule, directly against the annoying obstacles, and not against who is behind it [13, p. 12]. Such explanations, for example, of aggressiveness of the policy of the Soviet Union through the prism of this «syndrome of swaddling» were perceived as too general.

Somewhat further on this issue were separate representatives of the so-called schools of «ego-psychology». Continuing the tradition of psychologization social and historical processes, they argued the need to study societal and political phenomena (such as totalitarianism) from the point of view of the influence on the psychology of the individual and the public consciousness of behavior patterns and modes of action that prevail in a particular culture [24, 25; 34; 36; 40]. Then, the basis of totalitarianism began to see the loss of «wholeness» as a separate human person and society in general, inspired, for example, by the scale and pace of technological change, as well as the identity crisis, which largely provided the influence of totalitarian ideology and contributed to mass indoctrination population [17, p. 26]. One of the significant results of this kind of research is the widespread dissemination of ideas about the causal connection of the structure of the family, the structure of the character (individual, national and / or social), the peculiarities of the historical and cultural heritage of certain ethnic groups with the emergence of the phenomenon of totalitarianism.

At the same time, in the 1950s-1960's, extrapolation of the results of laboratory experiments (S. Milgram, S. Asch) and field studies (T. Adorno, E. Shils) on the process of studying complex socio-political phenomena became widespread. In particular, S. Milgram, who examined the mechanisms of subordination of man to absurd and even frankly criminal indications endowed with a certain status capital or authority of a person, became widely popular in the field of studying mass psychology [32, pp. 189-205]. In addition, particular attention was paid to the mechanisms of conformal behavior as a result of experiments S. Asch, who studied the effect of the influence of group pressure on isolated individual. The behavior of the latter in this case, as a rule, acquired the rice extreme conformism in relation to collective requirements [44, pp. 66-69]. The big problem here remains the answer to the question, under what conditions the «authoritarian

person» manifests its destructive potential, and in which it is limited to «automating the conformism». In addition, it is not entirely clear what role the authoritarian type of personality dominates over the peculiarities of the functioning of one or another political system.

The non-Marxist variant of the historical paradigm was developed in his writings by J. B. Moore, who tried to find totalitarian signs in the form of pre-industrial societies. The essence of totalitarianism, according to J. B. Moore, was «unsuccessful attempts to place under the central control all manifestations of human activity and the very thinking in order to achieve the total transformation of human behavior in the direction of some, supposedly high, purpose» [31, p. 36]. The difference between totalitarianism and autocracy here was still barely noticeable (which was well understood by J. B. Moore). He developed the concept of two types of totalitarianism (centralized and decentralized or popular). Centralized totalitarianism is established, first of all, as a result of the action of cohesive elite and involves a complex hierarchical social stratification and bureaucratization of society. Decentralized or popular implies a «decentralized or diffuse system of repression, which is readily perceived by the majority of the population» [31, p. 229], and less control by the central government of spontaneous repressions at the local level. Following H. Arendt J. B. Moore considered the first sign of the coming totalitarian dictatorship to collapse and collapse of the old social order.

Sociogenetical interpretations of the phenomenon of totalitarianism focused on the problems of the formation and development of totalitarian states. The actual design of this direction took place in the 1960's, when elements of a concrete historical approach to the study of the formation of totalitarian regimes were merged with separate provisions of the theory of modernization. Its main feature was the recognition of the decisive influence of existing state, political and intellectual traditions on the formation of totalitarian systems in such countries as, for example, Germany and the USSR. In Germany, the preconditions of totalitarianism attributed a greater, compared with other European countries, the degree of authoritarianism of the political regime, the inherent high discipline of the Germans, their propensity to anti-Semitism, racism and chauvinism, with the imposition of these features on the highest level of industrial development and elements of the modern liberal-democratic political systems [16, p. 18]. In the USSR, prerogative of autocracy or, in an updated version, the police state, the intellectual tradition of avtarchicity, expansionism, Pan-Slavism and the great-power, was mixed in the specific type of messianism and archetypes of thought raised by the Orthodox Church [45, p. 43]. And all this against the backdrop of economic backwardness, incompleteness of agrarian transformations and the industrial revolution.

This approach has both positive sides and obvious drawbacks. First of all, he perfectly illustrated the complexity and ambiguity of the phenomenon of totalitarianism, once again demonstrating the close, inextricable link between the political sphere and the field of culture, social consciousness, and the peculiarities of the mentality, and not simply with the totality of social and political institutions of one or another country. But at the same time, the seizure of a special development in the USSR and Germany often began to harm the general, the similarity that undoubtedly existed between the political systems that were formed in these states.

The political and cultural approach to studying the issues of totalitarianism owes its spread to the development of comparative studies and the emergence of a series of works on comparative communism. However, the first implications of this approach to the conceptualization of the totalitarian system were made already in the mid-1850's. In his early works, G. Almond singled out totalitarianism as a special type of contemporary political culture, along with Anglo-American and continental-European. The Anglo-American type acted as an obvious example of modern homogeneous and secular political culture. To her main characteristics G. Almond attributed: 1) a high degree of differentiation of roles; 2) the organization and bureaucratization inherent in it; 3) the stability of functions and role structures; 4) diffusion of power and influence in the political system.

Continental-European type was considered as an example of so-called fragmented political culture, the distinctive feature of which was the presence of rather autonomous and even antagonistic in some parameters of political subcultures and the interchangeability of roles (for example, the state bureaucracy is capable of assuming legislative functions). As for totalitarian

political cultures, like the Anglo-American ones, they were homogeneous, but this homogeneity was of an artificial nature, and the role structure was marked by the dominance of roles associated with coercion and functional instability of power roles [11, p. 157].

At the same time, further analysis of political systems in the countries of the «socialist camp» clearly demonstrated significant differences in the types of political leadership, the peculiarities of the functioning of the various communist regimes, while preserving a certain set of common features that would qualify them as totalitarian [14; 33].

Returning to the theoretical aspects of political and cultural analysis, it should be noted that the politico-cultural approach, in contrast to the sociogenetic, did not postulate the existence of some unchanging archetypes of thinking and behavioral patterns, although it noted the existence of relatively stable cognitive, affective representations and judgmental judgments as regards political system, political process and political actors. The essence of the politico-cultural approach to the problem was the study of the process of transformation of political culture, and based on fully verified data on the political behavior of individuals within a particular community. Thus, the politico-cultural approach was an attempt to integrate the achievements of the psycho-cultural and sociogenetic directions, avoiding the inherent disadvantages - the obvious subjectivity of the psychological method and static, fatalism, inherent in sociogenetic interpretations of the phenomenon of totalitarianism.

Proponents of this approach tried to combine the study of formal and informal components of political systems, dominant ideology with the analysis of national political psychology and patterns of political behavior inherent in certain countries. Actually, the very fact of the stability of certain nationally determined models of political behavior and political orientations, even in conditions of massive indoctrination in various communist countries, was perceived by adherents of the political and cultural approach as a vivid testimony to the theoretical capacity and practical significance of the concept [11, p. 157-158; 49]. The main disadvantage of the politico-cultural approach was that most of its supporters tried to reconstruct in a sufficiently arbitrary form a certain basic version of Russian political culture.

The modernization approach has become widespread in the West during the heyday of the modernization theory (for example, R. Amann, A. Brown, E. R. Burroughs, R. Lowenthal, R. Sarty, J. Armstrong, J. Kautsky, A. Gregor and others). The influence of socio-economic modernization on the evolution of the totalitarian regime was at the center of attention of R. Lowenthal and A. Gregor, each of them (in the cases of the USSR and Italy) considered the totalitarian regime as «a kind of dictatorship of development». In particular, R. Lowenthal noted that the communist revolutions are the specifics of underdeveloped countries whose traditional pre-capitalist order felt the influence of foreign capital, but where there was a lack of prerequisites for the general growth of the capitalist economy and where institutional barriers to social and political modernization of the country were very high. In these circumstances, the appeal to utopian purposes ensures the legitimization of the power of the Communists [28, pp. 33-34].

For the declared ultimate goal, it was necessary to create a «new man» free from egoism and other features of the capitalist and generally class society, while for the earliest economic development, the need for an educated and mobile «economic person», that is, the type of person created by modern industrial society, a person who pursues his own interests [28, p. 37]. This conflict of strategies leads to a collision of economic and ideological goals initiates the struggle between the faction of «communist fundamentalists» and the new generation of young technocrats and, in the end, undermines the total unity of the party, the state and the masses of the population based on ideology based on ideology.

In the framework of the concept of bureaucratization of Soviet society, foreign researchers described the Soviet system as «a complex bureaucracy, similar in structure and functions to giant corporations, government organizations and similar institutions in the West» [30, p. 190; 38, p. 467]. Unlike the classical totalitarian, the bureaucratic model can be correlated with a longer period of stable existence within a stable system. In such an interpretation, the bureaucratic model was actually seen as an equivalent replacement to an outdated and non-functional totalitarian model. However, supporters reduced all the specificity and uniqueness of the totalitarian regime to the specifics of «bureaucracy in power».

Conceptual positions of Western researchers came from the Weberian conceptions of the tendency towards bureaucratization inherent in modern society. Consequently, the conclusions looked somewhat more optimistic than the example of M. Djilas, who perceived the «political bureaucracy as a new class, which was intolerably related to the controversy of illusions imposed on him and his right to rule» [6, p. 198]. It was assumed that bureaucratization inevitably meant its rationalization. The politicians and the general public in the West were the most frightened of an irrational element in totalitarianism, which made the unpredictable foreign and domestic policies of totalitarian regimes. Based on this, the bureaucratization of a totalitarian state, first of all the USSR, was considered if not as a positive change, but at least as a very encouraging factor.

Subsequently, in connection with the discharges and changes in the USSR, new definitions began to appear, which were supposed to replace the usual, but burdened weight of prejudices and prejudices of the notion of totalitarianism. The most famous among them are «totalitarianism without terrorism» (A. Cassoff), «mono-organizational society» (T. Rigby), «Bureaucracy with a capital letter» (A. Meyer), «model of mature industrial society» (A. Inkeles), «advisory authoritarianism» (R. Lowenthal) and others like that. A departure from the political scene of the most odious instruments of violence «made a number of scholars draw attention to the fact that in the Soviet organization there are and always existed activities that are largely reminiscent of the activities of pressure groups in democratic societies» [1, p. 100]. At the same time, foreign researchers proceeded from the fact that any policy is always formed under the influence of subsystems of society, existing interest groups. Ultimately, supporters and corporatist and pluralistic approaches called for an end to the schematics of the concept of totalitarianism and to a very literal and orthodox understanding of the role of terror and ideology in the life of the state.

Conclusions. Thus, for all the diversity of the proposed conceptualizations of the totalitarian system of consensus about its main characteristics and components in western political science to date, there does not exist. In our opinion, this circumstance is connected with the evolution that totalitarian systems experience in the process of existence, which leads to the rapid aging of purely descriptive constructs. At the same time, the idea of the static nature of totalitarian systems, which is firmly established in the social sciences, becomes both an obstacle and a basis for creating more modern dynamic models. Meanwhile, retaining the basic qualities of totalitarianism, such systems nevertheless change significantly under the influence of the transformed social environment, the level of economic development, the nature of international challenges and intra-system political pressures.

The doctrinal and conceptual conception of the phenomenon of totalitarianism in the retrospect of the 1930s and 1980s was carried out within the framework of the concept of totalitarian movement, the theory of totalitarian dictatorship, the sociogenetic interpretation of the phenomenon of totalitarianism, psychological, structural-functional, socio-philosophical, functionalist-behavioral, modernization and politico-cultural approaches. With all the diversity of theoretical approaches to the analysis of such a multidimensional phenomenon as totalitarianism, one can not argue about the universality of any of the concepts, but only to find out some dimensions of totalitarianism as a political regime, the historical form of the social existence of certain states in certain periods of the twentieth century, and also as a type political consciousness, culture and behavior.

Література

1. Андерсон Р. Д. Тоталитаризм : концепт или идеология? / Р. Д. Андерсон // Полис. – 1993. – № 3. – С. 98-107.
2. Арндт Х. Джерела тоталітаризму : пер. з англ. / Х. Арндт. – К.: Дух і літера, 2005. – 584 с.
3. Арон Р. Демократия и тоталитаризм : пер. с франц. / Р. Арон. – М.: Текст, 1993. – 303 с.
4. Бжезинский Зб. Перманентная чистка. Политика советского тоталитаризма / Зб. Бжезинский // США – экономика, политика, идеология. – 1990. – № 7. – С. 84.
5. Боркенау Ф. Тоталитарный враг / Ф. Боркенау // Тоталитаризм: Что это такое? (Исслед. зарубеж. политиков). – М.: ИНИОН, 2003. – Ч. 3. – С. 5-16.
6. Джилас М. Лицо тоталитаризма : пер. с сербо-хорват. / М. Джилас. – М.: Новости, 1992. – 541 с.
7. Ильин И. А. О тоталитарном режиме / И. А. Ильин // Наши задачи. – Т. 1. – М., 1992. – С. 94.
8. Поппер К. Відкрите суспільство та його вороги. Т. I. У полоні Платонових чарів / К. Поппер; пер. з англ. О. Коваленко. – К.: «Основи», 1994. – 444 с.
9. Хайек Ф. А. фон. Дорога к рабству / Ф. А. фон Хайек. – М.: Экономика, 1992. – 176 с.

10. Adorno T. W. The Authoritarian Personality / T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, Daniell J. Levinson, J. NevittSanford. – N. Y. 1969. – 869 p.
11. Almond G. Communism and Political Culture Theory / Almond G. A. // *Discipline Divided*. – London: Newbury Park, 1990. – P. 157-158.
12. Arendt H. The Origins of Totalitarianism / H. Arendt. – New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1951. – 477 p.
13. Bauer R. A. How the Soviet System Works: Cultural, Psychological, and Social Themes / R. A. Bauer, A. Inkeles, C. Kluckhohn // *Russian Research Center Studies*. – № 24. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. – P. 12.
14. Bedell-Avers K. E. Conditions of problem-solving and the performance of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: A comparative experimental study / K. E. Bedell-Avers, S. T. Hunter, M. D. Mumford // *The Leadership Quarterly*. – 2008. – Vol. 19. – P. 89-106.
15. Berstein S. Democracies, regimes autoritaires et totalitarismes an XX sieckle: pour une historire politique du monede developpe / S. Berstein. – Paris, 1992. – 268 s.
16. Beyond Totalitarianism / Stalinism and Nazism Compared / Edited by Michael Geyer and Sheila Fitzpatrick. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008 – 540 p.
17. Brooks J. Thank You, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War / J. Brooks. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001. – 344 p.
18. Brzezinski Z. The Permanent Purge. Politics in Soviet Totalitarianism / Z. K. Brzezinski. – Cambridge (MA), 1956. – 256 p.
19. Deutsch K. W. Cracks in the Monolith / K. W. Deutsch // *Totalitarianism: Temporary Madness or Permanent Danger?* / Ed. by P. T. Mason. – Boston, 1967. – P. 115-118.
20. Easton D. A. Systems Analysis of Political Life / D. A. Easton. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979. – 507 p.
21. Friedrich C. J. Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy / C. J. Friedrich, Z. K. Brzezinski. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956. – 346 p.
22. Gellately R. Lenin, Stalin, and Hitler: The Age of Social Catastrophe / R. Gellately. – New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 2007. – 696 p.
23. Haines E. L. Placating the powerless: Effects of legitimate and illegitimate explanation on affect, memory, stereotyping / E. L. Haines, J. T. Jost // *Social Justice Research*. – 2000. – Vol. 13. – Issue 1. – P. 219-236.
24. Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences / G. Hofstede. – Newbury Park, CA : Sage Publications, 1984. – 328 p.
25. Human H. Political Socialization: a study in the psychology of political behavior / H. Human. – Glencoe: Free Press, 1959. – 175 p.
26. Inkeles A. The Totalitarian Mystique: Some Impressions on the Dynamics of Totalitarian Society / A. Inkeles // *Totalitarianism*. – New York, 1964. – P. 88-90.
27. Lasswell H. D. Propaganda Technique in the World War / H. D. Lasswell. – London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & co., Ltd.; New York: Knopf, 1927. – 223 p.
28. Lowenthal R. Development versus Utopia in Communism Policy / R. Lowenthal // *Change in Communism Systems*. – Stanford, 1970. – P. 33-116.
29. Linz J. Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes / J. Linz // *Handbook of Political Science*. – Vol. 3. – Reading, 1975. – P. 191.
30. Meyer A. The Comparative Study of Communist Political Systems / A. Meyer // *Communist Studies and the Social Sciences: Essays on Methodology and Empirical Theory*. – Chicago, 1969. – P. 190-192.
31. Moore J. B. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World / J. B. Moore. Reprint edition. – New York : Beacon Press, 1993. – 592 p.
32. Milgram S. Behavioral Study of Obedience / S. Milgram // *Totalitarianism Reconsidered*. – Port-Washington; London, 1981. – P. 189-205.
33. Nye J. S. The powers to lead / J. S. Nye, Jr. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 226 p.
34. Paul D. W. The Culture Limits and Political Symbolism: Toward a theoretical Synthesis / D. W. Paul // *World Politics*. – 1978. – Vol. 30. – № 4. – P. 243-257.
35. Pethybridge R. The Social Ingredients of Stalinism / R. Pethybridge // *The Social Prelude to Stalinism*. – London : Palgrave Macmillan UK, 1974. – P. 301-325.
36. Pye L. W. Political Culture / L. W. Pye // *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. – New York, 1968. – Vol. 12. – P. 218-225.
37. Rosenthal B. G. New Myth, New World: From Nietzsche to Stalinism / B. G. Rosental. – University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002. – 480 p.
38. Rigby T. H. New Trends in the Study of Soviet Politics / T. H. Rigby // *Politics*, 1970. – Vol. 5. – № 1. – P. 467.
39. Schapiro L. Totalitarianism / L. Schapiro. – London; Basingstoke, 1972. – 144 p.
40. Skinner B. F. Some Issues Concerning the Control of Human Behavior / B. F. Skinner // *The Technological Threat* / ed. J. D. Douglas. – Englewood Cliffs, New York : Prentice-Hall, 1971. – P. 122-134.
41. Spiro H. J. Totalitarianism / H. J. Spiro // *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. – Vol. 16. – New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968. – P. 107-108.
42. Stalin and His Circle / Ed. by R. G. Suny // *The Cambridge History of Russia*, Vol. 3 / R. G. Suny (ed.). – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 842 p.

43. Stalinism as Revolution from Above // Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation / R. C. Tucker (ed.). – New York: Norton, 1977. – P. 77- 108.
44. Thurston R. W. Cauldrons of Loyalty and Betrayal: Soviet Soldiers' Behavior, 1941 and 1945 // The People's War: Responses to World War II in the Soviet Union / R. Thurston, B. Bonwetsch (eds.). – Urbana and Chicago : University of Illinois Press, 2000. – P. 66-69.
45. Totalitarianism and Political Religions: Concepts for the Comparison of Dictatorships / Edited by H. Maier; Trans. by J. Bruhn. – London and New York: Routledge, 2005. – 428 p.
46. Tucker R. Political Culture and Leadership in Soviet Russia : From Lenin to Gorbachev / R. C. Tucker. – N.Y.; London : W. W. Norton, 1987. – 214 p.
47. Tucker R. C. The Soviet Political Mind: Stalinism and Post-Stalin Change / R. C. Tucker. – New York : W. W. Norton & Company, 1972. – 320 p.
48. Tucker R. C. The Theory of Charismatic Leadership / R. C. Tucker // Daedalus. – 1968. – P. 731-756.
49. White S. Political Culture and Soviet Politics / S. White. – London : Macmillan Press Ltd., 1979. – 234 p.

Literatura

1. Anderson R. D. Totalyaryzm : kontsept yly ydeolohyya? / R. D. Anderson // Polys. – 1993. – № 3. – S. 98-107.
2. Arendt Kh. Dzherela totalyaryzmu: per. z anhl. / Kh. Arendt. – K.: Dukh i litera, 2005. – 584 s.
3. Aron R. Demokratyya y totalyaryzm: per. s frants. / R. Aron. – M.: Tekst, 1993. – 303 s.
4. Bzhezynskyy Zb. Permanentnaya chystka. Polytyka sovet-skoho totalyaryzma / Zb. Bzhezynskyy // SShA – ekonomyya, polytyka, ydeolohyya. – 1990. – № 7. – S. 84.
5. Borkenau F. Totalyarniy vrah / F. Borkenau // Totalyaryzm: Chto eto takoe? (Yssled. zarubezh. polytykov). – M.: YNYON, 2003. – Ch. 3. – S. 5-16.
6. Dzhylyas M. Lytso totalyaryzma : per. s serbo-khorvat. / M. Dzhylyas. – M.: Novosty, 1992. – 541 s.
7. Yl'yn Y. A. O totalyarnom rezhyme / Y. A. Yl'yn // Nashy zadachy. – T. 1. – M., 1992. – S. 94.
8. Popper K. Vidkryte suspil'stvo ta yoho vorohy. T. I. U poloni Platonovykh chariv / K. Popper; per. z anhl. O. Kovalenko. – K.: «Osnovy», 1994. – 444 s.
9. Khayek F. A. fon. Doroha k rabstvu / F. A. fon Khayek. – M. : Ekonomyya, 1992. – 176 s.
10. Adorno T. W. The Authoritarian Personality / T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniell J. Levinson, J. NevittSanford. – N. Y. 1969. – 869 p.
11. Almond G. Communism and Political Culture Theory / Almond G. A. // Discipline Divided. – London: Newbury Park, 1990. – P. 157-158.
12. Arendt H. The Origins of Totalitarianism / H. Arendt. – New York : Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1951. – 477 p.
13. Bauer R. A. How the Soviet System Works: Cultural, Psychological, and Social Themes / R. A. Bauer, A. Inkeles, C. Kluckhohn // Russian Research Center Studies. – № 24. – Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1956. – R. 12.
14. Bedell-Avers K. E. Conditions of problem-solving and the performance of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: A comparative experimental study / K. E. Bedell-Avers, S. T. Hunter, M. D. Mumford // The Leadership Quarterly. – 2008. – Vol. 19. – P. 89-106.
15. Berstein S. Democracies, regimes autoritaires et totalitarismes an XX sieckle: pour une historire politique du monede developpe / S. Berstein. – Paris, 1992. – 268 s.
16. Beyond Totalitarianism / Stalinism and Nazism Compared / Edited by Michael Geyer and Sheila Fitzpatrick. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008 – 540 p.
17. Brooks J. Thank You, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War / J. Brooks. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001. – 344 p.
18. Brzezinski Z. The Permanent Purge. Politics in Soviet Totalitarianism / Z. K. Brzezinski. – Cambridge (MA), 1956. – 256 p.
19. Deutsch K. W. Cracks in the Monolith / K. W. Deutsch // Totalitarianism: Temporary Madness or Permanent Danger? / Ed. by P. T. Mason. – Boston, 1967. – P. 115-118.
20. Easton D. A. Systems Analysis of Political Life / D. A. Easton. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979. – 507 p.
21. Friedrich C. J. Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy / C. J. Friedrich, Z. K. Brzezinski. – Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1956. – 346 p.
22. Gellately R. Lenin, Stalin, and Hitler: The Age of Social Catastrophe / R. Gellately. – New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 2007. – 696 p.
23. Haines E. L. Placating the powerless: Effects of legitimate and illegitimate explanation on affect, memory, stereotyping / E. L. Haines, J. T. Jost // Social Justice Research. – 2000. – Vol. 13. – Issue 1. – P. 219-236.
24. Hofstede G. Cultures Consequences / G. Hofstede. – Newbury Park, CA. : Sage Publications, 1984. – 328 p.
25. Human H. Political Socialization: a study in the psychology of political behavior / H. Human. – Glencoe: Free Press, 1959. – 175 p.
26. Inkeles A. The Totalitarian Mystique: Some Impressions on the Dynamics of Totalitarian Society / A. Inkeles // Totalitarianism. – New York, 1964. – P. 88-90.
27. Lasswell H. D. Propaganda Technique in the World War / H. D. Lasswell. – London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & co., Ltd.; New York: Knopf, 1927. – 223 p.

28. Lowenthal R. Development versus Utopia in Communism Policy / R. Lowenthal // Change in Communism Systems. – Stanford, 1970. – P. 33-116.
29. Linz J. Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes / J. Linz // Handbook of Political Science. – Vol. 3. – Reading, 1975. – P. 191.
30. Meyer A. The Comparative Study of Communist Political Systems / A. Meyer // Communist Studies and the Social Sciences: Essays on Methodology and Empirical Theory. – Chicago, 1969. – P. 190-192.
31. Moore J. B. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World / J. B. Moore. Reprint edition. – New York: Beacon Press, 1993. – 592 p.
32. Milgram S. Behavioral Study of Obedience / S. Milgram // Totalitarianism Reconsidered. – Port-Washington; London, 1981. – P. 189-205.
33. Nye J. S. The powers to lead / J. S. Nye, Jr. – New York : Oxford University Press, 2008. – 226 p.
34. Paul D. W. The Culture Limits and Political Symbolism: Toward a theoretical Synthesis / D. W. Paul // World Politics. – 1978. – Vol. 30. – № 4. – P. 243-257.
35. Pethybridge R. The Social Ingredients of Stalinism / R. Pethybridge // The Social Prelude to Stalinism. – London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 1974. – P. 301-325.
36. Pye L. W. Political Culture / L. W. Pye // International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. – New York, 1968. – Vol. 12. – P. 218-225.
37. Rosenthal B. G. New Myth, New World: From Nietzsche to Stalinism / B. G. Rosental. – University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002. – 480 p.
38. Rigby T. New Trends in the Study of Soviet Politics / T. H. Rigby // Politics, 1970. – Vol. 5. – № 1. – P. 467.
39. Schapiro L. Totalitarianism / L. Schapiro. – London; Basingstoke, 1972. – 144 p.
40. Skinner B. F. Some Issues Concerning the Control of Human Behavior / B. F. Skinner // The Technological Threat / ed. J. D. Douglas. – Englewood Cliffs, New York : Prentice-Hall, 1971. – P. 122-134.
41. Spiro H. J. Totalitarianism / H. J. Spiro // International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. – Vol. 16. – New York : Macmillan and Free Press, 1968. – P. 107-108.
42. Stalin and His Circle / Ed. by R. G. Suny // The Cambridge History of Russia, Vol. 3 / R. G. Suny (ed.). – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 842 p.
43. Stalinism as Revolution from Above // Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation / R. C. Tucker (ed.). – New York: Norton, 1977. – P. 77- 108.
44. Thurston R. W. Cauldrons of Loyalty and Betrayal: Soviet Soldiers" Behavior, 1941 and 1945 // The People's War: Responses to World War II in the Soviet Union / R. Thurston, B. Bonwetsch (eds.). – Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000. – P. 66-69.
45. Totalitarianism and Political Religions: Concepts for the Comparison of Dictatorships / Edited by H. Maier; Trans. by J. Bruhn. – London and New York: Routledge, 2005. – 428 p.
46. Tucker R. Political Culture and Leadership in Soviet Russia: From Lenin to Gorbachev / R. C. Tucker. – N.Y.; London: W. W. Norton, 1987. – 214 p.
47. Tucker R. C. The Soviet Political Mind: Stalinism and Post-Stalin Change / R. C. Tucker. – New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1972. – 320 p.
48. Tucker R. C. The Theory of Charismatic Leadership / R. C. Tucker // Daedalus. – 1968. – P. 731-756.
49. White S. Political Culture and Soviet Politics / S. White. – London : Macmillan Press Ltd., 1979. – 234 p.

Оксана Докаш

Концептуалізація феномену тоталітаризму: основні підходи та інтерпретації

У статті аналізуються основні теоретико-методологічні підходи до визначення концепту тоталітаризму. Визначено такі його прояви: тоталітаризм як політичний режим, що позначає прийоми, засоби і методи здійснення влади; як історична форма суспільного існування деяких держав в певні періоди ХХ століття; як тип політичної свідомості, культури та поведінки. Обґрунтовано застосування політико-культурного підходу в дослідженні феномену тоталітаризму, що дозволило визначити вплив особливостей останнього на формування основних елементів політичної культури, політичної свідомості. Аргументовано положення про те, що використання політико-культурного підходу дозволяє інтегрувати інші підходи та збагачує наукове пізнання, евристичні можливості проблематики дослідження.

Ключові слова: тоталітаризм, політичний режим, політична свідомість, політична культура, ідеологія, держава, політична поведінка, конформізм.

Надійшла до редакції 15.09.2017 р.