Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ukraine

ZINOVIIA KARPENKO

karpenkozs@ukr.net

Axiopsychological Refutation of Totalitarian Ideologisms in the Era of Globalization

Aksjopsychologiczne sprostowanie ideologii totalitarnych w epoce globalizacji

SUMMARY

The article states that ideologisms are certain elements of an ideology which, by manifesting the political culture of society, fill it with a specific ethnical content. Ideologisms are embodied in myths, legends, traditions, collective conceptions, propaganda narratives, typical social illusions, etc. They represent the historical experience of the people, and, in the first place, render their geopolitical, crathological, militaristic aspirations in the context of their own ideological views and attitudes to other ethnic and cultural communities. Totalitarian ideologisms express a destructive subject-object attitude of certain society (the state) to large out-groups in terms of their usefulness for its own interests and are typical of totalitarian societies. Constructive ideologisms are based on the culture of tolerance and respect for the dignity of others; they are an example of a subject-subject attitude which is inherent in a democratic society.

Keywords: axiopsychology; globalism; ideology; totalitarianism; tolerance

INTRODUCTION

The fierce information war is accompanying the Russian Federation military intervention into the sovereign Ukrainian territory. That war led to brutal legal emission of the annexation of the Crimea. That imperialistic methods can be used in Donbass region and even much further on the Transnistria and the Carpathians. It's also caused a cultural shock on the EU, USA, Canada, Australia, Japan

about the unprecedented in the 20th century violation of international agreements, the subject of which is a nuclear state. This cultural shock raised a deep concern not only with the leaders of official institutions and heads of states, but it also revived the eschatological expectations of the end of history as a result of the escalation of uncontrollable aggression among the ordinary townsfolk, whose fundamental rights, needs and interests would be inevitably neglected, frustrated, or limited in this case. The professional psychological community in Ukraine, as well as abroad, turned out to be unprepared to the challenges of the information war on the part of Russia, which is carried out by the media controlled by the totalitarian regime, which generally preserves the relict features of "the Soviet imperialism" (the so-called "sovok"). The fact is that since World War II, infamous for the cynical Goebbels propaganda of the National Socialist (Natzi) ideology, it is the first time the world has encountered the shameless mass manipulation of facts, the substitution of concepts, the distortion of the semantic logic of the revolutionary events on the Maidan, the distortion of cultural and historical context and continuity of the national development in Ukraine, the scandalous Russian ethnocentricity, chauvinism and aggressive self-aggrandizement through the cult of military power and the dubious advantage over energy-dependent countries which are consumers of natural hydrocarbons.

It is clear that, in front of the daring disturbance of the increasingly nonsensical simulacra of the insatiable voluntaristic intentions for restoration of "the Russian World" within the Russian kingdom which is based on the Orthodox fundamentalism, the sacredness of totalitarian government and opposition against everything priori not "Russophile", the confusion of social and political psychologists was a spontaneous emotional reaction of both educated "academic" psychologists and the clan of practicing psychologists; and we, fortunately, have a good number of them now. However, this kind of professional shock, manifested against the background of cultural shock, cannot last indefinitely long. Time has come to recover, to think over the developments of psychological theory and practice that can be attached to the conditions and methods of the information war against Ukraine and its allies and advocates in the modern world, in order to refute the destructive ideologisms and propaganda myths which parasitize on social illusions of the mass consciousness of the recipients of ideological influence.

GLOBALIZATION AND MODERN TOTALITARIANISM

The topicality of the axiopsychological refutation of ideological foundations of the domestic and foreign policy of modern states is associated with the challenges of the era of globalism that arises as a result of using common cultural, informational, economic areas, and increasing mutual dependence and influence of states and regions (Vusatyuk 2014).

Globalization is an objective process of global development; it gives a powerful impetus for self-actualization of an individual and the rational use of human potential under the conditions of increasing labor mobility, the extensive development and the growing role of Internet communication, and within the liberal democratic system of social life (Alexander 2008). On the other hand, globalization also creates an alternative tendency – the anti-globalists' movement which emphasizes the role of particular factors: ethnic and cultural differences, the traditional division of labor and the sphere of political influence of certain states, environmental threats to some regions due to excessive use of natural resources, etc. (Kaldor, Vejvoda 1999).

This situation characterizes the dialectics inherent in all natural processes. However, analysis shows that there is a tendency to transform oppositional movements into new global projects with an aim to criticize the negative aspects of globalization. For example, the idea of the Third Rome as an alternative globalization project, which was put forward at the 7th World Ruthenian National Congress back in 2002, got a second wind. The postulated "integral orthodox model of personal and social life" is opposed to "Western" democracy, to "the dictates of transnational corporations". As a result, it aims to revive anachronistic ideologisms at all levels of private and public life of the so-called Rus' world, and these are destructive and totalitarian ideologisms. The followers of Moscow's mythological creation – the Third Rome – refer the following states to this enclave: Bulgaria, Belarus', Greece, Cyprus, Macedonia, Moldova, Russia, Romania, Serbia, Ukraine, Montenegro, as well as the diaspora of Orthodox peoples living outside this "embodiment of true righteousness" (the author's metaphor). According to their apologists, the transfer of religious and philosophical ideas to political doctrines, and the latter – to real actions, can lead to the desired civilizational changes and the establishment of a new and better order.

IDEOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF CULTURE

In this context, the starting point of our discussion is the phenomenon of ideology with an obvious axiopsychological content. Therefore, it requires a congenial countermeasure in case of destructive, de-personifying, conflict-causing, frustrating and dishonest propaganda maneuvers which are designed to demoralize an ideological opponent, to break his resistance, to cause panic, make him fell defeated, frightened, discouraged, weak and hopeless.

Thus, "ideology is a concept which traditionally defines a set of ideas, myths, legends, political slogans, party policy documents, philosophical concepts; in fact, being not religious in its nature, ideology is based on some kind of either cognized or »constructed« reality; it is focused on practical human interests and is aimed at manipulating and controlling people by influencing their consciousness"

(Gritsanov 2001, p. 386). As Gritsanov states in the referred article, the core of an ideology is a range of ideas that are related to questions of capturing, maintenance and use of power by the subjects of politics.

That is why, ideologisms as components of ideology, which is a special axiopsychological system, are substantially integrated in culture. Like cultural phenomena, they can express subject-object or subject-subject relations of human activity. The former ones, being universal in nature, register the basic structures of human consciousness, and are universal in nature, as they are realized in the categories of space, time, movement, matter, relation, quantity, quality, measure, content, causality, etc., and the latter ones record specific historical experience of a community that was formed in the course of its lengthy existence as a relatively independent unity, identical in itself. The historically conditioned specific ethnical collective ideas of the destiny of man, functions of society, structure of consciousness, the content of such evaluative categories as the good or the evil, beauty – ugliness, duty, justice, faith, hope, freedom, etc. refer to this cultural layer.

Stepin notes that there exist correlative relations and semantic resonance between the components of both subsystems of culture (as well as of ideology, as its integral part). The author writes:

The transformation of society and of the type of its civilization development always involve changing the deep meaning of life and values which are enshrined in the universals of culture. Society restructuring is always associated with the revolution in the minds, with criticism of the formerly prevailing philosophical orientations and the creation of new values (Stepin 2001, p. 526).

Meanwhile, the ideology of totalitarian societies is transformed into an inert system of ideological dogmas, evaluative set phrases, rhetorical *clichés* that is incapable of renewal and development, becoming thus similar to religion. "In this case, the state acts as an ideocratic system in which the high priest, who can interpret and transform ideological postulates, serves as the highest official and the political leader at the same time" (Gritsanov 2001, p. 387). The analogy with the Russian state leader in this context is more than obvious. The power structure of the neighboring state is built in such a way that not only crucial decisions but also any important decisions are centered around the president. Moreover, every public event with the participation of the head of the Russian Federation is acquiring still greater esoteric symbolic meaning, it acquires sacredness in the context of new imperial reconstruction of the exceptional spiritual mission of "the Russian World". This way it loses a viable support in the globalized post-modern world with its multi-cultural diversity and its universal social subjectivity of public bodies of different scale and functional capacity. Uncritical enthusiasm for the leader, pseudo-rational justification of his political decisions and gestures, attribution of virtues up to hysterical glorification and loyal adoration – all that presents a

broadening phenomenological spectrum of experiences of a typical representative of a totalitarian society. It angers the spiritually languid society (since it is a homogeneous, so to speak, "monotheistic" society), but it is a strong community due to group mania which turns into public obsession with simulacra of ideas which, like strange giant mutant plants, are looming lonely against the background of a multi-colored carpet of pluralistic visions of the modern world.

Some researchers point out the semantic and semiotic (or mythological) character of ideologisms, in the structure of which we find complicated rational and irrational components, objective reasons (the determinant) and the subjective desire (the determiners), authentic existential phenomena and their conventional cultural manifestations, etc. This fact brings together the concepts of ideology and ideologisms with the concept of national mentality, which also belongs to the core of culture and has a complex structure. That mentality consolidates people on the basis of common values, patterns of behavior, traditions, way of life, culture, and is laid (if not "programmed") on the level of consciousness – both individual and mass (Jurevich 2013, p. 94). Besides, the basic characteristic features of mentality are collectivity, unawareness or incomplete awareness, sustainability. The key components are the national idea and the national prototype (the positive image of a national hero). Jurevich distinguishes the following basic components of the national mentality which are at its core: 1) collective memory, 2) social notions, 3) collective emotions that strengthen them, 4) collective norms, values and attitudes, 5) language, 6) mental representations of culture, 7) way of thinking (and of social perception), 8) patterns of behavior, 9) national identity (Jurevich 2013, p. 95). In view of these components, there are reasons to consider each of them to be the source, the "material", the means and the instrument, the final result or any other mode of the existence of some ideology.

THE DESTRUCTIVE CONTENT OF TOTALITARIAN IDEOLOGISMS

The above mentioned ideas on the implicit structural and functional "wrapping" of ideology in mentality, and the latter – in culture, does not provide sufficient grounds for criterial classification of ideologisms into constructive and destructive, while the empirical expediency of the axiological opposition of this kind raises no doubts. Despite the fact that the outlined components, as befits a proper academic discourse, cannot be fundamentally overestimated, their intentional substance will undergo testing to prove their purpose consistency and teleological durability under specific conditions of the existence of society. I mean such a choice of axiometric coordinates, in which the above mentioned subject-object and subject-subject cultural vectors (ideology) would be properly taken into account, and in the future they would prove their practical and transformative potential.

From my point of view, it is this potential, as offered by Asmolov, that the division of cultures into cultures of usefulness and cultures of dignity, possesses. In one of his recent interviews on contemporary moral and psychological climate in connection with the military conflict in the Ukrainian Donbas region, which highlighted the weak points of national mentality and modern official Russian ideology and its propaganda via the media, Asmolov makes an explanation for the reader at large:

I suggest dividing all cultures into cultures of usefulness and cultures of dignity. In cultures of usefulness, man is a thing which is determined by its functions, it is a screw. Their key characteristic features are depersonalization, devaluation of a human being… In cultures of dignity, the mechanism of supporting variability and otherness is dominant… in the culture of dignity, the support for diversity and norms of tolerance is practiced… If the cultures of usefulness exist by the law of striving for survival and balance, the cultures of dignity – by law of the striving for life; in them, man always is in search of meaning… Social development is promoted by the two mechanisms, and every time one of them comes out to the front. This is the mechanism of conflict, and we have become captives to society development because of the conflict […]. The conflict is more vivid than mutual help. It exists in every culture and every society goes through it. At present, the norm of "fighting against the rules" has become common practice both in social and political behavior in Russia… When the norm "fighting against the rules" is in force, the main outcome of cultural development is the destruction of diversity. Even in the sphere of culture, there exist the formulas "the one not with us is against us", "if the enemy does not surrender, he is destroyed" and the like. This is the ethics of "the dispersion of people" […] When some culture is based on fighting against the rules, barbarians appear in it. Their main goal is to destroy the one who is different. Barbarity occurs in certain… critical situations. Very often, by fighting against the common enemy, it enables the achievement of some stability in society for a short period of time. They follow the principle "whom are you friends against?" and start making friends… In this case, there is no difference: whether to be against the USA, Ukraine or the national traitors. In case of barbarity, it is important to cry out "crucify him" at the right time, and all are turned into a crowd… After the conflict of culture, the system stuffs everybody with the ideology of hatred, the ideology of depersonalization; it creates the image of the enemy. Fascism, any variations national-socialism begin to appear with depersonalization […] When the people who represent the culture of usefulness (being deprived of their own identity and sense) suddenly acquire a common sense for all, they get under the illusion of security and stability (Asmolov 2014).

Answering the reporter's question of whether society without an enemy there would have no sense of security, the Russian patriotic scholar gives an affirmative answer and explains:

Any ideology of hatred is based on three pillars. The first one is the philosophy and ideology of fundamentalism as a closed society, which must be homogeneous and uniform. The second one is the psychology of fanaticism. The third one is terrorism technology in the broadest sense (Asmolov, Szechter 2013).

The above quotes present a clear essence of ideological, mental, ethnic, cultural, and civilizational confrontation between the societies which are oriented around diametrically opposite values and goals. The democratic tendencies of

social development are manifested in the appreciation of cultural diversity, creative individuality, ideological tolerance, mutual aid and cooperation, activity synergy and group facilitation. Instead, orientation of society towards totalitarian forms of state governing and the organization of public life of its citizens are based on "one-man management" and unreserved authority of the leader, whose maxims and decisions are agreed to by individual citizens (as sociotypical individuals rather than individual personalities) through the mechanism of rationalization. In this society, they encourage: ideological "monotheism", idolatry, the personality cult of their supreme leader (priest), intolerance of the dissenters, such as "national traitors", "zhydobanderivtsi", "amerykosy", "gayropeans", etc. in Putin's Russia, creating the image of an external enemy as a result of the projection of their own selfish or ethnocentric tendencies and features – greed, envy, the feelings of one's own inferiority and insignificance, or the opposite – ambition and contempt for others. It is worth mentioning that the typical discourse in social networks, which are affected by the totalitarian ideologisms of Russian users, is permeated with arguments of the culture of usefulness. Thus, the Ukrainians – patriots of their country – are accused of becoming the puppets of America (they are especially hostile towards its State Department), of the transnational companies which plan to extract shale gas in Ukraine (and therefore, this will undermine Russia's monopoly in supplying hydrocarbons to other states, but this fact is held back), and so on. The lack of subjectivity is impressive: Ukraine is not treated as a sovereign state with its own interests and independent policy. Resorting to invective vocabulary mixed with foul language in tough discussions, the Russian opponents present Ukraine as an infantile 'under-subject' that is mentally frail, easily influenced (by the West, which is particularly annoying), childishly impulsive and requiring care (of course, on the part of "wise" and "caring" Russia, and not the EU as a highly controversial subject in itself, as it is dancing to the tune of the US). They proclaim a biased assessment of Ukraine as an *object* (territory) of geopolitical manipulations of strong players in the international arena (in the polarized mass consciousness of Putin's autocracy, these are either Russia or the US), which plays the part of a passive consumer of foreign goods (preferably Russian) in conditions of its own backward and uncompetitive production that requires an experienced guide (an elder brother) whose wise supervision should be rewarded by obedience, humility, flattering. It is this assessment of Ukraine *by* the utilitarian criterion of convenience in the coordinates of the culture of usefulness that is persistently and constantly moderated by the imperial revanchist propaganda. It is clear that against the background of falsified reality (for example, the image of "the boy crucified by Ukrainian executioners"), real facts seem to be false – hundreds (or thousands?) of Russian soldiers killed in the Donbass region who

fought for the illusory idea of "lands gathering", which, by the way, is improper to articulate openly at a serious official level – the UN Security Council, European Parliament, etc.

INTERCULTURAL TOLERANCE AS A COUNTERACTION TO IDEOLOGICAL TOTALITARIANISM

The above mentioned facts lead to the conclusion that there is an acute crisis of values and orientations, which modern Russia is immersed in like in the infernal collective unconsciousness. Instead of the following the way of individuation and shaping their own identity in harmony with other subjects (persons), it avoids critical self-reflection, internal integration of the opposites, such as the subordination of the culture of usefulness to the culture of dignity, or the concept of conflict to the concept of mutual assistance (Kropotkin, Asmolov; Asmolov, Szechter 2013). This corresponds to the priority of transcendental values, openness and changes over the values of self-glorification and conservatism (Karpinskij 2013). In this respect, there arises an urgent task of both the conceptual axiopsychological refutation of the destructive ideologisms of a totalitarian society, and the search for efficient axiopsychological mechanisms in order to refute the hazards of these ideologisms with an aim to prevent the victimization of society which is subjected to aggressive propaganda in the conditions of information war (Nissen 2015).

In this connection, it is worth making use of psychotechnical developments that guarantee prompt opposition and rather a quick repulse against new ideologically oriented disinformation which humiliates, makes people infamous, and inhibits the recipient of destructive propaganda. In our view, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy has such means at its diposal. In contrast to psychoanalysis, it makes it possible to give an immediate response to a destructive ideologism and to dispose of its deadly charge.

Let me refer to the experience of forming intercultural communicative competence, which has, according to Pochebut, interethnic and interpersonal tolerance, trust and sensitivity at its psychological core.

In the theoretical research devoted to the characterization of tolerance in the context of the axiological approach, Shaiuk provides the explanation of this phenomenon by Bubis which is seen as the most appropriate for the problem under consideration. Thus, Bubis interprets tolerance as "indulgence, which someone stronger reveals towards religion, outlook, origin, nationality, skin color and history of some other person, who is weaker, and this creates a fundamental value of a *democratic* society" (the author's italics – Z. K.; Shajuk 2014, p. 48). Tolerance as a moral characteristic feature and an integral quality of an individual and society, involves "respect for the rights of another person, provided that this person

also respects our rights; this is independence from bias, prejudice and discrimina-tion" (Pochebut 2013, p. 7). The integral features of tolerance are: resistance to impact and pressure on the part of another person, recognition of the right of other people to have their own opinion, assertiveness – defence of their thoughts, their ideas, interests while recognizing the rights of others to have and advocate their ideas and interests; trust in others, based on the assurance that the behavior of this man is not harmful to us, interest in other people's ideas (concern).

There is no difficulty in observing the difference between the two mentioned approaches to tolerance, the first of which is axiologicaly unambiguous, and can serve as a guideline for the *prevention* of intolerance (violence and hostility be-cause of the escalation of interpersonal and intergroup conflicts); and the second approach is more practical as it takes into account the risks of a tolerant person or a democratic society in general under the conditions of an intolerant attitude on the part of other subjects, and, therefore, it may serve as a guiding principle for in-formational and psychological *resistance* to hostile propaganda which is founded on destructive ideologisms of totalitarian societies. This allows us to transform the mechanisms of tolerant consciousness (revealed by Pochebut) that are based on the process of cognitive categorization, into the mechanisms for the protection of democratic values under the circumstances of purposeful cognitive distortion of facts, distortion of motivations, falsification of intentions, humiliation of people's dignity and the importance of social and political current events, etc., particularly in the information war of Russian pro-government media against Ukraine. On this background, the information policy of the channel "Dozhd" (Rain) is rather an exception, but it is a very important tool in "conscience cleaning" of ordi-nary Russians from the suggestive influence of militant public television channels (a "zombie-box").

METHODOLOGY OF CONSTRUCTIVE VALUE CHOICE

Following the pattern of reinterpretation of the mechanism of categorical comparisons, the counteraction against intercultural intolerance (presented in the appropriate ideologism) may be presented in the following way.

The first stage is "rough" categorization according to the criterion "one's own – foreign" or "ours – theirs", "friend – enemy". There appears an intuitive assess-ment of a holistic Gestalt message. The basic notion of the message that causes initial trust or skepticism about the content of the perceived is grasped.

In the second stage, evaluation criteria become more varied. For example, the use of the criterion "similar – different" may look like this: we all want peace in the Donbass region, but the separatists want to get it only by separating it from Ukraine. The rest of the Ukrainians experience a cognitive dissonance: "Why should we kill our compatriots for the sake of peace?". In their turn, the separat-

ists do not understand why they have to love Ukraine for the sake of peace if they have a strong will to be in Russia which is mentally closer to them. Consequently, while the terminal value of peace coincides, there is polarity in operational values (unity – separatism).

The third step is the evaluation of an ideologism according to the criteria of "safe –dangerous", "constructive – destructive". Thus, the opposite approaches to keeping the peace are argued: either through the restoration of the territorial integrity of Ukraine, which requires a legitimate expression of will, or through a social consensus concerning the right of separating some territory from Ukraine, which looks like a fantasy scenario. Thus, the polarized opinions are at their peak, which leads the problem solution to exclusively a power option, and this causes an increase in losses and destruction on both sides of the armed conflict. Behind each of the alternative instrumental values, there is one's own "ideological right-ness", certain existential motivation, and people are willing to stand their ground to maintain it. The question is how to avoid bloodshed at the peak of ideological intolerance? From my point of view, this is possible only by appealing to human dignity, the honor of the ideological opponent, demonstrating faith in his ability to make wise decisions, supporting the attempts to deescalate of the conflict, by encouraging dialogue. Actually, these steps are being made by the US and the EU diplomacy with their participation in the negotiations between the representatives of Ukraine, Russia and the turbulent Donbass.

However, the facts that testify to the incitement of ethnic hatred, sponsoring terrorism, recruiting mercenaries, participation in the so-called 'hybrid war' etc. should be in the focus of attention. The well-known policy of "carrot and stick" remains relevant nowadays. As for social networking, one should be advised to refrain from verbal aggression in response to trolls which humiliate one's person-ality. Exposing the absurdity of ideologisms is more efficient when using subtle humor or ethically accentuated irony which show logical inconsistency of the opponent's postulates without going down to the bottom of anticultural Sabbath.

The fourth stage, according to Pochebut, is "aiming at tolerance – intoler-ance" on the grounds of "friendliness – hostility" (Pochebut 2013, p. 8) which concludes with choosing one of the alternatives. It is clear that in ideological competition, no one can make a choice *for* the opponent. If the latter is disposed to discrimination, does not recognize your identity, is openly mocking and making fun of you, then your choice of intolerance towards the evil (in the mentioned or other manifestations) will be axiologically appropriate. We can counteract a per-sistent (often because of being paid) destructive ideology by a complete disregard of the fanatical opponent by blocking him or by the discursive construction of propaganda counter-narrative (proved by facts, constructive ideological position) in which moral and pragmatic arguments are balanced and mutually reinforced. Of course, this task requires considerable efforts: mental and physical, sufficient

training, axiological sensitivity and responsibility, as our famous contemporary, the French writer Bernard Werber wrote: "You do not like this world? Imagine another, a better one", "Do you think that God is imperfect? Take his place" (Werber 2011, p. 594).

CONCLUSIONS

Under the conditions of information war of totalitarian states with democratic states, the axiopsychological refutation of destructive ideological rhetoric must be carried out on well reasoned positions of the culture of dignity, which are confirmed by the evidence of life-preserving expediency and utilitarian benefits. Psychotechnical achievements of psychotherapy, particularly of its cognitive and behavioral branch, allow to develop effective methods of information and psychological resistance, making the virtual communication space clear of the destructive influence of xenophobic ideologisms, inspired by the media of new totalitarian societies that are reviving revanchist ideas of bipolar world with pretensions to world domination.

REFERENCES

Асмолов А., Шехтер Е. (2013), *Черноризов А. Историко-эволюционный синтез: взаимная помощь как фактор эволюции*, «Вопросы психологии», 6.

Alexander B.K. (2008), *The Globalisation of Addiction. A Study in the Poverty of the Spirit*, New York.

Грицанов А. (2001), *Идеология*, [в:] А. Грицанов (ред.), *Всемирная энциклопедия: Философия*, Москва, Минск.

Юревич А. (2013), *К проблеме базовых компонентов национального менталитета*, «Психологический журнал», 4.

Kaldor M., Vejvoda I. (eds.) (1999), *Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe*, London, New York.

Карпинский К. (2013), *Конфликт ценностей как предпосылка смысложизненного кризиса в развитии личности*, «Вопросы психологии», 1.

Nissen M. (2015), *Meeting Youth in Movement and on Neutral Ground*, "Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal", 3.

Почебут Л. (2013), *Межкультурная коммуникативная компетентность как выражение человеческих отношений*, «Психологический журнал», 4.

Рачева Е. (2014), *Академик Александр Асмолов: «Грядущий хам стал хамом нынешним»*, www.colta.ru/articles/society/4588 (access: 11.09.2015).

Степин В. (2001), *Культура*, [в:] А. Грицанов (ред.), *Всемирная энциклопедия: Философия*, Москва, Минск.

Шаюк О. (2014), *Психосутнісна характеристика толерантності в контексті аксіологічного підходу*, «Вітакультурний млин: методологічний альманах», 16.

Вербер Б. (2011), *Тайна богов*, Москва.

Vusatyuk O. (2014), *Social Mythology of the Globalization Era*, "Scientific Notes of Taurida National V.I. Vernadsky University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology. Political Sciences. Sociology", 1–2.

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł stanowi o tym, że ideologizmy są pewnymi specyficznymi elementami ideologii, które przejawiają kulturę polityczną społeczeństwa, wypełniają ją konkretną treścią etniczną. Ideologizmy zawarte są w mitach, legendach, tradycjach, przedstawieniach zbiorowych, narracjach propagandowych, typowych złudzeniach społecznych itd. Reprezentują one historyczne doświadczenia pierwszych ludzi i wyrażają ich geopolityczne, władcze, militarystyczne aspiracje w kontekście własnych ideologicznych poglądów i nastawień do innych grup etnicznych i kulturowych. Totalitarna ideologia reprezentuje destrukcyjną postawę podmiot – przedmiot pewnego społeczeństwa (państwa) do dużych grup, obcych, pod kątem ich przydatności dla własnych interesów; są one typowe dla społeczeństw totalitarnych. Konstruktywna ideologia jest oparta na kulturze, tolerancji i szacunku dla godności innych. Jest ona przykładem postawy subiektywnej, charakterystycznej dla społeczeństwa demokratycznego.

Słowa kluczowe: aksjopsychologia; globalizm; ideologia; totalitaryzm; tolerancja