

UDC 316.64:364-787.86(045)

S. Ordenov

SOCIAL MEMORY TRANSFORMATIONS UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF POSTMODERN SOCIETY MOBILIZATION

National Aviation University;
e-mail: ordenov@nau.edu.ua;

ORCID: 0000-0002-2572-8300; Researcher ID: Q-7658-2018

Abstract. *The article deals with the postmodern transformations of social memory in the context of postmodern society mobilization. The study is based on the fact that the mobilization of society in the postmodern culture acquires negative, marginal and asocial form of mass mobilization. In respect that postmodern consciousness fragmentation prevents unification on general, universalistic principles, therefore, a globalized society is rapidly united in regressive and marginal forms of cohabitation, which deny social in its essence. With regards of this, postmodern society mobilization passes through the archaic installations establishment based on right-wing populism and the "politics of fear". Against the background of isolationistic existing tendencies, postmodern society mobilization takes the form of a nationalist and chauvinistic movement, and is aimed at the national-political incorporation of the population, supported by a "spiral of silence", that is the forced humility of the disagreeable part of the population. Being out of real ties with the present and the past, social memory becomes fragmentary, selective and split which impedes the objective society's self-reflection in the historical perspective.*

Keywords: social memory; forms of mobilization; postmodern culture; political populism; "politics of fear"; "spiral of silence".

Introduction

In scientific and humanitarian discourse, the attitude to the past and its interpretation has always occupied an important place. The connection of historical and social memory with political power is being permanently relevant from ancient times. The glorifying of the acting authorities and crowning its memory was one of the political tasks that have been always addressed to history since ancient times. Also, the authorities have always been interested in creating of the "right" image of the past through "rewriting" the history by means of the destruction or correction of the information ("the memory") about certain people or events from the past. In the XX century, the connection between the history and politics has only intensified, and recently new types of "the politicization of history" have emerged, when various forms of symbolic reality and identification are created artificially with the help of constructive function. Given that these factors have a global manifestation with the participation of a variety of social groups, the processes of transformation of social memory need to be examined in this study.

Aim and tasks

The article is aimed at analyzing the postmodern transformations of social memory under the conditions of postmodern society mobilization. In order to achieve the aim, there is a need for solving the following tasks: to differentiate the structural components of social memory; to reveal a set of stable relationships between social memory elements and sociocultural markers of the postmodern society; to consider them in the integrated dimension of human being, within the context of the relationship between a person and a globalized society, the nature of postmodern culture and the type of typical mobilization.

Research methods

The methodology of the study is based on the structural-functional, sociocultural and comparative approaches in their dialectical unity. The principles of systemacity, objectivity, ascension from the abstract to the concrete, general scientific principles of conformity and relativity are also used to solve specific problems of the study.

Research results

Social memory is characterized by continuity as an important characteristic of it, which indicates a certain heritability of the historical path and, accordingly, of the

socio-cultural progress. Thanks to social memory, society can not only make self-reflexion into the present but also create projections of the future, which allows outlining prospects, building plans and developing acceptable strategies for development. The continuity and heritability of social memory is also a sign of the organic changes in society, which are dominated by endogenous developmental factors immanently leading to a positive form of socio-cultural dynamics. And though development involves a continuous flow of changes leading to a transition from one form of social organization to another, thus becoming a kind of break with the past, nevertheless, the new that emerged in the course of development also contains the integration of the one that overcomes in this process.

In traditional societies, the period for reviewing the historical content begins with the introduction of modernization. In order to understand the peculiarities of social memory in the postmodern society, which eclectically combines communitarian and individualistic settings, we need to consider its retrospective forms in the endogenous-modernistic and traditionalist societies which went through the overcoming modernization at due time. In our opinion, these factors greatly affect the specifics of the interpretation of memorable events and the type of mobilization.

The role of tradition is to pass the institutional order to the next generation with maximum preservation of the of social relations structure. However, in the conditions of continuous socio-cultural changes that are produced by the dynamics of civilization, traditions, in traditionalist societies, lose their function of legitimizing and the transmission is carried out by partial loss or distortion of content. Consequently, social memory in the process of overtaking modernization becomes fragmentary, selective and split. In such a case, social consciousness becomes associatively sensual and prone to various forms of social amnesia. This factor speaks of discontinuity and inorganic development, where any purposeful creative activity becomes completely meaningless because of the barbaric attitude to its results. If the basis of modernism is, first of all, the desire to improve and multiply the existing things, which collectively defines the concept of development, then traditionalist

consciousness understands development as a radical revolution and the destruction of foundations.

The specificity of individualist societies is that people are mobilized around universalistic principles there. They are social, open and humanistic at the same time, since they are based not on disagreements but on the one that unites people together. K. Deutsch laid this feature of individualistic societies in his definition of social mobilization. He defined it as "a process in which the basic clusters of old social, economic and psychological inclinations undergo erosion or destruction, and people become open to new patterns of socialization and behavior" (Deutsch, 1961: 494-495). Liberal values, human rights or the values of the United States of Europe are examples of it.

In contrast, traditionalist principles are based on division and restriction. They are local, closed and of a conservative and reactionary nature, therefore, in the modern world, they acquire an asocial and marginal character. It should be noted that the principles of a closed society used to be not only permissible but also socially necessary in the community in the past. However, they are archaic and destructive for the modern differentiated world. At the same time, these principles continue to determine the form of mobilization of non-individualized societies as they are supported by the population and rely on the established system of relations.

It should be noted that in the globalized world, it is quite difficult to draw a clear demarcation between communities for their membership of traditionalist or individualist societies, given the layering of cultures, the interpenetration of ideas and the interplay of socio-cultural regulations. However, if we reject the exogenous factors imposed for us by various ideologists in the form of calculated indicators of economic or technological development, territorial proximity to the "center of Europe", common ancestors, of spiritual intimacy, etc., and turn to the structural endogenous factor such as produced system of relations, the level of social consciousness, the presence of certain axiological systems and sustainable social practices in society, then it will become apparent that individualist societies, in their classical sense, are countries which have long been determined by the liberal-democratic way of development. According to I. Wallerstein, these countries form the core of the global capitalist system and determine world politics. Most of the peripheral countries are essentially pre-bourgeois societies. Being in the fair way of the emerging countries and their economies, they are transformed to the requirements of the global capitalistic system from the outside only, while structurally staying changeable.

On the other hand, one cannot help but mention the postmodern processes of cultures hybridization. This is a phenomenon that is universal in nature and covers all countries and penetrates into all relations. So, individualism or traditionalism in a globalized world can only be conditionally treated. These concepts that determined the specifics of social relations in the modern period inevitably acquire the prefix "post" in the realities of the Postmodern culture which, in fact, may mean a change in form, content, and sometimes even the meaning to the opposite one. And if we add here

the problem of discrepancy associated with the postmodern ideological confrontation of all against all along with the produced globalized counterculture, the simulacration of the meaning; then it is not necessary to speak of certain set-up values based on the correlation of rationally grounded phenomena. Under these conditions, indeterminism with its ambiguity and nonlinearity becomes a norm, which is quite permissible in the existing cognitive model and fits into the contemporary world picture.

The connotational palette of hybrid concepts with the prefix "post" or "neo" produced by the postmodern culture may range from the deviation of its "autochthonous" content to the acquisition of the opposite value. In the modern world, the same happened with the key social Modern regulations such as liberalism, democracy, the state and the right, capitalism and so on. Postmodern consciousness interprets them in a different from the original, hybridized, distorted meaning. Liberalism, for example, is conceived as the uncontrollable will for enrichment and the material welfare of the selected people but not as the recognized autonomy of the individual and the equal rights for everyone; democracy is interpreted as a form of a good governance but not as a power of the people; the state and law are understood as tools for ensuring the rule of great capital but not freedom; capitalism becomes as the labor usurpation and a forced form of social violence but not as social relations that arose during the interpenetration on the liberal basis of competition and co-operation.

It is clear that in the postmodern consciousness, against the background of manipulations related to the substitution of concepts, the hybridization of cultures and the mutual influence of socio-cultural factors, there was an eclectic mixture of the premodern-communitarian and the modern-individualistic regulations. In this regard, M. Lypovetskyi correctly noted that, "in practice, postmodernism rebuilds binary and hierarchical orders of traditional culture into more complex but less stable forms of symbolic organization, generating dynamic, non-hierarchical, non-binary, unstable, hybrid, openly controversial and autoreflective "orders" which are built in the game of the signified and united by the rejection of "transcendental signifiers" as the inevitable source of repression" (Липовецкий, 2008: 25).

Proceeding from the fact that the postmodern culture positions further development as being associated with the deconstruction and rethinking of the existing things, then a peculiar Postmodern Program is getting rid of the axiological foundations of the Modern culture. This program can be regarded as an appropriate tribute to communitarianism, since the supra-localized model of vertically regulated capitalism is formed on its basis which provides with relations between elements based on the formal hierarchy. In our opinion, within the framework of the international regime concept, the model of the vertical organizational structure proposed as a necessary tool of global politics reduces democratic and liberal-legal values at the local level.

It would seem that capitalism which gave rise to liberalism in the West had inevitably to lead to universal liberalization in its global manifestation. As it turned out, the primacy of the relations economization or, in a

modern language, the liberalization of the economy does not lead to the emergence of a liberal society. Modern “capitalist” China, Russia, India and a number of other traditionalist countries confirm this thesis. The “liberal economy” which means, in essence, the utilitarianism of economic expediency that was put to the absolute fully coexists with the preserved paternalism of relations and the distribution of goods in society on the caste principles. Moreover, these countries are already demonstrating what the global world order will be like in the nearest future. A hybrid “capitalistic” model declared as a neo-liberal economy in the shell of the illiberal, closed society, which is replacing the present world order, obviously, will not have any signs of liberalism. Liberalism, as a socially oriented modern society holdover, will not even be declared! Present-day Ukraine can be an example of it, where under the auspices of the struggle against the communist past, such concepts-attributes of the rationally ordered and open society as public administration, a rule-of-law state, a social state, and the rights of a person are gradually withdrawing from the political discourse. And a part of concepts such as liberalism, democracy, competition, market economy, etc. obtains completely opposite meanings.

How did it happen that the global integration of capitalism along with the programs of general modernization and liberalization of relations turned into something completely opposite? The answer to this question lies in the very essence of the Postmodern culture. The ideologist of the Postmodern culture P. Kozłowski formulated its basic principles:

- dispelling the “general dictatorship” and establishing the diversity of plural formations. “One contradiction, consensus, history, progress, evolution are replaced by contradictions, stories, agreements, progresses and evolutions of historical processes and their phenomena in the mirror of reason” (Козловски, 1987);

- distancing from “the ideas imposed by the present, from the worldwide confrontation between the West and the East on the correct interpretation of the Hegel’s philosophy of the history,” (Козловски, 1987) or the accepted way of life in society;

- leveling up due to uncertainty “the steel chains of philosophy with its three-part division: Antiquity - the Middle Ages - the New time, thus giving a real temporary delay <...> for the fourth epoch” (Козловски, 1987);

Consequently, the Postmodern program by means of supposing a departure from Logocentrism substitutes the modern concept of the development by coexistence, and the universalist “general dictatorship” replace with the primacy of diversity. It seems to allow for traditionalist societies to “leap” immediately into Postmodernity, that is, into a globalized, highly differentiated technogenic world, passing the whole historical periods and stages of social, scientific, technical, industrial, economic and cultural development.

The ideological Modern foundations came up with a certain monistic, systematic order of things in its conceptual integrity, which appealed for the complete and final liberation of humanity within the concept of justice with both moral and basic social content (Honneth, 2001). Instead, the main feature of all Postmodern concepts was the recognition of the

ontological uncertainty which led to the loss of the objective order of values, moral relativism and the primacy of the pluralistic world recognition as a cultural dominant of coexisting universes conglomeration. In this paradigm, “post-ideology” is interpreted as a global rejection of the ideological dimension of reality, its transition to another mode of functioning, that is, to the world without ideology. In particular, it states that the ideological cliché no longer takes the place of the main principle of sensing reality. The usage of this concept is almost completely ignored in the texts of poststructuralist thinkers, and the ideological struggle with the so-called “ultraliberal ideology” is almost rejected (Stiegler & Petit, 2013). Despite the postulatory principle of ideology abandoning, the postmodern “postideology” forms its ideological socio-political palette (Пода, 2019) based on the principles of irrationalism, misinformation and manipulation.

In this regard, P. Virilio points out that “the globalization of telecommunications that is happening in real time ... and the informational revolution are leading to systematic denunciations that cause panic rumors and suspicions and are capable to eradicate the professional ethics of “the truth” and, therefore, and freedom of the press. The doubts about the facts being declared/denied, the uncontrolled manipulation of sources and public opinion foretells that the revolution of real information will also be a revolution in the virtual misinformation and history that is being written now” (Вирилио, 2009). It should be noted that the ultimate goal of this post-ideological misinformation is to form a single metropolis that has global leadership in the world.

Summarizing the conceptual vision of the postmodern ideological policy, modern scholars such as E. Brighi and L. Giugni distinguish the following constitutive elements as, “Strategic undertaking of ideologies like “old” ways of politics understanding against “new” ways of pragmatic problems solution; the passion for technical but not basic decisions, and the extreme personalization that borders on populism; the adoption of the late interconnection of capitalistic logic and neo-liberalism as undeniable facts” (Brighi & Giugni, 2016: 27). We believe that the ideological factors of post-ideology correlate with the ideological foundations of neo-liberalism, destructively acting on the development of culture in general and minimizing a human role in it. We agree with Barry’s point of view that, “It views economic growth as an ideology and structural interest of the capitalist state, one that serves the interests of a particular class or the elite rather than, beyond the threshold, the interests of a majority in society.” (Barry, 2020) Consequently, neoliberal ideology as a form of post-ideology does not correspond to the interests of society and a human role in it.

The mentioned above enables us to outline the key characteristics of society mobilization and social memory of the Modern and Postmodern periods. We summarize these characteristics in Table 1, for clarity.

Postmodern culture postulates that with the disappearance of the dichotomous criteria of modern culture such as reasonable/not reasonable; rational/sensuous; developed/undeveloped; right/wrong; moral/immoral; traditional/modern, in the global world, the confrontation will also disappear.

Table 1. Comparative characteristics of society mobilization and social memory within the Modern and

Postmodern cultures			
	Modern culture	Postmodern culture	
Society mobilization	- is based on interaction of social actors' functioning characteristics	- is based on disunity and restriction	<p>At the same time, the postmodern world is not an integral entity where the liberal democratic institutions effectively operate and capitalistic relations with a high standard of living are established everywhere etc. Therefore, when it comes to the distribution of resources as well as the place and role in the system of global capitalism, modern progressive regulations remain relevant. As a result, confrontation in postmodern society is only intensifying by gaining a global manifestation. If "the issue about the correct interpretation of the history of philosophy", in fact, divided modern world into two halves, then the postmodern world shattered into countless pieces of the ripples, desires, aspirations, whims, temporary interests, local demands and mini-narratives, thus obtaining the form of ideological opposition of everyone versus all. This situation allows for "the core countries" to concentrate money and power in their hands, while exporting chaos and uncertainty in the global dimension.</p> <p>On the one hand, while modern universalism mobilized all people "to be in favor of" and united different people in life-giving activity around common social goals and interests by structuring consciousness, then, on the other hand, the relativistic postmodern diversity can mobilize only "to be against of" by producing deconstructivism of sociality. In practice, it leads to the negation of even the instincts of self-preservation as the principal anthropological foundations of the existence of society. It is a characteristic feature of postmodern mobilization, which acquires a negative (Comroff, 2011), marginal and asocial form of mass mobilization. It serves not as constructive programs, but as a destructive and ghostly past-oriented agenda, that much "contributed to the partial merger of populism with nationalism." (de Cleen, 2017)</p> <p>To support these statements let us give examples of what the modern world wants to unite behind – ultra-right nationalism and chauvinism; intolerance of all forms and manifestations of sociality and adequacy (the criterion of allowed "pluralism" now only means a deviation from the norm which is clearly regulated), as well as universalism; mutual confrontation; home-grown fanaticism and groundless subjectivism and voluntarism. All of these mentioned are distorted communitarian regulations that, firstly, in the process of overcoming modernization and subsequently, in postmodern hybridization lost their social and anthropological foundations. It turned man-made civilization into a globalized tribal "life with its customs, emotions, collective passions symbolizing Dionysian hedonism, the importance of the icon of the body and pleasurable leisure, the revival of modern nomadism and all that accompanies tribalism in the age of postmodernism" (Маффеколи, 2018).</p> <p>As E. Morin rightly states, "Nation cannot resist planetary expansion rather than by closing down in its own regressive manner, its religions and its nationalism" (МопеН, 2011).</p> <p>Seeing the salvation from postmodern relativism in the artificial homogeneity and total localization, societies massively slip into the extremes of isolationism and nationalism by ethnic, linguistic, religious and cultural features based on the ideologies of either right or left populism. This leads to separatist</p>
	- mobilization "for" (takes place on the grounds of universalist social attitudes, the common things shared by people)	- mobilization "against" (takes place on the grounds of local, closed and conservative-reactionary attitudes, dictated by the "primacy of diversity"	
	- is based on the involvement of all man's vital forces and resources of society in the progressive movement of the social mechanism, totally shaped the human order of life and consciousness	- is based on universal marginalization, asociality and transhumanism	
	- ideological constructivism is an instrument of society mobilization	- "post-ideology", based on irrationalism, misinformation and manipulation, which eliminates man's role in society	
Social memory	- is characterized by the principle of historicism, heredity, continuity and organicity of change	- is characterized by historical fragmentation, discontinuity and inorganic changes	
	- has a projective form	- has an aggressive, artificially created form;	
	- is a tool for development	- is an instrument of ingress (Maffesoli, 1996)	
	- is based on universalism, anthropo-sociocentrism and rationalism	- is based on Dionysus principle, the pursuit of narrowly utilitarian goals and local interests of individual groups	
	- logical and consistent historical heritage as an object of cognition	- accentuation, dogmatism, and suppression of critical thinking	
	- is responsible for the constructive form of socio-cultural dynamics	- is responsible for deconstructivism and destructive hybridization of historical events	
	- represents a narrative system of frameworks portraying historical events	- represents the interpretation of historical events, depending on the current situation	

moods, fragmentation of countries, disintegration of unions and the intensification of conflicts.

It should be noted that during the modern period, the unification on a discriminatory basis by language, ethnic or racial characteristics was predominantly inherent in pre-liberal societies. Thus, they sought to preserve the integrity destroyed by the transformations of the traditionalist social organization. Unlike them, Western societies united around universalistic and liberal values. They rather represented civil-political unions under the protection of the state power sovereignty than homogeneous ethno-national communities.

In the modern world, the collapse of modern regulations of social organization inevitably entails a crisis and the breakdown of political and civil unions that we are observing now. Despite the fact that these processes are global in nature, the peripheral countries are experiencing a postmodern social crisis much deeper. A thin cultural layer and unstable liberal relations as well as individualistic regulations simplify going back to the past, thus reviving half-forgotten archaic forms of consciousness and coexistence (Ordenov, 2020). The acquired practice of "rewriting" the history in the context of prevailing ideological doctrines becomes a good ground for the unreflective perception of hybrid "neo" and "post" values ruling now. In view of this, the mobilization of the peripheral countries passes along the line of establishing regulations that are primitive but at the same time very effective for the unstable consciousness. These regulations are based on right-wing populism and the "low-level fear" (Massumi, 1993). They can be called the "reptilian" regulations, since they, bypassing the rational and limbic schemes, appeal immediately to what psychologists called the "reptilian brain", or "R-complex", that is the oldest part of our brain responsible for the instinctive behavior.

R. Wodak in his work "The Politics of Fear" argues that, recently, the right-wing parties appealing to instincts successfully construct fear in societies associated with various real or imaginary dangers. In connection with this, "throughout the European Union and behind its limits there are the tendencies of renationalization; in the heart of the ideology of right-wing populists there is the desire to constantly create new borders (or even walls), to unite the national state and citizenship (naturalization) with the nativistic (often gender and fundamental religious) policy of the body. Obviously, in the separatist rhetoric of the right-populist parties, for example in Ukraine, Russia, Greece as well as in Hungary we are witnessing the revival of the "people" and the "people's body" (Водак, 2018). We believe that the tendencies described by R. Wodak have the character of returning to the archaic community-based relations established on the ethological "alien/mine" dichotomy. For this purpose, nationalistic markers are being constructed in the field of the "political imaginary" and various narratives of identity are introduced into social memory.

Acquiring forms of a nationalist and chauvinist movement, mobilization in the peripheral countries is more directed at the national-political incorporation of the population supported by the "spiral of silence", that is the forced humility of the part of the population disagreeing with fear of isolation. E. Noelle-Neumann describes this

process as a method of social enslavement, "The one who was convinced of the correctness of the new ... policy felt general approval. Therefore, he expressed his point of view loudly and confidently. Those who rejected the new <...> policy, felt in isolation, locked up, were silenced. It was this kind of people behavior to contribute to the fact that the former felt stronger than they actually were and the latter were weaker" (Нозль-Нойман, 1996). For example, in Ukraine, non-governmental organizations under the auspices of the state law enforcement agencies of the country (the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine (MIA), the Security Service of Ukraine (SSU), etc.) were created for the realization of similar tasks. The purpose of such organizations is to collect and publicize information concerning persons who, in the opinion of representatives of these organizations, endanger the national interests or security of Ukraine by their actions or statements. These include the public database of Myrotvorets website (lit. Peacemaker), which is an Internet site that contains an open database of people's personal data, public actions, statements, positions whose views are contrary to existing political doctrine.

In his interview for the Ukrainian edition, Israeli media-historian Y. N. Harari noted that "there are states that prefer people to feel constant anxiety, dependence, self-doubt and, accordingly, hatred of others: immigrants, ethnic minorities who were assigned to the role of the enemy. Such states govern by the promise of protecting their citizens from those whom they do not like. Such states driven by fear and anxiety save on good education, access to qualitative medicine and other social benefits, because their strength is in the misery of their citizens. Misery is enough to rule" (Харари, 2019). A lengthy reform process that included Post-Soviet countries gaining independence confirms his words. The inherent basis of this process is the long-term destruction of the public administration system, as a complex of political management of the distribution system of goods and resources, the result of which is the formation of a number of structural entities, which together serve as an institutionalized mechanism of purposeful oppression of the population for the unconditional exercise of external superpower. In these circumstances, the most effective mechanism of governance is the "politics of fear" supported by the "spiral of silence".

Consequently, the integrated integration of mass management technologies such as the "politics of fear" and the "spiral of silence" allows for the oligarchic elite and populists to gain new victories not only in the peripheral countries, but also in global politics. That is not surprising, since under the fall of the foundations, any investments in fear-mongering are quite effective. All this greatly contributes to the transformation of social memory towards its fragmentation and selectivity, and as a result - the intensification of indoctrination of the population, which allows for more effective management of mass consciousness, strengthening the hegemony of ruling oligarchic groups in a global dimension.

Discussion

Researchers characterize social memory as "the information accumulated in the course of the socio-historical development that is recorded in the results of

practical and cognitive activity, passed from generation to generation through socio-cultural means" (Rebane, 1955: 100). It is largely responsible for the integrity of the historically developed socio-cultural community and for the sustainability of social ties and principles of action established in society. It normatively defines and at the same time legitimizes them in the system of social relations. In this respect, T. Parsons rightly noted that one side of the interpretation of social action is inextricably linked with the cultural content with its complexes of symbolically meaningful standards. These standards have normative values for the actor and in various ways determine what he must do by differentiating in a certain way the ways of his actions (Parsons, 1964: 140). Thus, from a social point of view, social memory acts as a value-normative mechanism of the human activity regulation and is responsible for the processes of stability, equilibrium and sustainability in society.

The understanding of the historical representation largely depends on the forms of discourse chosen by contemporaries, as well as on the level of social consciousness and dominant commemorative practices in each society. Generally, this is more like socio-political order than the impartial consideration of historical facts. That is why the historical past is periodically reviewed to the benefit of changing requirements for the image of identity in many societies. The urgency of such a revision in the conditions of socio-cultural dynamics is growing rapidly.

In the Western world, the modernist project of a thorough rethinking of traditions and the degeneration of consciousness in its genesis was based on the anthropocentrism and the humanism of the Renaissance philosophy which, in its turn, reached the roots of the times of Antiquity. In this period, due to the beginning of the historical movement and the emergence of the historical subject in the world politics, there becomes a need for the unbiased comprehension of the past in a modern society, as well as for the disclosure of the true historical meaning of events and the understanding of their true significance.

The orientation of the Western modern consciousness to personal freedom and autonomy largely determined the way of Modern being by "rationalizing" a human and by bringing the entire civilization process to the action. The emergence of a modern subject destroyed the patriarchal integrity of the collectivistic way of life. This led to the formation of a new social integrity based on individualistic values. Such metamorphosis of social relations became possible due to the rethinking of the social memory content on the volitional and rational principles. The various active forces of the Western society gathered around these principles. They operated in different social spheres, in order to achieve common goals in progress, differentiation and modernization.

In view of the above, we can consider social mobilization as a phenomenon of a modern society that combines the anthropological desire of a human to solidarity, constructivism, initiative and individualism of capitalistic relations based on descriptive interaction of social actors' functioning characteristics. We argue that the modern society produces its own type of mobilization which is characterized by the universal

involvement of all human vital forces and society resources to the progressive movement of a social mechanism that totally organizes the order of life and consciousness. In his work "Total Mobilization", E. Jünger noted, "It is enough to have a look at our life in its perfect emancipation and ruthless discipline, the heat and soot of its industrial regions, the physics and metaphysics of its movements, its engines, planes and millions of cities and you will surprisingly understand that there is not a single atom that would not have been in work and we ourselves are swallowed up by the same crazy vortex. The total mobilization is carried out not by people but rather by itself; in wartime and peacetime, it is an expression of a hidden and obedient requirement that our lives are subject to in the era of masses and machines" (Юнгер, 2000). Such mobilization totally permeates all relations. By monologizing the life of society, it also forms the psychological portrait of the individual. An emancipated and purposeful subject who is determined in his actions by a rational principle appealing to continuous social modernization is the example of the total mobilization in the modern period.

It should be noted that a number of authors also considered the notion of mobilization in the context of social changes, processes of modernization and integration (Apter, 1965; Lerner, 1958). So, A. Etzioni in his work "Mobilization as a Macrosociological Conception" developed the concept of mobilization in the systemic and evolutionary tradition and pointed to the existing interconnection and the interplay between these social phenomena and processes (Etzioni, 1968).

Given that the driving force of modernization is the integrated development of reason, science and education resulting from the development of economic relations, social memory in individualistic societies acquires a dynamic form and as an object of knowledge demonstrates its continuity with the past. Such a double character of social memory in individualistic, modern societies was associated with the secularization of consciousness and the penetration of the principles of criticality in everyday thinking on this ground.

In traditionalist societies, social memory is largely an instrument of influence and has a passive form. Under the passive form, we understand the lack of sustainable development and dogmatism against the suppression of critical thinking. This does not mean that the content of social memory in traditionalist societies is always stable and not subjected to revision. On the contrary, social memory represents a peculiar interpretation of historical events there in the context of prevailing ideological doctrines. For example, the fact that was shown in a good light yesterday can now be in disgrace and vice versa. The dictate of will and incident along with the ever-changing conjuncture dominate the rationality with its unsubjective logocentrism and the desire for realism in such societies. This destructively acts on everything created, producing new rules and restrictions at the same time.

Conclusions

The research has shown that the transformation of social memory in the conditions of postmodern society

mobilization contributes to the negative, marginal and asocial form of mass mobilization. In view of the distancing from rationalism, postmodern consciousness is forced to appeal to the subconscious and unconscious, uniting around limbic schemes and associative fields and finding the basis for thinking in them. The fragmentation of the postmodern consciousness does not promote the unification on the general principles. In this connection, the regressive and marginal forms of coexistence are unifying forces. They deny the social in its basis indicating the onset of the barbarism era in the technogenic civilization. Under the conditions of prevailing isolationism, mobilization takes place through the restoration of archaic regulations based on right-wing populism and the “politics of fear”.

Acquiring forms of a nationalist and chauvinist movement, mobilization in the peripheral countries is more directed at the national-political incorporation of the population supported by the “spiral of silence”, that is the forced humility of the part of the population disagreeing with fear of isolation. This is conditioned by the transformation of social memory into an instrument of manipulative influence capable of interpreting historical events in the context of prevailing ideological doctrines. Being out of real ties with the present and the past, social memory becomes fragmentary, selective and split which impedes the objective society's self-reflection in the historical perspective of events and the finding of adequate ways of social development.

Literature

1. Apter D. *The Politics of Modernization* / D. Apter. – Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
2. Barry J. A Genealogy of Economic Growth as Ideology and Cold War Core State Imperative / J. Barry // *Journal: New Political Economy*. – 2018: DOI: 10.1080 /13563467. 2018. 1526268
3. Benjamin De Cleen *Populism and nationalism* / De Cleen Benjamin. Vrije Universiteit Brussel; VUB Department of Communication Studies Centre for the Study of Democracy; Signification and Resistance. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
4. Brighi E. Foreign Policy and the Ideology of Post-ideology: The Case of Matteo Renzi's Partito Democratico / E. Brighi, L. Giugni // *The International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs*. – 2016. – Vol. 51. – № 1. – P. 13-27.
5. Comaroff J. Populism and Late Liberalism: A Special Affinity? / J. Comaroff // *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – 2011. – Vol. 637: Race, Religion, and Late Democracy. – P. 99-111.
6. de Cleen, B. Populism and Nationalism. In C. R. Kaltwasser, P. Taggart, P. O. Espejo, & P. Ostiguy (Eds.), *Handbook of populism*. – 2017. – 1. P. 342-362. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198803560.013.18
7. Deutsch K. Social Mobilization and Political Development / K. Deutsch // *American political science rev.* Cambridge. – 1961. – Vol. 55. – № 3. – P. 494-495.
8. Etzioni A. Mobilization As a Macrosociological Conception / A. Etzioni // *Journal: The British Journal of Sociology*. – 1968. – Vol. 19. – № 3.
9. Honneth A. Recognition or Redistribution?: Changing Perspectives on the Moral Order of Society / A. Honneth // *Theory Culture & Society*. – 2001. – № 18 (2-3). – P. 43-55.
10. Lerner D. *The Passing of Traditional Society* / D. Lerner. – N.Y.: The Free Press, 1958.
11. Massumi B. Everywhere You Want To Be: Introduction To Fear. In B. Massumi (Ed.) *The Politics of Every Day Fear*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press, 1993. – P. 3-37.
12. Ordenov S. Clarification of problems in modern society in the processes of informatization and globalization / S. Ordenov, O. Polishchuk, I. Skyba, T. Shorina // *E3S Web of Conferences*. – 2020. – 164, 11037. doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202016411037

13. Parsons T. Recent trends in structural-functional theory. *Fact and Theory in Social Science*. E.W. Count and G.T. Bowles eds., N.Y., 1964. – P. 140-157.
14. Stiegler B. *Pharmacologie du Front National* / B. Stiegler and V. Petit. – Paris: Flammarion, 2013.
15. Вирилио П. Низвержение в пустоту / П. Вирилио // Кризис сознания: сборник работ по философии «кризиса». – М.: Алгоритм, 2009. – 272 с.
16. Водак Р. Политика страха. Что значит дискурс правых популистов? / Р. Водак; [пер с англ.]. – Х.: изд. «Гуманитарный центр», 2018. – 404 с.
17. Козловски П. Культура посмодерна: Общественно-культурные последствия техн. развития / П. Козловски; [пер. с нем.]. – М.: Республика, 1997. – 240 с.
18. Липовецкий М. Паралогии: Трансформации (пост)модернистского дискурса в русской культуре 1920-2000-х годов / М. Липовецкий. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2008. – xxix + 848 с., ил.
19. Маффесолі М. Час племен. Занепад індивідуалізму у постмодерністському суспільстві / М. Маффесолі; [пер. з франц. В. Плющ]. – К.: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2018. – 264 с.
20. Морен Э. К пропасти? / Э. Морен. – СПб.: Алтейя, 2011. – 136 с.
21. Ноэль-Нойман Э. Общественное мнение. Открытие спирали молчания / Э. Ноэль-Нойман; [пер. с нем.]. – М.: Прогресс-Академия, Весь Мир, 1996. – 352 с.
22. Пода Т. А. Феномен соціальних мереж та їхній вплив на суспільно-політичні процеси у глобалізованому світі / Т. А. Пода // *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету. Серія: Філософія. Культурологія*. – 2019. – № 1. – С. 141-145.
23. Ребане Я. Принцип социальной памяти / Я. Ребане // *Философские науки*. – 1977. – № 5. – С. 94-104.
24. Харари Ю. Мы живем в мире, который пытается тебя хакнуть [Электронный ресурс] / Ю. Харари // Новое Время Интервью с историком Ювалем Ноем Харар 23 сентября 2019. – Режим доступа: <https://nv.ua/world/countries/iyual-nou-harri-intervyu-novosti-ukrainy-50043929.html>
25. Юнгер Э. Рабочий. Господство и гештальт. Тотальная мобилизация / Э. Юнгер. – Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2000. – 539 с

References

1. Apter, D. E. (1965). *The politics of modernization*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
2. Barry, J. (2020). A Genealogy of Economic Growth as Ideology and Cold War Core State Imperative. *New Political Economy*, 25(1): 18-29. doi: 10.1080/13563467.2018.1526268
3. Benjamin De Cleen *Populism and nationalism* / De Cleen Benjamin. Vrije Universiteit Brussel; VUB Department of Communication Studies Centre for the Study of Democracy; Signification and Resistance. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
4. Brighi, E., & Giugni, L. (2016). Foreign Policy and the Ideology of Post-ideology: The Case of Matteo Renzi's Partito Democratico. *The International Spectator*, 51(1): 13-27. doi: 10.1080/03932729.2016.1121688
5. Comroff, J. (2011). Populism and Late Liberalism: A Special Affinity? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 637(1): 99-111. doi: 10.1177/0002716211406079
6. de Cleen, B. (2017). Populism and Nationalism. In C. R. Kaltwasser, P. Taggart, P. O. Espejo, & P. Ostiguy (Eds.), *Handbook of populism*, 1: 342-362. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198803560.013.18
7. Deutsch, K. W. (1961). Social Mobilization and Political Development. *American Political Science Review*, 55(03): 493-514. doi: 10.2307/1952679
8. Etzioni, A. (1968). Mobilization as a Macrosociological Conception. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 19(3): 243-253. doi: 10.2307/588830
9. Honneth, A. (2001). Recognition or Redistribution? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(2-3): 43-55. doi: 10.1177/02632760122051779
10. Jünger, E. (2000). *The worker: Dominion and form*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka [in Russian].
11. Kharari Yu. (2019). *My` zhivem v mire, kotory`j*

py'taetsya tebya khaknut' An interview with historian Yuval Noah Harari. *Novoe Vremya*, (34). Retrieved from <https://nv.ua/world/countries/yuval-noy-harri-intervyu-novosti-ukrainy-50043929.html> [in Russian].

12. Koslowski, P. (1987). *Kul'tura posmoderna: Obshchestvenno-kul'turny'e posledstviya tekhn. razvitiya*. Moskva: Respublika [in Russian].

13. Lerner, D. (1958). *Passing of traditional society: Modernizing the middle east*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

14. Lipovetsky, M. (2008). *Paralogies: Transformations (post) of modernist discourse in Russian culture of the 1920-2000s*. Moscow, Russia: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie [in Russian].

15. Maffesoli, M. (2018). *The time of the tribes: The decline of individualism in mass society*. Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia [in Ukrainian].

16. Massumi, B. (1993). *Everywhere You Want To Be: Introduction To Fear*. In B. Massumi (Ed.), *The Politics of Every Day Fear* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 3-37.

17. Moren E. (2011). *K propasti? [To the abyss?]*. SPb: Aletyya [in Russian].

18. Noelle-Neumann, E. (1996). *Obshchestvennoe mnenie. Otkrytie spirali molchaniya*. M.: Progress-Akademiya, Ves' Mir [in Russian].

19. Ordenov, S., Polishchuk, O., Skyba, I., Shorina, T. (2020). Clarification of problems in modern society in the processes of informatization and globalization. *E3S Web of Conferences* 164, 11037. doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202016411037

20. Parsons, T. (1964). Recent trends in structural-functional theory. In E. W. Count & G. T. Bowles (Eds.), *Fact and Theory in Social Science* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press: 140-157.

21. Poda, T. (2019) Fenomen sotsialnykh mrezh ta yikhni vplyv na suspilno-politychni protsesy u hlobalizovanomu sviti [Social networks phenomenon and its impact on social and political processes in globalized world] *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviaitsiynoho universytetu. Seriya: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia*, 1: 141-145. [in Ukrainian].

22. Rebane, J. (1955). The principle of social memory. *Russian Journal of Philosophical Sciences*, (5): 94-104. [in Russian].

23. Stiegler, B., & Petit, V. (2013). *Pharmacologie du Front national*. Paris: Flammarion.

24. Virilio, P. (2005). *The information bomb*. M.: Algoritm [in Russian].

25. Wodak, R. (2018). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Kh. izd. Gumanitarny'j cenztr [in Russian].

С. С. Орден

ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ПАМ'ЯТІ В УМОВАХ МОБІЛІЗАЦІЇ ПОСТМОДЕРНОГО СОЦІУМУ

Вступ. Влада завжди була зацікавлена у створенні «правильного» образу минулого за допомогою «переписування» історії – знищення чи коригування відомостей («пам'яті») про певних людей або події минулого. У ХХ ст. зв'язок між історією і політикою лише посилювався, а останнім часом виникли нові види «політизації історії», коли, за допомогою функції конструювання, штучно створюються різноманітні форми символічної реальності та ідентифікації. **Мета і завдання.** Стаття спрямована на аналіз трансформацій соціальної пам'яті в умовах мобілізації постмодерністського соціуму. **Методологія дослідження:** Методологія дослідження базується на структурно-функціональному, соціокультурному та порівняльному підходах у їхній діалектичній єдності.

Результати дослідження. У класичному розумінні, соціальна пам'ять значною мірою відповідає за цілісність соціокультурної спільноти, що склалася історично, та за стійкість встановлених у суспільстві соціальних зв'язків і принципів дії, нормативно визначаючи, і, разом із тим, легітимуючи їх в системі суспільних відносин. Водночас, в умовах релятивістського різноманіття, культура постмодерну здатна мобілізувати лише «супроти», продукуючи при цьому деконструктивність соціальності, що на практиці призводить до заперечення навіть інстинктів самозбереження, як принципів антропологічних засад існування соціуму. В цьому виявляється характерна властивість постмодерної мобілізації, яка набуває негативної, маргінальної й асоціальної форми мобілізації мас. Вона слугує не конструктивним програмам, а деструктивному і орієнтованому на примарне минуле порядку денному. За допомогою інтегративного об'єднання таких технологій управління масами, як «політика страху» і «спіраль мовчання», транснаціональна еліта та політики здобувають все нові перемоги у глобальному політикумі. Все це значною мірою сприяє трансформації соціальної пам'яті у бік її фрагментарності та вибірковості, і, як наслідок, інтенсифікації ідоктринації населення, що дозволяє ефективніше управляти масовою свідомістю, посилюючи гегемонію правлячих олігархічних груп у глобальному вимірі.

Обговорення. Незважаючи на постулюєми принцип відказу від ідеології, постмодерна «постідеологія» формує свою ідеологічну палітру, засновану на принципах ірраціоналізму, дезінформації та маніпуляції. Ідеологічні чинники «постідеології» корелюють з ідеологічними засадами неолібералізму, деструктивно діючи на розвиток культури загалом та нівелиючи місце людини в ній.

Висновки. Трансформація соціальної пам'яті в умовах мобілізації постмодерного соціуму сприяє негативній, маргінальній і асоціальної формі мобілізації мас. З огляду на відхід від раціоналізму, постмодерна свідомість змушена апелювати до підсвідомого і несвідомого, об'єднуючись навколо лімбічних схем і асоціативних полів, знаходячи в них основи для мислення. Роздробленість постмодерної свідомості не сприяє об'єднанню на загальних засадах, у зв'язку з чим об'єднуючими виступають регресивні і маргінальні форми співжиття, які заперечують у своїй основі соціальне, що свідчить про настання епохи варварства техногенної цивілізації. В умовах пануючого ізоляціонізму мобілізація відбувається по лінії відновлення архаїчних установок, що ґрунтуються на правому популізмі й «політиці страху».

Ключові слова: соціальна пам'ять, форми мобілізації, культура постмодерну, політичний популізм, «політика страху», «спіраль мовчання».

С. С. Орден

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ПАМЯТИ В УСЛОВИЯХ МОБИЛИЗАЦИИ ПОСТМОДЕРНОГО СОЦИУМА

В статье рассматриваются трансформации социальной памяти в контексте мобилизации постмодерного социума. В исследовании обосновывается тезис, что мобилизация общества в культуре постмодерна приобретает негативную, маргинальную и асоциальную форму массовой мобилизации. Учитывая раздробленность постмодерного сознания, объединение на общих, универсалистских основах представляется невозможным, а глобализированное общество стремительно объединяется вокруг регрессивных и маргинальных форм общежития, которые по своей природе являются асоциальными. В связи с этим, мобилизация постмодернистского социума проходит по линии установления архаичных установок, основанных на правом популизме и «политике страха». На фоне существующих тенденций изоляционизма, мобилизация постмодернистского социума принимает формы националистического и шовинистского движения, и направлена на национально-политическую инкорпорацию населения, подкрепленную «спиралью молчания» – вынужденной покорностью несогласной части населения. Находясь вне реальных связей с настоящим и прошлым, социальная память становится фрагментарной, избирательной и раздробленной, что мешает объективной саморефлексии общества и осознанию своей исторической перспективы.

Ключевые слова: социальная память, формы мобилизации, культура постмодерна, политический популизм, «политика страха», «спираль молчания».