Totalitarian and Democratic Rhetoric as an Indicator of the Relations of Power in the Contemporary Information Society

Maryna PREPOTENSKA[1],
Inna PRONOZA[2],
Svitlana NAUMKINA[3],
Tetiana KHLIVNIUK[4],
Olha MARMILOVA[5],
Oksana PATLAICHUK[6]

[1] Kyiv National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine, gautama05@ukr.net, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-56017472

[2] Odesa South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after of K. D. Ushynsky, Odesa, Ukraine, inna140379@ukr.net, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2683-0630

[3] Odesa South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after of K. D. Ushynsky, Odesa, Ukraine, svetlana.naumkina@gmail.com, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1125-647X

[4] Odessa I.I.Mechnikov National University, Odesa, Ukraine, khlivniuktania@gmail.com, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7636-9088

[5] Vinnytsia Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, papiruda@gmail.com

[6] Mykolaiv Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding, Mykolaiv, Ukraine, volnistik@gmail.com, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1448-3360

Abstract: The article is devoted to study of totalitarian and democratic types of rhetoric. The classical dichotomy of rhetorical influence has been discovered: monologic use of rhetoric as a verbal weapon through propaganda, demagoguery, populism, creation of the image of an enemy, division of society (totalitarian type of rhetoric) and dialogical use of rhetoric as consolidating communication, truth-seeking, social consent and understanding (democratic type of rhetoric). It is shown that the trigger of democratic and totalitarian regimes is the existential of freedom.

The active influence of the postmodern rhetoric of the information age in its performativity in the acquisition of snack culture is determined, which significantly strengthens the manipulative strategies. Totalitarian tendencies of digital rhetoric are found in information warfare technologies (network trolling, mobbing, hype, hatering, holy waring, click-baiting, sockpuppeting), in the processes of censorship, ambivalence and negativism of information, spreading fake news, igniting conflicts in mass media. Militarization of vocabulary and spread of obscene language in ordinary communication as factors of compensatory aggression of the population, the danger of excessive information transparency of people's private lives are noted. Democratism of the digital rhetoric is manifested in such phenomena as the direct creation of e-democracy, access of citizens to e-voting, e-services, e-petitions, overcoming digital inequality, the ability to communicate with officials and public officers live on TV and radio, in social networks. Democratic principles of rhetoric, especially in Ukraine as a state of "transitional democracy" should be supported by quality education, fostering critical thinking and activity of civil society.

Keywords: *Totalitarianism, democratism, society, monologism, dialogism, freedom, digitalrhetoric, transparency, tolerance, ambivalence.*

Introduction

The history of conscious humanity can be assessed in terms of the history of states: from the first state formations of Mesopotamia, ancient Egypt and ancient India from 4-3 millennium BC - to civilisations of kingdoms, empires and superpowers founded in the following millennia of the latter of which are periodically marked by global standoffs.For a long period of time, one of the leading problems of state life has been the socio-political system depending on the political regime: totalitarian, authoritarian or democratic. In each of them there is a specific rhetoric of the ruling circles in the organization of government, communication with the people, in spreading ideological clichés, declarative guidelines and laws. In turn, citizens form their own communicative models "from below", which sometimes differs radically from the rhetoric of "the powers", and in this controversy the prospect of destruction of a certain type of government matures. Therefore, the study of rhetoric, due to which communication in the micro-society takes place, media messages, public opinion and macro-communicative content are formed, can be considered a very important task. In this article we will focus primarily on the rhetoric of our time, which has a unique, unprecedented specificity: global informatization and a steady progress of total digitalization. These processes obviously transform communication, social relations, individual and social life.

The topic of the article is obviously relevant in the context of the postmodern discourse of the humanities and social practices. The first analytical aspect in this regard is a specific interpretation of the power by postmodernists. In particular, Foucault's idea that power is a scattered, pervasive "multitude of power relations" is still acute: "Power is everywhere not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (Foucault, 1996, p. 193). Indeed, at every level of the social hierarchy, in any interpersonal communication, especially with a manipulative subtext, there is a range of authoritarian influence: from covert tricks to outright coercion, violence, and abusive behavior. It should be noted that the mentioned situations are made possible in rhetorical action, through verbal and non-verbal ways of communication. Attention should be paid to Foucault's idea of transversal power and in the sense that power is interpreted by postmodernists as a totalitarian atmosphere of human relations, where options for coordination, orders, punishment become a sad communicative tradition (Foucault, 1975, p. 328). It should be added that Derrida's well-known theory of deconstruction leads us to the understanding of "power"

relations in the language itself: the philosopher calls for overcoming logocentrism and binary oppositions of meanings as contradictions between logic and rhetoric to establish equality of the components of statements (Derrida, 2000). This opinion can be completely extrapolated to the rhetoric of dialogue, which ideally requires symmetrical, equal communication, mutual adjustment of communicators.

Deconstruction can also be commented on as a kind of cognitive-linguistic game that brings us to the next postmodern aspect - the game as a sign of general social processes and especially as a trigger of power relations. The apologists for postmodernism, Bart, Baudrillard, Derrida, Deleuze, and Foucault, presented the game as a certain ontological-speech alternative to the modernist absolute truth. "All identities are only simulated, arising as an optical "effect" of a deeper game, a game of differences and repetitions" (Deleuze, 1998, p. 9). Thus, if the truth has become elusive, and it has been replaced by play on words and arguments - this is the source of the phenomenon of post-truth: the rhetoric of speakers is far from finding objective meaning, and pursues the goal of winning subjective arguments imposing the right to "truth" as the right to power.

The phenomenon of the game is closely linked to another aspect of the postmodern philosophy and rhetoric – performativity. One can see positive moments in this: rhetorical discourses become spectacular, complemented by visual effects, enhanced by ICT. Today's speakers usually abandon ready-made classic clichés of eloquence, using, in particular, anti-narratives such as life stories. However, the demand for performance leads to an increase in numerous talk shows. Today we can talk about the general showization of politics and culture, given that in our country, screen politics has almost completely replaced culture. It is clear that any show involves pushing opponents, rhetorical tension. It is no secret that screenwriters prescribe conflicting roles to program participants in advance. Screen shows, especially political ones, deploy such rhetoric of power, which is based on the image of the enemy, in the language of hostility and populism. At the same time, as we know, the "heroes" of shows usually communicate quite amicably post factum, and this paradox hints at another basic aspect of postmodernism - the simulacrum.

In turn, simulacra, eloquently described by Baudrillard as "copies of what does not exist", as "reality that hides the fact that it does not exist" (Baudrillard, 2004, p. 7), testify to the total processes of imitation of events and feelings, about multilayered staging plots of contemporary politics,

culture, power influence. Therefore, for a contemporary individual, whom postmodernists joking apart called "ironic schizophrenic", it is incomprehensibly difficult to navigate in the ambivalent information, to understand the true meaning of statements of government officials, to predict events in an atmosphere of chaos, uncertainty and constant social turbulence. Apparently, only a new rationality, substantiated and presented rhetorically, together with the general socio-historical progress is able to develop new, clearer and more logical horizons of civilization, culture, communicative discourses. Contemporary searches for the justifications of post-postmodernism and post-rhetoric may be quite promising worldview vectors along the way.

Finally, the principal dominants of the postmodern worldview and rhetorical broadcasts (the omnipotence of power, the priority of the game, performativity, the spread of simulacra, the showization of life) provide accurate research "lenses" for analyzing contemporary rhetoric of power, identifying its totalitarian and democratic trends in the information society.

The purpose of the article is to determine the totalitarian and democratic tendencies of rhetoric in the information society on the basis of the existential foundations of the mentioned processes and their cognitive ambivalence. The objectives of the study also include clarification of the basic concepts, showing the historical continuity of communicative models of influence and identifying their innovative features, taking into account the role of mass media, virtual resources of the network, social activity of civil society.

The methodological keys of the study are socio-philosophical and socio-cognitive perspectives, achievements of communicative philosophy, philosophy of dialogue, philosophical-anthropological, psychological, existential approaches in the assessment of human thinking-speaking and the appropriate social behaviour.

Concepts and typology of political regimes

Let's clarify the concept of political regimes. Let's use the well-known definition of totalitarianism proposed by Arendt: "totalitarianism is a political regime marked by extremely broad (total) control over all aspects of society" (Arendt, 1996, p. 14). Friedrich and Brzezinski in "The General Model of Totalitarianism" outlined its leading characteristics, such as the unquestionable domination of a single party led by a dictator, development of an ideology leading to the idea of world domination, physical and

psychological violence against people, monopoly on weapons and total control over the economy and other spheres of life (1965).Classic examples of totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century are considered the communist regimes of Lenin and Stalin during the Soviet Union era, the fascist regimes of Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, Mao Zedong in China, Fidel Castro in Cuba, Kim Jong Il in North Korea, and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Thus, the arbitrariness of power and tyranny are the leading features of any totalitarian regime. Mikhailenko, a researcher of totalitarianism, notes that under totalitarianism society also has a certain responsibility for the essence of affairs, since many people are prone to a "powerful hand", welcome its emergence and zealously serve tyrants, thus "unlike authoritarian forms of relations "individual –society – power" totalitarian rule necessarily has a mass, collective nature" (2000). To clarify this view, it is worth remembering Fromm's remarkable idea of escaping freedom: the willingness of some people to give up their freedom to a dictator in exchange for peace and the illusion of stability, for the role of "a well-fed and a well-dressed machine" (2014).

According to Bekeshkina, an authoritarian regime is characterized by "restriction of political rights, freedoms and participation of citizens in governing the state and accumulation of power in one hand" (2006), although some communities in the atmosphere of cult of personality sometimes have a gap of social autonomy. The rule of Pinochet in Chile, General Franco in Spain, Qaddafi in Libya, etc., became well-known authoritarian regimes with elements of totalitarianism. The democratic system was eloquently described at one time by Abraham Lincoln as "Government of the people, by the people, for the people". There are many meanings behind these lofty words, and some democratic principles are quite shaky, which will be discussed below. However, the rule of law, provision of fundamental freedoms, the electoral system, pluralism and tolerance are integral features of democracy in action. According to the index of democracy (basic democratic freedoms and rights), about 70 countries of the world today are countries of full or relative democracy, and Ukraine is marked as a country with a transitional regime (The Humanitarian Portal). Therefore, Ukrainians need to cooperate more actively in overcoming the anti-democratic phenomena of life, which requires social and communicative consolidation (Gerasymova et al., 2019; Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska et al., 2020; Sheremet et al., 2019).

There are dozens of subtypes of these leading political regimes, but in terms of the objectives of our article it will be more correct to start from the extremes of totalitarian and democratic systems, because it is in this controversy contains the existential freedom as a leading trigger of social and individual development or stagnation in case of its deficiency. In democratic countries, freedoms are guaranteed by law and are mostly embodied in the reality of social processes, in totalitarian ones they are purely formal, and people are in fact captive to arbitrariness and coercion of power.

It is worth noting the emergence in our time of the concept of oxymoron "totalitarian democracy", authored by the American historian Talmon (1961). He expressed the idea that strict implementation of democratic norms still requires the dictate of the state rational machine. We would say that democracy is not a dictate of the state, but a "dictate" of the law, which is far from the same thing, therefore in this case we can talk about totalitarianism only metaphorically. In addition, the researcher saw the leading contradiction between totalitarian and democratic power not in relation to freedom, but in relation to politics in general. According to him, democratic politicians perceive politics as a sphere of trial and error, and totalitarian - as the right to an indisputable truth (Talmon, 1961). In this aspect, one can partly agree, although the declaration of the right to truth is embodied by suppression of the freedom of others, so freedom remains the cornerstone of the social order. The attitude to freedom and, in particular, to freedom of speech, to the search for truth and its proclamation brings us directly to the subject of rhetoric, because it is through rhetorical models that people in power carry their ideas to the masses. For the time being, we will not consider the rhetoric of directly totalitarian states, but the *tendencies* of verbal action, which can be called rhetoric of the totalitarian or democratic type.

It is known that rhetoric is an ancient subject of the humanities from the ancient understanding of it as a science to persuade - to postmodern views on it as a linguistic, ontological-aesthetic game, where coercion nests that requires deconstruction. According to postmodernist critical discourse analysis, rhetoric is interpreted as a verbal and beyond-verbal practice of communication in conjunction with performative means of influence (audio, video, various sensory additions). Today they talk about "image rhetoric", "cinema rhetoric", "city rhetoric", "business rhetoric", but regardless of the formats, they see it as a multimodal impact on the target audience. Since the history of rhetoric as a science, technology and art goes back to the history

of the institutions of ancient Athenian democracy, it is natural that its consideration has long been based on considerations of politics, the ideal state and the role of political speech in social life. Therefore, perhaps for many centuries in a row in the common perception rhetoric was mistakenly identified with oration, although in antiquity its dialogical nature was emphasized. After all, rhetoric unfolds discursively not only in public monologues, but also in dialogues, polylogues, disputes, conflicts, in any social and communicative interaction.

Dialogue is directly connected with the understanding of rhetoric in the history of philosophy - the analysis of interpersonal communication, which may reflect the controversy of values: manipulative influence of communicators for their own benefit, or actualization of interlocutors to understand and invent the truth about the subjects in question.Classical reflections on this issue can be considered Plato's dialogues, in particular, the dialogue "Thiet", which emphasizes the importance of finding truth through Socratic mayevtics —"extraction" of true knowledge of objects through dialogue, posing questions and interpretation of answers (Plato. Thiet). In Plato we also find a strong condemnation of sophistic rhetoric, which can become a "cooking for the soul" - a trick for the one-sided victory in disputes to circumvent the truth (Plato. Gorgias). Apart from this, there is a glorification of rhetoric as a means of establishing the truth on the basis of logic, respect for the opponent, well-thought-out argumentation. From the ancient rhetoric we have also received a triad of classical eloquence: ethos (morality of the speaker), pathos (the ability to convey high feelings), logos (mind, logic, intellect). In Quintilian, similar ideas reached the absolute in the image of the ideal speaker *vir bonus dikendi peritus* - a man honest and worthy in words and deeds (Quintilian). With the development of science and the rise of countries in the world, the philosophy of rhetoric continued to focus on the declared in antiquity controversy of manipulative influence (linguistic and psychological violence, totalitarian tendencies) and equal communication of individuals at the level of "Me– You", which determines public democratic space. Thousands years of human civilization were marked by development of Christian rhetoric, its sacred foundations ("In the beginning was the Word"), inclusion of rhetoric in the trivium of classical university education in Europe (poetics, rhetoric, philosophy), the use of rhetorical force, agitation and propaganda in igniting hostility between certain individuals, ethnic groups and peoples (inquisition, crusades, wars), for the radical transformation of state systems (revolutions), but also for the

arrangement of peaceful coexistence (peace treaties, agreements, declarations, multiculturalism policy, formation of consolidating institutions such as the UN, EU), etc. In the theory of rhetoric, heuristics as an art and technology of controversy (Schopenhauer) was separated, the role of dialectics for the logical construction of speeches and debates was shown (Hegel), it was found that human speech forms ontological parameters (language as a "home of being", Heidegger). Obviously, the list of evolution of philosophical and rhetorical aspects can be extended indefinitely, but let's return to the context of our topic - the dichotomy of totalitarian and democratic tendencies of rhetoric in the processes of influence of the speaker on the masses and in discourses of interpersonal communication.

Let's pay attention to the study of the existential nature of the crowd and the charismatic speaker who influences the masses, articulating totalitarian or democratic accents of public life. And although today's people of leadership exposition are mostly speakers from PC monitors or TV screens, some mechanisms of rhetorical influence probably remain universal. Moreover, according to psychologists, the close-up of the human face on the screen has a strong and even trance effect on the mass viewer, who subconsciously identifies himself with the speaker, announcer, actor, participant in media communication. Contemporary visual and sensory additions to speeches, music, "puzzles" of image systems, bright colors, plot cut-ins, transition of the camera from one TV communicator to another create rhetorical content that "attracts" users of media resources, forming relevant beliefs, opinions and public sentiment.

Lebon once substantiated the metaphor of the "soul of the crowd", which is easily obeyed by words, has no mind, and belongs to a lower form of evolution. Rhetoric demonstrates the abuse of the word and is used unilaterally - as the art of creating images and illusions; the speaker appeals to the instincts by the force of words, not to high feelings (Lebon, 1896, p. 18). Canetti, analyzing the rhetorical influence of the people of power on the masses, noted such features of the crowd as a passion for destruction, a willingness to panic and automatically obey the rhythm (Canetti, 1997). Indeed, from ancient times, mass gatherings to persuade, inspire, encourage the people to perform social rituals were accompanied by drumming, chanting, music and dancing, gymnasts' performances, torchlight processions, flags, slogans, posters, and later - manipulations with holograms, military parades involving cars, planes, etc. On the streets and squares of cities, on TV screens and on PC monitors, live, in cyber streams,

people perceive the presentation of ideas most significantly if they are deployed as a performance.

Moskovichi fixed transformation of the speaker of such genres into a kind of hypnotist, the eloquence of which becomes infusion, and quasi-debates - propaganda, the technology of mass production of masses (Moskovichi, 2001). Freud interpreted interaction of the leader and the crowd as a purely libido phenomenon, where obviously there is a powerful male principle of the speaker and a conquered female principle, the crowd. In the form of libido-charged rhetoric, it is possible to put any truth as long as there is mythologization of ideas and their uncompromised, peremptory proclamation (Freud, 1921). Consequently, we have such retrospective worldwide approaches to rhetoric, as understanding of its dual nature (manipulation / actualization), awareness of the great power of the word charismatic speakers on the crowd and the existing potential of performances, mosaic and screen culture as a catalyst of rhetorical influence.

From the second half of the twentieth century attention of scientists began to focus on the features of rhetoric in the information, globalized, virtualized and urbanized world. Leading researchers of the Information Society – Bell (2001), Martin (1990), Masuda (1983), Mahlup (1966), Kastels (1996) announced beginning of the information era and identified it characteristic features: emergence of the global information space of the Internet, ignition of a new industrial revolution based on information technologies, an increase in the number of employed specialists in the information sphere, the overall virtualization of life. Martin's thoughts deserve particular attention; he claims that the key element of the information society is communication, which provides small groups to rhetorically influence great mass of people and thereby significantly shaken the information society. From this the scientist makes a paradoxical conclusion that "contemporary terrorism is one of the consequences of a decrease in the stability of the society as it gets informatized". At the same time, the researcher is convinced that opposition to dangerous processes should be made by a "policy of accountability"– total biometrics (Martin, 1990, p. 117). It is difficult to agree with such opinion, because total accounting and control once have already been demanded "algorithms" of social life, for example, in the USSR, or in Nazi Germany, and sad consequences of such historical experiments are well known ... The topics of biometric control, transparency and accountability of individuals acquire as never acute relevance nowadays, in the conditions of pandemic and

lockdowns, when humanity feels an extraordinary concern about the prospects of total identification. Similar problems are more loudly articulated in publications of contemporary young scientists who focus on informational and technocratic factors of social activities, rather ambiguous in the sense of democratic freedoms.

Neves argues that our time demonstrates a symbiosis of technocracy and manifestations of totalitarianism, since development of information technologies cause the possibility of comprehensive control over the masses. The researcher postulates this problem as the main issue of contemporary philosophy (Neves, 2017). Alonso shows the danger of information transparency, which is the "obsessive cultivation of the private world" in social networks. Almost all options for individual life, such as birth, sex, work, entertainment, death become the property of the society, "epidemic of transparency" makes a person too open to the prying eyes, too unprotected. The author of the article calls this phenomenon "a totalitarian element in the execution service of individuals' disengagement" (Alonso, 2018, p. 601). Similar thoughts were expressed by Saladin, who also warns against unlimited transparency of individuals, because excessive openness together with identification of people and digital surveillance will create a totalitarian space, which is dominated by "the all-searching, all-knowing eye" (Saladdin, 2018, p. 170). Moreno put forward a reasonable idea, showing such a widespread phenomenon of communication of authorities with people, as populism, and justifies the opinion that actually populist rhetoric is "redefinition of democracy", because "in populist slogans leaders form the formless" and under beautiful slogans actually destroy democratic foundations (Moreno, 2019, p. 162). Postnikova et al in search of algorithms of totalitarian rhetoric, turn to the history of Cuba of Fidel Castro ruling times and argue that one of the basic techniques of his totalitarian rhetoric was a discrediting communicative strategy, within which a continuous information campaign unfolded to undermine the authority of the opposition, distributed dirty accusations, pinning labels on enemies of the regime (Postnikova, Nefedova, 2019). Peck articulates the topic in the context of transnational social capital and socio-spatial features of civil society. The researcher tracks dominant versions of the power discourse and also shows that they are based on dirty rhetoric, compromising information on competitors. In contrast, a democratic discourse is a "creative, constant, continuous work of the sound forces of the society", in particular in communities and locations of the diaspora (Peck, 2020, p. 142). Smith,

analyzing totalitarian and democratic discourses, indicates such a feature in the pressing of the power as "the desire to curb the popular opposition, public movements". The manipulative nature of the rhetoric of pro-government forces, which only seem to support social activity of the masses, and in fact, seek to "appropriate the discourse of public movement", taking them, so to speak, under their wing (Smith, 2016, p.17). Delhey, having analyzed 22 Western and Asian active public communities, finds a leading democratic rhetoric marker: formation of trust in communication, calling it "the glue of social cohesion", which ensures the cohesion of democratic forces and social integration of citizens (Delhey, Boehnke, Dragolov, Ignacz et.al., 2018). Barbosa correlates development of social networks and social capital and derives the concept of network culture, which, in his opinion, consists of associations of social agents capable of horizontally integrate models of sociocultural, economic systems, the exchange of experience of people of different nationalities and professions, thus forming effective international forms of democracy (Barbosa, Martins, 2010). Another researcher of social problems, Garnier, performing a frame analysis of 766 newspaper articles regarding, at first glance, a topic far from politics (about breeding chickens), comes to important socio-political conclusions: newspapers have ceased to be an important element of a strong democratic society, because instead of structuring information and public opinion in their rhetoric they broadcast increased diffusion and chaos, weaken democracy (Garnier, Wessel, Tamas, Bommel, 2019). One can fully agree with the above ideas about the loss of trust in the media, the spread of manipulative technologies of influence and the danger of total control technologies.

However, despite the large scope of research on rhetorical issues, the dichotomy of totalitarian and democratic tendencies in rhetoric needs further disclosure today. After all, awareness of these processes can provide relevant subject material for critical analysis and reservations and, possibly, for the social activity of citizens in the fight for democratic rights and freedoms.

Existential determinants of power rhetoric

Let's consider the existential nature of the rhetoric of power, which is the leading driving force of social change. Agreeing with Nietzsche's idea of the will to power, and with Fromm's conviction that others are ready to flee from freedom, we note that the fundamental cognitive-communicative

feature of persuasive speech is argumentation. It is in the process of argumentation that the speaker's attitude to opponents and to the ideas he proclaims is revealed. A person can be absolutely sure of his rightness, of the truth of his own opinion and at the same time adjust to the dialogical nature of the discussion. Then the rhetoric demonstrates intersubjectivity, equal communication of opponents, broadcasts democratic discourse. Otherwise, there is a danger of agony, existential redundancy, signs of totalitarian rhetoric.

In general, the will to power is reflected in the rhetoric of the totalitarian type as the desire to verbally dominate in communication, to individually influence the interlocutors, listeners, audience, crowd. Participants in the discourse are divided into "the rulers" and "the conquered", the latter of which are objectified by the speaker as material to influence. Realizing the authoritarian will to power, an individual experiences a certain pleasure, which can be explained even from biological point of view - a sense of organic superiority over other beings, raising their own vitality, active "consumption" of the appropriate energy of people who are influenced. This method of rhetorical assertion of power is inherent in a person who focuses on the idea of power as an end in itself, it is a monologic will, in which rhetoric becomes a speech terror, a verbal weapon, an instrument of domination. Sometimes the will to power can be combined with the desire to play, which leads to a new unique type of speaker - a political player, a professional manipulator. The rhetoric of manipulation can be formally reduced to a sincere dialogue, polylogue, dispute, but existentially it is also monologued. It is obvious that the instinct of self-preservation in a person of power is expressed, in particular, in the existential fear. It is the fear of losing power. It strengthens the urge to manipulate the word, because it gives the illusion of secret control over the danger of possible resistance from subordinate beings. The way to overcome one's own existential fear is to instill fear in the audience, create an image of the enemy and arouse aggression in his direction. This algorithm of manipulation is classical, and, despite a certain primitivism, the years of human civilization prove its ability to evoke the desired mood and actions. Division of the world into "us" and "them" distorts the picture of the world, inhibits the human soul, primitivizes thinking and develops hatred, which manifests itself as a sustained emotion. Such binary combinations, in which Jacques Derrida saw the logocentrism of power, the war of languages, unfold a social confrontation (Derrida, 2000). Simplification and

banalization of language quickly convey the idea of the speaker to the audience, ignite aggression. "The texts of Hitler's speeches are a continuous set of banalities and obscure expressions ... Everything was divided into black and white - there was no alternative; he was well versed in rhetoric, and more or less difficult questions were rejected with contempt or vulgarly simplified ... However, opponents had no hope of success ... His charisma is fanatical purposefulness, passionate persuasiveness of a pretended prophet and ideological self-confidence of a missionary", - wrote the researcher of rhetoric of Nazism, Kershaw(2014, p.59). The techniques of Nazi rhetoric are not fundamental innovations, they reach into sophistry and occult suggestions, their elements have always accompanied the relationship between the speaker and the audience in the "age of the crowd". A strong idea, its expressive proclamation, a demonstration of absolute faith and conviction create the image of a fanatic who captures the crowd and creates a special euphoria of "communication" between the leader and the masses.

Thus, the existential features of totalitarian rhetoric are the appeal to the low instincts of the crowd, the interaction of male and female, the primitivism of speech with existential redundancy in the proclamation of ideas and creation of images. Freud asserted: "The masses fall under the truly magical power of words that can cause terrible storms in the mass soul or curb the same storms ... The masses never sought the truth. They need illusions without which they cannot live" (Freud, 1921, p. 140). The rhetoric of manipulation, for all its sophistication, is recognized in the artificiality of verbal constructions, which are built on controversies and exploit the expressive arsenal of language for sensory attack on the addressee. In contrast, a harmonious human personality, moral, known and directed to benefit others is able to notice the lack of sincerity in manipulative rhetoric, which only skillfully plays on the strings of the soul.

Encratic or pro-government (according to Bart, 1994) rhetoric can be transformed by meticulously analysing its texts. Deconstruction of the text by Derrida (2000), overcoming the coercion of discourse by Foucault (2007) - contemporary methods of hermeneutic decoding of the rhetoric of power by identifying manipulative *subtext* and, we would add, by finding the "centre" of power in the personality of the man of power, in his ambitions. This requires a new political and rhetorical strategy of European humanism: "development of an alternative rhetoric to expose and overcome contemporary socio-cultural forms of limitation, manipulation, violence, repression, total control", - said Toffler (2002, p.15).

Demagogy and populism

Demagogy and populism are separate types of manipulative rhetoric of the authorities. The rhetoric of a demagogue can put people in a state of extreme despair and keep them in that state, constantly appealing to real or imagined threats. In order to support existential frustration in the most of listeners, demagogic rhetoric increases the feeling of danger, cultivates a passionate hatred of the "enemy", but instead of a concrete action offers a myth, an illusion of future "liberation", "paradise", "golden age". Populist demagogues may juggle the concepts of "patriotism", "heroism", "freedom", "glory", "higher race", "nation", "privileged class", "bright future", but these words are only verbal affects addressed to people who become infected and blinded by them. "People under the influence of demagogues ... become so insensitive to their true interests, so obsessed with emotions, that they can be used to achieve other people's goals. This is the psychopathology of fascism", Russell noted (1999, p. 201). After all, rhetoric of the totalitarian type makes dialogical existence impossible. A speaker-demagogue uses people cynically as objects to increase his vitality, throws "spiritual food" at the crowd as an illusion of a future paradise, in particular a well-fed life, and, as Reich wrote, "neurotic and hungry masses become the prey to political predators" (Reich, 1997, p.190).

If the will to power is not the objective, but an innate gift of governing people, an instrument of positive social change, such a person becomes a humane leader and opens to dialogic communication. "The activities of people in power, striving for creative self-actualization and actualization of the environment, determines the phenomenon of rhetorical inversion: an attempt to transform the crowd into a community of individuals, the emergence of polylogue in communication as a means of spiritual and theoretical understanding of the world" (Prepotenska, 2008, p. 203).

Rhetoric and ICT

Having considered the existential basis of the rhetorical influence, let's turn to analysis of innovative phenomena of the stated issues in the perspective of contemporary information technologies. The Internet has opened up a universe of global virtual communication, in which, however, one can see the same tendencies of totalitarian and democratic rhetoric that are reflected in real social interaction, but in new forms. As we wrote above, the totalitarian rhetoric is marked by a bipolar view of the world, the division of people into "us" and "strangers", creation of the image of an enemy. In

the Web, armies of virtual bots and trolls are deploying such sentiments quickly and technologically. As a rule, their rhetoric is a format of emphatically humiliating, rude, sarcastic statements addressed to the opponent, which can be called verbal violence.

Totalitarian tendencies of contemporary rhetoric. Information wars

In the context of information wars between supporters of certain interests, parties, leaders, projects, a number of rhetorical techniques have developed that incite hate speech and intensify psychological confrontation in society. A rather fashionable word "haterism" (from the English *hater*) began to denote today the rhetoric of hostility, the flow of compromising, offensive information addressed to people, ideas, communities. Hot facts, juicy stories, spicy details of someone else's life - a nutritious environment for haters, whose number is growing in accordance with the openness of information about famous people, events, insinuations of private and public life. Internet rhetoric brings to the surface the technological backdrops of people inveigling into conflicts, unfolds the processes of mobbing, trolling, harassment. Along with such phenomena, hype technologies are growing, when a loud media campaign takes place around an event or person for the sake of approval, or for the sake of media "destruction" of the subjects of confrontation. A series of totalitarian manipulations is supplemented by the spread of clickbait – distortion of information through false exaltation or condemnation, the insidiousness of network holy wars that "fight" with opponents 24 hours a day, covering them with verbal dirt and insinuations. Sock-puppeting technologies demonstrate false planted messages of excitement "for" or "against" certain people, and masters of claque (from French *claque* - organization of success or failure) and astroturfing (false initiative) further heat public opinion with their sharp remarks. It is not difficult to notice that manifestations of network information wars received mostly English names, which indicates the general processes of globalization and McDonaldization of rhetoric, culture, politics. From the same cut of cloth is the phenomenon of snack culture, which means hastily made for fast consumption "artifacts" that can only be formally considered cultural works. In fact, such phenomena are designed for instant consumption with a taste of pleasure, but with distant, not very tasty consequences: lively commercials, crashing into a linear news story, disrupt the perception of content and induce the effect of modular thinking in people, hastily printed "secret tips" a sort of "three steps to success", "10 recipes of wealth",

distort the deep psychological work on oneself, sitcoms "suggest" funny moments, bypassing the true sense of humor, pop music culture plays on sexual instincts and primitivize lyrics. After all, snack culture is a factor in simplifying people's thinking, turning them into an obedient mass that seeks quick pleasures, and will automatically obey orders rather than turn on critical thinking.

It is necessary to note such manifestations of contemporary media rhetoric as the plot concentration on negative news and creation of unreliable or unverified messages (fake news). For this purpose, a specific naming is used, which immediately attracts interest and strong emotions such as: "Accident. There are Victims", "Cats Eat Mistress", "New Deadly Disease", "Famous Actor Gets in Sex Scandal", etc. Five main topics (death, sex, scandals, sensations, funny stories) year after year fill the air, magazine and newspaper pages, social networks, play on the nerves of the audience, putting many in a state of obedience and social apathy. Another phenomenon in the service of totalitarian rhetoric is the ambivalence of information: at the same time, messages of exactly opposite content are thrown into the information space, for example, about the benefits of vaccination and its harm, about nearing peace in flashpoints and quick conflict ignition there; some odious person is presented as a hero, then as a criminal; and even on the weather report, rainy day and no precipitation day messages can appear simultaneously. Perhaps one of the reasons for the blatant ambivalence of information is incompetence of some contemporary journalists or copywriters. However, most likely these hidden guidelines from top officials and oligarchs - the masters of the media, their fixation on division of society, because the principle of "divide and rule" has an unlimited force, and totalitarian rhetoric accordingly is disguised as righteous anger against opponents. Moreover, when a person finds himself in the circle of ambivalent information, he experiences considerable cognitive dissonance and can become quite manageable.

Another phenomenon of the information society is the growing genre of blogging on the Web. Every six months, the number of bloggers doubles, which is an impressive phenomenon of mass culture. Many Internet speakers are quite charismatic, creative talkers. Nowadays, post-truths sometimes even say that the truth has migrated from television to the Internet, because indeed, a number of bloggers present a passionate part of civil society, trying to carry honest information about various events. However, around 2020, leading social networks began to actively censor

content, ban objectionable bloggers, remove avatars and pages of odious personalities from social networks, and set up technical barriers to streaming. This is not about banning immoral calls for violence or xenophobia, but about tabooing channels because of the political or commercial involvement of the curators of some online resources. Such signs obviously demonstrate an attack on freedom of speech, the tendencies of totalitarian rule.

Add to this the effect of transparency, which was discussed above in the review of contemporary scientometric articles. Indeed, the fall of the curtain on a person's private life is a sign of the contemporary information space in the media and on the Internet. On the one hand, the opportunity to confess and find feedback from many users about everyday events is a good way to overcome loneliness, for self-realization and presentation of talents. On the other hand, maximum openness "exposes" a person for tracking both by ordinary swindlers and by the authorities. Many options for personal gadgets (location, cash flow, private meetings, phone calls) are becoming more accessible to manipulators of all stripes, ready to abuse someone else's information, to control someone else's life. Milan Kundera rightly remarked: "If a private conversation is broadcast on the radio, can it mean anything other than the world has become a concentration camp? ... Concentration camp is not something exceptional, ... it is the world in which we are born and we can escape only with a great effort" (Kundera, 2002, p.33). Thus, one can agree that excessive digital transparency is a precursor to total control, which is one of the foundations of totalitarian power. Another manifestation of rhetorical violence, in our opinion, is the increase of militaristic vocabulary in the mass media and advertising slogans such as: "blot out", "screw somebody's brains", "explosive news", "war of tastes", "music snipers", etc. Looking like a funny play on words in the discourses of snack culture, such combinations obviously act on the subconsciousness of people and contribute to formation of compensatory aggression. Adding to this is the incredible prevalence of criminal slang and obscene language in ordinary interpersonal communication, which has long ceased to be the prerogative of irritated males, and migrated to female's rhetoric, children's dialogues, screen culture and public political battles.

Democratic principles of rhetoric

Thus, we have identified some features of totalitarian rhetoric in the information space, so we can focus on manifestations of opposite tendencies - democratic principles of rhetoric. In contrast to the monologue of totalitarian leaders, democratic rhetoric shows dialogue and freedom of speech of participants in communicative discourse, the ability of speakers to listen to each other without interrupting or pinning labels on opponents, to maintain visual contact with interlocutors, to provide nonverbal support on the level of facial expressions and jests, try to find agreement, consensus, compromise. Under the discourse of controversy, speakers also demonstrate correct behaviour and fairly literate language. When the dialogue is supplemented by other participants and turns into a polylogue, much depends on the moderator of the conversation, who (in a democratic discourse) tries to maintain symmetry of remarks, comments and directs communication to find the truth, or at least agree on the topic. Such processes should not be confused with conformism, pacifism or unprincipledness. This is an existential subtext of rhetoric, which involves perception of Anther, or even the Different as a peer person who has the right to his own opinion.

A sign of a truly democratic system is usually the presence of a public space and a broad discussion of problems by the community. Habermas' Öffentlichkeit (publicity) (Habermas, 2016) still remains relevant as a guiding principle of openness and freedom of speech based on truth and justice, the prospect of universal participation in public discourse, equal opportunities for expression, a healthy attitude to criticism, and neutrality of power at the same time (Habermas, 2016). Contemporary digital technologies are significantly expanding the possibilities of social dialogue. Interactive tools enable the mass of people to participate in important discussions of political, economic, cultural issues through electronic petitions, public online discussions, electronic voting, e-consultations, etc. Live TV and radio, online streams and chats provide a full democratic dialogue between civil society and government structures. Socio-political, legal, psychological, educational and other institutions currently have their own websites, social media pages and other web-resources for constant communication. In addition, ICT capabilities are used in the field of crowdsourcing to attract the creative class, representatives of relevant professions, potential consumers to solve problems of innovation activity at the community level. The rhetoric of dialogue acts as a substantial basis of digital democracy, or in general as a

dialogic democracy, which is expressed in the organization of e-government. It, in turn, provides for establishment of information communications between government, business, civil society, digitalization of a large number of services, which were previously marked by huge queues in the offices of officials and fueled corruption schemes.

It should be noted the emergence of the concept of "digital rhetoric", which was predictably proclaimed by Lenkhem in the 90s of the twentieth century (Lenkhem, 2008). The philosopher showed the classic forms of rhetorical action (persuasion and encouragement) in innovative forms of interactive media and virtual multimedia, proclaimed a radical revolution in education, literature, cultural and socio-political life, noted the great role of multimodal tools: web-texts, pictures, audio-video images, podcasts to programs that "draw inspiration from anywhere in the world" (Lenkhem, 2008). A special interesting point of research of Lenkhem and his associates is the development of the "concept of kairos" (from the ancient Greek καῖρος - auspicious moment), which means the ability to find the best time to present a wide range of author's ideas (Lenkhem). One can fully agree that in an atmosphere of information overload, spam and advertising pressure, it is very important to convey relevant messages to the public in a timely and appropriate manner in order to be heard, to encourage the public to dialogue. Speaking of digital rhetoric, we also note deployment of strategies for development of digital society in Ukraine, in accordance to which, it is provided, in particular, 80% of Internet coverage of the state and comprehensive assistance to citizens in acquiring online communication skills, overcoming digital inequality (Government). It should be added that during the pandemic period, all participants in the educational process of secondary and higher education involuntarily acquired online skills. The platforms ZOOM, Google Meet and other online resources have made it possible to conduct a full-fledged teaching process, albeit with great problems. However, this was the only way out of the difficult situation of quarantine restrictions, and some methods of online submission of educational material proved to be quite effective and promising for the future.

Tolerant rhetoric

An integral principle of democratic rhetoric, both in an online and offline format, is tolerance –"a communicative harmony in diversity" as defined by UNESCO. The concept of tolerance, which by its content comes

from the older lexical item "patience", determines important values of social life: solidarity, social agreements, peace treaties, agreements, protocols of constructive actions at the level of micro- and macro- communities. True tolerance presupposes a positive attitude of a person to himself, attention to one's own inner world and awareness of the nature of communicative acts. We now hear many calls for tolerance towards various minorities, but the principle of tolerance is relevant in almost all communicative situations: in family communication, in urban locations surrounded by strangers, in educational, scientific, any business, professional field, in politics, diplomacy, media, etc. Despite the artificial incitement of conflicts for the sake of spectacularity of certain programs and the corresponding growth of interest in them, still intelligent, moderate communication, for example, in a show TV studio can evoke the greatest respect for participants and meticulous attention to the essence of what is said. When communicators show empathy, patience and active listening, no one claims to be indisputable right and does not force their own point of view, then the main cognitive discourse of democratic rhetoric unfolds: the search for truth, consent, understanding.

In the context of free democratic communication, it makes sense to recall a phenomenon that Bakhtin called polyphony (Bahtin, 1972) and Florensky – the magic of the word (Florensky, 1990). Although Bakhtin substantiated the idea of polyphony by analysing literary novels, in particular, written by Dostoevsky, it seems to us that this metaphor is quite suitable for oral rhetoric of the democratic type. "Counterpoint", "polyvocality", "merging of several consciousnesses", "multitude of authoritative ideological positions", "polyphony of full voices" - all these features of literary dialogue, derived by Bakhtin, are clearly manifested in the free dialogue of peer individuals. After all, as the philosopher optimistically wrote, "nothing final has happened in the world yet, the last word of the world about the world has not yet been said, the world is open and free, everything is still ahead and will always be ahead ..." (Bahtin, 1972, p. 223). Paul Florensky, a unique author in his spirituality, also inspired the gift of speech, seeing in verbal action a certain erotic magic. He believed that a word filled with deep meaning, sincerity and spiritual light could "fertilize" the listener and give birth to a whole cosmos of associations and, ultimately, an understanding of the essence of what was said, a "child" of dialogue. The philosopher substantiated a unique theory of karyokinesis - the process of fragmentation of words and meanings (subject to mental intellectual communication) into

multitude of new meanings: "Fragmentation of the word goes further and further, amplifying the word, revealing and embodying in it hidden potentials and creating new tissues in the individual, which themselves will begin to bear fruit" (Florensky, 1990, p. 98). Obviously, such magic of the word is possible in a purely equal, free, democratic dialogue. Thus, democratic rhetoric becomes not only an effective tool of social action for the public good, but also gives everyone the opportunity to achieve existential depth of their own personality, to rise to transcendent values and discover spiritual, intellectual wealth of their interlocutors, to achieve the only luxury in the world: the luxury of human communication.

Conclusions

Let's summarize the considerations set out in this article. We analysed the totalitarian and democratic tendencies of rhetoric, its classical existential subtext and innovative forms in the context of virtualization and digitalization of contemporary life. Having completed a retrospective analysis of research on the problem, we found that since antiquity and throughout the period of development of human civilization and culture, rhetoric has been associated with two strategies of influence. The first strategy is direct or manipulative, monologue speech violence of the speaker or interlocutor, respectively - concealment of the truth and objectification of communicators. The second strategy is the actualized influence of the speaker or interlocutor on the masses or on the participants of the communicative discourse for the purpose of dialogical, co-creative search of truth, compromise and understanding in tolerant communication of peer individuals. It can be argued that the meaningful triad of rhetoric ethos-pathos-logos declared by Aristotle has remained relevant to this day, notably the ethical, moral dimension of the speaker has become decisive in the case of totalitarian or democratic tendencies of influence.

The existential basis of the rhetoric of power is the attitude of the speaker to the very process of power and communication: power can be seen as a means of organizing the public good (democratic principle) or as a selfish goal to influence and control others (totalitarian principle). The leading trigger of social processes is the existential of freedom, so existence of the freedom of speech and free communication reflects the democratic tendencies of rhetoric, and suppression of freedom, censorship, the claim to absolute truth indicate totalitarian tendencies. Characteristic features of totalitarian tendencies of rhetoric are instillation of fear to the masses,

creation of the image of the enemy, arousal of anger and hatred to opponents. Demagogy and populism become additional rhetorical tools of manipulative influence.

The democratic dimension of rhetoric is marked by morality of the speaker, development of a tolerant full-fledged dialogue, the search for truth and consent in communicative discourses. Of great importance in the theory and practice of rhetoric is the postmodernist view of rhetoric as a system of multimodal coercion of power in a set of performative means of influence - catalysts for perception of the word, which requires decoding, deconstruction, awareness of influence.

We have identified innovative forms of digital rhetoric. Totalitarian tendencies are reflected in the increase of negativism, creation of control systems over people, excessive transparency of private life in social networks and gadget account data, censorship of bloggers, distribution of guidelines for mass media, incitement of information wars through technologies of trolling, hatering and hyping, holy waring and other manifestations of snack culture in real and virtual media dimensions.Rhetoric appears as a verbal weapon, as speech terror, and through militarization of language, the spread of low and obscene vocabulary, and the technology of injecting ambivalent information into the info space for the mental divisions of society into "us" and "them".

Democratic-style digital rhetoric is represented in e-government and e-democracy systems, in building communication options for interactive communication between citizens and government: e-petitions, e-voting, crowdsourcing, in the digitization of various social services. The leading factor of democratic rhetoric is availability of an open public space, the opportunity for every citizen to voice one's concerns in the discussion of important social issues. This is facilitated by freedom of speech, live broadcasts on TV and radio, streams and chats on the Web, accessible pages of government officials on social networks Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Telegram and other online platforms for online communication with citizens. In Ukraine, in order to implement digital rhetoric strategies, digital coverage of the territory is being promoted, digital inequality is being overcome, and certain segments of the population are being assisted in learning to use the Internet. We should also mention such an innovative aspect of digital rhetoric as implementation of distance education and the dissemination of video conferencing of various political, professional, creative, scientific structures of society. Provided tolerance and dialogic

rhetoric, social consolidation and social progress are possible. Participants in rhetorical discourses join the richness of the gift of speech, experience its polyphony and "magic". In general, the leading achievement of democratic rhetoric can be considered assertion of humanity, embodiment of the highest values of existence, which since ancient times received the definition of kalokagathia (from the Greek καλοκαγαθία - beautiful and good) - the unity of Truth, Goodness and Beauty. The primary role in democratization of life is played by education, during which the young generation should ideally master critical thinking, tolerance, respect for others, the ability to distinguish between manipulative and actualizing technologies of influence, the skills of humane eloquence.

Acknowledgement

References

Alonso, A. (2018). Transparency, the open and its politics. In F.M. Campos, *Politica y sociedad, 55(2),* 597-614.
https://www.academia.edu/37610664/La_transparencia_lo_abierto_y_su_pol%C3%ADtica

Arendt, X. (1996). *Istoki totalitarizma* [The origins of totalitarianism]. Moscow: TsentrKom.
https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/evrejskaja/khanna_arendt_istoki_totalitarizma/76-1-0-1980

Bahtin, M. (1972). *Problemyi poetiki Dostoevskogo* [Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics]. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.
https://www.fedordostoevsky.ru/pdf/bakhtin_ppd.pdf

Barbosa, A. M. E. S., Martins, A. Jr. (2010). Social networks and social capital: possible uses and limitations as sociological categories. *Contemporanea-Revista De Sociologia Da Ufscar, 8(1),* 239-264.
https://repositorio.ufscar.br/handle/ufscar/6669

Bart, R. (1994). *Smert avtora. Izbrannyie rabotyi: Semiotika. Poetika* [Death of the author. Selected works: Semiotics. Poetics]. Moscow
http://www.philology.ru/literature1/barthes-94e.htm

Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris: Galilée. https://monoskop.org/File:Baudrillard_Jean_Simulacres_et_simulation_1 981.pdf

Bekeshkina, I. E. (2006). Avtorytaryzm[Authoritarianism].*Entsyklopediia suchasnoi Ukrainy [Encyclopedia of modern Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Institute of encyclopedic research of the national academy of sciences of Ukraine. http://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=42475

Bell, D. (2001). *Gryaduschee postindustrialnoe obschestvo. Obrazets sotsialnogo prognozirovaniya* [The coming post-industrial society. A sample of social forecasting]. Moscow. https://studfile.net/preview/1805599/

Canetti, E. (1997). Massa i vlast [Mass and power]. Moscow: Politizdat. https://www.sstcc.ru/files/1114/6273/5669/massaivlast.pdf

Deleuze, G. (1998). *Razlichie i povtorenie* [Difference and repetition]. Translated from French by N. B. Mank-ovskaya. SPb. TOO TK "Petropolis". http://www.bim-bad.ru/docs/deleuze1.pdf

Delhey, J., Boehnke, K., Dragolov, G., Ignacz, Z. S., Larsen, M., Lorenz, J., Koch, M. (2018). Social cohesion and its correlates: a comparison of Western and Asian societies. *Comparative sociology, 17(3-4),* 426-455. https://brill.com/view/journals/coso/17/3-4/article-p426_10.xml?language=en

Derrida, J. (2000). O *grammatologii* [On grammatology]. Moscow: Ad Marginem. http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/ z0000204/index.shtml

Florensky, P. (1990). *U vodorazdelov myisli* [At the watersheds of thought]. Moscow: Nauka. https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_russkaja/florenskij_so chinenija_stolp_utverzhdenie_istiny_vodorazdelov_mysli/15-1-0-653

Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard. https://monoskop.org/images/2/22/Foucault_Michel_Surveiller_et_Puni r_Naissance_de_la_Prison_2004.pdf

Foucault, M. (1996). *Volya k istine. Po tu storonu znaniya, vlasti i seksualnosti* [The will to truth. On the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality]. Moscow: Magisterium-Kastal. https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/fuko_vol/index.php

Foucault, M. (2007). *Poryadok diskursa. Lektsiya* [The order of discourse. Lecture]. https://gtmarket.ru/library/articles/777

Freud, S. (1921). *Massovaya psihologiya i analiz chelovecheskogo "Ya"* [Mass Psychology and Ego Analysis]. http://freudproject.ru/?p=1248

Friedrich, C. J., Brzezinski, Zb. (1965). *Totalitarian dictatorship and autocracy*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard university press. http://pavroz.ru/files/friedrichbrzezinski.pdf

Fromm, E. (2014). *Begstvo ot svobodyi* [Escape from freedom]. Zaporizhzhia: Big-Press. https://modernproblems.org.ru/philosofy/182-begstvo-ot-svobodi.html?start=1#content

Garnier, M., van Wessel, M., Tamas, P. A., van Bommel, S. (2019). The chick diffusion: how newspapers fail to meet normative expectations regarding their democratic role in public debate. *Journalism Studies, 21(5),* 636-658. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1461670X.2019.1707705

Gerasymova, I., Maksymchuk, B., Bilozerova, M., Chernetska, Yu., Matviichuk, T., Solovyov, V., & Maksymchuk, I. (2019). Forming professional mobility in future agricultural specialists: the sociohistorical context. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala, 11*(4), 345-361. http://lumenpublishing.com/journals/index.php/rrem/article/view/1604/pdf

Habermas, Y. (2016). Politicheskie funktsii publichnoy sferyi [Political functions of the public sphere]. *Strukturnoe izmenenie publichnoy sferyi: issledovanie otnositelno kategorii burzhuaznogo obschestva* [Structural Change in the Public Sphere: A Study on the Category of Bourgeois Society], 112- 137. Moscow: Ves Mir Publishing House.

Hegel, G.V. F. (2017). *Nauka logiki* [Science of logic]. Saint Petersburg. https://www.marxists.org/russkij/hegel/nauka-logiki.pdf

Heidegger, M. (1993). *Pismo o gumanizme* [A letter about humanism]. http://www.bibikhin.ru/pismo_o_gumanizme

Kastels, M. (1996). *Informatsionnaya epoha: ekonomika, obschestvo i kultura* [Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture]. https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/kastel/index.php

Kershaw, I. (2014). *Hitler: A Profile in Power.* https://www.perlego.com/book/1546749/hitler-pdf

Kontseptsiia rozvytku tsyfrovoi ekonomiky ta suspilstva Ukrainy na 2018-2020 [The concept of development of the digital economy and society of Ukraine for 2018-2020]. http://bit.ly/2DnDXyZ

Kundera, M. (2002). *Nevyinosimayalegkostbyitiya* [The Unbearable Lightness of Being]. SaintPetersburg: Azbuka-klassika. https://royallib.com/book/kundera_milan/nevinosimaya_legkost_bitiya.html

Lebon, G. (1896). *Psihologiyanarodov i mass* [Psychology of peoples and masses]. Saint Petersburg. https://consense.com.ua/ru/lib/showbook/Lebon-psychology_of_nations_and_masses

Lenkhem, R. (2008). *Elektronne slovo: demokratiia, tekhnologiia ta mystetstvo* [Electronic word: democracy, technology and art]. https://chestnut-ah.livejournal.com/113738.html].

Mahlup, F. (1966). *Proizvodstvo i rasprostranenie znaniy v SShA* [The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States]. Moscow: Progress.

Martin, W. J. (1990). Informatsionnoe obschestvo. Teoriya i praktika obschestvenno-nauchnoy informatsii [Information society. Theory and practice of social scientific information]. *Ezhekvartalnik, 3,* 115-123. Moscow.

Masuda, Y. (1983). *The information society as postindustrial society.* Washington: World Future Society. http://cyborganthropology.com/The_Information_Society_as_Post-Industrial_Society

Mikhailenko, V.I. (2000). *Totalitarizm v XX veke: Teoreticheskiy diskurs Totalitaryzm u KhKh stolitti* [Totalitarianism in the XX century: Theoretical discourse]. https://elar.urfu.ru/bitstream/10995/53926/ 1/5-7525-1084-8_2000_01.pdf

Moreno, J. A. S. (2019). On constitutional power and populist redemption: The intangible value of democracy. *Revista De Estudios Politicos, 183,*161-190. https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/POSO/article/view/60224

Moskovichi, S. (2001). Strategii propagandyi i kollektivnogo vnusheniya [Propagandaandcollectivesuggestionstrategies]. *Reklama: vnushenie i manipulyatsiya: Media-orientirovannyiy podhod [Advertising: Suggestion and Manipulation: A Media-Oriented Approach],*171-186. Samara. http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/advinc.ssi

Nerubasska, A., Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings, 11*(2), 240-255. https://www.lumenpublishing.com/ journals/index.php/po/article/view/2625

Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, *11*(4), 275-292. https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235

Neves, C. S. (2017). Totalitarianism technocracy and mass society: a reflection on the dystopia in contemporary society and the contribution of philosophy of technology. *Pensando-revista de filosofia, 8(15),* 100-118. https://revistas.ufpi.br/index.php/pensando/article/view/5932

Peck, S. (2020). Transnational social capital: the socio-spatialities of civil society. *Global networks-a journal of transnational affairs, 20(1),* 126-149. https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/42961/1/glob.12234.pdf;

Plato. Dialogues. Gorgias. https://classics.nsu.ru/bibliotheca/plato01/gorgi.htm

Plato. Theetetus. https://www.plato.spbu.ru/TEXTS/PLATO/theaitetos.htm

Postnikova, E., Nefedova, L. (2019). Discrediting strategy in the Fidel Castro's media discourse. Conference: III Post mass media in the modern informational society. Journalistic text in a new technological environment:

achievements and problems. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences, 66,* 380-389. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335024281_Discrediting_Strategy_In_The_Fidel_Castro's_Media_Discourse

Prepotenska, M. P. (2008). Sotsioantropohenez rytoryky u hranychnomu butti [Socioanthropogenesis of rhetoric in extreme existence]. *Multyversum. Filosofskyi almanakh [Multiverse. Philosophical Almanac],* 191–204. Kyiv: Ukrainian Center of Spiritual Culture.

Quintilian. (1920). Institutio oratoria. Book XII. https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio_Oratoria/12B*.html

Russel, B. (1999). *Iskusstvo myislit* [The art of thinking]. Moscow: Ideya-Progress. https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/analiticheskaja_filosofija/rassel_b_iskusstvo_myslit_1999/28-1-0-2646

Rating of the countries of the world by the level of democracy. Humanitarian portal: Research. *Center for Humanitarian Technologies, 2006–2021.* https://gtmarket.ru/ratings/democracy-index

Reich, W. (1997). *Funktsii orgazma* [Orgasm functions]. Saint Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga. https://coollib.com/b/108341

Saladdin, A. (2018). Panopticism and totalitarian space. *Theory in action, 11(1),* 1-16. doi:10.3798/tia.1937-0237.1801

Schopenhauer, A. (2016). *Eristika ili iskusstvo pobezhdat v sporah* [Eristics or the art of winning controversy]. https://booksonline.com.ua/view.php?book=143041

Sheremet M., Leniv Z., Loboda V., Maksymchuk B. (2019) The development level of smart information criterion for specialists' readiness for inclusion implementation in education. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 72, 273-285. https://journal.iitta.gov.ua/index.php/itlt/article/view/2561

Smith, J., Plummer, S., Hughes, M. M. (2016). Transnational social movements and changing organizational fields in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. *Global networks-A journal of transnational affairs, 17(1),* 3-22. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/glob.12152

Talmon, J. L. (1961). *The origin of totalitarian democracy.* L.: Mercury Books. https://www.twirpx.com/file/2163155/

Toffler, O. (2002). Shok buduschego [Future Shock]. Moscow: ACT. http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/toffler-future_shock-ru-l.pdf