

DOI 10.26886/2414-634X.6(33)2019.9

UDC 101.9

PERSONALITY TYPES AND FORMS OF POLITICAL REGIMES IN THE CONTEXT OF MENTAL MANIPULATIONS

O. Andriyenko, PhD, Professor

Academician Academy Higher Education of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine

The article is devoted to the philosophical analysis of the links between personality types and ways of mental manipulations in the context of different political regimes. The methodological background of the research is the cognitive approach. The forms of manipulation of the consciousness of the personality have been revealed depending on the characteristics of political regimes (democratic, authoritarian, totalitarian forms of the social mechanism of manipulation of the personality consciousness). It has been concluded that each of three main forms of political regimes (democratic, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes) has its specific features of mind manipulation and corresponds to a certain personality type (socially active, transitional and socially passive type respectively).

Key words: Personality, Personality Types, Society, Politics, Political Regime, Consciousness, Manipulation.

Personality is a complex phenomenon which has been investigated in different fields of science such as philosophy, psychology, sociology, cultural studies, etc. There are many approaches to the notion of personality and hundreds of theories. In the context of this work the following interpretation has been used: Personality is a dynamic social and cultural phenomenon which involves set of behaviors, cognitions, and emotional patterns that evolve from biological and environmental factors. To

understand the sense of personality as a social phenomenon it should be compared with a range of related concepts – “human”, “individual” and “individuality”. “Human” is a term which refers to the biological essence of a human being. “Individual” is also a biological characteristic which describes a certain representative of humankind. “Personality” and “individuality” are terms which refer to social features of a human being. Out of a society we cannot speak about these phenomena. Not any person becomes individuality. This term characterizes a certain level of personal development when a person becomes enough consciously to be factor of development for itself besides biological and social determination. A personality is not just a passive imprint of social relations, but a dynamic social and cultural phenomenon that embodies the most active trends in social changes, the ability of independent creative thinking and actions thereby giving impetus to the development of society. But personality can develop itself and be a factor of social development only when it is free from manipulative influences which are wide spread in modern informational society. In this context the issue of the interconnections between the political regime, personality type and mental manipulations is rapidly becoming relevant.

The aim of this article is the philosophical inquiry of the correspondence of personality types and certain forms of political regimes in the context of mental manipulation technologies.

The manipulation of personal consciousness in science has been considered from the perspective of a technological approach in which attention has been focused on the techniques of manipulating, and synthetic approach – the description and analysis of specific cases of manipulation of the consciousness of an individual or group. As for modern scientific works which are devoted to the problem of mental manipulations here can be mentioned the following authors: P. Berger [1], M. Billing and

C. Marinho [2], S. Kara-Murza and S. Smirnov [3], G. Kolesnikov [4], P. Lazarsfel'd [5], R. Petty, J. Cacioppo [6], W. Riker [7] and others. Most of their works contain the investigation of the problem of mental manipulations in general while the connection between ways of manipulation with political regime and personality type remains open.

The problem of distinguishing of several types of manipulations and describing them in a single system has so far been complicated by the lack of a common methodological basis for the study of the phenomenon of political manipulation. The absence of such a base is caused by disagreements among researchers about what methods should be used for political manipulation. Political manipulation can be understood as informational and psychological social phenomenon. This way of interpretation gives the opportunity to use cognitive methodological approach to the question of mind manipulation. Such an approach makes possible to combine and structure knowledge about manipulations accumulated in different areas of scientific discourse and build a system of manipulations which orients a person to commit a certain political actions [3, p. 82]. The principles of the cognitive approach suggest that the object of manipulation has the ability to both resist the effect of exposure and exacerbate it. This is because the effectiveness of manipulation is provided by the impact on the mental and thought processes of understanding and interpretation of information. Accordingly, the more cognitive efforts a person makes to analyze the information received by it the closer its action is to rational and the less he is malleable manipulations [6, p. 112]. In addition, in the study the general scientific principles, the application of which ensured the scientific character and reliability of the knowledge gained, namely: determinism, systemicity, correspondence, complementarity, completeness, and consistency have been used.

The determination of social space is carried out through the individual consciousness of a person which perceiving information acts on the social consciousness and it in turn produces a restructuring of the individual consciousness. This is because personal consciousness includes individual and social consciousness. The manipulative effect is directed at the social component of consciousness of a personality which restructures the individual consciousness as a result of which the personality falls into a rigidly determined social environment, while maintaining the confidence that its activity is completely independent in nature [4, p. 14]. This phenomenon is actively used in the conduct of network wars since their central task is “the formation of a model of behavior of friends, neutral forces and enemies in a situation of peace, crisis and war” [5, p. 103].

Generally manipulation is the practice of using indirect tactics to control behavior, emotions, and relationships. On the one hand, manipulation is a part of any kind of management [2, p. 169]. People use manipulative techniques unconsciously in their every-day life. But, on the other hand, everyone has the right to the truth and actualization of truthful motives, values and purposes. In the era of information technologies manipulation has become rampant and has become a means of waging a hybrid war. Thus, as never before it is important to look for ways and means to identify mental manipulations and combat them.

The manipulative effect that pushes a personality to a certain political behavior is the result of several types of multidirectional manipulative influences the participants of which are the state, society and personality itself. Total political manipulations exclude randomness from the social life of a person which is natural property of personal consciousness in the ordinary environment [7, c. 115].

The context of a situation (form of government, historical period, civilizational type) determining the content component creates the optimal

version of the social mechanism of manipulating the consciousness of the person in relation to specific conditions [4, p. 85]. But it does not affect the universal essence of the manipulative mechanism itself. This mechanism includes three universals: 1) Universal of implementation; 2) Universal of integration; 3) Universal of transmitting. The specifics of the functioning of the universal of implementation process are determined by the introduction of semi-false and false ideas and ideas into the consciousness of a person. The functioning of the universal of integration process is determined by the integration of values and attitudes. The functioning of the universal of transmitting process is determined broadcast expected behavior of manipulators of personality.

Political regime is a unity of methods and ways of realization of power, relations between society and the state, features of political culture and dominant forms of ideology which characterizes a certain type of political relations. Political regimes depend upon the procedures and ways of organization of political power, styles of decision making and relations between people and the state. Political science distinguishes the following forms of political regimes: authoritarian, totalitarian and democratic. There are two main approaches to political regimes in modern science: 1) legal approach which makes accent on formal norms and rules of realization of power; 2) sociological approach which is based on the analysis of methods and ways of realization of power in social and cultural context. The most adequate is the second approach because it allows investigating not only official structures and government as the agents of power but all social forces which have real impact of decision making.

The social type of personality is a reflection of how the social system affects the value orientations of a person and through them on its behavior. Personal activity and attitude to social reality are the basis of the typology of personality. There are various options for the social typology of personality.

For example, M. Weber takes the specifics of social action as the basis for his classification of personal types and more specifically the degree of rationality of social action. Marx makes the accent on the formation and class identity of the individual. For E. Fromm the social type of personality as the dominant type of character is a form of communication between the individual and society. However, it is impossible to define the only, the most correct type of personality. Therefore, there are several personality typologies. So, for example, a critical and uncritical attitude towards social reality is possible according to which a person builds models of its own behavior. In the context of our work we distinguish three personality types according to the criterion of personal attitude towards social and political life: 1) socially active type; 2) transitional type; 3) socially passive type.

Accordingly to the forms of political regimes the three types of mental manipulations can be distinguished: 1) democratic; 2) authoritarian; 3) totalitarian.

It is believed that under a democratic regime the source of power is the people. Society is defined as free and open. Personality is also understood as free. But in reality people have only a small degree of freedom provided that they follow the established order. The elites are half open. The legal status of a personality is determined by its proximity to power structures.

Main features of the mechanism of mental manipulation in democratic regime are as follows. The impact is made on spiritual needs. The dominant values that are embedded in consciousness are creativity, self-development, love and inspiration. This form of political regime and the mechanism of manipulation correspond to the socially active type of personality which focused on spiritual ideals. The main goal of manipulation under a democratic regime is the formation of a position of non-participation in the political life of the state. A pseudo-goal that is actively being

introduced into personal consciousness is the formation of the illusion of active participation of citizens in political processes. The pseudo-goal achievement model is based on personal achievements in areas of social life that are far from politics.

The true ideas that constitute the basis for manipulation are the ideas that self-improvement and creativity contribute to personal development. Semi-false is the idea that society needs creative people. The truth is that they are really needed. But the lie is that having reached the top of its creative development a person will be able to influence the political processes in the state.

Authoritarian political regime is intermediate form between democratic and authoritarian regimes. This form of political regime is widespread in those cases when the government wants to make fundamental transformations of the social system. The features of an authoritarian political regime are as follows: 1) State power is not totalitarian in nature, that is, it does not completely control social processes; 2) There is no single totalitarian ideology but there are separate ideological constructs that most people follow (national interests, patriotism, etc.); 3) There is no mass terror. The state exercises the function of coercion by non-judicial methods. The court plays a secondary role. Elites are semi-open. The actual status of a person is determined by its belonging to the social layer and personal connections.

The transitional type of personality dominates. Using the methods of manipulation creates a certain ideal of lifestyle that people tend to follow. The activity of an individual is built on socially approved goals. The development of creative abilities is encouraged but provided that they contribute to the achievement of social success. Public opinion plays the role of supreme judge. The main goal of the authoritarian regime is the formation of a controlled personality type. The pseudo-goal is social

success [4, p. 130]. The main method of achieving a pseudo-goal is cognitive activity. Social success equates to the meaning of life. The semi-seminal idea is that society needs educated people (society really needs them but the ruling elite does not).

The totalitarian form of the political regime is associated with the forcible imposition of public order and ideology. The state exercises monopoly control over all spheres of public life. In political life there is only one party whose leader is an absolute authority. There is no political freedom. Elites are closed. The status of an individual is determined by belonging to a party structure. The biological needs of the individual dominate (food, shelter, safety, sex). The idea of family value is being actively promoted since through the family one can more strongly manipulate a person [4, p. 132]. The totalitarian political regime corresponds to a passive personality type. The position of non-interference dominates. A pseudo-goal is the creation of some great goal that everyone should strive for (for example, a bright future, joining a certain alliance, etc.). The methods of diverting attention from real problems and controlling social energy become widespread. The true idea in this case is as follows: A person can change a lot. Semi-seminal idea: The future should be better than the present. False idea: A person can actively influence the life of society.

The manipulative effect on all personality types regardless of the political regime is activated in transitive societies. Personal consciousness in a state of "transition" is forced to endure serious psychological discomfort and tension. In connection with such processes as the loss of social identity, anomie and social marginalization this tension intensifies and develops into a crisis of personal consciousness. Naturally people are trying in some way to avoid this difficult psychological state and very often this is due to religion and social mythology. Religiosity which is directly related to

the church retains a fairly strong influence primarily among marginal elements [1, p. 106]. At the same time, in the state of “transition” in the personal consciousness, an idea of the relativity of any view of the world is formed the process of secularization is activated. But it is accompanied by the opposite process – the growth of individual religiosity and the formation of a new social mythology. This reflects the controversial nature of individual and collective consciousness in transition.

The social mechanism of counteracting the personality of the manipulative effect on its consciousness consists of three universals: 1) Creation of one’s own or the perception of other people’s ideas; 2) Critical and reflective consideration of these ideas; 3) Activity (in contrast to the manipulation mechanism where behavioral activity since the person acts consciously and actively). In order for the social mechanism of counteracting the manipulative effects of the personality to be formed a combination of internal and external factors is necessary.

Therefore, personality is a dynamic social and cultural phenomenon which involves set of behaviors, cognitions, and emotional patterns that evolve from biological and environmental factors. The social concept of “personality” is closely connected with concepts of “human” and “individual” (which reflect biological part of human nature) and “individuality” (which reflects the highest level of personal development in society and cultural context). The personality type is the result of a complex interweaving of historical, cultural, social and economic conditions of social life. Personal consciousness becomes the object of manipulation in any political system. But each of political regimes has its specific goal and is directed to a certain personal type. For democracy the dominant personality type is a socially active man who believes that he can influence on social and political life by self-improvement based on spiritual needs. For authoritarianism the main personality type is a transitive type which is strongly oriented on socially

approved goals (the main of them is “social success”) and public opinion which plays the role of “Supreme Court”. Socially passive and totally controlled personality type focused on biological needs and certain state *idée fixe* is inherent for totalitarianism. Regardless of the form of the political regime mind manipulations intensify during the transitional periods of social and political development.

References:

1. Berger P.L. (1969). *The Social Reality of Religion*. London, Faber and Faber, 239.
2. Billig M., Marinho C. (2014). Manipulating information and manipulation people: Examples from the 2004 Portuguese Parliamentary Celebration of the April Revolution, M. Billing, C. Marinho. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(2), 158–174.
3. Kara-Murza S., Smirnov S. (2009). *Manipulation of consciousness*. M., Eksmo, Algorithm, 528. [in Russian].
4. Kolesnikova G.I. (2014). *The social mechanism of personality consciousness manipulation*. M., DirectMEDIA, 272. [in Russian]
5. Lazarsfel'd P. (1991). *Personal influence*. Tomsk, Vodoley. [in Russian].
6. Petty R.E., Cacioppo J.T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. N.Y., Springer-Verlag, 262.
7. Riker W.H. (1986). *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 153.

Citation: O. Andriyenko. (2019). Personality types and forms of political regimes in the context of mental manipulations. *Innovative Solutions in Modern Science*. 6(33). doi: 10.26886/2414-634X.6(33)2019.9

Copyright: © 2019 O. Andriyenko. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.