



World Scientific News

WSN 67(2) (2017) 80-101

EISSN 2392-2192

Totalitarianism in sociological research

Andrzej Borowski

Department of Administration and Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Pomeranian University in Słupsk, 64 Westerplatte St., 76-200 Słupsk, Poland

E-mail address: aubor@poczta.onet.pl

ABSTRACT

Totalitarianism is a form of social system (usually a state one), the essential feature of which is to strive for seizing strict subordination and constant control over all areas of social and individual life. There are no legal limitations for the totalitarian power, nor it limits itself. All totalitarian systems are preceded by violent social revolutions that overuse [misuse] the slogans of the Great French Revolution. Involvement of the citizens is usually in their mass participation in different forms of action and expression of their enthusiasm for the “successes” of the system.

Keywords: totalitarianism, authoritarianism, Holocaust, dictatorship, junta

1. INTRODUCTION

The supremacy of the legal systems and the people who make [represent] them over the value systems is a central premise of every totalitarian system. It has its impact on the everyday life in the form of rationing of: goods, information and initiative, both individual and group one, in every area and respect. The state, through its representatives (the so called nomenclature), has the right to interfere, at any time and in any matter, in the life and the perception of reality by individuals.

2. TOTALITARIANISM

The concept of totalitarianism, like the concept of authoritarianism, as a political system was created after the First World War and originally it had positive connotations. It arose from the criticism of parliamentary democracy as a decadent and anomic plutocracy which was opposed by the state being based on power. Then, the slogans were taken by democratically oriented opponents of authoritarian movements who gave it a negative connotation. At present, totalitarianism has a clearly negative tone. In a broad sense, authoritarianism covers all non-democratic forms of government, including totalitarianism as its most extreme form, as the complete opposite of democracy. Some theoreticians raise doubts about empirical usefulness of the concept of totalitarianism, replacing it with the concept of authoritarianism (A. Perlmutter, 1).

In a narrower sense, authoritarianism shall mean:

- a specific form of government that is different from totalitarianism; or
- a mixed intermediate form, transitional between totalitarianism and democracy (liberalised totalitarianism); or
- a sui generis type, which is something more than just a mixture of totalitarianism and democracy.

According to J. Linz, a researcher into totalitarian systems, there are three salient features which differ authoritarianism from totalitarianism:

- limited pluralism, lack of overall all-embracing ideology,
- lack of political mobilisation of the masses,
- disposition of power, of certain though poorly defined formal limitations, by a leader or small a leadership group (2).

Totalitarianism is a form of social system (usually a state one), the essential feature of which is to strive for seizing strict subordination and constant control over all areas of social and individual life. It is also characterised by striving for as strong subordination of individuals to the collective as possible, as well as by a certain type of political gnosis that involves division of the reality into two areas – one good, which includes supporters of a given system, and one bad, which includes enemies of the regime. Totalitarianism is associated with dictatorship, significant limitation of civil liberties and personal freedom, abolition of freedom of speech and religion, limitation of inviolability of private property, and persecution of individuals who are in opposition to the totalitarian form of governance (3).

The decline of religious authority in the 18th century implied the liberation of human conscience, while the religious ethics was replaced by secular, social morality. The twilight of the idea of class society that resulted from the rise of individualism meant the loss of privileges, but at the same time brought a totalitarian temptation with it. If empiricism is the ally of freedom, and the doctrinaire spirit favours totalitarianism, the idea of the abstract man, detached from the historic formations to which he belongs, may turn out to be a powerful instrument of totalitarianism. These three currents merged into the idea of a homogeneous society, in which man live upon one exclusive plane of existence. The only recognised criterion of judgement was then social utility, as expressed in the idea of the general good,

which was spoken of as if it were a visible and tangible object. Modern totalitarian democracy is a dictatorship resting on the enthusiasm of masses, and therefore is different from absolute power wielded a divine-right king, or by a usurping tyrant. Left-wing totalitarianism is different from right-wing totalitarianism in its focus upon the problem of man. While the starting point for the first one has been and still is man, his reason and salvation, right-wing totalitarianism schools refer to the collective entity (state, nation, or race). The former orientation [trend / ideology] is essentially individualistic, atomistic and rationalistic, even when it raises the class or party to the level of absolute ends. Right-wing totalitarians are able to see only historic, racial and organic formations in their mind's eyes, exploit the concept totally alien to individualism and rationalism.

Totalitarian ideologies of the left wing always show a tendency to transform into a kind of universal creed, a tendency which is completely missing in right-wing totalitarianism, because reason is a unifying force, presupposing the mankind to be the total sum of individual reasoning beings. Right-wing totalitarianism implies the denial of such a unity as well as the denial of the universality of human values. It represents thus a particular form of pragmatism. Leaving aside the question of absolute significance of professed tenets, it aspires to a mode of existence, in which the faculties of man, in a deliberately limited circumference of space, time and numbers, may be stirred and realised so as to enable him to have what is today called the a wholly satisfying experience in a collective "élan", animated by mass emotion and the shocking charm of heroic acts; in short, it is all about the myth.

The second significant difference between the two types of totalitarianism is be found in their divergent conceptions of human nature. The left-wing proclaims in fact the goodness and perfectibility of human nature. The right-wing declares man to be weak and corrupt. Both preach the necessity of using violence. The right-wing teaches the necessity of force as a permanent way of maintaining order among poor and unruly creatures, and training them to act in a manner alien to their mediocre nature. The left-wing, when resorting to the violence, does so in the conviction that force is used only in order to quicken the pace of human progress and achievement of perfect social harmony. It is thus legitimate to use the term democracy with respect to left-wing totalitarianism, but it can not be applied in the case of right-wing totalitarianism. Whatever the original premises were, totalitarian parties and left-wing regimes have always invariably tended to degenerate into soulless power machines, whose lip service to the original tenets is mere hypocrisy. The modern secular "religion of totalitarian democracy" acts continuously as a social force for over a hundred years. Totalitarian democracy has its roots in a common stock of the eighteenth-century ideas and is not a recent phenomenon, alien to the Western tradition. It appeared as a separate trend during the French Revolution and has evolved continually ever since. Its origins go much further back than the nineteenth-century systems of thinking, such as Marxism (Marxism itself was only one, although the most vital among various versions of the totalitarian democratic ideal), which have followed each other over the last nearly two hundred years. Totalitarian democracy developed quite early as a model of centralised violence not because it rejected the values the eighteenth-century idealism but because from the very beginning it had a too perfectionist attitude towards them.

It made man the absolute point of reference. The established institutions were to be overthrown and remade, with a purpose of securing to man the totality of his rights and freedoms. All elements and principles of totalitarian democracy appeared or were outlined before the end of the 18th century. The 19th century brought into this conception the

replacement of individualistic premises by the theories of collectivism. The basic implication of totalitarian democracy that freedom could not be granted as long as there is an opposition and reaction to fear, renders the promised freedom meaningless. Liberty occurs when there will be nobody to oppose or differ in views, in other words – when it will no longer be of use. Freedom has no meaning without the right to oppose and the possibility to speak out different views. Totalitarian-democratic misconception or self-deception is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the eighteenth-century rationalist idea of man. A distorted idea brought forth the faith that irrational elements in human nature and different experience of living are an unfortunate accident, a bad remnant or a temporal aberration which, in time and under curing influences, will give place to some uniformly rational behaviour in an integrated society. The reign of the esoteric [exclusive], yet all-solving, doctrine of totalitarian democracy runs counter to the lessons of the nature and history (4).

The word “totalitarianism” appeared for the first time in 1925 and as authoritarianism was invented by fascism. The phrase “total state” made impression on B. Mussolini, sounded seriously, whereas the term “totalitarian state” boosted his vanity and rhetoric. However, Italian Fascism was something much less than totalitarian state. Democratic literature on totalitarianism, initiated by a pioneering work by H. Arendt and summarised in a classic tome by C. J. Friedrich and Z. Brzeziński, has two main points of reference – Nazism and Stalinism. As new generations emerged on the scene, fascism, together with Nazism, gradually became case number two (was dead), while Communism (that, by contrast, lived and was doing well) became an increasingly discussed issue. In his part of the book “Totalitarianism”, C. J. Friedrich names five essential conditions for the totalitarian system:

- an official ideology,
- a single mass party controlled by the oligarchy,
- a government monopoly on weapons,
- a government monopoly on the mass communication,
- a system of terroristic police control, and
- centralised economic governance (a condition being added later).

The above characteristic features are a syndrome – the totalitarian system is an effect of their entanglement and mutual reinforcement. The vagueness of the notion of totalitarianism is caused by the fact that it is used without limit in time and space, but also by the fact that it arouses exaggerated connotations not connected or poorly connected with idea of totality. Totalitarianism can be captured when we assign this term exclusively to a new, modern phenomenon and stay in the area of semantics – i.e. that on which “totality” focuses its attention. The modernity of totalitarianism is a technological modernity that allows expansion and penetration [permeation] of the totalitarian power. The move from the word “total” to the word “totalitarianism” shows that we are aware of and want to point to the unprecedented intensity, propaganda pressure and penetration [permeation] in terms of the scope and depth of what can be achieved by political rule [control]. “Leviathan” by T. Hobbes is a children’s bogey compared to G. Orwell’s monster, whereas the old tyrannies look innocent and harmless when we compare them with what totalitarian dictatorships are or may become. To emphasise this difference, we needed a conception, so therefore totalitarianism has been and remains effective and meaningful. Totalitarianism denotes semantic entrapment of the whole society within the state, all-penetrating domination of non-political human lives. Over the

course of time, totalitarianisms, as all new systems of government, lose their initial enthusiasm, the impetus assigned to them at the beginning, falling into a routine over decades.

The routinisation of totalitarianism may rather strengthen than weaken its features.

L. Kołakowski distinguishes a total lie as a very distinctive feature of totalitarianism. The polar conceptualisation of totalitarianism (as a polar variant of the ideal type) facilitates delineation of the map of political systems. On the other hand, the theory of totalitarianism is the more convincing, the closer it is in the semantic orbit of this notion. The main attribute describing the totalitarian regimes is therefore the scope and depth of total influence. From this point of view, features such as centralised economic governance can not be considered as defining characteristics but only as measures, or indicators, of extensiveness of the scope of totalitarianism (5).

Totalitarianism is not the exclusive domain of political scientists. It can not be defined only as a system of institutions. The years 1989-1991 showed beyond all doubt that institutional systems created by totalitarian regimes might appear formally intact but in fact they are only an "empty shell", or a "house of cards" near total collapse. The existence or collapse of totalitarianism depends on one hand on the totalitarian will of disciplined elite, inspired by a messianic message, but on the other one on the ability of this elite to impose on the population the ideocratic authority, based on the ideological control of thoughts and feelings. The most important and distinctive feature of totalitarianism is the existence, firstly, of mechanisms that create unusual, inhumanly strict discipline of the elite and, secondly, of ideological control of human spiritual life (such one that dictates people what to think), attempts to govern their emotional life, and establishes the code of conduct (6).

Expansive totalitarianism is characterised by an increase in the causal [causative] power to derailment on the pathway of temptation for power [strength / mightiness]. The point where increases in the causal [causative] power can not obtain a shift on further elements of the social organism falls by the wayside [is side-tracked]. In the minds of millions of individuals this looks as a clash with an opposing will (hidden enemy). So there is a phase of mobilising the collective psyche being roused by an increase in the causal [causative] power for the fight against this deadly enemy. The goals and means of the fight crystallise then, a mysticism of the fighting dynamism is created. This mysticism obscures everything, the fruit of which is a total derailment. The total state is a simple result of dissemination of the mysticism of the fighting dynamism. The phases of this ferment [fermentation] are: a leader, a total part, state totalisation and derailment of social forces. State totalisation means joining of all machines of socio-technics [social engineering] into one organic whole thing that serves one purpose. Total war completes the cycle of expansive totalism. Derailment of increased causal [causative] power finds here its terrifying final; the discussed cycle ends with exhaustion of energy. The quietistic-defensive totalism stems from temptation for apathy, is a disease of senile stagnation, poverty and weakness, applies to the nations being plunged into civilisation stagnation. The phenomenon of quietistic totalism includes civilisation stagnation as a starting point. The use of machines of socio-technics [social engineering] works only where it concerns the police (7).

Totalism is represented not only by Stalinism or Hitlerism but also by the Marxist-Leninist model of social life. Any totalism is a pathological form of state because it aims in a planned manner at human enslavement. The creators of totalitarian systems require blind obedience [allegiance / submission] to the class, nation, leader, and the ruling elite. In such a system, political, ideological, economic, cultural and pedagogic monopoly is being

introduced. Proponents [Advocates] of the totalitarian state grant special prerogatives in the field of socio-political life, pedagogy, education, culture and ideology, or means of information, etc. to themselves. They believe that they have monopoly on truth, wisdom and power. The consequence of any collectivism (class and racial) is totalitarianism, being based on a priori premises, although usually it refers to science. Totalitarian systems experiment on humans, attempting to specifically re-educate large human groups they destroy in a well-considered manner [conscientiously] human communities, family, nation, are aggressive towards humans, science and culture, strive to neutralise or even eliminate religious communities. This would entail destruction of family, national, historical, or ideological, etc. awareness. Only then it would be easier to manipulate human masses. In a totalitarian system, the power elite uses demagoguery, inspires fanaticism, usually uses physical and psychological violence, requires blind obedience [allegiance / submission]. In place of the transcendent sacrum, the man, state, social class, race, or leader, etc. is being absolutised. The totalitarian socio-political system exists because of violence. Dictatorship is based on the affirmation of individual and state-sponsored terrorism. All totalitarian-dictatorship systems have enslaved the man. This is confirmed by concentration camps, labour [prison] camps, well-developed police system, indoctrination of young people and adults, generation conflict, destruction of all opposition, including the parliamentary one. The freedom of totalitarian systems, although some of them use this phraseology, is the enslaved freedom. The totalitarian states totally control the means of information using them to promote the adopted ideology and the conducted policy. Any monopolisation of mass media leads however to concealment of truth and dissemination of falsehood (8).

Totalism is one of the threats to the functioning of large communities. According to its proponents [advocates], the society is a source of all rights for individuals, its representatives may establish and abolish, change and deprive or bestow all rights, The autonomy [independence], individuality of an individual [a person] is so limited that their moral disappearance becomes eventually a real danger. Examples of totalism are to be found in the institutions of the Nazi state where the rights of the human person were brutally trampled (9).

The totalitarian system in Poland started in 1949 (after the Gomułka trial); from the perspective of a sociologist, it is one of the darkest periods in the history of the development of post-war society. Poland was incorporated from this year into the system of Communist totalitarianism which encompassed the USSR and the countries being satellites to it – one of them also was Poland. All totalitarian systems are guided by the maxim “Divide et impera” – do rule so to quarrel, to divide, to sow distrust, mutual malevolence and disdain [animosity / antagonism]. People stopped believing each other, became distrustful, self-contained, and withdrawing. Escapism, introversion, anti-officiality [anti-formality] became a social norm not by choice but by totalitarian force [coercion]. The attempts of individuals to rebel against enslavement and totalitarianism were suppressed by the methods which often enough could surprise Gestapo torturers (10).

Totalitarian authority does not tolerate criticism and especially valid criticism. Therefore, the workers from Radom and Ursus had to be punished. The punishment was given several dimensions:

- physical punishment (the so called “fitness trails”),
- moral punishment (rallies in support of the authority),
- material punishment (throwing people out of work).

The workers, taught by the experience from previous protests against totalitarian authority, especially in 1956 and 1970 when they had been exposed to bullets of the guardians of law and order when going to the streets, employed another form of protest in 1980, i.e. a sit-down strike. The period of the so called unbridled [wild / frenzied] democracy (1980-1981) ended in the introduction of martial law (11).

Totalitarianism found its legitimisation in the police and military methods, not for the first time in the post-war history of the Polish society. The election of a Communist president somewhat stopped the process of totalitarian system elimination in Poland but this choice was dictated by the conditions of consensus in our country (12).

The next act of the end of the Communist system and totalitarian authority was municipal elections in 1990 (13).

A special mission of intellectuals in relation to totalitarianism is to deprive it of its ideological legitimisation. In the dialogue about totalitarianism, not only this is at stake. The tragedy of totalitarianism and its cruelty exceeding all imagination has been shock for both Christians and Jews. What is totalitarianism?

Totalitarianism is as system of exercising power in which that power, aiming subjugate the whole person, claims to be the expression of a force which rules the whole of reality, and therefore has the right to use all and any possible means of coercion against its opponents. Totalitarianism is more than just tyranny and absolutism. The difference between them dose not, however, lie in the extent of its lawlessness but in the way it seeks to legitimate its power. Power in totalitarianism presents itself as the expression of an absolute force which rules over everything in the territory in which it prevails, and which simultaneously claims that it and it alone possesses the secret of this power. The omnipotence of power includes its infallibility and the infallibility goes hand in hand [is closely connected] with omnipotence. The totalitarian power strives for instrumentalisation of people and relations between them (H. Arendt).

Totalitarianism would be therefore a radical denial of the Kant's categorical imperative which asserts that the human being should always be an end of his or her action and not a means to the end. Nevertheless, the instrumentalisation of interpersonal relations seems to be rather a consequence of totalitarianism than its principle or beginning. This derives from the entire ontology and epistemology which totalitarianism adduces to legitimate its claims. Totalitarianism justifies itself first of all through the world ontology (to have a real existence is to exercise power).

M. Heidegger associated totalitarianism with the philosophy of Nietzsche's "will to power". The mission of totalitarian ideology is to ensure good conscience even for criminals. This is being achieved by a skilful manipulation which assigns high ethical values to the political activity of authority. The culmination of ontological, sacrological and ethical legitimisation is the concept of total power which no human being and no sphere of his life can escape. This concept is especially clear in Stalinism. For instance, through socialisation of the means of production, the totalitarian power started to penetrate deep into the reality of human labour. This was it which ultimately became the owner of labour and its products. Only the totalitarian power knows what ontology, science, sacrology, ethics and politics really is. Totalitarianism forms a closed circuit of power, the way in which power is legitimised is an integral component of power as such, and power is an integral part of the way in which power is legitimised.

The links of modern totalitarianisms and pagan traditions raise doubts. This is clearly indicated by their ideologies, and confirmed by the practice of creating rituals. The belief in *fatum* is transformed in totalitarianism into belief in the cast-iron laws of history, the laws of economy, the rules of historical development. For some, they are the result of class membership, for others of racial affiliation. The unity of power and *fatum* justifies the thesis that the totalitarian power can not be replaced by any other power. If it were to fail, the state would collapse, nations would die, the world would end

Part of the ideology of power is far-reaching tolerance towards . . . cruelty. The totalitarian power is cruel. Totalitarianism unites Christians and Jews in commonly experienced grief. For this union through pain to endure, it must be adjoined [accompanied] by a deeper understanding of the principles of common faith. The totalitarian interpretation of the value of the sacred demands that everything, even the most precious values, be sacrificed. Summoned by the call of the sacred, the son sacrifices the father, and the father his son. In the confrontation with totalitarianism, a clear distinction must be drawn between the sacred and the illusion of the sacred. Totalitarian ideologies are correct to some extent – the sacred is a source of totalitarian claim. When recognising the absolute primacy of the experience of the good in the relationship between God, man and neighbour, we face an open perspective for changing the totalitarian conception of power. Confrontation with totalitarianism appears as a dispute over the nature of power. The totalitarian power is a pathological power. Observing the disease, we can better understand what is the nature of health. At that time, more clearly, we are in front of our responsibilities in the face of the totalitarian threat. The totalitarian power, in order to avoid self-destruction, must constantly call into being new enemies. The enemy of the totalitarian power is the same condition of its existence as its subjects. Stalin saw this clearly when he formulated his theory that class conflict increases as Communism advances. The disease of the totalitarian power originates in this contradiction. In opposition to the totalitarian power stands the human being who has been brought into being by faith; it is an exceptional person. He breaks out of every category which totalitarian ideology has prepared for him, he is totally incomprehensible for it. He should not really exist, but he does exist nonetheless. He should not speak, nevertheless, his voice is heard. He should tremble with fear, but he is perfectly serene. This man should not be regarded simply as an enemy of the totalitarian system, because if that were so this would mean that he moves on the same level at which move the men of this system. This does not mean that he is its supporter. He is outside the system. His presence outside the system carries weight of Stalingrad. His very existence demonstrates that an alternative world in relation to the world of totalitarian ideology is possible. The ultimate aim of the dialogue between Judaism and Christianity that is now in process, following the experiences of Holocaust, is to assist each other in the education of man to such faith (14).

The essence of totalitarianism is about striving for the total control over human minds, communication, memory so that the subjects become unable to ask themselves the questions other than those being brought against them by power, so that they are unable to express the thoughts that have not been already conceived, catalogued (Newspeak) before them, so that they are unable to find other points of reference to assess themselves and their social environment than those that have been established once and for all by the chief architects of the system. So that they do not feel of being trapped but stop to see the bars of restrictions and prohibitions, so that they treat everything what is being instilled in them and indoctrinated into as irrefutable certainties of humanity. In the totalitarian order, people stripped of the

imagination, ability to explore, free of the sense of freedom, are led to bodily experiences and this determines the shape and direction of exploration for them. Totalitarianism can not exist without division into ours and others [friends and strangers]. In the never ending struggle with others [strangers], all subjects must participate not as persons but as parts of a very large [complex] machine. No one is present as a person "I", everyone is an element of the bureaucratic institution that uses his body and brain, consumes them and, if necessary, replaces him with a new individual. The fire of war burns not only victims but also an executioner, making the distance between the pre-totalitarian world and the totalitarian one to become an impassable chasm. Only a few are privileged to directly exercise the laws of a new order. War has no other purpose than to conduct it further. This system aims in its essence at rebuilding the human nature, at creating such a race (class) of people for whom the longing for change, freedom, exploration and thinking is alien. In the action of ideologues and their supporters is what may be called a faith into unlimited omnipotent human capacity to accept any, consistent with the arbitrarily adopted vision of goal, direction of the development of history, any forms of the transformation of human environment. In the totalitarian world, everything is possible and what appears as a raw material is a flexible mass of which any project (drawn by the leader's command) can be formed. Totalitarian civilisation is not governed by a secret fatum but by what can be defined as the rules against all the laws of life, therefore it strives to destroy life or take control over it. Totalitarianism is a system which is ruled by death and therefore it is one of the main reasons why it undergoes atrophy. The principle of self-destruction is part of its structure.

The act of creation in the totalitarian project includes a hatred for the world. The reality, against which this system is created, is seen as corrupted by class struggle, extreme alienation, moral hypocrisy, Jewish influence, etc. The corruption includes not only classes or nations openly considered hostile. Denying both the world and the rights to exist, the totalitarian movement most fully shows its Gnostic affinities. This is because the belief that all so far existing forms and institutions are contaminated with a cosmic evil and that in the power of man is such their transformation that they conform to the vision of a prophet (leader) is common for Gnostic movements. At its inception, totalitarianism, using the revolutionary motivators, draws its strength and attractiveness from denial, rejection of what appears to be a superstition, false consciousness or bourgeois morality. Totalitarianism means the end of time and history, backing people into a corner, stupefaction and biologisation, where the only reason for the privacy of family and relations between people is more effective coping with the difficulties in satisfying the needs. The temptation of totalitarianism flows not from the faith in fatum but from the faith that there is no fatum, no prohibitions, that entirely new rules of life can be established. The totalitarian system was attractive or tried to be compelling for hundreds of thousands of people who did not realise what it means or what it can lead to. Suddenly, when it turned out that things have gone too far, transformation of the rules of life has led to the killing of life, it was too late. Everyone, more or less, is involved in the maintenance of this system. There was no alternative. It was necessary to keep on going, either with the stigma of shame, or with a feeling that since all are nonetheless guilty it is not possible to withdraw from the race (15).

According to totalitarianism, the purpose of marriage is to secure the interests of the society in the field of procreation. Totalistic theories capture the essence of state through an appropriate category of the whole which, with all modifications of interpretation, is understood as the absolute being, a specific supra-individual hypostasis, and at the same time

as a great existential unity existing by its own power and acting as an actual subject of own, self-justifying action. The state as a whole is the source of being and action of persons, as its refinement. Totalistic concepts have been accused that, while attributing to the state the features of the substantial being, hyperhypostasis, independent [intrinsic] supra-individual subject of action, they simplify the whole matter [thing]. The state is a being but only figuratively. When regulating the force of natural law in determination of the fundamental rules of social order and the frames for the activity of the state authority, it constitutes a barrier against despotism, or against totalitarian tendencies of the state authority. The totalitarian system obviously infringes the personal moral autonomy of its citizens and other members of the society. Contrary to the principle of subsidiarity, they do not fulfil their service obligations to the society. In totalitarian systems, the skewing of the uprightness of their social destination causes that, instead of guaranteeing the society its due freedom and opportunity to independently fulfil specific tasks relevant to it, impose the state model and scope of activity on it. They transform them from creative social entities into inert [inactive] executors of the action programmes being planned by the state authority with a loss of their social autonomy. Smaller or greater enslavement of man and his all-embracing subordination, depending on the state, being observed in these systems forces to negatively assess them from the position of a person defending the human political morality. Any possible modifications to this basic assessment may only lead to practical derogation of these systems from the ideological premises determining their structure (16).

In the linguistic sense, totalitarianism is the understanding of the reality recognising it as comprehensive (general). The entire reality is being reduced to one specific principle, originates from it and is based on it. The entire rich pluralistic reality is ontologically is reduced to one principle and is absorbed by it. In this principle, everything finds the reason and the basis of its existence, it is what comes first. Totalitarianism affects the man, such is the practice of the experience of history and such is his logic. Totalitarianism, consciously or not, wants to be applied metaphysics, pursue its prophetic message to the very being, let it reveal. To the very being, any resistance is excluded. P. Ricoeur in the “Symbolism of evil” analyses two possibilities of the relationship between the drama of creation and the drama which we could define as a personal one.

Two variants are to be accepted:

- the personal world is a continuation of the drama of creation (its extension),
- the personal world constitutes a completely new quality, irreducible to anything else, perhaps only to some absolute “you”.

The first case leads to totalitarianism, whereas in the second one totalitarianism is an error and falsification of the reality itself which appears as a personal structure at a significant level. The empiricism of totalitarian actions instructs [teaches / advises] that it breaks all ties between people, especially those truly deep and important. It is necessary to exercise power. Isolated individuals are not able to resist the organised force. Attack on families, destruction of informal relationships, creation of the atmosphere of distrust and fear, are due to the fact that totalitarianism does not recognise the otherness which has metaphysical foundations and which does not allow treating the other as one of many specimens of the same species It excludes recognition of the ontological pluralism. Hence the tendency to unification, although the unity is not identical with it at all. Totalitarianism is practically not-letting-an-individual-

to-be [live], despite the declaration that he unveils with him all that what-really-is. It needs and rests on a false “be”, on a general “be”, which turns out to be a denial-of permission-to-be. This logic of totalitarianism and its relationship with metaphysics, with existence which appears as favourable for the man and one-individuality [one’s individuality] (17).

Totalitarian political power is unlimited in its extent and includes all spheres of the social life. Total power is exercised through a party, the members of which take up all managerial positions. The entire system of power is based on the only ruling ideology which justifies and sanctifies the one-party system of power. The official ideology penetrates into [permeates] all areas of culture and pedagogical activity, education, morality, creating proper moral standards and beliefs (recognised by the party). The totalitarian state introduces a monopoly into the state communications (press, radio, TV, cinema, all publications, and their control – censorship), also eliminates any independent voluntary organisations, unions and associations. Instead, the state establishes its own ones but without the right to autonomy, they are controlled and operated by political and party units in a centralised way. The economy is subordinated to party administration, or production and distribution of national income is carried out under its supervision. There is collective ownership of the means of production, the apparatus of party officials controls the economic life of the country. The totalitarian system is also referred to as a police state because it is characterised by well-developed police force, including special security forces and the secret police, which is intended to keep all spheres of citizens’ life under surveillance, detect and fight all signs and manifestations of the activity of opposition. C. J. Friedrich characterises totalitarianism as a system of political power that differs from autocracy and West European democracies, and comprises the following elements:

- totalitarian ideology,
- mono-party based on this ideology, directed by one person,
- dictator (leader),
- well-developed secret police,
- three types of control (mass media, operation force, control over all organisations, also economic ones).

Generally, this system is based on the concept of uncontrolled leadership (18).

In totalitarianism, the value of a person is omitted, and as a matter of fact a person is brought to a living thing, even if a living thing is treated as something analogous to a cell in the entire organism [body] (19).

For totalitarian movements in general, and particular for leaders, there is nothing more specific than a surprising quickness with which the memory about them disappears and an astonishing easiness with which they can be replaced. To the bitter end (so long as they have power and their leaders are still alive), totalitarian regimes enjoy the support of masses and are based on it. The propaganda of totalitarian movements, which precedes the totalitarian government and later accompanies them, is both sincere and deceitful. Totalitarian movements are possible wherever there are masses who, for one reason or another, have acquired the appetite for creating political organisation. The support of masses for totalitarianism meant the end of two illusions being specific for democratically ruled countries (especially for nation-states and their party system). Totalitarianism showed that inert [inactive] masses can seize power in a democratic state. The fact that totalitarian movements

were less independent of the formlessness of the mass society than of the specific conditions being created by atomised and individualised masses can best be seen when comparing Nazism and Bolshevism. In order to transform the revolutionary dictatorship of Lenin into full totalitarian government, Stalin had to, by artificial measures, achieve such atomisation of the society which historical events prepared for the Nazis in Germany. Totalitarian movements are a mass organisation of atomised isolated individuals. More disturbing for us than the unconditional loyalty of the participants of totalitarian movement and the support of masses for these regimes is the awareness of unquestionable attraction of these movements for the elite. The openly pronounced activism of totalitarian movements, preference for terror as the primary form of political activity, attracted the intellectual elite and the mob alike. The temporary alliance between the elite and the mob was explained by a genuine delight with which the former watched the latter destroy what is considered decent, the elite is appealed by any radicalism as such. Wherever totalitarian movements have seized power, they got rid of sympathisers before even they joined the greatest crimes. For totalitarianism, intellectual, spiritual, artistic initiatives are just as dangerous as the gangster initiatives of the mob. Only the mob and the elite are attracted by the momentum of totalitarianism itself. The masses have to be won by propaganda. Propaganda is the greatest instrument of totalitarianism in contacts with the non-totalitarian world. Terror is the very essence of totalitarian form of government. For total propaganda, more specific than direct threats and crimes against individuals is the creation of indirect, veiled, and menacing hints against all who do not heed its teachings. The strong emphasis of totalitarian propaganda on showing the “scientific” nature of its assertions has been compared to certain advertising techniques applied to masses. The “scientificity” of totalitarian propaganda is about its almost exclusive insistence on scientific prophecy as distinguished from the more old-fashioned appeal to the past. Totalitarianism proposes propaganda techniques that are brought to perfection. The true purpose of propaganda is not to transfer but to organise (accumulate) power without possession of the means of coercion.

The weakness of totalitarian propaganda is revealed at the time of failure. Totalitarian movements attack the “status quo” more radically than revolutionary parties. These movements were referred to as “secret societies opened in broad daylight”. The most striking similarity between the secret societies and the totalitarian movements lies in the use of rituals (official marches, party days, etc.). The possession of all instruments of power and violence is not a blessing for a totalitarian movement. This is because power means a constant confrontation with reality. The necessity of the struggle for total domination of the total population of the earth, the total elimination of every competing non-totalitarian reality, is inherent in the totalitarian regime. The so-called totalitarian state - the state machinery is a facade which hides and protects the real power of mono-party. The ostensible power of the party bureaucracy is contrasted with the real power exercised by the secret police. In the totalitarian state, one maybe sure that the more visible certain government agencies are, the less power they carry. The so-called “leader principle” does not favour creation of the hierarchy of power. The leader’s monopoly of power and authority and his relationships with his chief of police is one more characteristic feature of the totalitarian state. The state represents the totalitarian regime in the non-totalitarian world. The totalitarian police starts to operate after the pacification of the country, claiming that there still is an enemy, a resistance to the new authority. Professional careers are an illustration of the police operation in the totalitarian state.

The emergence of concentration camps is a specific test laboratory for the political premises of totalitarianism. According to H. Arendt, there are three categories of concentration camps:

- Hades – relatively mild forms of camps in non-totalitarian countries,
- Purgatory – with Gulags (labour camps) as an example (chaotic forced labour, being an element of punishment),
- Hell – Nazi German concentration camps (strict planning of each element of the functioning of camp community).

Totalitarian ideologies do not strive to transform the outside world but to change the human nature. Terror is for carrying tasks of the totalitarian movement, creating new mankind, with simultaneous elimination of individuals for the sake of the species. Total terror is to serve as a tool to accelerate the course of history (20).

Totalitarian faith that everything is possible has proved however that everything can be destroyed. Two first parts of H. Arendt's "The Origins of Totalitarianism" (Anti-Semitism and Imperialism) served a double function. On the one hand, it was to analyse various elements which sometimes, unknowingly, enabled the appearance of time and places suitable for development of a totalitarian undertaking, political anti-Semitism as a weapon directed against the state that was based on the psychological dilemma [conflict], emancipated Jew, colonial expansionism, fall of the nation-state and the legal order; on the other one, the task of the previous chapters was to develop the key concepts which would then be used in the analysis of the totalitarian system, the concept of masses and excess mass outbreak, bureaucracy, historical process, etc. If the explanation of the phenomenon of totalitarianism lies in the crystallisation of many possible motivations taken from the entire complexity, then part 3 of "The Origins of Totalitarianism" is the place where explorations of the author crystallise on the grounds of previous explorations. In her analysis of the totalitarian system, H. Arendt distinguishes two stages: the pre-power stage and the stage of totalitarianism in power. Propaganda of the system and its organisation are two connected and being mutually conditional aspects of the first stage. Reference to propaganda is necessary as long as totalitarianism grows in an environment that is hostile to it, but after the power has been taken there is time for indoctrination. The form and the effect of propaganda are more important than its content. Assuming the shape of infallible prophecy, totalitarian propaganda made ideological scientificity and its tricks consisting in formulation of predictions an efficient though absurd method in terms of the content. A characteristic feature of the totalitarian power is the strengthening (doubling) of different kind of services, ostensible power hiding the actual power being exercised by mysterious forces.

The nucleus of power is in the hands of super-efficient and super-competent police. The notion of "objective enemy" is the key. Its definition varies depending on the political circumstances and the needs of the system. Using terror, totalitarian systems seek to get rid of obstacles or delays in their implementation being encountered by the laws of nature and history. They are based on terror, like democratic systems on civil liberties. The absolutist rule leads the man to the situation of liminal [boundary] experience, with its radicalism and hopelessness of helplessness [impotence / powerlessness], experience of complete isolation [loneliness] with respect to the world, feeling of inadequacy [uselessness] that results from the

fact of rejection from the society which lost the original meaning “societas”. The Arendt’s work was criticised for:

- for lacking a clearly defined research method; numerous readers are baffled by the way in which the author paints her socio-historical frescoes using archival documents as if they were belles-lettres. The Arendt’s works, through rejection of academism, was the result of informed choice of a phenomenologist who attempts to capture the phenomenon of totalitarianism using the elements which, in her opinion, would be able to bring the understanding closer;
- the term “totalitarianism” itself is controversial [questionable]. Do we need to see in it a mixed product [creation] of the American political science and the wisdom of nations, the main value of which is a possibility to refer it to any situation. Arendt claims that this term must be used wisely and sparingly;
- some criticism did not hesitate to point out that the author’s analysis had been focused in the first two chapters on the example of Germany, thus they were not able to explain the evolution in the USSR;
- Arendt was reproached for the fact of systemisation of certain data which probably were more the result of a specific historical context than a fully conscious undertaking – assigning political decision to what partially is the consequence of elaborate and complex institutional evolution (D. Riesman, *ibidem*);
- lacking an in-depth analysis of leaders after their death (Hitler, Stalin); the author claimed however that, for instance, the detotalitarised Krushchev’s USSR could, day by day, return to totalitarian practices.

Without asking ourselves a question about totalitarianism, it would not be possible to make a single step in the area of knowing the rules of political and social life of our time. By analysing the form of the totalitarian system, Arendt created a totally one-of-a-kind piece of work which is still relevant today. About the system which seeks to make people equally worthless in order to take exclusive control over the whole man and every man. About the system which tries to build the supra-reality, the cogency, coherence and consistency of which move up to the desire to transform the very human nature. At the end of this work, Arendt writes “... every end in history necessarily contains a new beginning; this beginning is the promise, the only ‘message’ which the end can ever produce...” (21).

Within each system of the police state which operates concentration camps, these camps were or are part of each of such problem circles as deprivation of freedom, lawlessness, terror, cruelty and bestiality, deportations, forced labour and slave labour, exploitation and mass murder. Forced labour and mass murder are present both inside and outside a concentration camp. Division of crime into camp-related and camp-unrelated ones gives purely formalistic impressions. Concentration camp is a place where during the war the civil citizens of hostile countries become concentrated. There are two basic undisputed assertions which must be considered as the starting points in any discussion about the state systems:

- there is a multitude of sentiments [viewpoints / beliefs] and views [opinions] among people about any conceivable issue. There has never been and will be a chance to eventuate the full compliance of sentiments [viewpoints / beliefs] and views [opinions] among at least two, let alone all people. It is unthinkable that there is any instance which could decide on the

rightness of most views [opinions] or force to abandon their actually or allegedly false sentiments [viewpoints / beliefs];

– no one is called by God, or by any other gods, by fate, or based on some signs [earmarks / traits], to exercise power over other people. This power can be exercised only by the one who has been appointed by them to do so by the free act of will and indefinitely.

Who in practice goes against the latter statement and who forcibly, invoking such or other alleged rights, seizes power over other people is a usurper. But who does not recognise the second axiom also theoretically and who, having seized total power, tries to deny by force the first axiom is a totalitarianist (22).

Acceptability and responsibility of collating and comparing the totalitarian systems to the USSR and the Third Reich were initially questioned because researchers avoided such comparisons due to strong (paralysing) psychological Soviet domination. The acceptance of Nuremberg resulted in admitting that punishment was meted out to the obvious culprits by the party which had been guilty of genocide. It was feared to portray the two systems in parallel because Neo-Nazi milieus might use informatively [propagandistically] these dependencies. The first concentration camps were created in Cuba in 1896 and in South Africa during the Boer War at the turn of the century. All first camps were a place of isolation for the families of fighting opponents and were more camps for hostages, and therefore had little in common with later Nazi and Stalinist ones. The creators of the camps in the modern version were L. Trocki and W. Lenin. Mutual dependencies of the two totalitarianisms (Communist and Nazi ones) are undisputed, whereas co-operation [joint action] in the parallel process of extermination and plan of mass enslavement (apparent with regard to the Polish nation) is obvious. The essential similarity of the two systems was expressed in defining the categories of individuals considered to be dangerous and to be destroyed. The ideology was accompanied by the emotions most apparently externalised in the semantics of the stigmatised (vermin, bedbugs). The centrally-inspired terror triggered reflexes with all the specificity of murderous, even sadistic, resentments. In the first place, these were old personal scores [vendettas / accounts]. The first stage in the creation of concentration camps in Germany was 1933-1934, while 1918-1922 in the USSR.

After a short period of the local terror, both systems entered a stage of centrally controlled terror. The totalitarian power has to have enemies in any situation; when they are missing, it creates a new opponent. The aimless coercion, assuming [involving] also mass extermination, is the camp specificity. Some prisoners belonged to independent militant groups.

The latter ones, the totalitarian system wants to eliminate. “We do not need your labour, what we needs is your corpses [dead bodies]” – this is what the prisoners of concentration camps and Gulags often heard. The essence of totalitarianism is perhaps best shown by the ideological treatment of labour. Totalitarianism is essentially a monstrous multiform extension of the slave system. There are five categories of prisoners in it:

- political opponents (and those regarded as potential opponents),
- individuals belonging to certain social and national groups and their families,
- religious believers,
- criminals,
- incidental prisoners arrested as additional workforce.

All those who are not members of a mono-party are regarded in the totalitarian system as enemies or potential enemies. The basic rule is to put a political prisoner somewhere below the criminal one. The terror police differs from the total state police in remaining outside the law, it itself is the law, it commands the state which it does not serve but rather controls over. The threat of imprisoning any citizen for any reason provoked [induced / developed] responses of continued inertia [inaction] because totalitarianism educated through collective responsibility (23).

According to modern totalitarian doctrines, the state as such is not the highest end; this is rather the Blood, the Nation [People], and the Race. G. F. Hegel wrote that in the existence of a nation, the substantial aim is to be a state and preserve itself as such. What happens to a nation has its essential significance in relation to the state. The state that is thus formed is to be totalitarian, it must permeate and control the entire life of the people and their all functions. The state is therefore the basis and centre of all the concrete elements in the life of people: of art, law, morals, religion, and science. G. F. Hegel not only developed the historical and totalitarian theory of nationalism but also clearly foresaw its psychological possibilities. Nationalism answers the needs and desires of men to find and to know their definite place in the world. The G. F. Hegel's philosophy of identity, through its contribution to historicism and identification of what is right with the power, has become an incentive for the totalitarian way of thinking (24).

K. R. Popper, as early as in the 1930s, proved himself to be a critic of totalitarianisms based on the Hegel's belief in historical necessity. The Second World War becomes for him the time of reflection on the essence of totalitarianisms which, after rejection of democracy and rationalism, are trying to create an inhuman society by referring to the unverifiable theories being propagated by visionaries who reserve for themselves the function of spokesmen for the history (25).

L. Kołakowski is mainly interested in external enemies of the open society, indicating that the potential for self-destruction contained in it and its ideals holds on intact even though it has been a long time since the major offensive of totalitarianisms and the enemies of democracy disgraced themselves very much in that time. K. Szaniawski notes, however, that totalitarianism which K. R. Popper saw 60 years ago (ideological totalitarianism), believing in its mission, totalitarianism that is intelligent [cogitative / thoughtful / thinking] and sensible [liable] to philosophical criticism, no longer exists. The system of real socialism, with a bare system of interests and coercion, has remained only (26).

The axioms of the totalitarian regime are as follows:

- the state power is the basic mechanism of integration of the social life;
- the power [authority] is a body standing higher than other organisations of the social life, has a supreme control over them, using violence;
- is ruled by the minority, claiming that this is the majority which rules (illusion);
- the ruling minority “knows best” how to rule.

The axioms of the democratic systems are as follows:

- the state is a representative of the aspirations and the will of the society, the right of citizens to establish norms and to appoint governments;
- the state activity is of constitutional nature;

- the link between the state and the society is “intermediary bodies” (parties and associations);
- the citizens have inalienable rights (political rights, right to freedom of thought, right to express views, right to join in deliberately organised groups).

The system which had been attempted to be imposed on Poland in 1944-1989 not only had authoritarian features. In its intentions and plans, it was a totalitarian system, an intensification and universalisation of authoritarian principles. The Communist version of totalitarianism (unlike Nazism) is defined by two phenomena:

- complete subordination of economy to the political power by nationalisation of the means of production,
- remarkably sophisticated ideology with universalistic ambitions which, assumedly, is to explain all the phenomena of reality.

The Communist totalitarianism presented itself to all as a socialism. Maintaining the full independence by the Church and maintaining the private agriculture within part of the society are the features causing an incomplete coherence of Poland to the totalitarian model, even in the darkest years 1949-1955. The 1989 breakthrough was accomplished at parliamentary and governmental level. These changes precede the emergence of full forms of civil society organisation and co-exist with the remnants of totalitarianism. The economic structure is rather in the state of disintegration than crystallisation, with fragmentation of the political party scene and weakness of associations.

In 1989, the following sayings were famous: “Your President, Our Prime Minister” (Solidarity) and “Your Prime Minister, Our Apparatus” (the weekly *Polityka*) (27).

The totalitarian systems are characterised by a remarkable ability to create enemies and sow hatred. Everyone can be subsumed under the heading of renegade, traitor or apostate, ideological heretic, enemy or opponent of the system, regardless of his / her nationality or class. Manifestation of the approval for the existing system and condemnation for its opponents is a norm that is to facilitate survival in the totalitarian system (28).

Totalitarianism is often mistaken with other forms of authoritarianism, for instance with military dictatorship or tyranny. These two do not contain the most dangerous component of totalitarianism which is monopolistic ideology. It is the root of totalitarian enslavement, regardless of orientation. Totalitarianism is characterised by:

- monism of power (cult of personality);
- striving for perfectionism through elimination of inconvenient individuals;
- contempt for democracy; support in masses as opposed to individualised community;
- a Newspeak, codified by Orwell, as an instrument of power;
- law that is based on any interpretation of facts;
- totalitarianism aims to eliminate chances, everything must be planned and subjected to strict control (29).

The main drawback of the substitute of the J. Szczepański’s summa of knowledge about totalitarianism seems to be the lack of clear presentation of the power and ideology relations, what decides about the specificity of totalism, and the rendering of which should be an

ambition of even so small form. Seeing in the monopolistic ideology the most dangerous component of totalitarianism, the author does not explain whether every [continues / fixed] thesis variables and ideological axioms are only a convenient weapon in the political struggle, or the madness of totalism stem from fatal fixation on the false, ideologically mystified and static picture of the reality. The whole book should be regarded rather as a codification of knowledge about totalitarianism than a presentation of its logic, or illogicalness. The emphasis is placed on the effects of the contact of power with social matter [materiality], on totalitarian folklore, not on the internal dynamics of power (30).

Two approaches to the paradigm of the totalitarian power have imperishable value (H. Arendt and T. [J. J.] Linz).

H. Arendt treats totalitarianism as a special existential situation, she is thus interested in the structures and techniques of power which serve destruction of individual identity. In this respect, she analyses the legal system which punishes not for individual actions but for belonging to a given social category. The proposal of T. [J. J.] Linz is also interesting (definition of totalitarianism in the "Handbook of Political Sciences"). She [He] highlights the structures of totalitarian power, such as:

- a party with clearly articulated [expressed] and identified political subjectivity,
- an important role of ideology, a clear disparity between official and private languages,
- an emphasis on mobilisation combined with treating the society as a resource of power and blurring the boundaries between the structures of power and the society (social structures of self-control) supporting the power, and
- a terror not normalised by law.

The basic objections that can be made in relation to the so characterised paradigm of the totalitarian power are as follows:

- it is difficult to understand the basic differences between the USSR's totalitarianism and the Nazi one (lack of analytical structures and tools),
- a static concept of the totalitarian state,
- this paradigm is not able to capture systemic barriers that prevent the rationality of control from being universalised in socialism (overestimates own control possibilities of the power) – the reason for this is own conceptual apparatus and omitting the issues of ownership (31).

In non-democratic forms of social organisation, more often than a rebellion [revolt / rebel / mutiny], there is an attitude of withdrawal (exclusion). There are many indications that during the occupation a large portion of the Polish population did not participate in any organisation of the public life, but was ready to engage at the moment when, along with regaining the independence, relations between the authentic social life and the state structures serving it and determining its organisational frames would be re-established. After 1945, under different circumstances, manifestations of the "excluded" society, in which most of its members consider themselves t as those released from moral participation in the collective plan being imposed on them, excluded from the national community, were observed again. This is not a healthy society. Above all, it is impossible under such condition for the democratic social organisation, the basis of which is the principle of participation, to actually function.

Mass emigration rush, aversion to public school, no confidence in the currency, seeking earnings outside the country with disregard for local work, an wariness [aloofness] against all civic initiatives speak a lot about the exclusion attitude, especially in the 1980s (32).

Post-totalitarianism means a weakening of the totalitarian dynamics which led to the decomposition of the system created by Communists. The real socialism has two stages : totalitarianism and post-totalitarianism. The term totalitarianism should be reserved for the system of total enslavement which deprives people of their subjectivity not only in the public sphere but also in the private one. Authoritarianism is the system socially alienated, as opposed to totalitarianism which has the support of the masses. In Poland, in the so called Gierek's era, there was an unintended detotalitarianisation as a result of disideologisation of the party and ineffective ideological oppression. In the 1980s, the party's apparatus, by self-limitation, made further detotalitarianisation. Z. Brzeziński distinguished three stages of the retreat from Communist totalitarianism:

- Communist authoritarianism,
- post-Communist authoritarianism,
- post-Communist pluralism.

As H. Świda-Ziemia states in her “Psychological heritage of totalitarianism”: ...totalitarian system and total institutions have one thing in common. This feature is associated with including the whole life in the system of principles [policies] (rules) which thoroughly penetrate [permeate] them” (33).

The twentieth century, with its “revolt of the masses” and attempts to solve this situation by way of introducing the totalitarian system (in the German and Soviet versions), brought the politisation of human life to the extreme point. On the other hand, as can be seen in the beginning of the post-totalitarian era, there is no escaping politics. Someone has to make decisions on behalf of others, struggling with the particularity of social interests (34).

Aleksander Hertz analyses an increase of non-democratic tendencies in the politics of the 1930s. Although it is possible to roundly set democracy against dictatorship, the author is trying to show that the seeds of totalitarian power are contained in the rules of democratic leadership, that evil grows out quietly and unspectacularly of a good political form (35).

The power is totalitarian in that sense that it wants to take control over the whole society (36). In totalitarian systems (e.g. in real socialism), the civil society is a citizen self-organisation attempt to resist totalitarian claims of the state (or a political party) that attempts to control in a centralistic way all forms of the social life and restrict the citizens in their political, social and religious rights. Totalitarianisms with a nationalist or collectivistic tinge are based on obedience to the ideology which is to be “redemptive” and which is to bring happiness to particular individuals and the whole society. Totalitarianism often requires internal and external uniformisation, stands out against pluralism and citizenship, and closes down civil society institutions. A “new” social organisation, which is proposed by it, reduces or even eliminates the sphere of freedom to which citizens are entitled. Under these conditions, the life of society is progressively disorganised and goes into decline. As part of the totalitarian vision of the world, there is a serious danger that the fundamental rights of the human being will be denied, with an attempt to absorb even religious needs into politics. In the period of totalitarianism, social ties are being weakened, and subjectivity of the society is denied by subjecting the individuals to multifarious control of the state. The culture and

praxis of totalitarianism involve a rejection of the Church. The state or the party which claims to be able to pursue the absolute goodness, and which sets itself above all values, will not tolerate the affirmation of an objective criterion of good and evil, other than the will of those in power, which in certain circumstances could become the basis used to judge their behaviour. [actions]. This is why totalitarianism attempts to destroy the Church, or at least subordinate [subjugate] it and make it an instrument of its own ideological apparatus (37).

Totalitarianism is not only terroristic, political arrangement of the society but also its non-terroristic, economical-technical arrangement which operates through the manipulation of needs by the owners of capital, precluding the emergence of an effective opposition against the whole (38). Since 1974 to the early 1990s, a phenomenon being termed “third wave of democratisation” is observed in the whole world. It lies in changing the totalitarian way of exercising power ruling thus far in some countries. S. Huntington divided methods for achieving such changes into transformation (USSR, Chile, Turkey), transplacement (Poland, Nepal, South Korea), replacement (GDR, Romania, Greece), and intervention (Grenada, Panama). This author notes that by 1990 at least two-thirds of the world’s counties were not ruled democratically.

They include independent [autonomous] state regimes of the Marxist provenance similar to the USSR, one-person dictatorships in Central African countries, religious fanaticism in Islam countries (excluding Turkey), or military and Communist regimes in Eastern Asia. Despite the great wave of democratisation in the last quarter of the century, Huntington observes a possibility of the rebirth of new totalitarianism in the form of:

- nationalist authoritarianism (Third World and Eastern Europe),
- religious fundamentalism (Iran, Israel, India),
- authoritarian oligarchies (developed countries),
- populist dictatorships (where there is a problem with privatisation of land ownership),
- ethnic dictatorships (Northern Ireland, Republic of South Africa, Sri Lanka) (39).

In totalitarian institutions (do not confuse with total ones), the following principles apply:

- complete isolation from the outside world,
- any activity is very exhausting physically,
- activity is not planned (continuous stress associated with uncertainty),
- there is no system of privileges, only submissiveness counts (if someone tries to show it),
- new forms of psychological terror (harassment) are constantly devised,
- the existence of tortures as a form of deliberate, planned abusive treatment (40,41).

Every institution has total tendencies but not each of them has totalitarian tendencies.

3. CONCLUSION

Totalitarianism is a form of social system (usually a state one), the essential feature of which is to strive for seizing strict subordination and constant control over all areas of social and individual life. As part of these efforts, totalitarian systems generate the formation of a

number of institutions that strive to surveil and control individuals and social groups. The operation of total institutions in such systems aims at achieving extreme values in measurements of the degree of isolation and incapacitation and the number of applied barriers.

References

- [1] A. Perlmutter. *Modern Authoritarianism. A Comparative Institutional Analysis*, Londyn, 1981.
- [2] A. Borowski. Ghettoisation as a new dimension of totalisation. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 2 (2013) 56-60.
- [3] A. Borowski, Social interactions in the public space in the context of public confidence. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 25 (2014) 33-41
- [4] J. Talmon. O demokracji totalitarnej. *Znak* 4/92
- [5] G. Sartori. *Teoria demokracji*, Warszawa, 1998
- [6] A. Walicki. *Marksizm i skok do królestwa wolności*, Warszawa, 1996.
- [7] J. Stachniuk. *Zagadnienie totalizmu*, Wrocław, 1990.
- [8] S. Kowalczyk. *Człowiek a społeczność*, Lublin, 1994.
- [9] W. Granat. *Personalizm chrześcijański*, Poznań, 1985.
- [10] A. Sosnowski. *Różnorodność życia społecznego*, Szczecin, 2000.
- [11] A. Borowski. Confidence in social institutions in the post-communist countries. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 25 (2014) 7-17
- [12] A. Sosnowski. Społeczeństwo- władza- administracja publiczna w okresie przejściowym od totalitaryzmu do demokracji, w: *Państwo- społeczeństwo- administracja po obu stronach granicy po zmianach systemowych*, Szczecin, 1993
- [13] A. Sosnowski. *Od totalitaryzmu do samorządności / socjologiczna analiza sposobów sprawowania władzy w powojennej Polsce/. Samorząd terytorialny w nowych warunkach ustrojowych*, Szczecin, 1991,
- [14] J. Tischner. Totalitarne wyzwanie. *Res publica* 5/89
- [15] P. Śpiewak. Oswajanie ciemności. *Res publica* 5/89
- [16] T. Ślipko. *Zarys etyki szczegółowej*, t. 2. Kraków, 1982.
- [17] A. Rekiel. Totalitaryzm a metafizyka. *Horyzonty wiary* 3/90
- [18] J. Turowski. *Socjologia - wielkie struktury społeczne*, Lublin, 1994.
- [19] F. Copleston. *Historia filozofii*, t. IX. Warszawa, 1991.
- [20] H. Arendt. *Korzenie totalitaryzmu*, t. 1-2. Warszawa 1989.
- [21] F. X. Dumortier. *Korzenie totalitaryzmu /recenzja/. Przegląd powszechny* 9/90

- [22] A. J. Kamiński. Koszmar niewolnictwa. Warszawa, 1990.
- [23] W. J. Wysocki. Koszmar niewolnictwa - recenzja, Głos 64-66/90
- [24] K. R. Popper. Społeczeństwo otwarte, t. 2, Warszawa, 1990.
- [25] J. Życiński. Społeczeństwo otwarte- recenzja. Krytyka 32-33/90
- [26] K. Wolicki. Społeczeństwo otwarte- recenzja. Krytyka 32-33/90
- [27] W. Wesołowski. Przejście od autorytaryzmu do demokracji. Krytyka 32-33/90
- [28] J. Borejsza: Antyślawizm A. Hitlera, Warszawa, 1988. Essen: Antyślawizm – recenzja. Zdanie 9/89.
- [29] J. Szczepański. Maleńka encyklopedia totalizmu, Kraków, 1990.
- [30] K. Deker. Totalitaryzm w ilustracjach / recenzja Maleńkiej encyklopedii totalizmu/. Czas kultury 21/90.
- [31] J. Staniszkis. Ontologia socjalizmu, Warszawa, 1989.
- [32] I. Słodkowska: Rodzina, a ład demokratyczny. Więź 3/89.
- [33] A. Walicki. Totalitaryzm i posttotalitaryzm, w: /red. Z. Sadowski/ Społeczeństwo posttotalitarne, Warszawa, 1991.
- [34] K. Mannheim. Ideologia i utopia, Lublin, 1992.
- [35] A. Hertz: Szkice o totalitaryzmie, Warszawa, 1994, s. IX / wstęp/
- [36] K. Mannheim. Człowiek i społeczeństwo w dobie przebudowy, Warszawa, 1974,
- [37] J. Mariański. Kościół Katolicki w społeczeństwie obywatelskim, Lublin, 1998.
- [38] H. Marcuse. Człowiek jednowymiarowy, Warszawa, 1991.
- [39] S. Huntington. Trzecia fala demokratyzacji, Warszawa, 1995.
- [40] E. Goffman. Characteristics of Total Institutions, w: D. Kelly, Deviant Behavior, New York 1984.
- [41] Andrzej Borowski. Landscapes of prison islands in the sociological perspective, *World News of Natural Sciences* 6 (2017) 52-63

(Received 14 January 2017; accepted 06 February 2017)