

## SOCIAL DETERMINISM, MANIPULATION, AND FREEDOM

Ph.D., V. N. Pervushina<sup>1\*</sup>, Ph.D., V. S. Ostapenko<sup>2</sup>, Ph.D., L. M. Savushkin<sup>3</sup>, Ph.D.  
N.M.Morozova<sup>4</sup>, Ph.D., E. A. Timofeeva<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>State University of Justice, Central branch, Voronezh, Russian Federation, email [veravalen47@yandex.ru](mailto:veravalen47@yandex.ru)

<sup>2</sup>State University of Justice, Central branch, Voronezh, Russian Federation, email [ostapenko-vl@yandex.ru](mailto:ostapenko-vl@yandex.ru)

<sup>3</sup>State University of Justice, Central branch, Voronezh, Russian Federation, email [savushkin.lieonid@mail.ru](mailto:savushkin.lieonid@mail.ru)

<sup>4</sup>Voronezh, Voronezh Institute of the Ministry of internal Affairs, Voronezh, Russian Federation, email [nadezhdamorozova11@gmail.com](mailto:nadezhdamorozova11@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup>Research Institute of the Federal penitentiary service of Russia, Moscow, Russian Federation, email [anna0474@mail.ru](mailto:anna0474@mail.ru)

\*Corresponding Author

### Abstract

Paper is dealt with the concept of determinism in a broad context, including the recognition of diverse forms of determination, the use of a systematic approach in their classification, the discovery of the inner unity of determinism and freedom. The use of the Marxist approach made it possible to regard social processes in the unity of material and spiritual factors, to identify manipulation as a constituent element of social determinism in the functioning and development of society. Manipulation is a derivative of power and functions on the societal, group and personal levels. At the societal level, manipulation is carried out through cultural archetypes. At the group and personal levels, manipulation is included in the purposeful subject-object relations. The basic components of manipulation are governance, regulation, and control. In the paper manipulation is analyzed in unity with its opposite – freedom. It is noted that the origin of freedom at the societal level is associated with a sacred ontological meaning and is based on duality: chaos-order, manifested in the orgiastic-carnival version of life. Later, as the historical process is being more personalized, freedom is regarded in terms of freedom-arbitrariness, freedom and responsibility.

**Keywords:** determinism, social determinism, manipulation, cultural archetypes, freedom-chaos, freedom-arbitrariness, freedom-responsibility

### INTRODUCTION

The problem of determinism and free will was regarded as a central in different philosophical and philosophic-religious theories. The authors of the paper try to take a new look at the formulation and solution of this long-classic problem from the standpoint of the ontological unity of social determinism, manipulation, and freedom.

## **DETERMINISM: THE ORIGINS, MEANING, AND FREE WILL**

The deterministic conception of the world underlies the classical rationalism and European culture as well. A detailed analysis of the deterministic conception is not the purpose of the paper. It should be noted that in the Russian literature determinism was analyzed in broader and constitutive context: the understanding of determinism was not limited to the recognition of Laplace-type determinism (dynamic determination) but included the recognition of various connections-genetic, correlation, mediated, teleological, functional, etc.; the importance of probabilistic determination, randomness was actualized [Meshcheryakova 1998, 6-24 ]. Determinism is considered to be a methodological principle of science. The introduction of synergetic into scientific circulation allowed overcoming the fatalistic-deterministic logic, to accept the thesis about the emergence of "order from chaos" (I. Prigozhin, I. Stengers). It should be noted that the concepts of "order", "chaos" have mythological roots. So, the problem of determinism is connected with the question of, whether being is an ordered formation (order) or it is a chaos. The origins of the understanding of determinism come from the idea of fate, God's Providence, natural necessity. In the ontological sense determinism includes the principles of substantiality (the world is one or multiple); development (the world is identical or is changing); separateness and interrelationship. If we explore the world, it is impossible to know it without recognizing the substantiality of human existence. Thus, the problem of determinism cannot be understood outside of connection with the existence of human being, and this inevitably raises the question of relationship of fate, Providence, predestination, and human freedom. Historic- philosophical reconstruction shows the following existential forms of freedom which have become the subject of philosophical reflection: freedom-chaos, freedom-arbitrariness, and freedom -responsibility.

The analysis of freedom-chaos was given in the doctrine of heretical-pantheistic mysticism by M. Eckhart and J. Bohme. J. Bohme distinguished the two-natural distinction of God. There is something more primordial than God - Ungrund, nothing, a baseless will, and equivalent to the deity of apophatic theology. It is a free nothingness, existing beyond good and evil, light and darkness, more primordial than God and beyond Him. It is The First Deity, The Divine Nothingness. "God is neither nature nor creature. He is the abyss (Ungrund) and the Foundation of all beings – the eternal One in which there is neither foundation nor place. Nature and Creation are His Something by which He makes Himself visible and found" [Bohme 2000, 36]. "This will is eternal, and proceeds from itself; and if it were not, all would be nothing, neither light nor darkness; for something, that is, the eternal will, tart and desiring the wonders of creation" [Bohme 2007, 14]. The understanding of freedom as chaos was later reflected in the works of romantics, F. Schelling, and Russian philosopher N. A. Berdyaev. Following the mystics, N. A. Berdyaev accepts the position of irrational freedom as chaos, the original will in eternity, believing that such an understanding of irrational freedom makes it possible to understand the genesis of being, and with it the genesis of evil. Such freedom is not a regulated relation of human being to God; spiritual freedom has not yet been meaningfully defined.

Irrational freedom-chaos appears as an infernal principle, reflecting in the metaphysical riot against the order, laws and organization of the world, recognizing the world as free only in its destruction. Arbitrariness sometimes took the form of an "abstract and ominous shadow" that knows no boundaries and barriers, "until embodied in the body of some ideology" (A. Camus). Freedom as a riot contributed to the change of scientific paradigms, ideological attitudes, reforming of social institutions, etc. The negative consequences of the riot were social destruction, nihilism, the emergence of tyranny, and now the environmental crisis and terrorism. Freedom, knowing no boundaries, becomes an unbearable burden for human being; the destructive elements inherent in it begin to prevail. The freedom for oneself is turned out not to be a freedom for others.

In theology in terms of the doctrine of the fall freedom-chaos acquires the character of free will. In antiquity a human being perceived the blows of fate as a natural and surmountable obstacle: chaos must be replaced by order. In theology salvation is possible only as a result of God's grace, and this requires free will. St. Augustine was the first in the history of philosophy to recognize the problem of 'philosophical reflection of will'. A human being must direct his/her will to good, to destroy evil. This is a freedom. To whom God's grace is directed is considered to be the freest creature. Liberum arbitrium through grace turns into freedom (libertas). St. Augustine calls libertas, the possibility of free will, to choose the best [St. Augustine 2006, 80,193,203 ].Augustine's merit lies in the fact that he is the first to raise the question of the value of free will, inalienable from freedom of choice, free from duty, i.e., able to choose in favor of evil. Liberum arbitrium is willfulness, my will, the limits of which are determined by the subject of action. The idea of the later nominalists of free will as a value (Duns Scotus and W. of Ockham) means - causa indeterminate ad alterutrum oppositorium - liberum arbitrium. It has been brought to the absolute willfulness; the right of individual to acquire willfulness as an absolute value. Negative freedom, the choice in favor of evil, received a positive meaning and was more accepted by philosophy than theology.

The problem of freedom-arbitrariness, Willkur, freedom and responsibility became the subject of analysis in German classical philosophy. Kant, Fichte, and Hegel understood the meaning of overcoming freedom-arbitrariness with overcoming the border of the individual as a private person. A human being must go beyond the individual isolation and transcend to the whole, humanity, to the sphere of due (the world of higher values). Through transcending the individual becomes a person. Kant admits the concept of God proceeding from the idea of moral perfection which reason constitutes a priori, and which Kant inextricably connects with free will [Kant 1965, works in 6 vol., vol.3. 478]. Freedom, understood as "unconditioned cause", is not equivalent to arbitrariness and willfulness, it is determined by the "universal principle of morality", underlying the action of all rational beings, as well as the law of causality underlies all phenomena. Free will in Kant's teaching consists in the ability of reason to act, according to its own laws, created by it. Freedom acquires the formula of freedom of choice in favor of duty: you can, you must, and then you are free! Free will is "absolute and transcendental", determined by reason and chooses "what it recognizes as practically necessary, i.e. good" [Kant1965, works in 6 vol., vol. 4. part 1. 250]. Fichte had the same idea. The system of absolute subjectivism is nihilism. The hypertrophied self gives rise to individualism as a self-sufficient entity, reveals the evil in human being, he/she begins to revel in such freedom to rise above nature and other people, and this is the way to tyranny. In Hegel's philosophy the self-consciousness of the subject is an adequate existence of freedom as an absolute creative self-determination, deployed in the organized world - state. In existential philosophy the individual subjectivity, the uniqueness of the human personality was actualized and conceptualized. The representatives of this philosophical trend appealed to the divine in human being; they were tormented by the question of the tragedy of being, the meaning of human existence, and the problem of immortality (the structure of temporality in Heidegger's philosophy). A human being, God-like and God-equal, must realize the highest justice on earth. To do this it is necessary to overcome the fear of death and slavery within yourself.

The genesis of freedom from chaos and its transformation into freedom-responsibility (for existentialists absolute freedom of choice presupposes total responsibility) shows its contradictory path immanent to the historical process.

## **SOCIAL DETERMINISM AND MANIPULATION**

The authors of the paper adhere to the Marxist methodology and consider it to be the most fruitful in understanding of the conception of social determinism. Firstly, from the point of view of Marxism, a person is the result not only of the influence of the socio-cultural environment, but also the product of his/her own spiritual and material activities, i.e. he/she is an active subject of social action. Secondly, the activity approach allows us to establish a correlation between objective in nature social laws and their implementation through human activity in accordance with its needs and interests under certain historical conditions. This interaction avoids the pitfalls of substantial reductionism and, accordingly, the substantialization of both the activity itself and social laws ["Social practice and social relations" 1989, 7]. Thirdly, the Marxist theory of social determinism assumes a variety of forms of determination; the use of a systematic approach in its classification; the discovery of the inner unity of determinism and freedom in statics and dynamics, functioning and development of society. The use of the formational approach to the analysis of the historical process allows us to regard in unity the objective and subjective, material and spiritual components (basis and superstructure), to articulate the system-forming factor (economic relations), determine the levels of social determination (universal, particular, individual). In Marxist literature the determining role of the basis in relation to the superstructure and its reverse effect on the basis has been analyzed but we would like to draw attention to the following. The superstructure includes the political sphere (media, political parties, etc.), affecting on the phenomenon of state power, interested in maintaining of the status quo. It raises the question of the possibility of forming of the given needs and interests, i.e. manipulation. Manipulation, thus, is an integral part of social determinism. It is noted in modern literature the danger of increasing manipulation of public consciousness due to the advent of big data technology, the increase of more sophisticated forms of social control from psychological pressure through the media, including cyberspace, to economic coercion [see Akerlof, Schiller 2007; Mayer-Schonberg, Cukier, 2014; Davis 2017]. The authors of the paper believe that manipulation is a derivative of power, manifested at different levels: interpersonal, group, societal. At the societal level manipulation acts through cultural archetypes, traditions and customs, preserving archetypal features, the change of which occurs very slowly due to "historical" inertia" (A. S. Akhiezer). They remain safely in the new social space, ensuring the preservation of the socio-cultural identity of the system. A. Pentland saw in cyberspace in individualized transactions (exchange of goods, money, information, and rumors) the stereotypical social behavior (social-network stimulus), uniting people into social bonds and directing their activities [see Pentland 2018]. At the group (classes, strata, etc.) and personal levels, the impact on the object of manipulation is carried out

purposefully and exists in terms of object- subject relationships. Manipulation, understood in this context, is governance and a form of social control, is included in the normative regulation that determines the socialization of the individual, the form of realization of his/her subjectivity, the unification of behavior, the integration of individuals into society, social orientation. The normative aspect of culture is inherent in both the material and spiritual spheres of human activity. We can see the close connection of norms and values. Through the implementation of regulatory standards the identity of the social system is preserved. Manipulation refers to the functional characteristics of a social system. In this respect it is an inevitable companion of mankind, existing at all historical stages of development, is closely related to power, is a form of its existence and is immanent to social determinism.

Combining together state power and manipulation, we actualize its social essence, substantiality, manifested through the legitimization of normativity, cultural matrix (communicative, behavioral and ideological processes). The manipulation of public consciousness as a technology of power is carried out through the value-normative environment, socio-cultural stereotyping of public consciousness. How is the manipulation of public consciousness realized?

One essential feature of social consciousness (social psychology and ideology) allows manipulation to coincide at all levels, namely: the mythological nature of social consciousness and, therefore, its conservatism. This explains the persistence of racist attitudes in the United States at the level of public psychology despite the introduction of tolerance in the ideology and belief in a "post-racial utopia" [see Stephens-Davidowitz 2018]. This phenomenon was previously noticed by K. G. Jung. He considered that mythological representations were forms of consciousness of the collective unconscious, archetypes. They are actualized and manifested in myths tied to a certain time and place. The process of myth-making is a continuous process peculiar to a human being at all times and at all stages of cultural and historical development of mankind. "We look into a dim mirror in which, vaguely pointing to an invisible truth, a dark myth takes shape" [Jung 1994, 171]. "The people of modern civilization, the pinnacle of civilization, are still at the mercy of myths..." [Berdyayev 2000, 51]. On the basis of the primacy of the archetype of wholeness inherent in the collective unconscious and the unconscious of each individual per se, the need for the birth of myth is explained. It is the mythological component of social consciousness that is the basis through which manipulation is being carried out.

A. F. Losev and M. Eliade convincingly proved why myths were encoded in the human subconscious. The matter is that the myth touches existential bases of human existence. "The myth is life itself", a «necessary category of consciousness and being in general" [Losev 1991, 27, 72], the myth reflects ancestral, generic interests of mankind. The myth "affirms a human being existentially", has a direct "relation to his/her existence and way of staying in this world" (M. Eliade), and includes life cycles: birth, youth, maturity, death, resurrection. Death is a part of the life cycle. This is the ontological depth of the myth, expressed in it "the thirst for immortality, freedom, and heavenly bliss" [Eliade 2005, 25]. Of course, modern human being does not experience time vitally, he/she, on the contrary, is at the mercy of time, social space with its status-role ranking. The living of this primitive life cycle has survived to our days in degraded rites (New Year, marriage, birth of children, obtaining a new position, funeral). At the level of everyday practice at all times can be traced undying passion for eternal youth, rejuvenation, fear of withering, old age, death, and an attempt to get rid of the inevitable end and postpone it for a while. This ineradicable thirst for life makes myth a universal feature of social consciousness, and creates objective conditions for manipulating of person's natural desire to live, to preserve health, and to push back old age. The action of many modern social institutions is aimed to satisfy this desire - health care, perfume and cosmetic industry, sport, fashion industry, entertainment, show business, etc. You can easily, relying on people's natural fear of losing health and precious life, using the media and businessmen from science, to provoke mass hysteria about various diseases and sell tons of stale medicines, etc.

But the myth is not only "embedded" in everyday social practice, it penetrates into the theoretical and rationalized part of ideology. The basis of this is, according to A. F. Losev, Cartesianism with its all powerful subject and deprived of content object [Losev 1991, 264]. All content is transferred to the subject, and "dead and empty schemes can be projected onto the object". Belief in the omnipotence of science, democracy, freedom, free market, etc.; political, economic, and social prophecies about "bright future", "market economy", "financial stability", etc. - all these are myths of faith. Mythological consciousness penetrates military history, which is based on the primordial archetype of "heroes" and "villains". Obviously, this archetype is used in PR companies, especially in the period of different levels and types of elections.

Modern myths, of course, are different from archaic, but the mythological symbolism is clearly traced: the main ideological postulates are based on ancient archaic myths about good and evil, heroes, Messiah,

Savior, Golden age, Paradise, Supreme justice, etc. The element of myth in ideological practice is so obvious that the success of the introduction of the ideological system of certain views can be determined by a direct dependence on irrational, unconscious, mythological representations, adapted to the level of ordinary consciousness in the ideological concept. After all, "the mythical model can be applied in a variety of ways"[Eliade 2005, 136]. The close connection of mythology with its static, structural, and symbolism with the plural meaning of the latter gives a wide field for interpretations and its application in various areas of social practices, including, above all, politics (symbolism of flags and banners, manifestos, ritualization of political actions). Modern civilization is marked by the process of the return of the myth – remythologization. It is explained by a number of reasons. Firstly, the beginning of the XX century was marked by the fundamental changes in culture, reflected in art, social practice (revolution). There was a kind of return to the original state of "materia prima" (M. Eliade). Malevich's famous "Black Square" is, according to many art critics, a zero degree, a zero point of reference; it is nothing from which something is being born. The world is diving into complete chaos, which should be followed by the creation of a new world order and worldview. Secondly, radical changes seemed to lead to the loss of traditional values, generally accepted norms and moral orientations. After the Russian Great October revolution 1917 there was a tolerant attitude to prostitution, and the fight against this phenomenon was conducted exclusively in terms of labor education. In December 1917 responsibility for homosexual intercourse was abolished. The criminal codes of 1922 and 1926 did not provide for liability for homosexuality. Until May 1928 there was no ban on drug trafficking. In fact there was an indifferent attitude to drug use and drug trafficking as a social phenomenon. But then the cultural archetypes of traditional society have prevailed. In the 30s the social rehabilitation of women, engaged in prostitution, was curtailed. A repressive policy is being pursued against them. In 1934 criminal liability for homosexuality with punishment in the form of imprisonment for the term from 3 to 8 years is entered. In the same year criminal liability was established for sowing poppy and Indian hemp [Gilinsky 2002, 36-37].

The need for remifologization is explained by the need to recreate a holistic view of the world, giving it stability and some static, and therefore integrity, authenticity and depth. From this point of view, the static and symbolic nature of the myth relieves a person from the tension of the permanent information flow and the dynamism of social changes. Mythology supports the individual's involvement with the world, his/her solidarity with society and humanity. The social component of the myth adds credibility to what it is happening, turning doubts into unshakable faith, possibility into truth. Indeed, the myth appears in the form of a universal model that exists in the depths of the human psyche, allowing containing all the contradictory versatility of the existing world, the dichotomy and antagonism of modern reality. The mythological model, imposed through the prism of social consciousness on modernity, smoothes its "sharp corners", brings it into a state of clarity and accessibility, clarity for understanding and awareness, " ... myth realizes economy: it cancels the complexity of human actions, gives them essential simplicity, abolishes all dialectics, all attempts to go beyond immediate visibility...the world extends in its obviousness, creating a sense of blissful clarity... " [Barthes 2004, 270].

## **MANIPULATION AND FREEDOM**

The thinkers from classics - G. Hegel, K. Marx, and M. Weber to modern ones -D. Bell, A. Toffler, and K. Popper emphasized the immanence of freedom to the historical process. We would like to note one more point. The different forms of manifestation of freedom characterize the historical types of manipulation: traditional society is marked by freedom-chaos in its orgiastic-carnival version [see Eliade 2005, Bakhtin 1990], the formation, though temporarily, of the living space in which power has no right to interfere. Theoretically this form of freedom has been reflected in philosophy and theology (free will). The orgiastic-carnival version of life was very far from total denial and rejection of official social life. Though temporarily denying it, it ultimately aimed at its obligatory revival; since existing traditions were identified with the way it should be (as only it can be). And if there was a clash with foreign customs, they were simply considered to be "untrue", unacceptable or even non-existent" [Drobnitsky 1974, 24]. At the same time, within the framework of the orgiastic-carnival version of life, the living space was constituted, in which power at a certain point in time could not invade, commit violence. In the period of antiquity and the Middle Ages through ideology (myth and religion) has formed traditionalist consciousness, focused on certain cultural, moral, and political foundations. The activity of the traditionalist consciousness was super-individual, unreflexive. Behavior of the traditionalist consciousness was determined by fate, God, the demands of a tribe. The action of medieval human being expressed the general trend of medieval society - corporatism and paternalism. It would seem that freedom in the conditions of spiritual standardization should not be. But even in the traditional type of society one can distinguish an elementary level of self-consciousness, internal motivation which does not require, however, a developed self-reflection, rational thinking and individual

choice. There were bearers of other views, other normativity, different from the generally accepted ones. In this sphere of anti-normativity detraditionalization is making its way. It is denoted the space of freedom. Its bearers seem to fall out of the framework of cultural mainstream. In antiquity there was Socrates, in the Middle Ages there were heretics.

The personal beginning in history is connected with the culture of individualism (Renaissance and early Protestant movement of the XVI century) [see Batkin 1989]. A new type of personality has developed, revealing the ability to self-discipline, self-coercion. M. Luther's saying "I stand on that and I cannot otherwise" became the motto of the New Time. The philosophical generalization of this type of personality gave I. Kant, introducing the concept of "autonomy" and formulating a metaphysical understanding of freedom in contrast to the understanding of it as a conscious necessity - "I must, I am free." Individuals who have risen to such heights cannot be manipulated.

For the non-traditional type of society the deployment of freedom in social space is carried out through social emancipation (social institutions and everyday life), freedom of choice and emergence of subjective freedom, philosophically analyzed in existentialism and postmodernism. The formation of the non-traditional type of society has led to the destruction of social class-estate dependence, psychology and values of traditional society. A qualitative leap in the culture of non-traditional society was associated with the growth of autonomy of the individual and becoming of individuality. It became possible to form inner freedom in the sense that "human being wants" to be «judged by definition." He/she is free in this relation; whatever external definitions would not be formed. This is an inner conviction of a person in which an outsider cannot interfere with. The value of a person is determined by his "inner motive" (G. Hegel). Making a free choice, a person took on himself/herself the full measure of responsibility for the decision.

Changes in society have led to the emergence of new conditions for the formation of individual choice. Self-consciousness is already based on self-determination. The very act of choice is associated with a critical and evaluative attitude to the world, requiring individual and personal self-control. The dignity of the individual, not requiring "reinforcement", is affirmed. The person had greater independence from the pressure of external circumstances, custom, and traditions. The personality already had a developed individual motivation, based on normative and evaluative regulation, individual-selective attitude to values, self-reflection. With one motivation different results became possible [1993 Pervushina, 71-74]

The social order, embodied in everyday life, in which the need for "ontological security" [see Giddens 2004] of human being is satisfied, is not limited to cognitive and normative content, but includes relations of power, domination and subordination. It was especially evident in traditional society, where manipulation, power relations penetrated the system of interpersonal social interactions (during the reign of Queen Elizabeth in XY1 century for eating meat instead of fish on fish day people were imprisoned for a period of 3 months).

How does the form of control, regulation and governance change in modern society? The conveyor production, the system of supervisors has disappeared; they were replaced by technological means of control. Latecomers to work are recorded by computers. In supermarkets, at the train station, at work, in banks surveillance is carried out through video cameras. Incomes of citizens are recorded in computers; plastic cards allow learning at once about all movements, purchases, preferences. Correspondence and information, distributed over the Internet, can be easily monitored: it is available for viewing and control (the management of firms collects information about which sites are visited most often by their employees). The authorities, thus, have the opportunity invisibly to control information, collect it, monitor the behavior of people, and, if necessary, to use it.

The continuing rationalization of modern life dictates the emergence of new rules governing and ordering what to do within the system and what not. Employees are required to have appropriate responsibilities and qualifications. Control and ranking by status is carried out through endless tests and exams "for compliance", provoking "the emergence of feelings of fear and uncertainty" [Bauman 2002, 290]. M. Foucault also noted that the exam combined the technique of "supervising hierarchy and normalizing sanctions". The exam is a "normalizing look, "allowing classifying and passing sentence. Through examination individuals become visible, they can be differentiated. In society the exam plays the role of a ritual, a game, a theatrical action, in which there is a system of questions and answers, its methods of grading and classification. In examinations in the form of tests, interviews you can see the "whole type of power", manipulation, its working "tiny scheme", which has become widespread in pedagogy, public service, psychiatry, the production process, the hiring of labor, etc. It turns out a continuous process of examination, which the individual is subjected to almost all his/her life - from passing the test for "normality" in 6-7 years to employment, not including regular medical examinations to check for compliance of "health standards". The exam introduces the individual into the "documentary field" of school, medical, military, state codifications of behavior and success with the aim

of correcting, classifying, normalizing, excluding, etc. [Foucault 1998, 446-447]. Power still ranks, classifies, normalizes, and in this context manipulation manifests itself in its purest form.

But unlike the disciplinary space of early industrial society normalization is not correlative to the practice of punishment and imprisonment, as it has been presented by M. Foucault. In industrial society, and especially in post-industrial one, there is a very different attitude to the excluded. They are included in the social space; the border between the norm and pathologies becomes very fragile, although proclaimed as an ideological principle, the idea of tolerance, causes a mixed reaction in society (legalization of gay marriage, the conflict between Muslim traditions and the norms of secular European culture, etc.). In addition, the vector of social control has shifted most of all to the economic- financial sphere. Money is still the only equivalent of exchange, so we can say that monetary relations are a form of power. But the increase in living standards, social emancipation, "liberation from the restrictions of traditions "[Multi-Faceted Globalization (ed.) Berger and Huntington 2004, 17] gives maximum freedom of choice, so power cannot totally, as in a traditional society, control the sphere of interpersonal relations, private life.

A new type of social space, the "life world", *Lebenswelt*, is being formed, going beyond the control and governance of the authorities, society can no longer be "totally repressive". The thesis of total manipulation in industrial and modern societies through consumerism, serving as a kind of ideology for mass culture, does not stand up to criticism.

Total manipulation in modern society is possible only in one case, when there is a threat to the survival of human being, (humanity), the preservation of life and health – natural, man-made disasters, military conflicts, the threat of terrorism, pandemics, food shortages, etc. The manipulative practices work without denial in this case.

The analysis of the transformation of historical forms of manipulation shows the contradictory nature of its manifestation, reflecting the contradictory nature of the historical process itself. On the one hand, there is a change in social regulation. This is manifested in changing the specifics of normative regulation from tradition to norms, reducing the repressiveness of society. The expansion of the space of freedom, analyzed in terms of freedom of choice, freedom of self-realization, and the formation of subjectivity associated with it, is noted. It is actualized freedom beyond conditions and prejudice, freedom to be different. I am different, and this is my normal state. The expansion of the space of freedom is manifested in the growth of consciousness and organization of protest movements (yellow vests in France). On the other hand, the process of globalization, affecting the generic interests of mankind, poses the problem of overcoming the ideology of consumerism in relation to nature, the solution of global environmental and social problems (the Russian philosopher N. F. Fedorov was the first to report about it). It is occurred a return to the idea of the unity of humans and nature (*Cosmos*), the unity of practical and theoretical reason – science and a new morality that takes into account the interests of all mankind.

## **CONCLUSION**

Social determinism, considered in the context of the diversity of forms through the prism of human existence and the internal unity of determinism, manipulation, and freedom, makes it possible to analyze the historical process, from the point of view of traditions and innovations, universal and particular, ontology of holistic perception of the world and personalization of historical development. Ontologization of freedom allows us to consider it in terms of freedom-chaos, freedom-arbitrariness, limited by law and the sphere of due. In this case freedom-arbitrariness is transformed into freedom-responsibility. Globalization revives the idea of geocosmic civilization of the Russian philosopher N. Fedorov, including a new morality that reflects the prospects of mankind, determining its generic interests. It is the ethics of sobornost (collective believing consciousness), "to live with everyone and for everyone."

## **REFERENCE LIST**

1. Akerlof A, George, Schiller J., Robert, 2007. *Fishing for Fools. The Economics of Manipulation and Deception*, M: Mann, Ivanov, and Ferber.
2. Bakhtin, M.M., 1990. *Creativity of Francois Rabelais and Folk Culture of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, M.: "Fiction".
3. Barthes, R., 2004. *Mythology*, M.: Publishing House of Sabashnikov.

4. Batkin, L. M., 1989. *The Italian Renaissance in Search of Individuality*, M.: Nauka.
5. Bauman, Z., 2002. *Individualized Society*, M.: Logos.
6. Berdyaev, N. A., 2000. *Creativity and Objectification*, M.: Econompres.
7. St. Augustine, 2006. *Confession*, M.: EKSMO.
8. Bohme, I, 2000. *Theosophy*, St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Philosophical Society.
9. Bohme, I, 2007. *On the Triple Life of Man*, St. Petersburg: Publishing House "Mir".
10. Davies, William, 2017. *The Happiness Industry. How the Government and Big Business Sold Us Well-Being*, M.: Publishing House "E".
11. Drobnitsky, O. G., 1974. *The Concept of Morality*, M.: Nauka.
12. Eliade, M., 2005. *Aspects of Myth*, M.: Academic Project.
13. Foucault, M., 1998. *Supervise and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, M.: AD MARGINEM.
14. Giddens, A., 2004. *Runaway world. How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, M.: Publishing House "Mir".
15. Gilinsky, Y. I., 2002. *Criminology. Theory, history, empirical base*, St. Petersburg.: Peter
16. Jung, K., 1994. *On Modern Myths*, M.: Practice.
17. Kant, I., 1965. *Works in 6 Volumes*, M.: Thought.
18. Losev A. F., 1991. *Philosophy. Mythology. Culture*, M.: Politizdat.
19. Mayer-Schonberg, Victor, Cukier, Kenneth, 2014. *Big Data. A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think*, M.: "Mann, Ivanov, and Ferber"
20. Meshcheryakova, N. A., 1998. *Determinism in Philosophical Rationalism: from Thales to Marx*, Voronezh State University Press.
21. 20.-2004. "The Multi-Faceted Globalization. Cultural Diversity in the Modern World" (eds.) Peter L. Berger and Samuel P. Huntington, M.: Aspect Press.
22. Pervushina V.N., 1993. *Modern Ethics: Problems of Determinism and Free Will*, Voronezh State University Press.
23. Pentland, A., 2018. *Social Physics*, M.: AST.
- 24.- 1989. "Social Practice and Social Relations" (ed.), Yanovsky R.G., M.: Thought.
25. Stephens-Davidowitz, Seth, 2018. *Everyone Lies*, M.: EKSMO.