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Abstract:

The article elaborates on the thesis that in modern society ideology should be qualitatively different from its classical counterparts from past eras. A new quality of modern ideology can develop due to its dynamic restructuring that will make the ideology a “living” one – able to adapt to the fast changes in the external and internal environments. We have shown that the traditional approach to building ideological parties “first ideology, and then – a political organisation” should be changed to the opposite: first one has to create “living” political organisations and the main function of these organisations will consist in producing a full-fledged “living ideology” in a real-time mode by efforts of the collective intelligence generated as a result of synchronisation of the mental activity of their members. The backbone component in the structure of the “living ideology” has to be the organisational ideal as an integral part of the social ideal. The organisational ideal should be almost fully realised in newly created “living” political organisations from the start through the introduction of a pre-selected and coherent organisational structure by initiators.

A “living” political subject-organisation can and should become the bridge from our time to the future, providing today the path for party members to follow in their intra-organisational interaction so that tomorrow they could lead the entire society and
based on the gained experience could reproduce in future the pre-tested, verified and improved social ideal.
The lack of real ideological parties in Ukraine is among the most cited causes of the functional failure and decline of the Ukrainian political system and as a result – of the degradation of the entire state organism. The true diagnosis is established and the next step seems to be obvious – treatment should begin, i.e. creation and development of ideological parties, hoping for a quick recovery of the national political system, which will certainly lead to the convalescence of the state organism and prosperity of the country.

However, all attempts to build such political organisations ran into the sand of systemic resistance due to the fact that Ukrainian politicians and civil activists are moving in a circle of the “ant maelstrom of death” of national politics [1].

To exit the “ant maelstrom” by creating and deploying real ideological political organisations, we, first of all, need to determine what ideology should be like in the post-industrial information society and how it should differ from the classical ideologies of past eras.

Let us consider the nature of ideology in terms of the organisational approach as a tool for activation, management and coordination of activity of large groups of people. In the past, a prophet, genius or a gifted and talented person, sometimes a group of them, simultaneously or at different historical periods, concurrently or sequentially formed a complex sufficiently large-scope intellectual product with an ordered structure – i.e. classical ideology, which in different ways, often on the initiative and due to endorsement of those in power was fully or partially broadcast to its potential carriers (the public) and internalised by them at the level of faith. This made it possible for those in power, leaders, and rulers to purposefully activate carriers of ideologemes (making them generate, accumulate, and release social energy), control their behaviour, and coordinate their activity in a structural way (through straight directives and coercion) –
in the framework of political or paramilitary organisations, or in an unstructured way (in the light of internalised ideologemes) – outside the framework of organisations in order to implement relevant ideological goals.

Obviously, constructing effective ideological parties based on classical ideologies of past eras requires an appropriate level of social archaisation – similar to that of 50-300 years ago. It is only in an archaised society that ideology like faith can activate and inspire people to great deeds – to fight, kill and die for an idea or its dissemination, to create in its name, to sacrifice your fortune and endure poverty, to work hard, and, most importantly, to mindlessly obey those in power, leaders or rulers.

In this context, the targeted archaisation of Russian society seems quite natural as a prerequisite for the spread and establishment of a number of outdated surrogate imperial ideologies. However, today the modern ideological surrogate for indoor and outdoor use in this country is produced in large volumes not by geniuses or prophets but rather by unscrupulous hack workers of the information and virtual fields via eclectic compilation of fragments of other people’s and their own obsolete ideas and ideologemes of the past combined with modern tools of psychogenic influence – the invisible weapons of information and consciential wars.

If we reject the path of archaisation of Ukrainian society and instead choose to develop it to the level of the societies of Western democracy, we must recognise that in today’s information post-industrial society ideology remains an instrument of activation, (self-) management and coordination of large groups of people but it should qualitatively differ from its classical past counterparts.

Let us try to set the parameters of this difference. At its core, the political ideology is an added sense of the political myth. The political myth thus can be defined as a transcendent symbolic story aimed at legitimising a political ideology [2]. The
Ukrainian political scientist Natalia Probyiholova in her publication “Political Myth of Modern Ukrainian Society” [3] described the difference between classical and contemporary myths. Classical myths are integral stories that have a logical beginning, climax and an end; while modern myths are typically fragmentary and logically incomplete, explaining only an individual episode. The mythology of our time combines the conscious and the unconscious, the real and the ideal, the rational and the irrational. The true essence of the myth consists in the content hidden from direct analysis contained in the myth and powerfully affecting its consumers. The author argues that the structure of the myth includes the following elements: the archetype of any situation, the content of a particular experience, a mythologised idea, political symbols, patterns of behaviour, motivational needs, system of values, political humour, communicativity and attribution, and system-generating relations. Thus, a political myth is a form of synthesis of the mythological and political types of consciousness, emotive sensual idea of the political reality that largely displaces and supplants its real picture, and a system including specific views that represent the system of values generated by the mythologised political idea. Most modern mythologemes are based on knowledge of the peculiarities of the human mind, relevant achievements in the field of psychology, sociology, and psycholinguistics.

From the point of view of systems analysis [4], emergent properties (external qualities) of the political myth as a system depend on its structure, in this case on the balance and relationship of the above components. Thus, the formation of a qualitatively new ideology as an additional sense of a political myth implies purposeful modification of its structure. In our view, the strategy of forming a modern ideology should involve the following structural changes in two planes. On the one hand, the rational part of the political myth should be highlighted and
enhanced to be more perceivable (suitable for practical comprehension, analysis and targeted modification), its unconscious, ideal and irrational components should be presented accounting for the modern ideas of social and political psychology, sociology, archetype studies, etc. On the other hand, discontinuity and logical incompleteness of modern political myths, first of all, spawns the need for a constant review of its logical structure and re-designing (continuous restructuring in real time) as an implementation of the striving for perfection, and, secondly, the need for the constant improvement of its content and meaning, development, modification, adaptation and maintenance in accordance with the fast changes of ideas about reality. Systemic implementation of these requirements is only possible as a result of intensification of the processes of algorithmic and orderly collective communication of the carriers of this or that ideology within their own political organisation and acceleration of their information interaction with the environment.

Therefore, a qualitatively new ideology should be a “living” one – i.e. able to dynamically change, adapting to the changes in external and internal environments.

This is especially true in the context of development of modern manipulative information technologies that quickly change, improve and adapt to the current state of society, destroying old and creating new political myths. A “living” ideology should be able to recognise, analyse and neutralise their destructive influence by self-reconstruction and content and meaning improvement.

A “living” ideology by definition cannot be created by one genius or a group of people once and for all. A “living” ideology can be produced in the real time mode only by “living” subject political organisations with corresponding qualities: they should be able to handle the growing flow of information, and, based on their broadband analysis,
quickly make and adopt appropriate integrated solutions, including those adapting the ideology itself to ongoing changes in the external and internal environments. In addition, modern political organisations should be able to increase in numerical terms without losing their primary qualities, to self-educate through their members, to change their organisational structure for the sake of the most effective and efficient fulfilment of their current functions. They need to have holographic properties, where each their individual member or unit can to a certain extent represent the entire organisation in informational terms, etc.

“Living” political organisations can acquire the above properties if they are deliberately constructed based on the organisational structures specially designed for them by interdisciplinary experts in line with modern scientific approaches to organisation theory, social psychology, theory of elites, social engineering, archetype studies, systems analysis, management and other related areas of expertise. We constructed a variable structure of modern political organisations – a dynamic network, which is described in a number of our publications, such as [5, 6, 7, 8].

The results of our research suggest that the traditional approach to the construction of ideological parties: “first ideology, and then – a political organisation” should be changed to the opposite: first one has to create “living” political organisations based on a small number of organisational and ideological principles and values that are determined, chosen, and agreed upon beforehand by their founders. The main function of these organisations will consist in producing a “living ideology” in a real-time mode by efforts of the collective intelligence generated as a result of synchronisation of the mental activity of their members in the process of application of the chosen organisational tools. This approach is consistent with the ideas of most authors of the theory of business organisations.
concerning what should be considered primary in their creation – strategy or structure (see, e.g., [9]).

Obviously, a full-fledged “living” ideology can be created and maintained relevant in real time only as a result of systematic fulfilment of much work by a large group of members of the political organisation. That is, the ability of party members to interact without conflicts as large groups is a prerequisite for building effective “living” political organisations. Actually, the centuries-long failure to engage in such activity spawns another organisational problem of Ukrainian society and its elite groups – i.e. otamanschyna. This term is used to describe the tendency of Ukrainians to build simultaneously a large number of autonomous small-number units, teams, or groups headed by Otamans (Cossack chieftains), where most of the power and energy is spent on mutual struggles and internal strife, preventing from effective tackling of general social problems and joint work on and achievement of common strategic goals. This can be illustrated by a striking fact – today there are almost three hundred registered political parties in Ukraine engaged in a tough struggle for power and using the entire arsenal of Sun Tzu, as evidenced by the animosity of the current election campaign. Thus, otamanschyna is an organisational system-generating cause of the failure of Ukrainian elites to acquire subjectivity and strategic thinking, which, in turn, on the one hand, makes them focus on external powerful geopolitical actors (often diametrically different), and, on the other hand, generates inferiority, parochialism, provincialism, and Little-Russian mentality [10] with its “virtues”, such as defeatism, opportunism and compromise. The problem is compounded by the fact that the network organisational culture [11] and its corresponding habitual practices inherent in Ukrainians run contrary to the hierarchical organisational culture and its practices, which causes dysfunction of Ukrainian political organisations and, accordingly, the
power bodies which they form. Therefore, the construction of modern ideological political parties in Ukraine is impossible without overcoming otamanshyna through adoption by the members of national elite groups of a new organisational culture eliminating the conflict between the inherent network organisational practices and current hierarchical organisational practices of Ukrainians, allowing them to carry out collective activities in larger groups without interpersonal and intergroup conflicts. This, in turn, would make it possible for a “living” political organisation to offer other actors of the Ukrainian political system a strategy of cooperation based on competitive interaction [12], as opposed to confrontation strategies traditionally chosen for interaction in the existing political organisations.

Let us consider the classical definition of political ideology and its present typical structure in order to illustrate the difference between the few basic ideological principles and values declared by founders of political organisations and the very ideology in its full format; as well as with a view to describing the work to be carried out by a modern political organisation in the process of generating a “living” ideology.

Thus, a political ideology [13] is a concrete historical systemic representation of significant aspects of the political reality and acts as a kind of class or group political consciousness and self-consciousness, a system of ideas, hypotheses, concepts, ideals, slogans, and programs that represent the fundamental political and, therefore, economic interests of social communities and groups, and their practical position in the political sphere in relation to other social communities, groups and the state, assessment of the position of these political actors in public life, as well as views of the course of political development and of the reflection of this development in the political ideologies of other political actors. A political ideology as a special form of social consciousness, as a particular kind of ideology has an internal structure, which is
important to expose in order to fully reveal its essence and social functions, and to develop its theory. The structure of political ideology includes the following elements: ideas, hypotheses, concepts, theories, ideals, slogans, and political development programs viewed through the prism of their mutual relations manifesting a certain systematicity and stability. Central to preservation of the stability of the structure of political ideology and ensuring its functional efficiency is coordination, consistency of its content elements, logical and semantic streamlining of connections and relationships among them.

One of the most important components of a political ideology is its social ideal. Based on its gnoseological nature and social functions, it is a specific type of an aim determined by state, class, group, and party interests. It is a concentrated expression of ideology providing an integrated idea of the future, guidelines that reflect different aspects of the desired, anticipated, predicted or foreseen (foretold) social development.

Any significant political force that appears in the historic arena provides its own ideal of social development. An ideal is an imaginary sample of perfection, the model for actors to strive for as the goal of their activity; while with regard to society it is an idea of the perfect social system that ensures the real happiness of human life, it is a model to be pursued as the ultimate goal.

The social ideal organically includes political, economic, moral, legal, and other aesthetic ideals acting as its organic manifestations. Political ideals are basic ones in the system of social ideals, which makes the political ideology dominant in the system of ideological norms.

Obviously, all these definitions are true for the “living” ideology. However, based on our research [14] we concluded that the backbone of its structure has to be an
organisational ideal as an integral part of the social ideal (our vision of the organisational ideal is described in [6, 8]). In turn, the main governing parameter of the organisational ideal is the structure of the political party determining the density and proportion of its vertical and horizontal connections, defining the basic values and setting relationships among members of the organisation and its units, launching motivators which will activate members and encourage them to act together, determining the methods and methodologies of collective action, stipulating the behavioural schemes and strategies to be chosen by party members for their interaction within the organisation and outside it, specifying the types of strategies that the organisation will choose for interaction with external actors, etc.

Besides, we believe that organisational ideal, unlike the other components of the social ideal, has to be almost fully implemented in the newly established political organisations from the very start – the founders should introduce a pre-selected coherent organisational structure and corresponding principles, rules and algorithms of the collective interaction of organisation members and units, declared even before it is created along with the key ideological principles and values of the organisation.

In our opinion, the organisational ideal of political parties should be implemented in a way that would make it impossible at a later stage of development for the founders or leaders to manually modify organisational structures, algorithms and rules of interaction among members in order to launch a number of social and psychological processes and effects that will inevitably lead to concentration of power in their hands due to Michels’ iron law of oligarchy [15].

A political party with the organisational ideal implemented in practice as a result of conscious and purposeful actions of the initiators will become a laboratory of the
future, generating, testing and improving its value, relationship and organisational models and standards. Thus, a “living” political organisation can and should become the bridge from our time to the future, providing today the path for party members to follow in their intra-organisational interaction so that tomorrow they could lead the entire society and based on the gained experience could reproduce in the future the pre-tested, verified and improved social ideal.

If the members of a newly formed political organisation from scratch choose to interact within the current traditional organisational culture and in the interpersonal and intergroup interactions opt for the patterns and strategies based on related behavioural patterns and standards, the probability that they will realise the social ideal of the party ideology in the future is almost zero.

Thus, the practical implementation of the social ideal of a “living” ideology in the country should start with immediate practical enactment of its backbone component – i.e. the organisational ideal – in political organisations, which will help them acquire the collective subjectivity. Such organisations will become the centres of crystallisation that will trigger the restructuring of the entire society based on their model, provided that they are more attractive, efficient and effective than the existing alternatives.

A subject organisation is an active multi-intelligent social model organism endowed with senses, consciousness and will, able to reproduce itself over a long time, and capable of cognising and changing the world: to adequately perceive information from internal and external environments; to process and analyse it in the rational plane; to understand its own interests; to cyclically implement regulatory planning for their realisation, consisting in an open choice of means,
objectives, goals and ideals; and to deliberately act in accordance with the
developed and adopted plans.

To overcome the resistance to change on the part of existing institutional actors, such as oligarchic clans, criminal groups, and external control structures, the described political subject organisations should be able to increase their power without losing their original qualities.

In this case, power stands for total social energy that can be produced by the members and supporters of the political organisation to make social change.

In this context, the question that needs to be answered is why today a couple of political organisations – puppets of oligarchs – are more successful than three hundred other Ukrainian political parties? What is the secret of their success? It is obvious that the answer is the money invested by their owners.

What is the function of money? Clearly, they activate the party members who get them through the sieve of inner corruption. That is, oligarchic money is a means of generating social energy in political party members and the relevant functionaries of the electoral process in order to win the election.

Thus, the key to success for modern ideological parties consists in the activation of their members in such a way that their emitted social energy is greater than the energy collectively emitted by puppets of oligarchic clans activated by money. We are talking about increasing the social energy produced by each member of the ideological party, as well as the targeted growth of its membership due to the type of organisational structure. These two factors can bring the total amount of the social energy produced by the organisation to the required scope.

Therefore, to defeat the puppets of the oligarchs in elections and beyond, the initiators of modern ideological parties must learn to generate social energy of their
members and supporters by activating them through intangible incentives in order to accumulate and direct it to achieve the set ideological goals. That is, the key to success for modern ideological parties is now in the hands of their leaders or founders.

However, to achieve it they will have to share the most precious things to them – power and glory – by distributing them among the rank-and-file party members. Besides, this has to be done not in a manual way as Indian giver, but rather through the use of appropriate algorithms, rules and regulations of collective elaboration, adoption and implementation of decisions within the organisation as described above and as determined by the chosen organisational structure.

Unfortunately, it is always the insuperable obstacle, unconquerable peak, and the insoluble task of which these leaders do not even want to hear. The reason for this is the fact that the highest values for Kshatriyas (modern politicians and the military) are their own power and glory, as opposed to the truth and the general public good, which, ideally, are the highest values for Brahmins (modern philosophers, experts, academics, moral authorities, religious figures). Thus, establishment and creation of a modern ideological political organisation with a “living” ideology and leading it to success without oligarchic money is only possible for Kshatriyas-Brahmins or politicians-philosophers who possess the qualities of both varnas for whom the common social good is as important as power and glory, which will make it possible for them to distribute power and glory evenly throughout the organisation without hesitation.

A perfect example is the politician and philosopher Marcus Aurelius – one of the most famous emperors of Rome, whose deeds are still remembered and respected. In Ukraine, the willingness to distribute power in wartime was shown by the founders of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (UHVR) headed by its president Kyrylo
Osmak. Today, we can look, above all, to ATO soldiers who will soon want to become politicians.

**Resume.**

1. In today's society, ideology should be qualitatively different from its classical counterparts from past eras.

2. The new quality of modern ideology can be ensured through its dynamic restructuring that will make the ideology a “living” one, i.e. able to adapt to the fast changes in the external and internal environments.

3. The traditional approach to the construction of ideological parties: “first ideology, and then – a political organisation” should be changed to the opposite: first one has to create “living” political organisations aimed primarily at producing a full-fledged “living ideology” in a real-time mode by efforts of the collective intelligence generated as a result of synchronisation of the mental activity of their members.

4. Construction of modern ideological political parties in Ukraine is impossible without overcoming the inherent *otamanschyna* by internalising a new organisational culture that would allow Ukrainians to carry out collective activities in larger groups without interpersonal and intergroup conflicts.

5. The backbone component in the structure of the “living ideology” has to be the organisational ideal as an integral part of the social ideal. The organisational ideal should be almost fully realised in newly created “living” political organisations from the start through the introduction of a pre-selected and coherent organisational structure by initiators.

6. Practical implementation of the organisational ideal in real political organisations will help them acquire collective subjectivity. A subject-organisation is an active multi-intelligent social model organism endowed with senses, consciousness and
will, able to reproduce itself over a long time, and capable of cognising and changing the world: to adequately perceive information from internal and external environments; to process and analyse it in a rational plane; to understand its own interests; to cyclically implement regulatory planning for their realisation, consisting in an open choice of means, objectives, goals and ideals; and to deliberately act in accordance with the developed and adopted plans.

7. A “living” political subject-organisation can and should become the bridge from our time to the future, providing today the path for party members to follow in their intra-organisational interaction so that tomorrow they could lead the entire society and based on the gained experience could reproduce in future the pre-tested, verified and improved social ideal.

8. A modern ideological and political organisation with a “living” ideology can be established and led to success without oligarchic money only by Kshatriyas-Brahmins or politicians-philosophers who possess the qualities of both varnas for whom the common social good is as important as power and glory, which will make it possible for them to distribute power and glory evenly throughout the organisation without hesitation.
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