

THE SPECIFICS OF INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT «POLITICAL ANTI-UTOPIA»

У статті запропоновано аналіз різних інтерпретацій поняття «політична анти-утопія». Розглянуто синонімічні та близькі терміни, виділено характерні риси анти-утопій, подано визначення антиутопії з літературознавчого, філософського та політологічного підходів.

Ключові слова: антиутопія, деперсоналізація, тоталітарне суспільство, свобода, модель.

В данном исследовании автором предложен анализ различных интерпретаций понятия «политическая антиутопия». Рассмотрены синонимические и близкие термины, выделены характерные черты антиутопий, предоставлены определения антиутопии согласно литературоведческому, философскому и политологическому подходам.

Ключевые слова: антиутопия, деперсонализация, тоталитарное общество, свобода, модель.

In this research the analysis of different interpretations of dystopias is suggested by the author. The synonyms and related terms are considered; the characteristics of dystopia are emphasized; the definitions of dystopia according to literary, philosophic and political sciences' approaches are provided.

Key words: dystopia, anti-utopia, depersonalization, totalitarian society, freedom, model

Problems of individual liberty, depersonalization and authoritarian obedience began anew treated in the twentieth century. They found their expression not only in works of professional scientists – philosophers, political scientists, sociologists, psychologists – but also in fiction. We can even select the specific number of works which are called dystopia. They certainly are, both individually and collectively, the bright reflection of the overall picture of the world – moods, hopes, fears and expectations of the average person. So dystopia becomes a genre on the verge of literature and science, journalism and researches. This fact once again confirms the topicality of this issue and becomes a major research problem of this paper.

In the twentieth century dystopia becomes the subject of many research papers. Among the well-known researchers of dystopia are E. Batalov, O. Zverev, Y. Kagarlytsky, J. Kateb, A. Morton, G. Ryahuzova, C. Walsh, N. Frey, W. Chalikova, T. Chernysheva, K. Shakhova and others. In the scientific literature the socio-historical and political causes of dystopia' emergence are examined, its specific scientific and fiction features are observed.

The purpose of the article is to identify characteristics of political dystopia due to comparing of the most accepted interpretations of dystopia.

It should be noted that this paper focuses on emphasizing the kinship of political dystopia and anti-totalitarian theories in political science.

First we'll characterize the antonymic term – «utopia». In the «Concise Oxford dictionary of politics» the utopianism is defined as «a disposition to embrace the vision of an

alternative society from which present social evils have been eradicated and in which there will be full self-realization, entire welfare due to the strengthening of perfect justice, freedom, equality and other ideals which are formulated by the authors of utopias» [9, p. 711-713]. The most famous works-utopias are «Utopia» (1516) of T. More, «The City of the Sun» (1602) of T. Campanella, «New Atlantis» (1627) of F. Bacon and others. The evolution of arts and science of the Renaissance gave impetus to the utopia, describing a society transformed with using knowledge and economic and technological development. Later in the nineteenth century the new socialist doctrines were widely accepted as preaching of salvation the industrial working class in its struggle for liberation from exploiting components of industrial capitalism.

However, the utopian thought of the nineteenth century with all its very progressive assumptions faced widespread criticism in the twentieth century. Utopian ideals were refuted by the critics who were inspired by the spirit of dystopia reaction. Literary dystopia (in which the authors seek to uncover the terrible consequences of attempts to translate into practice some rational model of utopia) became a very influential trend in the twentieth century.

Anxiety about utopianism which leads to totalitarianism in practice increased because of the Stalinism, fascism and brutal sort of rational bureaucratic state of the twentieth century.

First time the word «dystopian» as antonym to «utopian» was used by the English scientist John Stuart Mill in 1868.

The very same term «anti-utopia» as the name of literary genre was introduced by N. Glenn and M. Patrick (in the anthology of utopias «Quest for Utopia» (1952)) [13, p. 48]. In the mid-1960s the term «anti-utopia» appears in the Soviet and in English criticism.

«Leviathan» (1651) of T. Hobbes and a novel of S. Butler «Erewhon» (1872) are considered as the first dystopias. Y. Zamyatin considered dystopia as an artistic phenomenon of XX century, whose predecessor was H. Wells. Therefore an important question is when exactly a dystopia appeared. A. Batalov and Y. Kagarlyksky believe that dystopia formed gradually when the principles and ideas that were fundamental for utopia started criticized. Y. Kagarlyksky [8, p. 290] relates the decisive feature of the genre to the historical crisis of ideas. This fact explains the active expansion of dystopia in the XX century because it reflects any threat faced by mankind.

Evolution of dystopia considered from two perspectives: 1) as an eternal satellite of utopia which appears with it, passes all stages of development and acts as a dynamic correction of utopia which is static and inaccessible; 2) as a response to the growth of scientific and technical progress and social-political contradictions of the early twentieth century.

According to Y. Zhadanov a dystopian motif which existed for several centuries finally gets a complete genre form only in the twentieth century [7]. In anti-utopias the same ideal society is described. In such a society the utopian features are brought to a logical conclusion and converted to their full opposite.

So artistic preconditions for the final formation of dystopia are: firstly, philosophical orientation as the main feature of the literature of the twentieth century which characterized the works of all genres and socio-philosophical learning of reality which covered all areas; secondly, the widespread use of artistic techniques produced by science fiction which were subordinated to the expression of socio-political and philosophical issues.

The issue about the genetic roots of dystopia is polemical. Y. Zamyatin considers that T. More, J. Swift and H. Wells are the first dystopia classics. Modern researches (who are primarily interested in the correlation of dystopia and utopia) consider that «Utopia» of T. More and «The Republic» of Plato became the source of the genre. However, other researchers (F. Cassidy, T. Chernysheva, J. Latynina) lead the genealogy of genre from myths, legends and folk tales [5].

One of the first interpreters of the term «anti-utopia» is Y. Zamyatin. One of the first local researchers of genre is Y. Kagarlyksky. He noted that dystopia is not a criticism of the utopian ideas of a perfect society or real society that exists now. «Anti-utopia» is a form of criticism «when only Time is a judge» [8, p. 290].

However, in modern science, there are many other definitions of this genre. This fact indicates about the underdevelopment of this definition. Y. Shatsky gives different definitions of negative utopia: anti-utopia, dystopia, kakotopia, contra-utopia, novel-prevention, etc [15]. But in the national discourse the terms «negative utopia» and «anti-utopia» are the most extended.

Some researches believe that «anti-utopia» and «dystopia» are the synonyms. According to the opposite opinion dystopia is a «victory of the mind forces over the

forces of good». But anti-utopia is an absolute antithesis of utopia, just a negation of the principle of utopia, which introduces more degrees of freedom [11]. However, the term «anti-utopia» is spread much wider and usually is meant in the sense of dystopia.

The classical utopia focuses on demonstrating the positive features of the social order which is described in novel. But anti-utopia seeks to identify its negative features. Thus, the utopia differs from dystopia only because of the point of view of the author. An important feature of utopia is its static. In dystopia different possibilities of the further transformations of social orders are described (usually – in the direction of growth of negative trends that often leads to crisis and collapse). Thus, dystopia usually deals with more complex social models.

Dystopia is a perfect image of poor society, the image of social and deeply personal evil which doesn't exist yet. Anti-utopia is usually aimed at debunking of utopian tendencies. Y. Zamyatin and G. Orwell have different ideas about the main evil of the future. For example, Y. Zamyatin considers that this is a technology but G. Orwell emphasizes the psychological control. In «Brave new world» A. Huxley most clearly specifies the source of evil that is originating in the test tube reproduction system and cultivation of the members of different castes as the building blocks of a new world.

Dystopia is often seen as an antithesis of utopia. However, some researchers oppose such view on this issue. V. Novikov [12] considers that in the XX century this genre «was fully crystallized and exhausted» so modern anti-utopia tends to interact with other genres. And according to a forecast by A. Morton, the main target of anti-utopia will be not the development of social defects but the development of the personality [10, p. 247].

Thus, we can identify several approaches to the specific interpretation of anti-utopia. According to literary approach (e.g., N. Dobrynska [3], O. Evchenko [5]) anti-utopia is defined as a flexible synthetic genre whose parody principle is laid in his genealogy and is reflected in its structural and compositional features.

From a philosophical point of view (e.g., Y. Boguslavskaya [2], O. Shishkin [16]) anti-utopia can be treated as fictional project for the future, the critical model of society. Such a model is the antithesis of utopia and is confronted with a complex of economic, political or technological problems. The causes of these problems lays in an uncontrollable technological progress (robotics of production, introduction of technically advanced tracking systems, the crisis of overproduction and rearmament) or dictate that terrifies the entire country and so on.

According to political science' approach, we are particularly interested in, the author suggests the following definition: «anti-utopia» is fiction trend, partly – in science, which is in satirical allegorical description of any society with dominating of negative trends. This is theoretical conceptual model of society, which is a conditional prediction-caveat, symbolic model of social development providing the maintaining or enhancing negative effects of socio-political and/or moral life of society. So, anti-utopia with the widespread anti-totalitarian conceptions can play a significant role in informing the general public about the dangers of totalitarian societies, depersonalization, denial of freedom and choosing the strategy of absolute conformity as the dominant in political life.

The main anti-utopia' feature is the prediction of undesirable future. In numerous works anti-utopia is considered as a socio-philosophical model of the future in which the real life trends are carried to the logical absurdity.

Y. Zamyatin identified features of «synthetic art» (e.g., his novel «We»): the fantastic plot, concentration of the symbols and colors, brevity of speech, philosophical orientation [4]. Modern researchers noted the widespread use of the science fiction, grotesque satire, hyperbole, bringing some ideas to the absurd.

Genre of anti-utopia has always been closely associated with political life and historical reality. Anti-utopia identifies the most dangerous social trends. The works of this genre are both a response to these trends and prediction of their future development. The society's features are attributed to some imaginary society which is located at a distance – in space or in time [17, p. 23].

We can conclude that the most important features of the world described in anti-utopia are the restrictions of inner freedom, the removal of the individual right to critical reflection of the reality. People are inculcated absolute conformity; the frameworks of mental activity are established for them. And going beyond these frames is a crime.

The content of anti-utopia is subjective image of negative effects of socio-political society sphere. In the center of anti-utopia often are such issues as person and material and technical progress, moral and ethical issues of good and evil, the ratio of the individual and the totalitarian system, «depersonalization» of man in the modern technocratic civilization. These issues, according

to researcher O. Evchenko [5], are global and universal. So this is improperly to correlate them with any particular society, because it's characterized in varying degrees to each modern state system.

Therefore, in our opinion, it is possible to identify some characteristics of political regimes that are described in anti-utopia, as a kind of opposite example to follow to:

– anti-utopia society is tightly integrated and coherent system, a society of networks (intelligence, transnational corporations, resistance movements, etc.);

– total control of anti-utopia – it is the main state function that supports the existing system and gives stability; anti-utopia is a model of a society of control;

– strict regulation of daily life – a necessary condition for stability is not a punishment for disobedience but the exclusion of any possibility of committing a crime;

– the true faith of anti-utopia citizens is the only possibility of their existence, but because of it freedom becomes completely illusory and turns into slavery.

In whole, anti-utopia is considered as a reaction to the failure of utopia; as a kind of artistic verification of social and political concepts to identify their falsity or harmfulness to humans. In this regard, you can specify that anti-utopia generates in the reader's mind the search for true values.

To summarize, we can note that a detailed analysis of society and political system that lead to depersonalization allows to look at their content characteristics newly, to focus on the study of political aspects of anti-utopia as specific kind of anti-totalitarian concepts.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Бесчѣтнікова С. В. Жанр антиутопии в ситуации постмодерна: «жизненная правда» и «другая действительность» / С. В. Бесчѣтнікова // Славянскія літаратуры у кантэксте сусветнай : VII Міжнар. навук. канф., 12–14 кастр. 2005 г., Мінск : [зб. навук. арт. : у 3 т. / Беларус. дзярж. ун-т, філал. фак.; рэдкал. : Г. М. Бутырчык]. – Мінск : Выд. Цэнтр БДУ, 2007. – Т. 1. – С. 135–141.
2. Богуславська Ю. С. Утопія як форма соціального передбачення : автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філософських наук за спеціальністю : 09.00.03 – соціальна філософія і філософія історії / Ю. С. Богуславська. – Донецьк, 2010. – 17 с.
3. Добрынская Н. Г. Антиутопия: пространство государства и пространство личности [Электронный ресурс] / Н. Г. Добрынская // Культура народов Причерноморья. – Симферополь : Межвузовский центр «Крым», 2000. – № 15. – С. 106–108.
4. Евгений Замятин и культура XX века. Исследования и публикации / Сост. : М. Ю. Любимова. – СПб, Изд-во Рос. нац. б-ки, 2002. – 476 с.
5. Євченко О. В. Драма-антиутопія. Генезис. Поетика : автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук за спеціальністю : 10.01.06. – теорія літератури // О. В. Євченко // Інститут літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України, Київ, 2002. – 17 с.
6. Єршов В. О. Політична драма: становлення теорії і особливості поетики : автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук : 10.01.06 / В. О. Єршов. – К., 1992. – 18 с.
7. Жаданов Ю. А. Роман Джорджа Оруелла «1984» у контексті антиутопії першої половини ХХ століття : автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук за спеціальністю : 10.01.04 – література зарубіжних країн // Ю. А. Жаданов. – Дніпропетровський державний університет, Дніпропетровськ, 1999. – 17 с.
8. Кагарлицкий Ю. Что такое фантастика? / Ю. Кагарлицкий. – М. : Худож. лит., 1974. – 390 с.
9. Короткий оксфордський політичний словник / Пер. з англ. ; За ред. І. Макліна, А. Макмілана. – К. : Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2005. – 789 с.
10. Морсон Г. Границы жанра / Г. Морсон // Утопия и утопическое мышление. – М. : Прогресс, 1991. – 421 с.
11. Невский Б. Грезы и кошмары человечества. Утопия и антиутопия / Б. Невский // Мир Фантастики и Фэнтези. – 2007. – № 49 (сентябрь). – С. 9.
12. Новиков В. Возвращение к здравому смыслу. Субъективные заметки читателя антиутопий [Текст] / В. Новиков. – М. : Знамя, 1989. – С. 214.
13. Романчук Л. Утопии и антиутопии: их прошлое и будущее / Л. Романчук // Порог. – 2003. – № 2. – С. 48.
14. Рязузова Г. М. Современный французский роман «предупреждение» / Г. М. Рязузова. – К., 1984. – 283 с.
15. Шацький Є. Утопія і традиція [Текст] / Є. Шацький. – Івано-Франківськ : Лілея-НВ, 1990. – 315 с.
16. Шишкин А. Бабуины жаждут? Перечитывая Олдоса Хаксли [Текст] / А. Шишкин. – М. : Диапазон, 1993. – № 3 – 112 с.
17. Шишкин А. Есть остров на том океане: утопия в мечтах и в реальности [Текст] / А. Шишкин. Утопия и антиутопия ХХ века. – М. : Прогресс, 1990. – С. 5–34.

Рецензенти: Іванов М. С., д. політ. н., професор;
Ханстантинов В. О., д. політ. н., професор;
Шубін С. П., д. політ. н., доцент.

© Соловйова А. С., 2014

Дата надходження статті до редколегії 12.05.2014 р.

СОЛОВЙОВА Анна Сергіївна – кандидат політичних наук, старший викладач кафедри політичних наук Чорноморського державного університету імені Петра Могили, м. Миколаїв, Україна.

Коло наукових інтересів: споживацтво, масове суспільство.