MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„Re-reading Marcuse and Frankfurt School from an anthropological perspective"

Verfasser

Dmytro Bielobrov (BA, MA)

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2012

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

«This repression, so different from that which characterized the preceding, less developed stages of our society, operates today not from a position of natural and technical immaturity but rather from a position of strength. The capabilities (intellectual and material) of contemporary society are immeasurably greater than ever before – which means that the scope of society's domination over the individual is immeasurably greater than ever before»

(Marcuse, Herbert 1964; Society without Opposition).

The matter of «alienation» intrinsically fascinates and concerns me since long ago. It appears to be the most enigmatic and albeit central concept concerning human culture: firstly comprehended as «simple» (especially in the interpretations of Marx's «formulae»), but then there seems to be an abyss of significandum (meaning). The diverse quests on the essence of «alienation», as a fundamental axiom, have been undertaken many times in many different fields of thought: by philosophers (from Aristotle to Simmel) or economists (like Marx and Engels in that case), or psychologists (Freud), and emerged from pure theory, like 'eternal, abstract cunning'. But valid resolutions could be found, for me, only in anthropological insight, as it is capable to take into account the state of mind of a certain epoch as well as employing various historical schemata and empirical methods. Accepting alienation as a given, 'fundamental law', there remains the puzzling problem that since the origins of human societies and in the ongoing process of constituting the social world, humans still seem to be trying to get rid of alienation's restrain. Why and how do mundane men endure alienation, seek it and fight it all at once? And are apparently and persistently ignoring the obvious notion that alienation it is an integral part of the processes within society and within each individual?

Anthropology has a wide variation of methods and approaches of studying human societies, drawing on and exchanging with many other disciplines. This inter-disciplinarity gives it the possibility to constantly expand the range of knowledge, concepts and methods concerning the study human societies in general. The human

sciences certainly do not exist as strictly separated disciplines. Researchers need additional skills from psychology, sociology, history but also biology, medicine etc., for a more complete understanding of the studied processes, because none of these sciences are able to study the man «in vacuum», without having to turn to other scientific data. This applies not only to the humanities, but also to the natural sciences. In this whole context philosophy plays an important role as articulating thought in systemic ways, giving basic conceptual frameworks, supplying axiomatic notions and articulating worldviews.

Cultural and social anthropology studies all human activity through the prism of the culture in which they exist or are informed by as particular, but also studies them by comparison, therefore cultural and social anthropology also explores encounter, contact and collision of different cultures, or, to use Walter Benjamin's interpretation, the clash of different «barbarities»:

> *«For what he surveys as the cultural heritage is part and parcel of a lineage which he cannot contemplate without horror. It owes its existence not only to the toil of the great geniuses,who created it, but also to the nameless drudgery of its contemporaries. There has never been a document of culture, which is not simultaneously one of barbarism. And just as it is itself not free from barbarism, neither is it free from the process of transmission, in which it falls from one set of hands into another». (Benjamin 1974).*

Cultural and social anthropology seeks to understand the relationship of man with the products of his activity. Philosophical anthropology is quite complex and encompasses many different thought traditions in order to fit it into a single definition. To date, anthropology is at the forefront of the study of man. As the science of man, it tries to answer the most important questions of the day, providing and testing the impact of all possible sources of information.

On the one hand it is the study of the nature and essence of man, his position in the universe. On the other hand it was defined as one of the areas in the creation of a philosophical direction which involved Schoeller, Plessner and Gehlen, where originally part of their philosophical anthropology was aimed at the deification of human nature, the establishment of the Christian laws in functioning of the universe.

However, since the mid-twentieth century, this Christian humanistic anthropocentrism is replaced by new philosophical tendencies, which, at first glance, have only a rather distant relationship to this particular philosophical anthropology school.

Herbert Marcuse and the members of the Frankfurt School are undoubtedly representatives of philosophical anthropology which posed quite different questions and pursued other aims. Their scientific discourse is directly related to the concept of the embeddedness of human beings in a given social environment. Moreover, the «negative dialectics», a central notion in their approach, developed anthropology based on the negation criterion, created a new kind of anthropology, which views culture not as a derivative human «product», but as well as existing outside of human influence environment, reproducing independently. According to the Frankfurt School, people in their understanding of themselves can find themselves in opposition to their culture

The aim of our research is not only to trace the influence of Marcuse on anthropologists, but in doing so we also must research the relationship that this philosophical anthropology direction had and has with cultural and social anthropology. From our point of view, in terms of cultural and social anthropology, we must perceive the impact of its proposals as we need to understand and learn more, in order to achieve a more complete understanding of our own roots of anthropology as a science tradition. Perceiving Marcuse as a philosophical anthropologist, his understanding of discourse is the most important approach and had the most impact up to now, as its ethical and philosophical views are largely defining influences in the contemporary world of science and everyday life. The other key issue inherited from Marcuse is of course his concept of «alienation».

The beginnings for the encounter with the notion of alienation lie already in the roots of the three «Abrahamical» religions which are based on the idea of 'deity' revealing itself to a prophet and on the existence of τέλος. Now revelation denies alienation as such. With unity under the supreme authority of the word and the true deity, alienation, thus, becomes an obsolete 'fact', which, sooner or later, has to sink into oblivion, to Letha. But, for various substantial reasons, that did not happen.

The last 'combat' with a «growing sense of alienation» in Western European culture takes place in 60s of the 20th century, usually seen as a cultural and philosophical renaissance after the Second World War. I often thought about this epoch as quite

paradoxical, as it seems to me to be a grim turning point in history; and actually symbolizes alienation *almost visibly*. Grim it was because the musical and ethical revolutions, pacifist movements and struggles for civil rights and liberties, of course, had to change fundamentally the ruling social ideals as well as their modes of representation, but *how* had that really happened? Back then many intellectuals believed that changes *must* occur; they believed as well in the righteousness of these changes (no matter what grade and type and by which means). Perfect conditions, entrenched, could be a mirror image of those vices that people seemingly have managed to overcome. However, none of these ideals became real.

The ideas of the 60s received a wide response among the people in Western Europe and North America. Worldviews became different (literally − alienated), «the 60s» (if we will take a date as a starting point) 'won', but only in a very broad sense. The so-called «victory» was quite unforeseen and was understood as such only because all the «revolutionary proclamations» were too positive and up-to-date for losing the chance to fulfil them. Still the fact is that Euro-American culture did change and in a way has been «celebrating» diverse symbolic victories since then, but if one looks closely at the present there was not much left for «the winners».

In the 60s people «felt success» in advance, by realizing the positions of the opposing «parties» − the past is always dark, senile and wrong when it comes face-to-face with the bright and cheerful perceptions that youths have. There is always direct antagonism and taking one side seems relatively easy. The old ideologies and their capabilities were forced to exhaust themselves and gave way to a «new culture of freedom». From then on «victory was inevitable». But at the same time the myth of a «new» civil society was destroyed as society could be anything, but certainly it couldn't be «new». Even the new cultural norms of the «revolutionary opponents» were derived from the same old, «improper» culture. That old, despised, «wrong» culture gave to the «young» the opportunity to have different opinions, to disagree with the elder generations and to protest openly against all that they had they been given, so fighting the establishment included also overlooking the benefits of the old system −apparently an inherent dialectic of the social process.

In the 60s many prominent revolutionary leaders sought *conflicts for the changes*, though, substantial *change of conflict itself* really took place. One could also come to

the opinion that public control of discrimination, segregation and any violent social action dreamed by many people, led to the triumph of total hypocrisy. Those who used to be «enemies of society» learned to hide. Society, instead of being constituted as a straightforward opposition, produced an assemblance of political and social institutions, tending to the same standards of public life as its virtual opponents. Open conflict, in the words of Max Gluckman, as «healthy phenomenon in society», ceased to exist openly. Conflicts or the outbreaks of the conflicts became the appendage of marginalized people who refused to be integrated into society. Before the 60s integration into society could happen through career and/or wealth. After the 60s persons are required to have certain political affiliations and reliabilities, which give them the chance to obtain a more or less important position in society.

However, the inhibitions of the revolution of the 60s gave additional stimuli for the social theorists in their search for «truth» and the very structure of the social sciences has not remained unchanged. Unfortunately, at present, where it seems to me that the issue of society is in need of the most direct and objective analysis, it seems that the social sciences are marginalizing themselves.

Many theories have made an attempt to distance their approach from the established structure – function analysis of society and have focused on livid displaying of «life», «society» found itself in a condition that Russian writer Andrei Platonov expressed as «nothing to live for». A person needs and wants to move on, but the social system blocks opportunities, claiming that he or she already reached the desired conventional «peak» of development and really has nowhere else to go. Such an attitude greatly influenced the social sciences, making them reveal some mistakes and flaws of the so called «new» social order, seemingly not realizing that the nature of these mistakes is at very root of the social order in question.

Philosophers of the Frankfurt School attract me with their "Don Quixote" standpoints. They are clearly aware of their impotence in the struggle against ideology itself, criticizing Soviet socialism, and German fascism and the Western democracies. They, like many philosophers before them, tried to point out the failure of ideology, its alienating effect and its grasping essence. So they have not been heard neither before 60's, when they were one of the first harbingers of future revolutions, nor after they tried to stop the process of the formation of a new ideology. Despite the fact Max

Horkheimer called their philosophy "pessimistic Jewish transcendentalism", the ideas of the Frankfurt School contain notions of early Christianity. Considering that the scholars of the Frankfurt School departed from the influences of the philosophical anthropology of Max Scheler, Helmuth Plessner and Arnold Gehlen. Quests on the essence and nature of man, opened by these philosophers, became fundamental to the further development of their ideas with much more mundane questions about human nature (Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud). This mixture of the idealistic conception of man as the center of the universe, worth fighting for, and of man as a being tending to commit self-destruction and death, form the basis for the development of the Frankfurt School's ideas. Understanding that Christianity and the religious education of a person no longer give the opportunity to live in peace with one's self, they came to the conclusion that all ideology should be eliminated from human consciousness, the very thing that Herbert Marcuse called "the Great Refusal".

The nightmare of Marcuse's predictions is not in that they will come true at once. The real sense of "nightmare" is that the society described nearly 50 years ago has changed only in form, but has remained unchanged in content.

Marcuse as the most straightforward and declarative revolutionary of the Frankfurt scholars will be the key subject of this study. Being the spiritual leader of the student protests at the Sorbonne in 1968, Marcuse had the most profound impact on culture and social sciences in "industrial society". His idea of "non-taking" position, maneuvering between capitalism and communism turned out to be a crucial factor in the further establishing of a coming dominant ideology, which so little differs from the worldview he described in his key-work, the «One-Dimensional Man.»

The new ideology, based on the material well-being and on consumer values, could and can not deploy propaganda against itself. Ideologists are forced to make practical selections of the ideas of Marcuse and the Frankfurt School which are suitable for further reproduction. Sometimes the followers in the tradition acquire the idea of constant social critique, which actually is pseudo-constructive criticism of the system, aimed at a result but not at the cause. This is the only permissible criticism, devoid of such epithets as «grumbling» and «dissatisfaction». In the post-industrial society no one can criticize the structure, only the product, or rather, its possible hypothetical "imperfection" can be criticized.

Cultural and social anthropology did not escape this seemingly collective ideological influence. The hypothesis of this work is that Marcuse's effect has gone beyond margins of philosophy and sociology. Prominent anthropologists of the 60s and post-60s, in my opinion, took this "constant criticism" standpoint in their analysis of industrial and later post-industrial societies, perceiving themselves as a cultural group of intellectuals (intelligentsia), intended to produce final "ideological truth". Their opuses, in fact, are not "researches" in the strict meaning. Object and subject of study thus are no longer independent moments. They become an integral part of the struggle, the symbolic elements of the global injustice of Western civilization, both in relation to itself, to the world and people. One could almost say that they carry out a project of new system control, which, to a greater or lesser extent, is worth a separate study.

Marcuse's notions about total revolution could not be translated into reality. To employ his ideas fully is not possible, since commonplace ideologies take the path of partial borrowing «convenient» ideas and silencing «inconvenient» ones. Ideological thinking tends to perceive Marcuse as revolutionary more than an intellectual. The direct impact of Marcuse's ideas on cultural and social anthropology is difficult to assess to the full extent, because very few scholars link their approaches directly to his work. However, there is a number of indirect reference to him, where we can trace the influence of his ideas and the way they became part of new ideology constructs after the 60s.

The influence of diverse well-known theorists and philosophers on Marcuse and the Frankfurt School is studied rather well. But there are two scholars, which should be mentioned in primo context in regard to the Frankfurt group. Their influence is not directly evident and it is not referenced by authoritative sources. But in my opinion some of their ideas reappear in the works of (to use the word «existence») Marcuse, Adorno and Horkheimer and seem to be precursors to these philosophers. The two scholars are Ernest Renan and Dmitry Merezhkovsky.

The philosophy of Herbert Marcuse and his co-scholars in the Frankfurt School lies not only in the their critical engagement with the nature of dialectics or «negative dialectics» as Adorno called it. Their influence also relates to these directions of their philosophy which rest embedded in the continuity of early Christian traditions. The combining of early Christianity with the Old Testament (it is known that Jesus visited the synagogue on the Sabbath, observed the Torah, was circumcised, and so on) has

been a central element to the understanding their philosophical approaches, what Horkheimer means when he calls it «pessimistic Jewish transcendentalism.» We are dealing with a romantic interpretation of early Christianity, which has departed from the tenets of the Jewish faith, but has not yet created an official ecclesiastical Christianity. At this point, the earthly and the heavenly, the rational and the irrational intermingle.

Several notions common to the members of the Frankfurt School point towards this interpretation of an embedded Christian tradition: Their commitment to the triumph of individualism over total subjugation, the denial of life in society as controlled object, the desire to overthrow the existing conditions and the lack of freedom by revolutionary means. All these elements are already articulated in cults of early Christianity, from the time of the Apostolic Age to the time of Constantine the Great (not taking into account the Christianization of Armenia and Georgia).

Similar ideas, like the denial of an ecclesiastical understanding of Christianity, and the attempt of bringing it closer to the traditional way of life at the time we see in Ernest Renan's work «The Life of Jesus». The book caused a public scandal and gained extreme popularity in late 19th century, because Renan presented Christ as a man who combines the desire for God with his human life. This is a very important approach because for Renan the humanity of Jesus does not negate his being god, both instances rather complemental than negating each other.

Renan was foremost a scientist, a historian, archaeologist and scholar of religions and himself not an orthodox Catholic, which did not prevent him from being a believer in the humanity of Christ, named Joshua, who studied Philo, planned and organized the Jewish revolt. This anarchism of Christ in the work of Renan and of Renan himself could not have gone unnoticed and stands quite opposed to one-dimensional, traditional perceptions of Christ dogmatically accepted for centuries (Renan, 1864).

Dmitry Merezhkovsky, as writer and culture critic, is in our view, even more interesting in this respect. His brilliant intellect and constant dialectical style of thought resembles the Frankfurt scholars in their pursuit to understand and overcome the gap between visionary idealism and necessary reality. In his famous trilogy «Christ and Antichrist» (and this is most fully expressed in the first part «The Death of the Gods. Julian the Apostate»), he explored the difficulty of the choice and the incompatibility of the spiritual and the physical. The novel is devoted the reign of the Roman Emperor Julian

the Apostate, who in opposition to the spread of Christianity, forcefully tried to revive lustrous Greco-Roman polytheism. The author's interpretation at the same time attracts and repels the reader from Christianity, with the awareness of this religion of Good not able to exist in this world. Symbiosis of stillborn Christianity full of asceticism, mortification, and escape from earthly life (which is vaguely reminiscent of the Freudian death wish), and a desire to understand its heavenly and spiritual nature characterise the novel. Julian, who could not make a choice, fascinated by Christ, but rejected by His people, emphasizes the rivalry between spirit and flesh, the darkness and the light, the soul is required to not succumb to the flesh. What needs flesh, rejects the soul. The unattainable unity, the eternal alienation literally breaks Julian's heart – the heart of a great sinner and a hero. His final words at his deathbed are: "Heaven is up, Heaven beneath, if you *take thus*, Glory to thee" (*translation from Russian – D.B.*).

Accordingly, the true life of religion in the spiritual domain must be displayed in everyday life, making it possible for people to glorify the spiritual ideals of the day-to-day life (Merezhkovsky, 1895).

One could therefore say the Frankfurt School has taken the path of searching 'religion' in the construction of reality as built by industrial society. The search for truth, the pursuit of truth, the humanistic ideals of freedom associated with the group dispay a reality that rejects idealism. In their diverse approaches the fight of real and spiritual reaches a new level, because now even if these two poles are not combined then they are just 'not-separated'. The Frankfurt scholars have realized that the dominant notion of reality was actually the substitute and replacement for the spiritual, and in the connection of these two poles are in fact reproducing a new religious reality. This is commitment to achievable ideal of universal freedom and tolerance in the differences with the complete absence of differences, and the one-dimensionality of modern society.

"Underneath its obvious dynamics, this society is a thoroughly static system of life: self-propelling in its oppressive productivity and in its beneficial coordination. Containment of technical progress goes hand in hand with its growth in the established direction. In spite of the political fetters imposed by the status quo, the more technology appears capable of creating the conditions for

pacification, the more are the minds and bodies of man organized against this alternative."

(Marcuse, 1964; p. 17).

Methods:

This work is basically a contribution to theory in anthropology. The research relies entirely on literature, therefore the key elements of my methods are intensive critical reading and re-reading. After primary readings to select the relevant works discussed in the context of this thesis I return to the source-texts and try to engage in a kind of discourse with these original sources.

This work is at the same time an attempt to employ philosophical reasoning as a method for anthropological theory building. Therefore, after introductory reading the focus lies on selected primary sources, seminal texts of the selected authors, from the Frankfurt school and the pre-conditionary thinkers and the selected relevant anthropological text.

This intensive discussing and re-thinking of the main topic in relation to the texts is indebted to the traditions of hermeneutics in philosophy. The thesis tries to fuse anthropological theory and method building with philosophical ways of debating and theorising. It attempts to build a contribution to the ongoing debates between the two disciplines – philosophy and anthropology, in reference to work done by Josef Salat (Salat 1976) or most recently Michael Zellinger (Zellinger 2012) in the issue of hermeneutics. With these methods we can try to trace the influence of Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School in the anthropological field.

According to Zellinger, Clifford Geertz did an important work inside anthropology, using the hermeneutic approach (Geertz, 1973). But in his conclusions, he is somewhat narrow. Zellinger suggests to move from Geertz and Josef Salat to the basic re-reading of Gadamer and to apply his ideas of the particular relationship of theory and practice to anthropological research (Gadamer, 2004). I agree with the analysis of Zellinger, that the way Geertz applies hermeneutics in anthropology is only one possibility and like Zellinger said probably not the most fruitful one.

In a way this work tries to do something comparable with another philosophical tradition and its theoretical methodical approach – the Frankfurt School.

My research consists consists basically of a hermeneutic approach and discourse analysis. It should be understood that discourse in this context is defined as a way of socializing and a mode of communication between people, the process of attempting

understanding of each other. Discourse analysis explores a particular discourse in order to understand the content of meaning and the mode of utterance, and in a more abstract way it is also tool of reflection on positions of scientific interrogation in relation to the reality of everyday pratiques. Discourse is not interesting to us all by itself but is important to us at the time of the refractive index, if it is possible to use the methodology of Victor Turner, in a liminal position.

In the context of this work, critical discourse analysis as it is outlined by Norman Fairclough, one of the leading researchers in the field was applied. Fairclough is influenced by Mikhail Bakhtin, Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. He considers discourse as a means of constructing the social world, while remaining faithful to the Foucauldian perception of totality of power, nevertheless retaining a vision of power as a creative force, and a continued commitment to the Marxist view of ideology (Jorgensen, Phillips 2002). Critical discourse analysis deals with the way discourse produces, reproduces or opposes relations of social and political power and relates structures of specific talking or writing to the sociopolitical context. A critical attitude of Fairclough to public institutions also helps us to study the contemporary anthropological discourse in order to understand what aspects of cultural and social anthropology are influenced by the Frankfurt School, or under the influence of modified and simplified ideas of the Frankfurt School.

Here we are using selected primary literature for critical reading by the methods of hermeneutical and critical discourse analysis. The authors selected are chosen for exemplary analysis of the influence of Marcuse and the Frankfurt School. In the selected texts we can see the interdisciplinary connectedness of concepts in the social sciences as our authors are media scholars, philosophers, social, symbolic and post-structuralist anthropologists. Together, they are part of the anthropological discourse that we need to consider. In the words of Norman Fairclough:

[T]he discursive constitution of society does not emanate from a free play of ideas in people's heads but from a social practice which is firmly rooted in and oriented to real, material social structures. (Fairclough 1992 p. 66)

MARCUSE AND THE FRANKFURT SCHOOL

In the past the man has been first;
in the future the system must be first.
Frederick Taylor

As already mentioned, the aim of this research is to study the influence of Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School on modern cultural and social anthropology. In order to draw conclusions, it is necessary to consider in detail the socio-cultural and intellectual background of the phenomenon of the Frankfurt School. To do this, we need to analyze the key philosophical positions of the main representatives of the Frankfurt School by focusing on their particular approaches.

First of all it is necessary to clarify that the Frankfurt School was a new, and probably also the last, large-scale enterprise in the development of philosophy in the Marxist, «left-wing» tradition of Materialism. The group influenced not only many of their contemporaries, but their ideas shaped the future of philosophy and other social sciences. This generation of scholars had survived the Second World War, most of them were Jewish in origin, and they were all educated in a humanist tradition, so their collective historical experience and their intellectual background shaped the questions they raised and the form and content of their socio-cultural critique – Humanity in the middle of the 20th century had to survive two destructive totalitarian systems, had to live through the effects of the Gulag and Auschwitz, and had to search for new answers and new definitions of the *conditio humana*, the purpose of life in the modern world. So we can see why their philosophy had such a large and lively response in a variety of sciences and why there was also an exchange of ideas with existentialist approaches.

To explore all aspects of the scope of interests of the Frankfurt School philosophy and their various influences on the next generations of scholars is somewhat difficult to limit, as there is a range of scholars and researchers associated to the Frankfurt Institut like Walter Benjamin, Erich Fromm or Hannah Arendt, who each developed their independent approach and created a particular corpus of work, which each had enormous influence. Therefore, in the context of this work I will focus solely on the «three pillars» – Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse.

In their ideations fully displayed was what was then called the Frankfurt School philosophical singularity: the growing alienation of man in modern industrial society and the increase of technocratic forces capable of generating and developing this alienation, and as the most important aspect of alienation, or rather as the result – the appearance of One-Dimensional Man. On the one hand, objectively, one-dimensional man is a product of industrial society, on the other hand he is a product of the conditions in which man appears to himself, to be on his own, or rather, because of the lack of his own will to fight for his liberation.

In our view, the preconditions for the emergence of new philosophical issues can be found in the economical and intellectual spheres of the time and the key question that will be touched upon in this work may seem rhetorical: is the emergence of the Frankfurt School a cause or a consequence of the Epoch? Were there any prerequisites for the Frankfurt school, or the representation of the very vast industrial society which emerged after their impact?

In this case, for comparison, we can cite as an example the image of the Marxist proletariat, which was put to use by Marx himself. But for Marx "proletarian" meant no more than social type, or, better to say, social function, whereas the images and representations of society created by the Frankfurt School have to be understood differently.

The twentieth century is characterized by particular developments of a European culture of that era (including the Russian Revolution as part of the European cultural universe), there were three ways of development: the capitalistic West, the communistic east and central European fascism. The Western "capitalist" style of development, partially modified, thus suitable for assessment, reflection and discourse has reached our days and is, according to the modern mainstream ideology, the only way, the right way of development. In his opus magnum the famous American political scientist Francis Fukuyama in 1992 proclaimed The End of History – a highest point in the development of social and cultural evolution (Fukuyama, 1992). After the ruining of Soviet Union he had a reason to think so, but the subsequent events show the simplification and banality of Fukuyama's theories. For the end of the 20th century his ideas of "Heaven on Earth" became very popular, but to extend this to the whole century meant that it was a large practical dispute between different forms of social organization. For the larger part of

the century the supremacy of liberal capitalism had been a controversial issue, especially while the Western world was in the Fordist stage of the development of industrialization. And despite the fact that the Taylorist theories were gone, they left the task of optimization of the production:

> *«Science, not rule of thumb; Harmony, not discord; Cooperation, not individualism; Maximum output, in place of restricted output; The development of each man to his greatest efficiency and prosperity» (Taylor, 1911. p. 79).*

In other words, the main idea of scientific management is that each type of human activities should be supported by scientific prove; so the employee must be trained for the acquisition of the necessary skills. Taylor believed that every worker is lazy by nature and, therefore, the growth of labor productivity and production is only possible through the forced standardization of tools. Taylor was one of the main ideological enemies of the workers and the theorists of scientific alienation as well. However, he was replaced not by a theoretician, but by a practitioner – Henry Ford. The man in Fordist system does not look like humanistic ideal of a free thinking personality, but is an appendage of the large-functioning system. The system uses a man and his resources to maximize the benefits of his existence in the system, developing ways to optimize his labor. In fact, this step is straight unabashed use of man should be left behind. And so it was, because Taylorism and Fordism established the new forms of control where person takes paradoxically slavery as liberation. Consequently, correct operation of the industrial system became its core "ideological" principle. This, in our view, Marcuse remarkably understood.

Through the book «One Dimensional Man» one of the most interesting, in my opinion, thoughts of Marcuse, which serve as a paradoxical leitmotif: «rationality in irrationality.» This is, on my opinion, the main criterion for understanding his philosophy, and the main criterion, which is overlooked in the interpretation of his views:

> *«Artistic alienation succumbs, together with other modes of negation, to the process of technological rationality»(Marcuse, 1964; p. 57).*

The citation shows the transition from Taylorism to post-Fordism changed the look on

the problems, but did not change the balance of power. The man was under the influence of ideology (perceiving ideology as «false consciousness», according to the interpretation of Lukacs), which decides for man how he ought to exist. It must be clarified that the ideology or «false consciousness» *is very same with* scientific management. The difference is that Taylorism openly called for it, and Fordism has already indicated a personal interest in well-coordinated operation of the system. Irrationalism had become an everyday part of life. According to Erich Fromm:

«We have become automatons who live under the illusion of being selfwilling individuals… He lives in a world to which he has lost genuine relatedness and in which everybody and everything has become instrumentalized, where he has become a part of the machine that his hands have built. He thinks, feels, and wills what he believes he is supposed to think, feel, and will; in this very process he loses his self upon which all genuine security of a free individual must be built» *(Fromm, 1961. p. 253).*

Frankfurters acquired the image of the dark industrial operating factory where everyone subordinated to one idea of improving productivity. Only dark industrial image was replaced by a new ideology that is more frightening then this symbolic model of industrialism, because it is possible to escape from the factory. Although no one escapes from the ideology. Marcuse says:

«The era tends to be totalitarian even where it has not produced totalitarian states» *(Marcuse, 1955. p. xi).*

This phrase should be reckoned like that: ideology penetrates into all spheres of human existence. Even in spheres where previously it had no way, now it appears. Dispute or disagreement expelled from the ideological environment, as well as ideology already occupied all the space of human life. So, the conflict legally (because it contradicts the ideology) eliminated from public life. Moreover, the ideology not became the main feature of the public life. It gradually occupied the personal space and possessed a human being, grounding the inner "ideology" on the necessary, worked out images. One-Dimensional Man is generated since then. His one-dimensionality is characterized by complete abandonment of critical thinking: criticism creates a conflict. We can summarize with the phrase of Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno:

«In wrong society laughter is a sickness infecting happiness and drawing it into society's worthless totality. Laughter about something is always laughter at it, and the vital force which, according to Bergson, bursts through rigidity in laughter is, in truth, the irruption of barbarity, self-assertion which, in convivial settings, dares to celebrate its liberation from scruple. The collective of those who laugh parodies humanity» (Horkheimer, Adorno; 1947. p. 112).

Positivism served as cornerstone in nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' social sciences. Scientific management emerges from positivist scientism. Positivism, in fact, was the foundation of the ideology of a new type, so that once and for all cemented in the public mind invoking the crucial law of methodology: the one and only source of truth is the empirical study. In other words, the only real thing is something you can actually touch is beneficial. Otherwise it all goes into the category of metaphysics positivism successfully rejects. Positivism was also the basis of the industrial age, the outline of whole system of social relations. Provability of the fact was the main criterion of validity or invalidity. In these circumstances a critic – a follower of a certain value system, had to rely on facts and the examples to prove why he criticizes the object. That means, that proven irrationalism has become a factor of ideology. Almost everything proved is true. Legalized absurdity could be true, if it confirmed by the facts.

Marx always had been the major critic of capitalist society. His predictions that the conflict between the classes will increase not come true that has become the main weapon against the ideology of Marx. Criticism of his thoughts came from the opposite – once the ideas of Marx were not justified, it means that he was wrong in the way of thinking. But here lies the main problem – being mistaken in the conclusions, Marx was not mistaken in the way of demagnification, while ideology accepts any way of thinking, but insists that they must lead to the same result with everybody else. Critical pathos of Marx, which was to expose the false consciousness, Marcuse perceived sincerely and sometimes emotionally. Marxism is not fully paid off in the form of critical theory. Without a dialectical analysis and Freudianism in the twentieth century, it was impossible to perceive a person because needed a new stage in the development of Marxist thought.

The early catalyst for changes in Marxism were the ideas of Gyorgy Lukacs in his book «History and Class Consciousness». Most likely, this work is significant as the basis for

the philosophers of Frankfurt School. This was the first attempt to distance themselves from Marx and his «philosopher of the action.» Lukacs opinionated the theorists of II International, who regarded Marxism as an objective theory, and real goal to aspire, and the scheme for implementation in global economy. Moreover, Lukacs pointed out that the dialectic and historical materialism gone by the wayside, and ceased to be a part of genuine Marxism. In addition, Lukacs carried forward Marxist concept of «alienation», insisting that working group has inner integrity, instead of isolation from each other. That's integrity, according to Lukacs, should be separated from social positivism, and therefore all the reasons in the positivist understanding of the society. In addition, Lukacs said: ideology as that must be destroyed.

«For to eliminate the objectivity attributed both to social institutions inimical to man and to their historical evolution means the restoration of this objectivity to their underlying basis, to the relations between men; it does not involve the elimination of laws and objectivity independent of the will of man and in particular the wills and thoughts of individual men. It simply means that this objectivity is the self-objectification of human society at a particular stage in its development; its laws hold good only within the framework of the historical context which produced them and which is in turn determined by them» (Lukacs, Gyorgy. 1971; p. 49).

In the core concepts of the Frankfurt School we can feel significant influence of Walter Benjamin, who was ideologically a «sole» of the Frankfurt School (they were friends with Theodor Adorno), although he was ahead of his time. However, he was one of the first who gave to the radical left philosophy a mystical, unknown and surreal level. In his article, «The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction» is considered a new level of understanding of art in the technocratic world. That means work of art does not live their life, but loses an «aura» in the case of constant mechanical reproduction. Benjamin brought philosophy to the level of conscious metaphysics, defending the right of improvable to be real.

«The increasing proletarianization of modern man and the increasing formation of masses are two aspects of the same process. Fascism attempts to organize the newly proletarianized masses while leaving intact the property relations which

they strive to abolish. It sees its salvation in granting expression to the masses –
but on no account granting them rights. The masses have a right to change
property relations; fascism seeks to give them an expression in keeping these
relations unchanged. The logical outcome of Fascism is an of aestheticizing of
political life» (Benjamin, 2010. p. 41).

Hannah Arendt in a certain sense echoes to Benjamin. In her work "Eichman in Jerusalem" she draws a portrait of Adolf Eichman – a simple man in a bureaucratic machinery, who was just doing his work correctly. His job was to kill people in the most efficient way, and so he simply did not see or understand the sheer horror of what was happening, he obeyed, because his only will was to do his work well. Such simple, even radical realism, according to Arendt, could lead to the most devastating consequences (Arendt, 2006).

The history of the Frankfurt School can be started from the 30s, when the Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt-am-Main was headed by Max Horkheimer. The Institute was formed in 1923 and its first head was the Austrian Social-Democrat Karl Grunberg, who outlined the direction of the university as a «left» and engaged in the study of economic issues. Horkheimer, along with Theodor Adorno found a common interest in the philosophy of Schopenhauer and Marx. According to the memoirs of Horkheimer, at the university they were taught that philosophy is different from all other disciplines. In 1925, Horkheimer defended the thesis on the work of Kant's «Critique of Judgment.» After he led the institute in 1929, studies were forwarded to the side of social philosophy. In 1932, they start to make «*Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*». After the Nazis came to power the school moved to Geneva, then in Paris and then in the United States.

Abroad school begins the study of the causes and origins of fascism and the reasons its support of the community. Marcuse and Horkheimer taught at Columbia University. After the war, Horkheimer and Adorno returned to Germany, and Marcuse remained in the United States.

As already mentioned, the greatest attention should be paid to Herbert Marcuse, who had the   most significant impact on XX century philosophy. Marcuse was born in

Berlin in 1898 in a Jewish family; he studied in Berlin and Freiburg. He was the only one of Frankfurters who was not descended from a family of creative intelligentsia. Marcuse even was a member of the Social Democratic Party during the revolution in 1918. He was greatly influenced by the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and was an assistant to Martin Heidegger.

Marcuse was not an orthodox Marxist. He criticized the straightforward interpretation of historical materialism, believing that it must be regarded as a theory

«The new mode of thought is today the predominant tendency in philosophy, psychology, sociology, and other fields. Many of the most seriously troublesome concepts are being "eliminated" by showing that no adequate account of them in terms of operations or behaviour can be given. The radical empiricist onslaught thus provides the methodological justification for the debunking of the mind by the intellectuals – a positivism which, in its denial of the transcending elements of Reason, forms the academic counterpart of the socially required behavior» *(Marcuse, 1964; p. 21).*

Marcuse, as mentioned in our chapter on Marx, took over the thesis that philosophy is not to explain, but to change the world. History, in his opinion, has opportunities used or lost. Significant is the fact that Herbert Marcuse was actively involved in the publication of the first edition of «Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts» and «The German Ideology.» Based on these works, he writes research «The Foundations of Historical Materialism». This study uses the Hegelian-Heidegger's term «negation». It is a denial of obvious and existing. A look into the subjective, a departure from the materialism of understanding of the universe, which Marcuse called «dialectical phenomenology». He proposed to perceive Marx from an anthropological point of view (especially his early works), as well as partly with existentialism:

«It is not because Marx is limited by a particular kind of philosophical terminology that he so often speaks here of 'human essential powers' and 'man's essential being', or, for example, that he calls 'the established objective existence of industry...the open book of man's essential powers' or wants to grasp its 'connection with man's essential being' and, in the places quoted above, uses a philosophical framework to describe labour and private property» *(Marcuse,*

1972).

Such an approach to Marxism has opened to the world a new of Marx, much more diverse than how he was considered by the orthodox Marxists. Marcuse paying more attention to the category of «alienation», which takes the main place in the «Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts.» He continues to think about the alienation of the worker from the produced commodity, explores conscious and subconscious in human mind, adopting the Freudian legacy. Man becomes an appendage of not only labor and employer, but also the entire living space, where he is closed in captivity of rules and regulations. In works of Marcuse, probably more pronounced critical philosophizing, that distinguishes the Frankfurt School scientists from everybody else. Marcuse's theory of the totalitarian reality of power not supported by everyone and everywhere . So many commentators (Western and Soviet) at the time and even now are criticizing him.

The main targets of our criticism are the «gaps» that the authors of articles and critical notes cite as evidence of incompetence or failure of the theory of Herbert Marcuse. I propose to consider four options critics: a professional orthodox Marxist, layman's opinion, Soviet or post-Soviet criticism, as well as criticism of one of Marcuse's students.

For example, considering the criticism of Paul Mattick, one can see a detailed study of the «one-dimensional man.» There are several examples of his work:

> *«It is clear that Marcuse is not realistically describing existing conditions but rather observable tendencies within these conditions. In his view, it is the unchallenged unfolding of the potentialities of the present system which seems to lead into the completely integrated totalitarian society. Preventing this development, Marcuse says, would now require that the oppressed classes «liberate themselves from themselves as well as from their masters.» To transcend established conditions presupposes transcendence within these conditions, a feat denied one-dimensional man in one-dimensional society. And thus Marcuse concludes that «the critical theory of society possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and the future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative.» In other words, the critical theory – or Marxism – is now merely a beau gets» (Mattick, 1971).*

Mattick, as much more «pure» Marxist, does not agree with the position of Marcuse's Great refusal. His outrageous statement on the critical theory of Marxism sounds that latter is only «A gesture noble in form but meaningless in substance». He does not like the fact that the proletariat loses own revolutionary nature, and should fit into bourgeois society. Not as important to him in this quote is that Marcuse was a Marxist, as his lack of faith in the leadership of the proletariat. Namely, it was the leading honors of Frankfurters from traditional Marxists. Mattick confirms the words:

> *«Although the contradictions of capitalism still persist, the Marxian concept of revolution no longer fits the actual situation, for, in Marcuse's view, the capitalist system has succeeded in «in channeling antagonisms in such a way that it can manipulate them. Materially as well as ideologically, the very classes which were once the absolute negation of the capitalist system are now more and more integrated into it» (Mattick, 1971).*

He believes and criticizes Marcuse for lack of faith in the revolutionary role of the proletariat. Moreover, according to Mattick, unbelief is based on the fact that Marcuse believed that the government had reached all corners of human life, and if not entered yet, you will soon penetrate totally. Mattick's opinion is understandable, because when you consider about the proletariat and its revolutionary nature under control, there can be no question of a revolutionary change in the bourgeois system. Accordingly, it is necessary to deny full control and authority over human technologies. Otherwise, Mattick had to admit that because of the control (non-violent) the proletariat had some moments of leadership in history. And the need for changes remains only in marginalized groups. His emotional dissatisfaction with the fact Marcuse was telling the truth, arguing that society lost the opportunity for revolutionary change. In his own words, the point is not in Marcuse himself and his critical theory, but in the Marxist model of capitalist not justified itself. Capitalism not died, it acquired new forms and shapes, but remained the same system Marx criticized. Mattick says also that the development process does not replace the contradictions that have been in the society before it. Technologies are not omnipotent. In this Mattick sees Marcuse's pessimism and lack of faith in the Marxist doctrine:

> *«Marcuse describes this situation as the co-existence of communism and*

capitalism, «which explains both the metamorphosis of capitalism and the disfigurement which the original idea of socialism has undergone in practice.» While this co-existence precludes the full realization of socialism, he also sees it as the «driving power» behind the general growth of productivity and production. It impels capitalism, he says, « to stabilize itself and hence it brings social integration within capitalist society; there is a suspension of antitheses and contradictions within the society.» Now, there can be no doubt that in both the so-called communist nations and in capitalism proper productivity has been increased and will be further increased with continued technological development. But this does not necessarily lead to greater stabilization and social integration; it can have, and in our view, must have, quite opposite results» (Mattick, 1971).

On the other hand, Mattick still finds a weakness of «one-dimensional man.» He gives the following example:

«For Marx, too, science and technology are specific to capitalism, but only in the sense that their direction and development find their determination and limitations in capitalist relations of production. Should these relations be abolished, science and technology could take on an unhampered and different course, in accordance with the conscious and rational decisions of fully-socialized man. For Marx, it is neither science nor technology which constitutes a system of domination, but it is the domination of labour by capital which – with everything else – turns science and technology into instrumentalities of exploitation and class rule. In Marcuse's view, however, it is no longer capitalism which determines the state and nature of technology; it is technology which determines the state and nature of capitalism» (Mattick, 1971).

There is no error in Marcuse's thought per se but in the context of its relationship to the situation. For Marcuse the power of technology is a sort of mystic power, the secret weapon in the fight against freedom. Mattick sees this as a mistake in the context of the materialist conception of history. Technologies alone not to be the oppressors, while according to Marcuse, the technology, in fact, controlling the capitalist economy as a kind of higher power. I emphasize that I do not see here straight mistakes in Marcuse's logic. His philosophy not established (and did not apply for it) on the obvious and

provable facts. «One Dimensional Man» is not a detailed analysis or accounting report. Its essence is unknowable and hidden in the fact that people and societies not fully realize. The power of technology could be fully apparent, as our life is entirely dependent on this power. That was the philosophy of Marcuse's «rational in the irrational.» His philosophy was not an orthodox Marxist, but in its movement forward. If in the middle of the XIX century technology could not have power over the economy. From mid-twentieth century to nowadays, technology plays a major role in the industrial and post-industrial societies. An interesting example, about Marcuse and «one-dimensional man» could be read on the website «Thenewdirectionoftime». A critical review of «One-Dimensional Man» accurately describes the distorted perception of Marcuse. According to my hypothesis, the impact of Marcuse was defined rather indirectly. His revolutionary appeal the denial of a permanent, viewed superficially, has created a simple form of extreme liberalism that does not respond to what was said in the «one-dimensional man»:

«Student, civil rights and minority activists and feminists read Marcuse's postulates seriously. Their efforts helped to do a great deal to humanize society: making it more difficult for governments to wage unjust wars, confronting Jim Crow laws, addressing conditions of racial & gender inequity and so on. And yet what Marcuse's coalition of outsiders couldn't do, inspite of having so small amount of success in challenging the hegemonic, one-dimensional discourse, that had seemed monolithic until the early sixties, what turned out to be non-accomplishable in the four decades since Marcus's death in 1971, was to mount a genuine challenge to capitalism». (http://thenewdirectionoftime.com 2012).

What can be said from the above quotation? The author sees the postulate of the leading role of outsiders and misfits as fighters against Jim Crow laws. Despite the negative attitude to racial discrimination, Marcuse is not focused on the laws of Jim Crow and gender inequalities. This is a superficial perception, which involved already with stereotypes of our everyday life. If somebody expresses the idiom «civil rights» that necessarily implies a fight for the rights of ethnic and racial minorities. Marcuse wrote about all the one-dimensional society, not only in relation to blacks. Moreover, a columnist for some reason treats one-dimensional society as something that was «before the early sixties.» This is the second argument not in favor of this review. Culture and

the era of the 60's did not change the structure of a one-dimensional society. on the contrary, they have allowed the public to see what its weakness are. but the public stereotyped consciousness does not see the dialectic of Marcuse. It sees only a «fight for ...» and «The struggle against ...» and does not understand the structure of the «Great Refusal».

Regarding this theme we should recall, that slovenian freudo-marxist philosopher Slavoj Zizek in his works often criticizes the position of left-liberals. According to many of his statements, this kind of worldview has nothing to do with a real leftist vision, mostly because of its constant appeal to blurred humanistic principles. His point is that left liberals do not want to destroy the capitalist environment, but want to have privileged position in it. According to Zizek the permanent 'U-turn' to humanism has led to the total simplification of left-wing philosophy and to a relapse of primitivism in contemporary philosophy (Zizek 2000).

The newspaper Pravda.ru is quite characteristic of the post-Soviet press article (with the prevailing role of the comments (by tradition of the Soviet press), «Herbert Marcuse. Serving the Cold War.»

This article was about the fact that Marcuse making «Soviet Marxism» served for the government of the United States.

> «The German historian Tim B. Müller in his study «The soldiers and scientists. Herbert Marcuse and systems thinking during the Cold War», shows that the intelligence activities of Marcuse to American special services was neither deviation from the path of progressive-minded left-Western intellectual nor obligation to the U.S. government for political asylum» (http://www.pravda.ru 2011).

This quote features traditional Soviet critics of the «New left» – the rejection of the ideas of Marxism, from the leading role of the proletariat, surveillance by the security services, the search for a «negative attitude» to work in his works, etc. Soviet critics of Marcuse's views pointed out: although Marx emphasized that in a communist society where human labor will be no external compulsion and inner necessity of everyone, people will enjoy their work, but it is «in no way means that this work will just a lot of fun».

«Add that Marcuse criticized his associates on the Frankfurt School and not for the» whitewashing «of the Soviet regime. Erich Fromm astutely observed that Marcuse covers the revolutionary rhetoric, in essence,» irrational and anti-revolutionary «views. Marcuse criticizing the concept of» non-repressive society «, Fromm accuses his colleague for what they postulated ideal of a «new man» is diametrically opposed not only Marx's concept of man, accenting the active side of the subject, but also Freud's picture of the person» (http://www.pravda.ru 2011).

This quote explicates the unevenness in the perception of Marcuse's post-Soviet readers, as in Soviet times, the one who did not support the Soviet system and did not show him a friendly sympathy automatically attributed to the enemies. Complex and ambiguous for understanding Marcuse opposed to simpler and less pessimistic Erich Fromm as «not bourgeois, but progressive.» The author himself is confused in regards to Marcuse, the denigrating him as an associate of the U.S., praising him for his whitewashing of the Soviet regime.

All of these critical notes have one thing in common – the lack of understanding of the philosopher Herbert Marcuse exactly as the philosopher. Adopting Marx's thesis that the world must change, Herbert Marcuse exactly aims to do this, but not completely satisfied with any of the foregoing. For Marxists, he walked away from the roots and too freely interprets the concept of Marx. For the average reader, he becomes liberal ideologue of change and a harbinger of May 1968, before which society was ossified and authoritarian, and after that everything changed and improved drastically. He also was a stranger to the Soviet system, which with much more pleasure hosted his ordinary disciples (as Angela Davis), and whose dialectic was too anti-Marxist for party apparatchiks.

Perhaps the most simple and at the same time fully, Marcuse's position as a man and a philosopher expressed his student and a representative of the third generation of Frankfurters – Douglas Kellner:

«Marcuse's post-Second World War writings return to the emphasis on the individual as an agent of human liberation and political action central to his early writings and creatively reconstruct the relatively orthodox Marxism, class politics

and Hegelian rationalism of his second stage. By bringing Freud, psychology and nature into his theory, he develops a new concept of reason which he called libidinal rationality» (Kellner, 1984; p.363).

Compared to a multitude of philosophies, Marcuse was able to create a new philosophy declaring personality struggle against repression, but that does not give simple answers to complex questions. Namely easy answers readers require him.

The main thesis of Frankfurters, and their innovation was the invention of philosophy, which not only sought to unambiguous answers or conclusions. The philosophy of the criticism was directed at the social structures of industrial society. It was called «critical theory.» Title occurred not only from a critical position, but in contrast to conventional philosophy. Adorno said:

«Thus criticism does not merely mean the reformulation of contradictory statements for the sake of consistency in the scientific realm. Such logicity, by shifting the real substance, can become false. I should like to add that this change in approach likewise affects the conceptual means of sociological knowledge. A critical theory of society guides the permanent self-criticism of sociological knowledge into another dimension… self-reflection of knowledge become aware of its implicit values; that is, he desires that self-reflection does not falsify its truth content in order to prove something»(Adorno, 1976. p. 115.)

Such a question can be asked, moving from the society to the individual. Why do people think and live a certain way, why not set the critical questions of themselves and of life. Whether he wandered of anything, and if so, why is that?

A person could not fully answer these questions, because one's mind is filled with ideology. The ideology in vision of Frankfurters – exists as negative background of a civilization. The ideology distorts reality, gives ideations distinctive from reality, forms the reality of institutionalized irrationality, which takes on the attributes of truth.

According to the philosophers of the Frankfurt School, this stagnation in the development of civilization must be passed, and there should come a new era of society, which is close to what Marx called the human society. Critical theory must be the key to this new understanding. Horkheimer, continuing the theory of Hegel and Lukacs,

suggests that Hegel in contrast to the positivists, considered only the knowledge of the whole, except for partial knowledge. The world can be known solely as a whole. And the most important thing is moving away from the materialistic and rationalistic understanding of the world since the natural sciences had lost ability to characterize modern society adequately. Ideology has brought huge amount of irrationality and absurdity, natural-scientific knowledge. Human society is conscious in every single, individual case, but unconsciously in the mass. The theory is designed to treat a person not in a particular case, but as a system of relations with the world. Marcuse developed a negative dialectic (Adorno's therm, a way of understanding the «critical theory»). In his work «On the problem of dialectic,» he calls to the negation, as a means of knowledge; and focuses on understanding of truth according to Hegel. Hegel saw the truth as something that requires breaking through the world of things. On this he writes in his book «Reason and Revolution»:

«The truth, Hegel maintained, is a whole that must be present in every single element, so that if one material element or fact cannot be connected with the process of reason, the truth of the whole is destroyed» (Marcuse, 1986. p. 260).

According to this work, the negative dialectics not only allows breaking through the world of things, but also helps to understand the object in its entirety. Marcuse saw in the positivism the threat that led to the current prevailing position of the ideology. Ideology is intended to convince people that they live in a better condition than ever. Positivism, encouraging a cheerful attitude to modernity turns a man into a conformist, unable to think critically. The generation of conformist society leads to totalitarian state, which hoisting the banner of rationalism, leads humanity to new forms of fascism, whether Soviet or capitalist regime. Negative Dialectics criticizes society because it knows how it might develop. Understanding this possibility, the present becomes a disappointing payment for the world of Orrwellian absurd.

«These identifications, which appeared as a feature of operationalism, reappear as features of discourse in social behavior. Here functionalization of language helps to repel non-conformist elements from the structure and movement of speech. Vocabulary and syntax are equally affected. Society expresses its requirements directly in the linguistic material but not without opposition; the

popular language strikes with spiteful and defiant humor at the official and semi-official discourse Slang and colloquial speech have rarely been so creative» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 70).

Marcuse, however, not only inherits the ideas of Marx, but also exposes them to criticism. In his view, Marx's dialectic is not enough critically adjusted to reality. According to Marcuse, a person not capable to think critically. The human being not able to communicate freely and determine own position. In his work «The End of Utopia» he marks:

«...there is one valid criterion for possible realization, namely, when the material and intellectual forces for the transformation are technically at hand although their rational application is prevented by the existing organization of the forces of production. And in this sense, I believe, we can today actually speak of an end of utopia. All the material and intellectual forces which could be put to work for the realization of a free society are at hand. That they are not used for that purpose is to be attributed to the total mobilization of existing society against its own potential for liberation. But this situation in no way makes the idea of radical transformation itself a utopia» (Marcuse, 1967).

Marx and Hegel believed that denial is the root of contradictions and when the contradictions disappear, it will be a new opportunity for human development. But Marcuse doubts this notion, pointing out that the contradictions have lost their driving function. Society has ceased to bear contradictions in its root, and therefore no longer required to carry a destructive force directed against conformity. Back in the «One-Dimensional man» Marcuse pointed out:

«Dialectical thought understands the critical tension between "is" and "ought" first as an ontological condition, pertaining to the structure of Being itself. However, the recognition of this state of Being – its theory – intends from the beginning a concrete practice. Seen in the light of a truth which appears in them falsified or denied, the given facts themselves appear false and negative. Consequently, thought is led, by the situation of its objects, to measure their truth in terms of another logic, another universe of discourse. And this logic projects another mode of existence: the realization of the truth in the words and deeds of

man» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 99).

In other words, dialectical materialism is weak and unable to be a pillar of modern man in his rejection of reality. Marx's dialectic was still progressive, in the belief that social change can come naturally.

The dialectic of the past neglected the imposed needs by which modern man lives. Neutralized controversy is not only taken into account, and did not exist in the system of values of the Marxist dialectic. Criticism, which is possible in this case, must come from the outside world. The outsiders:

«The untruth inherent in all transcendental treatment of the problem thus comes into philosophy 'from outside': hence it can be overcome only outside philosophy. 'Outside' does not mean that social factors affect consciousness from without as though the latter existed independently. It refers rather to a division within the social whole. Consciousness is 'externally' conditioned by social existence to the very extent that in bourgeois society the social conditions of the individual are eternal to him and, as it were, overwhelm him from without. This externality made possible the abstract freedom of the thinking subject. Consequently, only its abolition would enable abstract freedom to disappear as part of the general transformation of the relationship between social being and consciousness» (Marcuse, 1968. p. 118).

Theodor Adorno also studied the negative dialectic. According to him, the philosophy should no longer exist in a world of abstractions, but must address the reality that is often more difficult and irrational than any possible human notions. Adorno and Marcuse confirmed that the goal of «negative dialectics» in negation that can not be named and explained. That means hidden irrationality in the very essence of the object, need to be explained and understood. The essence of the content of the object lays in the unexplained.

Adorno and Horkheimer in their work, «Dialectic of Enlightenment» in 1947 attempted to assess the lessons of fascism and its legacy for humanity. In this joint work they expressed notion of human society itself as a constructed chain of command, on top of which stood the industrial ideology. They criticized the philosophy of Enlightenment (and positivist philosophy), indicating that this philosophy itself actively engaged in

myth making, although it was intended to exempt a person from life surrounded by myths. In this example, Adorno and Horkheimer used the Marxist view of history: movement of people from the firstborn freedom and closeness to nature, to the division of labor and the transition to subject-object relations. And on, to the enslavement of human beings by themselves, when the integrity and unity of man and nature been broken up, transforming into relations of the conqueror and the conquered, domination and subordination. Symbolic dominance of the myth over the man was the direct consequence of historic process. Symbol began to discipline the human character by setting a "model" behavior. This model goes back to the ancient gods who created the desired image of the world, should be emulated. The law of subordination and aspirations were fixed on official level of «masters of the world.» Myths, in contrast to the nature, has created a special kind of human behavior, aimed at achieving success by any means. Rationality not stops at nothing. Control of the emotional nature has led to the need in controlling others, mutual alienation and stress, which is hidden from the eyes by visible rationalism. The culture of education, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, was designed to monitor the human emotional expressions by rationalism. Thinking and meditation needed the mechanical repetition in the transformation of man's natural appendage of reality. Industrial society is the main creator of the modern logically reasonable myth (Adorno, Horkheimer, 1944). The everyday life of a man from birth to death, subordinated by mythological absurd logic of desire of comprehending abstract "Kafkaesque" rules. Individualism of man, supported on official level, becomes a relic since the person is not able to withstand the massive «collective unconscious» and one's personality becomes an appendage of the collective mind. Pseudo-individuality is becoming the main slogan of the real industrial society, which proves that man is an individual, when he performs a certain set of unwritten laws of individualism, subjected to pleasing the list of rules needed to create the illusion of freedom. A man is completely dependent on the dominant value system that deprives him of moral and ethical choices. Exactly, the possibilities of choice. Lack of progress is justified by the achievement of a possible peak of civilization, that is, formally, the achievements of the «kingdom of God on earth.» Men became surrounded by forces have been aimed to conquest the nature. Emotions are vented outside of objective behavior. Irrationalism dominated on rationalism. Very important in the philosophy of Frankfurters was the fact that they claimed that German fascism is devoid of a purely

national nature. Modern ideologies give special attention and severe evaluation to German fascism as the characteristic applied only to German nationality. In the view of Frankfurters nationality has no relation to the fascism. Fascism is an extremeness of irrational policy of the state of the mythological (unchecked), reaching impossible heights in an effort to satisfy requests of the state. Fascism is a modern civilization, carried to the limit stage of the absurd when Orrwellian «doublethink» is no more an ephemeral literary fiction:

«A universe of discourse in which the categories of freedom have become interchangeable and even identical with their opposites is not only practicing Orwellian or Aesopian language but is repulsing and forgetting the historical reality – the horror of fascism; the idea of socialism; the preconditions of democracy; the content of freedom. If a bureaucratic dictatorship rules and defines communist society, if fascist regimes are functioning as partners of the Free World, if the welfare program of enlightened capitalism is successfully defeated by labelling it "socialism," if the foundations of democracy are harmoniously abrogated in democracy, then the old historical concepts are invalidated by up-to-date operational redefinitions» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 78).

Rethinking the idea of "history of lost opportunities", Herbert Marcuse, following Adorno and Horkheimer, developed a new interpretation in «Eros and Civilization.» Adopting the Freudian understanding of the world, Marcuse says that the human subconscious mind is constantly going on collision between instincts. Basically it is two instincts: Eros – the pursuit of pleasure, and Thanatos – the desire for destruction and death.

Their interaction occurs through Eros «infringement of rights», because it is impossible to satisfy all the desires. In place of Eros comes Thanatos that sublimates power for destructive actions. Due to the fact that the person no longer exists in the conditions of nature, he/she cannot always satisfy own needs, and compelling to subordinate them to the conditions in which he/she finds own self. Because the reality does not allow people to fully satisfy their needs, it substitutes ideological basis, other then supposedly necessary human needs, founding the way that "offers" reality to a person. Thus, a person puts a lot of strength, turning into a means of production. This policy is not

limited to the legal limit. It goes on, forcing man to limit himself to the interests of the despotic "rule of the rule". Real human requirements ignored, needing to be replaced in the existing cultural universe. Thus we can define the culture only as *form of repression*, directed on human mind to subordinate it, enforce operational capacities, and extend subordinations over the whole society. A man is measured not by the «human» criteria. A man evaluated according to how much effort he put in his «economic productivity.» This is the «building blocks» for the construction of the vertical power of oppression. People go on living with oppression, because they think that Eros is satisfied. Here, mass culture takes the action convincing people have chosen the right way.

Alienated labor and alienated relationships are unsatisfactory, but culture confirms that this is the real work and relationships worth making all possible efforts. Dominance of irrationalism causes aggression against Eros, resulting in masochism and sadism. Installed rationality is based on alignment of logically related absurdity, lined up on one another, like a high-rise building. Fascism as a commitment and one of the possibilities of civilization development, have not disappeared. It still to exists in a "prohibited condition". At a certain stage of development of society, it becomes inert, getting all sorts of benefits and cultural support. Industrial society becomes one-dimensional, «atomizes» the people, creating the illusion of existence, while the man only fulfils the conditions of existence. We are moving to the main, programmatic work of Marcuse – «One-Dimensional Man.» In fact, it concentrates all previous ideas Marcuse and Frankfurters in a single work. People do not have the ability to criticize the system in which they live, and the opposition is becoming a phantom because the opposing sides have a common basis:

> *«Technical progress, extended to a whole system of domination and coordination, creates forms of life (and of power) which appear to reconcile the forces opposing the system and to defeat or refute all protest in the name of the historical prospects of freedom from toil and domination. Contemporary society seems to be capable of containing social change – qualitative change which would establish essentially different institutions, a new direction of the productive process, new modes of human existence. This containment of social change is perhaps the most singular achievement of advanced industrial society; the general acceptance of the National Purpose, bipartisan policy, the decline of pluralism, the collusion of*

Business and Labor within the strong State testify to the integration of opposites which is the result as well as the prerequisite of this achievement» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 9).

Person in dependent position on the system is not able to resist enslavement, because not interested in own liberation. In one's opinion he/she is free, being enslaved:

«In the social reality, despite all change, the domination of man by man is still the historical continuum that links pre-technological and technological Reason. However, the society which projects and undertakes the technological transformation of nature alters the base of domination by gradually replacing personal dependence (of the slave on the master, the serf on the lord of the manor, the lord on the donor of the fief, etc.) with dependence on the "objective order of things" (on economic laws, the market etc.). To be sure, the "objective order of things" is itself the result of domination, but it is nevertheless true that domination now generates a higher rationality – that of a society which sustains its hierarchic structure while exploiting ever more efficiently the natural and mental resources, and distributing the benefits of this exploitation on an ever-larger scale» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 107).

In the context of understanding the impact that Marx has had on Marcuse, it is interesting to compare their different definitions of alienation from the «Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts» and «One-Dimensional Man.»

An important point of this comparison is that Marx's alienation is the negative side of human existence:

«The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien» (Marx, 1969; p. 72).

Alienation in Manuscripts is an force that destroys the basis of a person consuming it commitment to work. Marxian alienation of man from the labor can be described like this:

«Its alien character emerges clearly in the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, labor is shunned like the plague. External labor, labor in which man alienates himself, is a labor of self-sacrifice, of mortification. Lastly, the external character of labor for the worker appears in the fact that it is not his own, but someone else's, that it does not belong to him, that in it he belongs, not to himself, but to another. Just as in religion the spontaneous activity of the human imagination, of the human brain and the human heart, operates on the individual independently of him – that is, operates as an alien, divine or diabolical activity – so is the worker's activity not his spontaneous activity. It belongs to another; it is the loss of his self» (Marx, 1969. p. 72).

In continuation of this, Marx says:

«Its alien character emerges clearly in the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, labor is shunned like the plague. External labor, labor in which man alienates himself, is a labor of self-sacrifice, of mortification. Lastly, the external character of labor for the worker appears in the fact that it is not his own, but someone else's, that it does not belong to him, that in it he belongs, not to himself, but to another. Just as in religion the spontaneous activity of the human imagination, of the human brain and the human heart, operates on the individual independently of him – that is, operates as an alien, divine or diabolical activity – so is the worker's activity not his spontaneous activity. It belongs to another; it is the loss of his self» (Marx, 1969. p. 73).

Marcuse goes a little further in understanding of alienation, filling it with doubts and halftones. Although in most cases in the context of its work word «alienation» is still used as a negative aspect, it appeared to bear more semantic. The alienation defined as kind of "place" to escape from reality, it poses, becoming the part of the universe of art and creativity:

«They are the expression of that free and conscious alienation from the established forms of life with which literature and the arts opposed these forms even where they adorned them» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 53).

In the Marxist dialectic there is no risk of getting rid of alienation. This is followed by

the release, like the ending of the tale, after which there is no continuation. In Marx's view, the release comes immediately after the destruction of alienation. But, it is worth to mention that Marcuse and Marx spoke of the various criteria of alienation:

«The positive transcendence of private property as the appropriation of human life, is therefore the positive transcendence of all estrangement – that is to say, the return of man from religion, family, state, etc., to his human, i.e., social, existence. Religious estrangement as such occurs only in the realm of consciousness, of man's inner life, but economic estrangement is that of real life; its transcendence therefore embraces both aspects» (Marx, 1969; p. 103).

Marcuse had not seen alienation as a confrontation, as allusive front, where the enemy forces are on opposite sides. Marcuse imagined alienation as a substance that occupies the area in which it is not yet located. He adopts the Freudian understanding of alienation, as a forced escape from reality. If reality is becoming increasingly hostile to man, an escape is the only way for a person to save self.

It is also interesting to compare the movement of a society to communism in Marx's understanding, and a new vision of this in Marcuse's works. Marx considered private property as a manifestation of base human instincts:

«feudal landed property is already by its very nature huckstered land – the earth which is estranged from man and hence confronts him in the shape of a few great lords» (Marx, 1969. p. 61).

However, for Marcuse exemption from hagglers – it's not an easy way out. It is a long and complex process that has many irregularities in the way when the understanding of the changes should take place where they cannot happen, but should happen so. This is similar to the «ontology of not-yet-conscious « by Ernst Bloch (Bloch, 1995). That means being, has not yet been formed, but educated and ready to move, realizing the world as a tendency for possible development:

«However, the dialectical logic insists, against the language of brute facts and ideology, that the slaves must be free for their liberation before they can become free, and that the end must be operative in the means to attain it. Marx's proposition that the liberation of the working class must be the action of the

working class itself states this a priori. Socialism must become reality with the first act of the revolution because it must already be in the consciousness and action of those who carried the revolution» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 40).

There is no longer moving forward, there is a deviation, there is an understanding and awareness of their slavery. Moreover, socialism should be ready for that start right from the beginning of the immediate revolution, led by genuinely coveted revolutionaries. You cannot just cross the «masters.» It is necessary for overstepping revolutionaries should already have all the resources to build socialism.

The revolutionaries (or rather «those who make the revolution») should be aware for the sake of what they cross that line, and that would follow after that.

Two-dimensionality of the human condition is cancelled. People are united, not even wanting it, and perhaps rejecting. «One Dimensional Man» is much more uncompromising book than much of what Marcuse and his colleagues said earlier. Society cannot, according to Marcuse, to be changed physical way. Revolution, whatever it may be, can not throw off that system, which for years been building industrial civilization:

> *«Free election of masters does not abolish the masters or the slaves. Free choice among a wide variety of goods and services does not signify freedom if these goods and services sustain social controls over a life of toil and fear-that is, if they sustain alienation. And the spontaneous reproduction of superimposed needs by the individual does not establish autonomy; it only testifies to the efficacy of the controls» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 17).*

Science and creativity outside the ideology are able to release the person, but only in case of his own will:

> *«Prior to the advent of this cultural reconciliation, literature and art were essentially alienation, sustaining and protecting the contradiction – the unhappy consciousness of the divided world, the defeated possibilities, the hopes unfulfilled, and the promises betrayed» (Marcuse 1964; p. 54).*

Otherwise, the person will always remain a slave to his desires and imposed illusion.

Following the ideas of Freud, Marcuse says that the only (unconscious) output for a person from the world of oppression and slavery is a neurosis, which is the body's reaction to the constant pressure from the outside. Industrial civilization is building «the kingdom of God,» not because it wants to, but because people have a response to it willing to be slaves in order to see firsthand paradise. Marcuse called this condition «The End of Utopia,» when the desired perfection is almost reached.

Marcuse tries to give an answer to the theory of the Great refusal, in the art of the displaced marginal's. But he finds only frustration and understanding that discourse should be continued. Negation should exist by itself, constantly reproducing itself:

> *«Fiction calls the facts by their name and their reign collapses; fiction subverts everyday experience and shows it to be mutilated and false. But art has this magic power only as the power of negation. It can speak its own language only as long as the images are alive which refuse and refute the established order» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 54).*

At the same time, Marcuse attempts to save the reader from confusion between the real Art of and the «mass culture», which is designed to distract from the real and sincere manifestations of creativity:

> *«Now this essential gap between the arts and the order of the day, kept open in the artistic alienation, is progressively closed by the advancing technological society. And with its closing, the Great Refusal is in turn refused; the other dimension" is absorbed into the prevailing state of affairs. The works of alienation are themselves incorporated into this society and circulate as part and parcel of the equipment which adorns and psychoanalyzes the prevailing state of affairs. Thus they become commercials – they sell, comfort, or excite» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 56).*

After the students' protests in 1968, when Marcuse odds with Horkheimer and Adorno in opinion regarding the revolutions, Marcuse once again gathers his ideas in «An Essay on the liberation,» in which he notions the destruction of prohibitions and tabooing of any form: a real revolution that will bring salvation for humanity to break through the «continuum of repression» (Marcuse, 1969)

Being a revolutionary in its temperament, Marcuse cannot give up ideas to improve a

person's life. In one of his last works, «The counterrevolution and revolt,» he tries to understand the reasons of defeat of new revolutions, and he has to reject most of those marginal, which he paid such close attention (Marcuse, 1972). He is forced to say that constant education and radical rebels cannot be together with those for whom they arrange revolution. Counter-culture and the marginal personalities were reared on the same soil, which the repressive culture was created, therefore, they have been part of it since the beginning, and it is their extreme views and is an «apple of discord» for reasons which society can not accept the revolutionaries. Radicalism deters everyman:

«The modifications in the structure of capitalism alter the basis for the development and organization of potentially revolutionary forces. Where the traditional laboring classes cease to be the «gravediggers» of capitalism, this function remains, as it were, suspended, and the political efforts toward change remain «tentative,» preparatory not only in a temporal but also in a structural sense. This means that the «addressees» as well as the immediate goals and occasions of action will he determined by the shifting situation rather than by a theoretically well-founded and elaborated strategy» (Marcuse, 1969. p. 53).

That is the position which Marcuse kept in the end of his life being closely acquainted to many revolutionaries. From Trotsky to Bobby Sands, they found themselves in that period of life when their revolutions not grounds for riot and remained as marginalized as were originally. The tragedy of Marcuse that he had to give an answer, but could not, because there was no answer in his theory. Their response was to constantly incessant negation on which man is not capable man, for because everything that a man has he owes to ideology. According to Slavoj Zizek:

«Ideology is an empty container open to all possible meanings» (2012 Fiennes, Zizek).

Man cannot exist outside of ideology, however, that negative dialectics should tell a man that the reality in which he lives is illusive. Marcuse tried to express this, but from him, as well as from every revolutionary (real or imaginary) required to give a precise answer to the leninist question «What is to be done?"

Marcuse's answer did not satisfy the revolutionaries, because they need conscious goal

for society. This has led to a massive misunderstanding of what Marcuse's said what topics rose. Marx had seen a revolution in the states where the proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. And the revolutionaries of the late 60's failed to realize that successful revolution must to be understood as Art (so understood it Marcuse and the members of the Frankfurt School). Inevitable simplification and lowering of the details made from Marcuse a "brand" in popular culture, where it is in line with other heroes of his time. However, the ideology refuses to accept him as a philosopher, a simple and affordable, but one that has found an opportunity to express their ideas in the book, presenting accessible overview of the state of modern society He had an enormous influence on the art, culture and science, but it is not the effect that he wanted. He began to be used by most of the marginal's, in which he was disappointed at the end of life. The irony is that the one soft-revolutionary marginalizati became popular, hence the «ideological allies» of the events of May 1968 were the majority, and inadvertently embedded Marcuse in ideological discourse.

MARX AND "THESIS ON FEUERBACH"

The main influence on Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School had a mixture of Marxism and Freudianism. They are worth to consider in detail, taking into account the effects of both the ideological critique of Feuerbach in the theses of Marx, as well as in the context of the alienation concept.

Marx saw every meeting object as complete monolithic structure. And it is not considered from the point of view of a particular process and where that object is made. All Feuerbach images, in his consideration, characterized religious German logo centric tradition. They are excogitated; they are rational and intelligible, but not alive. German idealism observed the absoluteness of the spirit, rationality, Divine mind. The basic idea – Feuerbach is right, articulating sensuality and objectivity of the world, thus sensitivity must be taken as objectivity, produced and concrete, but not abstract. Marx puts the problem so. Considering particular productive activities, during which opens the reality of the world, produced as actual. Long before the phenomenologist we can see in the Marx's works the problem of the differences between the fact of social reality, and the fact of world reality, which is represented as the actual structure of production. When and where (in space or time, in the temporal or topological aspect) production exists, a genuine reality exists. For Marcuse, as a disciple and successor of Husserl and Heidegger open space between the completion of fact and articulating the fact and nature of the construction of the world was extremely significant. When facts are verified or disputed through research of actual structure, on the other hand when the actual structure was implemented and presented in a particular fact.

The main difference between Marx and his contemporaries is that he sought not to understand the world «in the form of the object» but to change it as much as possible.

The critical nature of the theses on Feuerbach can be transferred into our research. Feuerbach represented a German philosophy with elements of theology, which is considered immutable. The nature of modern scientific anthropological idea is in a deep bond with the ideology.

Exploring the Theses on Feuerbach, it is possible, taking into account each argument

separately, to see the profound influence of the early ideas of Marx (this is an important clarification) on the philosophy of Herbert Marcuse. We consider each argument separately with comments.

1) The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism – that of Feuerbach included – is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object or of contemplation, but not as sensuous human activity, practice, not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the active side was developed abstractly by idealism – which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such.

Feuerbach demands sensuous objects, really distinct from the thought objects, but he does not conceive human activity itself as objective activity. Hence, in «The Essence of Christianity», he regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuinely human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its dirty-judicial manifestation. Hence he does not grasp the significance of "revolutionary", of "practical-critical", activity (Marx, 1970. p. 121).

The first thesis should be presented together with the eleventh thesis, because, in our opinion, the first argument is a detailed the preparation for the perception of the eleventh thesis.

11) The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it (Marx, 1970. p. 123).

The eleventh thesis, the most popular and well known, received the greatest response in the philosophy of Herbert Marcuse. Being the most revolutionary and effective in nature, Marcuse tried with his mind and senses to act for the good of the world and its future change.

2) The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. Man must prove the truth — i.e. the reality and power, the this-sidedness of his thinking in practice. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking that is isolated from practice is a purely *scholastic* question (Marx, 1970. p. 121).

The second thesis continues to reveal the efficacy of the question. Distantly second thesis in its structure resembles a Freudist conceptual pieces. This is important because the nature of Freud's words is figurative (metaphoric), they are not the terms. The

meaning of this thesis (to use Freudian construction) – the differences between the theorizing and practice. The lack of practical skills turns philosopher into scholiast. Sublimation can occur when active thinking isolated from practice.

3) The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances changed by men and that it is essential to educate the educator himself. This doctrine must, therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society.

The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice (Marx, 1970; p. 121).

The third thesis continues the idea of the first and second thesis that knowledge is a movement, and world could be learn, seen, and objectify only on the go.

We can do a brief summarizing conclusion of the first, second, third and eleventh thesis: these theses lead us to the level of dialectical thinking. The Marxist concept of dialectics (on which referred all members of the Frankfurt School) lies in the fact that matter is constantly in motion, and thus helps its development. Dialectics acts as a body of law, which is summoned for to help this development. According to Marx:

> *«My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of "the Idea," he even transforms into an independent subject, is the Demiurges of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of "the Idea." With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought» (Marx, 1915. p. 25).*

Difference from Hegel's dialectic allows us to build the concept of action, to which Marcuse was committed, and to a lesser extent Adorno and Horkheimer.

In Adorno's writings we find many of the dialectic constructs:

> *«Dialectics unfolds the difference between the particular and the universal, dictated by the universal. As the subject-object dichotomy is brought to mind it becomes inescapable for the subject furrowing whatever the subject thinks, even*

objectively – but it would come to an end in reconcilement. Reconcilement would release the nonidentical, would rid it of coercion, including spiritualized coercion; it would open the road to the multiplicity of different things and strip dialectics of its power over them" (Adorno, 1966 p. 6).

«Philosophical thinking is the same as thinking in models; negative dialectics is an ensemble of analyses of models. Philosophy would be debasing itself all over again, into a kind of affirmative solace, if it were to fool itself and others about the fact that it must, from without, imbue its objects with whatever moves them within it» (Adorno, 1966. p. 29).

«The dialectic, as a philosophical mode of procedure, is the attempt to unravel the knot of that which is paradoxical with the oldest medium of the Enlightenment, the ruse» (Adorno, 1966. p. 141).

Passing through the Hegelian dialectic and partially adopting the Marxist dialectic, Adorno leads us to the fact that the dialectic is the main instrument of cognition, his weapons in constant dispute with himself and the world in the process of in-depth study. The dialectic is inseparable from knowledge.

4) Feuerbach starts out from the fact of religious self-alienation, of the duplication of the world into a religious world and a secular one. His work consists in resolving the religious world into its secular basis.

But that the secular basis detaches itself from itself and establishes itself as an independent realm in the clouds can only be explained by the cleavages and self-contradictions within this secular basis. The latter must, therefore, in itself be both understood in its contradiction and revolutionized in practice. Thus, for instance, after the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed in theory and in practice (Marx, 1970. p. 122).

Despite the fact that Marx thought that religion is an integral part of society, in this thesis, he says that we cannot addict in the human nature of Deity. It sounds a kind of warning. Religion cannot be reduced to the earthly understanding. Frankfurt School

fixating this law. Religion should be understood in its contradiction and then in fact revolutionized by eliminating contradictions. Consequently, for example, after that in the earthly family will be found solving the mystery of the Holy Family, the Earth's family must itself be subjected to theoretical criticism and almost revolutionary transformed.

Marx says that religious differences need to find and remove, perform the act.

5) Feuerbach, not satisfied with abstract thinking, wants contemplation; but he does not conceive sensuousness as practical, human-sensuous activity (Marx, 1970. p. 122).

In its content, the fifth thesis follows the second. Man needs an emotional outlet. However, Marx does not say how to apply the output of feelings and where it should be sent.

6) Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual.

In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.

Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled:

     1.   To abstract from the historical process and to fix the religious sentiment as something by itself and to presuppose an abstract – isolated – human individual.

     2.   Essence, therefore, can be comprehended only as "genus", as an internal, dumb generality which naturally unites the many individuals (Marx, 1970. p. 122).

Feuerbach, who does not deal with criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled to abstract from the course of history. Religious feeling is isolated and assumes an abstract – isolated – human individual. So human nature can only be regarded as «species» as an internal, dumb generality, which unites the many individuals only with natural ties.

Marcuse, following this indirect call of Marx echoed in the thought that we cannot ignore the social. It reflects very well the quote from the «Eros and Civilization»:

> *«In introducing the term surplus-repression we have focused the discussion on the institutions and relations that constitute the social «body» of the reality principle.*

These do not just represent the changing external manifestation of the one and the same reality principle but actually change the reality principle itself. Consequently, in our attempt to elucidate the scope and the limits of the prevalent repressiveness in contemporary civilization, we shall have to describe it in terms of the specific reality principle that has governed the origins and the growth of the civilization» (Marcuse, 1955. p. 44).

From this we can conclude that the one-dimensionality of man – it's not a natural connection. It is a social construct of communication, which appeared in humans only in the process of socialization and industrialization of society.

7) Feuerbach, consequently, does not see that the "religious sentiment" is itself a social product, and that the abstract individual whom he analyses belongs to a particular form of society (Marx, 1970. p. 122).

Marcuse does not dwell on thoughts of Marx that religion is a social product. Marcuse leads this further suggests that any sense in an industrial society (and the consumer society) becomes a social product. No exceptions.

8) All social life is essentially practical. All mysteries, which lead theory to mysticism, find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice (Marx, 1970. p. 122).

Marx's attitude towards civil society somewhat vague. Rather, he understood it as a way, as a transitional stage on the way to becoming another more perfect form of human society. Marcuse attitude towards civil society is much more univocal. It is a direct participant in this society, and he expects it to change, and the fact that there is a chance for these changes:

«In the overdeveloped countries, an ever-larger part of the population becomes one huge captive audience – captured not by a totalitarian regime but by the liberties of the citizens whose media of amusement and elevation compel the Other to partake of their sounds, sights, and smells» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 172).

9) The highest point reached by contemplative materialism, that is, materialism which does not comprehend sensuousness as practical activity, is contemplation of single individuals and of civil society (Marx, 1970. p. 123).

Contemplative materialism leads to a somewhat distorted form of individualism. Such «false» individualism has repeatedly criticized by Frankfurters and Marcuse in particular. Since everyone in one-dimensional society considers itself unique. This is the problem of mass culture. That is, the proclamation of the uniqueness of a complete identity. Rational in the irrational.

10) The standpoint of the old materialism is civil society; the standpoint of the new is human society, or social humanity (Marx,1970. p. 123).

Thematically, the tenth thesis continues the eighth, and confirms our hypothesis. Civil society is a transitional stage on the way to human society. The very structure of the theses on Feuerbach involves guessing. Since theses are the primary, and in many ways an unfinished form of expression, we can personally fill the gaps in them. He says that between the sensible and practical world there is something else. Marx does not say so explicitly, but he does not limiting the following reflections and positing of something else. The concept of the unconscious and repressed (Freudian concept does not contradict Marxian) can fit into the dialectic.

In the concepts of understanding the world, Marx was never been purely natural. Its basis was the humanity. Marcuse put it very well:

> *«Materialism, which is not tainted by such ideological abuse of the soul, has a more universal and realistic concept of salvation. It admits the reality of Hell only at one definite place, here on earth, and asserts that this Hell was created by Man (and by Nature). Part of this Hell is the ill-treatment of animals – the work of a human society whose rationality is still the irrational» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 167).*

FREUD AND REPRESSED UNCONSCIOUS

According to Paul Ricoeur (the logic of his work is difficult to imagine without the influence of «Eros and Civilization»), Freudianism is not so much doctrine, but much more an interpretation (Ricoeur, Paul; 1969). Interpretations of Freud's teachings are expanded so much that appeared too many platitudes and common places in them. The only way to look beyond their limit is to continuously update our appeal to his texts. It is worth noting that even the most careful reading of Freud is not a guarantee that the conclusions will be different from the existing ones.

The Frankfurt School and Herbert Marcuse, as one of its leaders, borrowed ideas from different philosophies. Their predecessors were not only Karl Marx, Max Weber, Hegel and Kant. A huge impact on the very structure of philosophy, its nature of revising the usual and obvious at first glance factors. This is Sigmund Freud's influence. Central place in work of Herbert Marcuse (as in One-Dimensional Man, and in Eros and Civilization) is unconscious and the continuation and development of thought on the alienation of man. According to Marcuse (we can find it in Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer work) in modern society Freudian pleasure principle is satisfied. This is an aspiration for death, which reduces mental stress to a minimum.

Referring to the work of Sigmund Freud, we can see that the culture has unique interpretation in his works. Culture is a body of knowledge, rules and ethics, accumulated over a long period of human civilization. Culture has also a lever of influence on nature, rather, it conceived as an operation force. However, apart from this, the culture also intended to restrict a person in his basic instincts and natural inclinations.

When a person enters into a society, grows and develops in it, socializes, he is forced to give up due to cultural laws of the many needs of Eros (the need for pleasure), for the benefit of their position in society. Using Freudian constructs in man's mind there is a struggle between the ego and the superego. In the super-ego exists a subsystem of the Ego ideal. This is the state whose people never reach, but there is a desire to achieve this ideal. At the same time, the Ego, logical and rational, understands that there is a need of being in society. In these circumstances, the man sacrifices his ego ideals in

order to improve the social situation. Individual is forced to do so, because the conscience and morality (another superego subsystem) does not allow attaining goals without considering the cultural norms of the universe, in which the individual exists.

Such constant inhabitation as its desire for an ideal condition, and the pursuit of instant gratification of primary needs (ego also controls impulses emanating from Id) is in a person enmity toward culture, because the culture is a deterrent factor. That means that society and culture recreate permanent intrapersonal conflicts, being an assistant of man, but at the same time his enemies. Reproduction of constant internal conflict is destructive effect on the psychological health of the person because the body was originally adapted to other conditions, including in immediate needs, and the inability to delay their own gratification.

This does not mean that a person is constantly limits himself. However, most of the manifestations of Id is considered an «animal» in the manifestation of the society, though, and is not officially prohibited. Man sets himself restrictions, his conscience and upbringing. This is something that can be described as the primary right to choose where their instincts for braking can get public benefits. Conversely, when for the satisfaction of their basic needs can be subject to sanctions (albeit, mostly symbolic).

Prejudging Marcuse and the Frankfurt School, Freud said that society seeks to protect people from interpersonal conflicts and self-destruction. To do this, it seeks to remove the line between culture and people, mitigating conflicts with art. But art is a temporary solution to the persistent problems that a person needs to be solved in cases where a person does not want to resolve conflicts and problems, and seeking shelter in the disease. Exclusion is one of the forms of related «flight into illness», which he uses to protect himself from the aggression of the outside world. On the basis of the id and ego conflicts generated neurosis, which deepens the alienated condition.

Alienation in itself is related to the displacement of being part of the repressed unconscious. Alienation should fence off man from the reality that he cannot achieve satisfaction by approved methods, alienating themselves from reality, a person rejects the outside world.

What is the repressed unconscious, whose part is the alienation?

In his writings on the human psyche Sigmund Freud singled consciousness and

unconsciousness. Freud spoke of two kinds of unconscious: the repressed unconscious and preconscious. The subconscious – is able to move itself into the consciousness, while the path to the repressed unconscious to consciousness is closed because of some resistance force. If we talk about the approaches to the psyche studies that in classical psychoanalysis, figuratively speaking, there are two kinds of unconscious: a preconscious and unconscious repressed, the same dynamic approach is talking about only one, of the repressed unconscious.

Talking about the differences between the unconscious and repressed unconscious in «Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's Gradiva», Freud elaborates:

«Everything that is repressed is unconscious; but we cannot assert that everything unconscious is repressed» (Freud, 1917; p.178).

Based on this quotation, we can assume that Freud had in mind that the unconscious itself has a rather static character; he uses it as a descriptive term. As for the displaced, here we can talk about the concept of the dynamic, the concept of which takes into account the occurrence of various mental processes. Moreover, this concept proves the existence of a certain internal resistance, which can monitor mental activity.

Based on the works of Freud, the repressed unconscious is that part of the psyche, which contains something, was once perceived by us, and then for some reason forgotten. Moreover in the repressed unconscious get our pathogenic feelings that can cause neurosis and a host of other diseases. Everything that goes into the repressed unconscious can manifest itself in the form of neurosis, disease, dreams, or erroneous action.

Sigmund Freud said that the repressed unconscious can be observed on the example of a dream. At night, the huge number of thoughts that are inspired by waking human activities, looking and finding for connection to various unconscious desires, which have each person from early childhood, but who for some reason have been pushed out and excluded from his conscious being. These thoughts are looking for an outlet in the active the scope and may emerge in the mind in the form of dreams, but, as a rule, people do not know about the hidden meaning and has no idea about the content of what is repressed in the unconscious.

In «The Ego and the Id», Freud describes a structured approach to the consideration of

the human psyche. Freud said that the repressed is a typical example of the unconscious. At the same time, he stressed that the psychoanalytic concept of the unconscious follows directly from the teachings of the displacement and that, strictly speaking, the term «unconscious» is used only as repressed.

In further work on the human psyche, it was found that there were insufficient, unsatisfactory differences between the pre-conscious and the repressed unconscious. Found that I am associated with consciousness, initially responsible for the repression, that is, thanks to him, part of the mind is filled with the repressed unconscious, and when Ego, looking for analytic treatment does not come close to the repressed (Freud, 1923).

From this we can conclude that in Ego there is something unconscious that stands before us like a repressed, but they are not. Later in his work «Moses and Monotheism» Freud says:

> *«The repressed material is unconscious. It would be a cheering simplification if this sentence could be reversed, i.e. if the difference of the «conscious» qualities and unconscious were identical with the difference: belonging to the Ego or repressed. The fact that our mental life harbored such isolated and unconscious material would be new and important enough. In reality things are more complex. It is true that all repressed material is unconscious, but not true that everything belonging to the Ego is conscious… We then say more correctly: the Ego is essentially preconscious (virtually conscious), but parts of the Ego are unconscious» (Freud, 1939. p. 153-154).*

From these considerations, Freud concludes that there is a need for a structural understanding human mind. In addition to the pre-conscious and the repressed unconscious, Freud introduces the concept of a «superego». Freud, in accordance with a structured approach to the consideration of the human psyche, the psyche represented as being composed of Id (passion), Ego (mind, intellect) and the Superego (parental authority, conscience, ideal). Freud focused on the fact that Ego and Id does not have a distinctive border, are unconscious. So he tried to make some adjustments to the understanding of the unconscious. First of all, Freud was repelled by the fact that Id merges with the repressed unconscious, but is representative of only part of it.

Repressed unconscious isolation only on Ego, this is due to the resistance of repression. It is Due to the repressed unconscious opens the opportunity to connect with the Ego.

Once in the structure of the unconscious mind was allocated to the super-ego, it has become necessary also to examine its relationship with the repressed unconscious. By studying the questions, Freud says that the selection the super-ego, it is like two sides of the «Ideal-I»: One side bears the liability (for example, «children should be like their parents»), while   the other side carries the ban («children have no right to do those things that their parents doing, because only parents has the right to do such things»). That ban, which dictates the Superego, is directly related to the displacement of the Oedipus complex. Freud emphasized the fact that the emergence of the human psyche, superego predetermined displacement, so presence in the human psyche repressed unconscious. Freud says that the larger the Oedipus complex was at a certain stage of psychosexual development of the child, the more severe was the education under the influence of which was his expulsion, then, moreover, later superego is demanding, and the super-ego, as it was written before, controlled Ego in the form of conscience and unconscious sense of guilt.

To summarize, in classical psychoanalysis great significance was given to the repressed unconscious, its terms, nature, and above all the forces of education, were both the subject of the research and therapeutic practice. Repressed unconscious plays a role in the formation of dreams, erroneous actions and neurotic symptoms.

According to the theory of Frankfurters, displacement into the subconscious desires is the result of the suppression of instincts. Their suppression purports to strengthen the person for a meeting with reality, as well as in his struggle with nature and the social environment. The pleasure principle, the reality principle, subordinates human society.

According to Frankfurters, society and the individual deprived of the opportunity to argue, and the person is unable to resist the totalitarian interference in their lives. The growth of alienation leads to the confirmation of the Marxist concept of the end of history.

We propose to examine some Marcuse's quotes that reference (directly or indirectly) on the theory of the unconscious, sublimation, etc.

«The concept of controlled desublimation would imply the possibility of a

simultaneous release of repressed sexuality and aggressiveness, a possibility which seems incompatible with Freud's notion of the fixed quantum of instinctual energy available for distribution between the two primary drives. According to Freud, strengthening of sexuality (libido) would necessarily involve weakening of aggressiveness, and vice versa. However, if the socially permitted and encouraged release of libido would be that of partial and localized sexuality, it would be tantamount to an actual compression of erotic energy, and this desublimation would be compatible with the growth of unsublimated as well as sublimated forms of aggressiveness. The latter is rampant throughout contemporary industrial society» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 65).

In this quotation, Marcuse attempts to expand the boundaries of the unconscious (repression and desublimation). He brings these concepts beyond sexuality, trying to give them a social character, paradigmatic bring to the diagnosis of the whole society. After that, from the diagnosis of the society proceed to a diagnosis of action. Marcuse believes that this is a good example, but trying to understand the laws of the principle of the mechanism and how it can be used in the conversion.

«In the light of the cognitive function of this mode of sublimation, the desublimation rampant in advanced industrial society reveals its truly conformist function. This liberation of sexuality (and of aggressiveness) frees the instinctual drives from much of the unhappiness and discontent that elucidate the repressive power of the established universe of satisfaction. To be sure, there is pervasive unhappiness, and the happy consciousness is shaky enough – a thin surface over fear, frustration, and disgust. This unhappiness lends itself easily to political mobilization; without room for conscious development, it may become the instinctual reservoir for a new fascist way of life and death. But there are many ways in which the unhappiness beneath the happy consciousness may be turned into a source of strength and cohesion for the social order. The conflicts of the unhappy individual now seem far more amenable to cure than those which made for Freud's "discontent in civilization," and they seem more adequately defined in terms of the "neurotic personality of our time" than in terms of the eternal struggle between Eros and Thanatos» (Marcuse,1964; p. 64).

This quote reveals the danger of desublimation. Marcuse analyzes the society dialectically, pointing to the danger of de-sublimation and opens the aspect of the social mechanism. According to him sublimation is a possible basis for follow-up. The struggle, marked by Freud between Eros and Thanatos, Marcuse perceived as dialectical struggle.

> *«Obviously, in the realm of the Happy Consciousness, guilt feeling has no place, and the calculus takes care of conscience. When the whole is at stake, there is no crime except that of rejecting the whole, or not defending it. Crime, guilt, and guilt feeling become a private affair. Freud revealed in the psyche of the individual the crimes of man-kind, in the individual case history the history of the whole. This fatal link is successfully suppressed. Those who identify themselves with the whole, who are installed as the leaders and defenders of the whole can make mistakes, but they cannot do wrong – they are not guilty. They may become guilty again when this identification no longer holds, when they are gone» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 68).*

Marcuse brings contradictions of part and whole to his concept of one-dimensionality. Quote illustrates the one-dimensionality of a roundabout way, but it certainly leads to the main conclusion and the basic structure: each person, regardless of their wishes and preferences, is involved in the construction of a one-dimensional society. If you use more expressive expression, we can say that every person is guilty of hypocrisy, which is the basis for the conformist society.

> *«Introjection suggests a variety of relatively spontaneous processes by which a Self (Ego) transposes the "outer" into the "inner." Thus introjection implies the existence of an inner dimension distinguished from and even antagonistic to the external exigencies – an individual consciousness and an individual unconscious apart from public opinion and behaviour. The idea of "inner freedom" here has its reality: it designates the private space in which man may become and remain "himself» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 18).*

This quote describes the gradual transition of ideas from Marx to Freud, and then to Marcuse. Introjection in modern society must play a crucial role in the formation, training and socialization. The ideas of others, perceived as their own, are no longer a

part of family life and the transfer of experience «from father to son.» Overdeveloped society (using the Marcuse's concept) on the grounds serves as a full-fledged teacher of each individual, and all of them together. Source introjection is not coming from the family but from everywhere.

> *«Industrial society possesses the instrumentalities for transforming the metaphysical into the physical, the inner into the outer, the adventures of the mind into adventures of technology. The terrible phrases (and realities of) "engineers of the soul," "head shrinkers," "scientific management," "science of consumption," epitomize (in a miserable form) the progressing rationalization of the irrational, of the "spiritual" – the denial of the idealistic culture» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 165).*

This quotation is presented as one more proof of the influence that Freud had on Marcuse. They can be described as the key to understand modern society. Terms such as «correction», «Engineering», «Working with soul» has its origins precisely in psychoanalysis. Society in Herbert Marcuse understanding is not a separate part of the civilization in which people perceived the existence of the fact. Society according to Marcuse is a part of human life, but the man is a part of society. Not only on the fact of being in it, but also because the people directly involved in its formation.

It should be noted that Marcuse well understood Freud as a possible interpretation.

TRACING INFLUENCES ON CULTURAL AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

In this chapter we will critically examine seminal works of selected researchers in the discipline and look at the way the Frankfurt School and Marcuse in particular have informed and influenced anthropological research and work in inter-related fields like media-studies or political sciences connected to anthropological theory-building.

Victor Turner:

Victor Turner is a central figure of 20th century Social and Cultural Anthropology and at the same time seems to be the only direct heir of Marcuse and the Frankfurt School theories. He adopted their ideas of industrial society, its impact on society and people's obsession with repetition of rituals. Turner studied drama and ritual as an integral part of human life. His concepts of "liminality" and "communitas" had a significant influence on the subsequent development of many of the social sciences. In my opinion, Victor Turner is one of the few scientists who developed key ideas of the Frankfurt School in an important direction and also gave a new understanding to them. While many scientists have used Marcuse's ideas as the basis for the politicization of their work, Turner gave them a new development, and led from the materialist conception (though the Frankfurt School was not interested in mysticism) to the level of metaphysics, which gave their philosophy a timeless character. He pointed to the fact that Marcuse's critique of society is not temporal or relating only to the processes of the 60's period. He showed that their philosophy is much more universal and carries an important social and philosophical message.

Victor Witter Turner born in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1920 and died in 1983. He graduated from Manchester University, and belonged to Max Gluckmann's research school, but was also strongly influenced by Alfred Radcliffe-Brown (as was Gluckmann himself) and Margaret Mead. His first works continued the discourse of the Manchester direction in anthropology. In 1967 he published his work "The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual" which is a direct continuation of Gluckmans' ideas and social theories

about the equilibrium of the social structure. His views transformed subsequently to symbolic anthropology. His researches about ritual process, liminal society and communitas were the first of their kind and changed the view of the research process for generations to come. Turner was most interested in anti-structure, ritual, ceremonies, role-playing, theater as a social measurer, and social conflict. He remains one of the most influential anthropologist of the 20th century. Turner's other most influential works are "Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society (1974), "From Ritual to Theater: The Human Seriousness of Play" (1982) and "The Anthropology of Performance" (1986).

Let us now examine two of his books "Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society " and "From ritual to theatre: the human seriousness of play". Our goal is to understand Turner's concepts and research goals. In this context the process of the "demagification" of the world (in the words of Max Weber) is of interest to the analysis of Turner and to how he understands the world, how he explores it, and which role in his conclusions the concepts and notions of the Frankfurt School like industrial society, alienation, control, and many others do play.

«In the present context, «fields» are the abstract cultural domains where paradigms are formulated, established, and come into conflict. Such paradigms consist of sets of «rules» from which many kinds of sequences must be excluded. Paradigm conflict arises over exclusion rules. «Arenas» are the concrete settings in which paradigms become transformed into metaphors and symbols with reference to which political power is mobilized and in which there is a trial of strength between influential paradigm-bearers» (Turner, 1974. p. 17).

In this particular case, Turner not only adopts the ideas of Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School, but also develops it at a higher symbolic level. «Rules» allow to reconstruct the doctrines that serve different forces and allow paradigms to fight each other in the arena, using this paradigms. Ideologically, man becomes part of the game where the rules are not used according to honesty or needs of particular person. The rules in the Turners world converted to the objects of use that are moving from different areas of study, without changing its essence. The rules do not have any deep relationship

to the principles on which the distinction bases. Turners «rules» are just tools for system management. Next, Turner says:

«Sociocultural systems depend not only for their meaning but also for their existence upon the participation of conscious human agents and upon men's relationship with one another. It is the factor of «consciousness» which should lead anthropologists into extended study of complex literate cultures where the most articulate conscious voices of values are the «liminoid» poets, philosophers, dramatists, novelists, painters and the like» (Turner, 1974. p. 17).

Here Turner literally repeats the words of Marcuse that impact on society have «liminal» (in other words, the thresholds that define the boundaries of discourse, which are then being developed by anthropologists and take root in the ideology) group of artists. Moreover, the combination of two ideas about marginals creating certain movement in society, but also about the artists in a general sense. Marcuse on this subject said:

«[Principles] are the expression of that free and conscious alienation from the established forms of life with which literature and the arts opposed these forms even where they adorned them» (Marcuse, 1964; p. 53).

This means that alienated artists are most striking embodiment of understanding the world.

Turner criticizes existentialism, which understands society as something that takes away from the people their identity. Turner says:

«To my mind these thinkers have failed to make the analytical distinction between communitas and the structure; it is structure they seem to be talking about when they speak as Martin Heidegger does of the social self as the un-authentic part of human being». But they are really addressing themselves to a communitas of «authentic individuals» or trying to liberate such individuals from social structure» (Turner, 1974. p. 54).

Turner thought that the members of the Frankfurt School were talking about false release. That is when each person sees itself as a person, although it is not.

Existentialism means each person as an individual, but an attempt to liberate the "individual" from the "social" do not have and can not have success. Social is not only authoritarian rule (according to Foucault, «power – is total»), but also that which generates the individual. He speaks about anomie:

«Anomie is prevented or avoided and a milieu is created in which a society's members cannot see any fundamental conflict between themselves as individuals and society» (Turner, 1974. p. 55-56).

That is, for lack of understanding of the conflict of the individual and society creates a certain environment separate universe, where the conflict is not understood and cannot be understood by people included in this environment. Turner says that this process only works if the communitas in liminal society is at a high level. When society is in a frontier condition, everyone in this society understand the very structure of «environment». Society has always been and will be used to control the environment and the people that live in it:

«The exchange of qualities makes desirable what is socially necessary by establishing a right relationship between involuntary sentiments and the requirement of social structure. People are induced to want to do what they must do» (Turner,1974. p. 56).

Turner concludes with the topic of the «fields», showing another form of control. He talks about the spontaneity of charisma, which is to be unified, and thus reduced to the level of absurd. Thus, as the prophets have become a kind of planned actions, predictable and stereotyped:

«…as Weber says «charisma becomes routinized»…the spontaneous forms of communitas are converted into rationalized structure, or become routinized, often as ritual» (Turner, 1974. p. 248).

In the book «From ritual to theater» he continues themes he explored throughout whole life. He's trying to clarify the meaning of liminality and its basis:

«Liminality is, of course, an ambiguous state, for social structure, while in inhibits full social satisfaction, gives a measure of finiteness and security; liminality may

be for many the acme of insecurity, the breakthrough of chaos into cosmos, of disorder into order, than the milieu of creative interhuman or transhuman satisfactions and achievements… It may be anomie, alienation, angst, the three alpha sisters of many modern myths" (Turner, 1982; p. 46).

Very appropriate Turner cited the fact that liminality may be (or already is) a catalyst for alienation. Liminality, the threshold condition is releasing process that allows you to return to the chaos of life, which relieved from the chaos, and that becomes emasculated and impossible to change. These are the myths about the marginal poets and artists, which are mirror images of society. And so accurate image that, as already mentioned, Turner argued in their favor, as the most striking display of modern society.

Let me give an example, in which Turner is going on in the development of the theme of one-dimensionality of society and man:

«I am aware that I am starting another paradox – that the more spontaneously «equal» people become, the more distinctively «themselves» they become; the more the same they become socially, the less they find themselves to be individually» (Turner, 1982. p. 47).

The one-dimensionality does not appear in the sameness of thinking. The one-dimensionality is expressed in the irrationality of the human condition, whether the person socialized and mingled with the crowd, or whether they are equal in political terms with alienated individualist. What is «normal» as any attempt to enter into a one-dimensional society, an attempt to become one of those who received encouragement from the society for the fact that they are reliable:

«The so-called «normal» may be more of a game, played in masks (personae), with a script, than a certain then a certain ways of behaving «without a mask», that are culturally defined as «abnormal», «aberrant», «eccentric» or «way-out» (Turner, 1982. p. 47).

The game of normality is simpler and easier than trying to draw attention to them by being called eccentric. Liminal status of a person benefits him when the public is in the liminal stage. In other words, the marginality of the human condition will be adequately perceived in society, when society itself marginalized or is on the verge of great social

change. Moreover, the marginalization itself creates a person to become a social change in society. That is, liminality is a litmus test of society that is able to detect new types of people, with their individual types of relationships, culture, perception of reality, or social experience.

Turner creates the concept of social drama:

> *«I tend to regard the social drama in its full formal development, its full phase structure, as a process of converting particular values and ends, distributed over a range of actors, into system of shared or consensual meaning» (Turner, 1982. p. 75).*

Social drama is a complex structure that recreates the values and gives them meaning.

> *«Since social dramas suspend normal everyday role playing, they interrupt the flow of social life and force a group to take cognizance of is own behavior in relation to its own values, even to question at times the value of those values…dramas induce and contain reflexive process and generate cultural frames in which reflexivity can find a legitimate place» (Turner, 1982; p. 92).*

Social life according to Turner is the formation of an aesthetic life. Social Drama is life on the script, which is played on a prepared scene. Reflection, which many consider as a freethinking process, is a well-prepared one. Reflection is legitimized, in turn, reminds us that not only the charisma becomes a routine. And any possible demagification of the world becomes a routine in itself. However, the drama does not only attract the social world. They also give the world the opportunity to live and reproduce itself. World for itself creates the opportunities that need to be used:

> *«Social dramas keep us alive, give us problems to solve, postpone ennui, guarantee at least the flow of our adrenalin, and provoke us into new, ingenious cultural formulations of our human condition and occasionally into attempts to ameliorate, even beautify it» (Turner, 1982. p. 110-111).*

These conditions, which for Marcuse and the other Frankfurt members were obviously negative tendencies (that is to say subordination to the spectacle played by the society), have been developed by Turner in a less judgemental direction that holds more options

of interpretation. Turner suggested that the man is not only dependent, but is in need of dependency. Soft forms of subordination provide a social drama that recreates life in the process of living. It takes into account the needs and provides opportunities for the community to live the life that is needed. People, once they find themselves in this reality, create for themselves a fundament on which, ritually, they can evolve.

As already mentioned, Victor Turner is one of the most consistent followers of the ideas of Herbert Marcuse, and many his philosophical views were directly based on Marcuse. He developed ideas of the Frankfurt School and gave them a new (modern) context in which they could generate new meaning. Also he understood Marcuse not only as the "ardent revolutionary," but also an intellectual, who gave birth to a new philosophy, a much more complex one than previously interpreted. Society as a one-dimensionality is not only under the influence of totalitarianism, but also reproduces that totalitarianism. Totalitarianism for Turner carries not only negative sense, but also enables society to develop positions of theatrical play, where totalitarianism appeared in relation to the commitment of people to the dramatic, to rituals and mass happenings in the format of the whole society.

Another central focus of Turner based on concepts of social mechanisms as Marcuse saw them is the issue of play and role, terms that became almost theological notions in the universe of Victor Turner. The rules governing games and plays exist by themselves and play a variety of roles, both positive and negative. This understanding is close and yet very different from the understanding Marcuse was approaching. He tried to show that the rules of life in society, rooted in ideology, are not only defined and strictly enforced, but also have a "more than real" meaning. Marcuse tried to show that the laws of the ideology are living their own lives. They do not need a regular flow of the human potential that will develop ithem and give them new strength in relation to real human needs. Marcuse pointed out that the ideology reproduces itself, regardless of the wishes of its creators. The ideology itself formulates the laws, according to the credibility it was originally endowed with, in a symbolic moment of its creation. So Turner's idealism is very well seen in the fact that he denied existentialism. His quest was outside, in the real world, not deep in the human personality. The answers to questions about the nature of human play, controlled charisma and rituals lies entirely in the social structure where they can be studied and not in the depths of human nature itself. We can say that the

answers to the questions lie in the universe created by man, but not in man himself. This is at the same time also one of Marcuse's warnings: Do people understand that the surrounding reality is no longer dependent on them? And the even more frightening question: Do we notice that something that was generated by us has begun to control us?

Michael Taussig

Another central researcher who is strongly influenced by the Frankfurt School is Michael Taussig. Michael Taussig was born in 1940 in Sydney, Australia. He graduated from the London School of Economics and at the beginning of his career was known for his medical anthropological research. He then became stronglyinterested in Marxism and its diverse thought traditions, which informed and influenced all his following work.

In his first influential text "The Devil and the Commodity fetishism" (1980) his main interest is, connected to ideology and the notion of 'false consciousness', to prove that capitalism is somehow unseen for the people, who consider themselves as a Western "first world". In his opinion, people should see what is happening outside the capitalism system, and whose hands built it "outside". Among his most notable works are "The Nervous System" (1992), "The Magic of the State" (1997), or more recent "Law and lawless Land: Diary of Limpieza in Colombia" (2003).

In the purpose of this work we will examine his seminal work "Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing" which was published in 1987 and had a lasting impact on anthropological theory-building, especially on research on violence and power.

It is entirely based on his extensive field-research in Colombia from which he builds a general theoretical approach to the analysis of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

«A society shrouded in an order so orderly that its chaos was far more intense than anything that had preceded it – a death-space in the land of the living where torture's certain uncertainty fed the great machinery of the arbitrariness or power, power on the rampage – that great steaming morass of chaos that lied on the

underside of order and without which order could not exist» (Taussig, 1987. p. 4).

It is a known fact that Taussig is a big fan of Walter Benjamin who probably influenced him most, but in the same quotation we can see at the same time the embodiment of the heritage of Herbert Marcuse – Chaos, which is better than order because the order prevents development, and which in turn cannot exist without chaos. The arbitrariness of the machinery of power is the same as the power of technology. Succinct quote, very symbolic in its structure, puts Taussig in a row with the heirs of Frankfurters. Although, as has already been said, rather refers to those researchers who (consciously or not it is unknown) simplify the philosophy of Herbert Marcuse and reduce it to a confrontation between good and evil. Taussig explain this in the context of which universum exists «space of death»:

«The space of death is important in the creation of meaning and consciousness, nowhere more so than in societies where torture is endemic and where the culture of terror flourishes» (Taussig, 1987. p. 4).

The culture of terror, which is a separate viable system, creates a place where death is beginning to have an impact on human life. Taussig consciously recreates the demonic image of the «space of death.» His views are deeply anti-totalitarian; he cannot look without emotion at violence in any society. Moreover, in societies like South American, which he unwittingly romanticized:

«With European conquest and colonization, these spaces of death blend into a common pool of key signifiers binding the transforming culture of the conqueror with that of the conquered» (Taussig, 1987. p. 5).

European conqueror brought with him the very culture of terror and death, which he conquered. Europeans made their local culture, mixed it with the abscissious traditions. European demonic evil is not limited to the destruction. He mixes them, thus violating the symbolic innocence of culture in South America. Terror is not limited to physical destruction. It is held at all levels, including propaganda and change religions, and the same an economic question:

«…terror was efficacious for the needs of the labor system… To claim the

rationality of business for this is unwittingly to claim and sustain an illusory rationality, obscuring our understanding of the way business can transform terror from a means to an end in itself» (Taussig, 1987; p. 53).

Therefore, the terror, which was initially serves the business can be a terror for its own sake.

Taussig interprets the philosophy of Frankfurters in a mystical way. For him, the power of "Industrial evil" triumphs over weak traditional goods through the use of this culture – a set of unknown devices for the enslavement and destruction. Terror for him assumes the character of the individual being with its own character and desires. Its treatment of colonization overly filled with mythology and the struggle between Light and Darkness, in order to objectively understand the purpose of the research. The author, citing its numerous factual observation, binds them together with the subjective chain links. His painting symbolic picture of battle, which overshadows the collected data, as they are no longer the goal itself but a means to prove the author's views.

Continuing to study the economic aspect of the case, the author cites the example of rubber boom:

«In debt-peonage system,… built around the fiction of traders and not commodities, it is the debt and not the commodity that is fetishized – so that is answer to the question What makes man a man?… As commodity fetishism was to the discourse of the political economists of Marx's England and France and to the folklore of capitalism there in the heartlands of empires, so we might say «debt fetishism» was to the discourse of the colonizers and the colonized of the Putumayo rubber boom» (Taussig, 1987; p. 70).

According to the author's logic, «rubber barons» were much more interested in the fact that local people were in debt dependency on them. That is, the task was in many ways not to make money, but to have a steady income from the debtor (in fact, a slave). According to him, changed the very understanding of the interpretation of the commodities fetishism. In its place comes «terror for terror.» According to the author, the Indians will long have to suffer because of the consequences of «white economy».

Taussig, among other things, criticized the system of relations «European-savage» that

has developed in the Middle Ages, in the first period of colonization:

«Indigenous (and in all likelihood pre-Hispanic) constructions of wildness blends with the late medieval European figure of the magically savage and animal-like «wild man» brought to the Andes and the Amazon by the Spaniards and the Portuguese» (Taussig, 1987; p. 99).

His humanistic impulses are understandable, but from the point of view of the researcher, they are a bit unprofessional. Mankind is by its nature takes a certain path of development. Yes, maybe the Spanish and Portuguese colonists were not the epitome of humanism, but Taussig does not accept their right to make a mistake. In those days there were no liberalism, and an established relationship as a conqueror-victim were objective at that time. But the author does not consider the concept as fair and criticizing it. He criticizes the European system of naming someone «wild» without reason, although it is a basis for a possible research, but not conviction.

The colonists brought with it another subspecies of terror. This informational terror when rumors must undermine the credibility of even positive-minded Europeans to Indians. Such were the rumors of cannibalism, which the author ridicules and criticizes:

«…uncertainty surrounding the possibility of Indian «treachery» fed a colonially paranoid mythology in which dismemberment, cannibalism, and the exposure of the body parts and skulls grinned wickedly» (Taussig, 1987. p. 104).

«…cannibalism for the colonial culture functioned as the supple sign for construing reality» (Taussig, 1987; p. 104)

«Allegations of cannibalism served not only to justify enslavement of Indians by the Spanish and the Portuguese from the sixteenth century onwards; such allegations also served to flesh out the repertoire of violence in the colonial imagination» (Taussig, 1987. p. 105).

Constructed reality, according to Taussig, reproduced myths about Indians, cannibals, and creating division and tension among Europeans. Rumors of cannibalism gave carte blanche to the conquerors at the physical destruction of Indians, which could

theoretically meet hostility. Cannibalism was an indulgence for them. Moreover, according to Taussig, namely whites were far more bloodthirsty:

> *«The whites have thereofer to be more like beasts… killing all the Indians of a communal house down to the children at the breasts for succumbing to that addiction» (Taussig, 1987. p. 105).*

Continuing the excursion of terror, Taussig cites the example of what Bertolt Brecht said about the power of the Third Reich. He said that there is ruled by fear. Business of whites in South America was built on fear:

> *«...market logic, viewing the terror as a means chosen for cost-effectiveness… and if rationality suggested killing of the labor supply within a few years it was no less a sport to kill and torture Indians as to work them» (Taussig, 1987; p. 128).*

The author explains his idea about irrationalism on terror, which, if it will be necessary, can destroy all who stand in his way to the goal achievement. His goal is the profit. But apart from that, the goal is death, that is, the pursuit of Space of death:

> *«… if there was anything to that notion of Benjamin's and T.W. Adorno's concerning the resurgence of primitivism along with the fetishism of commodities, then it was in the theater of racist cruelty on the frontier uniting wildness with civilization that the fetish force of the commodity was fused with the phantoms of the space of death, to the dazzling benefit of both» (Taussig, 1987; p. 129).*

What is and where is the boundary of rationalism and mindless violence? According to the author, she is in the position of the border between civilization and savagery. When the colonists killed and were the true savages, they killed in the name of civilization. Although in reality it was a business:

> *«Fascist poetics succeed where liberal rationalism self-destructs» (Taussig, 1987; p. 134).*

Michael Taussig created a book of his "private" semiosphere (Lotman 2000), living by it's own law. This does not mean that the universe is not rational. However, it is susceptible to ideology. In the authors world there's no halftones.

As has already been said, he builds own ideology on poetic contradictions. His mythology is almost completely taken over from Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School. In this world of evil the European machine industry is conquering the 'weak but noble savages' of South America, turning them into slaves of a cold system. Ironically, in such a mythologem those same savages are completely absent. The images create archetypes, and reproduce a European 'feel' of the "noble savage", which for centuries had been created in literature. The position of the 'savage' is of secondary importance compared with the position of the author, protecting them, and the destructive and cruel system that seeks to enslave innocent people. The construction of "archetypes" occurs post factum, as we have not specified what constitutes the opposite, the "not noble savages."

Such conclusions should be interpreted as the negative impact of Frankfurters. Hence, in our opinion, is much more important to note the fact that this is a mistaken interpretation. "Dialectical image" of which the author says in the book as a moving picture of what is happening and gives the effect of perception. The author obviously prefers subjectivism, said beforehand that he prefers the works of imagination in a technocratic era. He prefers to see the residents of Frankfurt school as fighters, not as intellectuals, and in my opinion, this is actually the main difference between Taussig's approach and the philosophy of the Frankfurt School.

Therefore Taussig is interesting to us particularly in how he builds ideological confrontation. Being on the side of the weak and defenseless, being a Marxist and an atheist (which paradoxically is hiding the Christian vision of the world), Taussig creates oppositions of ideologically perfect system. It is the opposing sides in the power struggle and the way in which the defeat of the weaker party is accomplished where tmeaning is contained and distinction is formulated. But this defeat only shows who is who, in fact pointing to the "honest" and "dishonest", the "just" and the "unjust". For him, the penetration of European culture in the valley of Putamayo river is in itself an unjust action, which destroys the

endogenous spirituality by lust for profit and cruelty. To prove his point of view, he uses the left ideology of non-violence simple humanism as a permanent position to criticize the ideology of the existing dominant system. The problem is that, according to Marcuse, ideology is contained even in quite

simple humanistic impulses. However, in this humanism hides the most powerful ideological pressure.

John Fiske:

The next author, whose work we will critically study is John Fiske. Fiske was born 1939, graduated from the Cambridge University in 1967, and is currently one of the most influential media scholars and researcher of popular and mass culture with a massive impact on anthropological research. His main interests are the cultural aspects of mass-media, the positions of the viewer-entertainer in their correlation and the understanding of the contradictions between these two categories of social communication, and the notion of subversion as contained within. According to Fiske, the viewer it is not a weak and totally controlled unit, but has his own opinion and worldview. Among his notable works are "Television culture" (1987), "Introduction to Communication Studies" (1990), "Understanding popular culture" (1989).

As he is a researcher working on the topics and issues of the Frankfurt School with a strong influence on anthropological concepts we will closely examine one of his key books, which was published in 1993: "Power plays, power works".

His research in the field of media studies resulted in studying the semiotics of television. According to him, everything said on the screen has a certain value, but at the same time, the audience does not always understand the view expressed on the screen and does not necessarily see what the TV show producer 'saw' when making the show. This phenomenon is called the "semiotic democracy." Fiske suggested that television as a mass media (a fact that had been foretold by the Frankfurt scholars) is not the exclusive owner of the human mind.

«The opposition between the power-bloc and the people is one constantly in process, never structurally fixed» (Fiske, 1993. p. 10).

The power-bloc adapts to public opinion and people. It adapts to any situation. Fiske understand it as a force, capable to influence and affect people's opinion. The authority and power, which is contained this block does not remain aloof from the social universe. The mechanism of the influence of government on people varies, is depending on society as whole:

«Power, as Foucault has shown us, operates through a set of technologies and mechanisms rather than through a social class: it is diffused throughout society rather than imposed by one class upon people which works to ensure the maintenance of the social order and ensure its smooth running» (Fiske, 1993. p. 11).

Here we see two important points. The first point is a mixture of classes, the rejection of further differentiation between them. Power is not considered to be a class differences. The second point – the power is a mechanism that takes us back to Marcuse and automation of the society. As soon as the author compares the power of the automation, with the machine in the industrial mechanism – a direct reference to the ideas of Herbert Marcuse. Position of the people in this system is unenviable. People do not participate in public life, although, according to Fiske, they should do it:

«The people» are those who benefit least and are disciplined most by this power system. They, too, must seen as a set of social forces rather than as social categories… people do not have ease access to the system of power and cannot, in general, turn it to their own advantage» (Fiske, 1993. p. 11).

This means that the system educates, sees humans as the forces, but not as individuals, and do not give them admission to the system. The mechanism of the system is not set up on the understanding that a person can or should be involved in the management of life, himself and society, according to Fiske.

«Power… interested in strengthening its control over the immediate conditions of the everyday life. These conditions comprise thoughts, feelings, beliefs and actions; they include social identity and social relationship as they are made material in the places, temporalities and routines of daily life» (Fiske, 1993. p. 12).

Power according to Fiske (much like Taussig) has supernatural abilities to enter into life, to build a system of values and subjugate the citizens to it own will. This power will penetrate through the media, which create this vertical of power, where people are forced to submit:

> *«Culture always has both sence-making and power-bearing functions» (Fiske, 1993. p. 13).*

Here we see the difference from Marcuse, who saw real culture contrasting mechanical power. Despite the fact that he believes that the culture creates a sense, it emphasizes the reproduction of its strength. But here we need to highlight, which is likely, Fiske has in mind exactly the popular culture. These two phrases at the end of the twentieth century have become virtually synonymous. In other words, culture, according to Fiske, is torn between creating a sense of existence, and to commit acts of violence.

Surprisingly, the author comes to the area of colonization, and gives a simple and familiar idea for the modern reader:

> *«Being colonized is not the same as being enslaved or exterminated, even though all are equally important effects of Western capitalism's desire to control the resources of the world (including its peoples)» (Fiske, 1993. p. 38).*

Fiske continues the tradition to express critically concerning Western civilization. According to his words, Western capitalism wants to control everything, despite the fact that it no longer wants to create slaves. On the one hand Fiske continues the tradition to see in Western capitalism the main problem of the modern world, but at the same time, it introduces a new shade. Now, the West does not want slavery. Perhaps society reproduces slavery in a different context due to the activities of it power-blocs.

Greater complexity the author sees in being an individual:

> *«The consciousness of being an individual which most people have, and enjoy having, was seen as a false consciousness produced by ideology, so promoting or encouraging any sense of individuality became a way of participating in the work of that ideology…» (Fiske, 1993. p. 67).*

Ideology functions so that people perceive themselves in the right place at the right

time. If fashion demands from the person to be an individual with a predefined set of codes, the government creates conditions for man to realize his individuality, even if he is not a personality.

> *«Documented knowledge is used to evaluate the individual against the norms, to separate him or her from others into a hierarchical ranking and thus to enable the award of individuatedly appropriate rewards or sanctions… Disciplined individuals have to be constantly examined» (Fiske, 1993. p.75).*

Present personality must always be under control, one should get encouragement or punishment, depending on the assessment. Assessment exhibited by the power that understands the danger of resistance or meaningful rebellion coming from the free personality.

Considering television of the bygone era, Fiske shows how at one time TV participated in the formation of public opinion. Public opinion, in turn, is transformed into a way of life that people have to keep looking at his «reflection» on the screen:

> *«Television played a crucial role in this, not only by showing the suburb to itself, but by enhancing the individuation and therefore discipline of each household by ensuring that its links with the outside world would be within the place «held» by the house… Television was to be integral in the ordering of family life, in both space and time» (Fiske, 1993. p. 100).*

Television in the twentieth century took the role of the teacher, agent, and even the institute in one person in the process of socialization. By showing and pronunciation of how and what should look like. By placing the image on the screen, the information is thus transferred into reality, transforming society, creating a new basis for it's self-education, after the foundation, which laid by television.

> *«The power to represent reality makes its representations real» (Fiske, 1993; p. 155).*

What is reality, if not reproduced seen unreality? At this point, we come to the Marcuses' thesis on rational in an irrational. Hidden in what should be an open and logical that must be illogical.

«The power-bloc serves its own interests by restricting popular access to the machinery of power» (Fiske, 1993. p. 155).

«[Realism] grounds our culture identity in external reality» (Fiske, 1993; p. 155).

John Fiske raises the question news map that structures the perception of news as the area covered by the force of power. Authorities demonstrate their awareness in the news, what confirms the legitimacy of their rights.

«Popular knowledge are fascinated with what lies outside the realm of the ordinary» (Fiske, 1993. p. 159).

Explain and tell something unreal easier and more convenient. This allows the viewer to discover new worlds that do not know about them. This manifestation of power shows that not only news, but also fantastic worlds is dependent on the media. Television creates the effect of human presence in the environment in which had never been, and, consequently, needs a conductor. The conductor also controls the person in this fictional reality.

«Scientific ways of knowing are excorporated into the popular when they can be used tactically to increase control over people's immediate conditions of life» (Fiske, 1993. p. 198).

John Fiske raises the question whether and how news map structures of perception and how news are shaped as the area covered by the force of power. Authorities demonstrate their awareness in the news, which confirms the legitimacy of their rights.

"Popular knowledges are fascinated with what lies outside the realm of the ordinary" (Fiske, 1993. p. 159).

To explain and tell something that is unreal is easier and more convenient as it allows the viewers to discover new worlds they know nothing about. This constitutes again a manifestation of power which shows that not only the news, but also the fantastic worlds are dependent on the media. Television creates the effect of a human presence in an environment in which humans had never been, and, consequently, need guides and

conductors. The conductor also controls the person in even in the fictional reality.

> *"Scientific ways of knowing are excorporated into the popular when they can be used tactically to increase control over people's immediate conditions of life" (Fiske, 1993. p. 198).*

The universe of John Fiske forms in front of us another part of the application of the philosophy of Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School. It ceases to be a sinister and pessimistic. The man has no possibility to control. He is the being controlled, but there is no fatalism of the "end of time". On the contrary, to some way, Fiske sees this as an aesthetics of time. He talks about the influence of culture as a creating factor and destructive. The force of power creates particular interest - the ideas of the new totalitarianism times mingled with a certain irony, which was a natural reaction to Herbert Marcuses' the philosophical stress.

At first glance, Fiske overlapped very little with the theories of Herbert Marcuse and is yet related to it. However, we can see that his research is based on a kind of denial of the Frankfurt School outlook on TV and the media. The Frankfurt scholars saw one of the key dangers for society in popular culture that subjugates its people to irrational logic. Fiske himself does not have any illusions about the qualities and effects of mass media reinforcing mass ideology. He realizes that people are not able to control the flow of incoming information, and can not resist the power. The power has a goal -–to continuously capture new spaces. That is why one can not fight with what is a force of power itself. Here the influence of Marcuse. is quite evident. For Fiske the media as social authorities have received the status of personification, have become a living organism, which operates according to its own laws. The power has character, it seeks to capture as if it were a living being. Trying to show that this kind of impact is and can not be complete or total, Fiske is still susceptible to the Frankfurt worldview. For him it is the very ideological confrontation between the content and the person who should be able to filter this content. Culture for him is the filter, which helps to separate the lies from the truth. That is, he comes to the same conclusion as Marcuse: the fight against the rule of ideology lies in real art, which is remote from the mass and mass media and will be able to create its own space of forced alienation. Thus, this "cultural alienation" can save people from ideology.

Patrick Chabal:

In Fiske's vision the world he sees does not have the mythical pressure that Taussig describes, and government conspiracies are not perceived as total, like in Patrick Chabal's work which we will also briefly examine in the context of tracing influences, albeit in Chabal's case the Frankfurt school influence is mediated. Chabal is a historian, political scientist and one of the current major Africanists, who is strongly influenced by the French tradition of Political Anthropology and who himself has become very influential in Social Anthropology in regional studies concerning the African continent and in studies of power and politics

His main research interest is the political and social situation of African countries and the comparative study of the politics of the so-called Third World. He has been studying Africa for more than 20 years, researching it's modern history, the impact and the different forms of neo-colonialism as well as the socio-cultural conditions that enable diverse modes power. He is trying to show the different faces of Africa, drawing the picture of the continent who is suffering from post-colonialism and the prejudices of the Euro-American worldview and power constellation. His recent main works are "*Culture Troubles: politics and the interpretation of meaning*" (2006), "*Africa: The politics of suffering and smiling*" (2009).

We will here analyze his book "*Power in Africa: An Essay in Interpretation*" which was written in 1992 and had great influence in the social sciences. This book presents an analysis of the then current political situation in the primarily Sub-saharan African countries and the particularities of diverse African political systems. Throughout the book Chabal also tries to critically examine the dominant stereotype of Africa as a backward continent. He defends Africa's right to freedom and is trying to destroy the stereotype as a continent without history and future. The author points to colonialism as the main cause of poverty in modern Africa.

> *"Africa is making war on itself; African rulers are despots; politicians are venal, corrupt and violent; the state is a predatory monster; the people are fatalistic; Africans destroy the natural habit, provoking droughts and plagues; etc. Is Africas crisis self-inflicted?" (Chabal, 1993. p. 4).*

The context of the cited phrase illustrates his entire approach quite well. He clearly states that the researcher should not formulate a value judgment regarding the cultural and political processes as his foremost purpose is to describe what is happening. The researcher can and should indicate the reasons for what is happening. But we need to mention that the causes of Africa's woes lie not in Africa itself. The rhetorical question posed in the end of the quote explains that the author would not seek the causes of poverty in Africa itself. He confirms it:

> *"But is it plausible to study Africa as a whole? I believe it is, with the crucial proviso that what is meant here is Black Africa…, that part of Africa which was colonized by the European powers at the end of the nineteenth century. The fact that it was parceled out between different European powers is far less important in this respect than the fact that it was colonized at all. For the starting point in the analysis of independent Africa must be pre-colonial and colonial Africa rather than merely the national entities created in the process of decolonization"* *(Chabal, 1993. p. 4-5).*

From our theoretical point of view Chabal poses his question in a purely rhetorical but certainly not analytical way as history does not lend itself to conjunctive mood. We cannot assume how different things could happen, and how the history of Africa would have developed if it had not colonized. We do not know and we will not know it. Chabal divides the world into rival camps, allocates the innocent and the guilty in conflict, and suggests that it is the conflict that we do not see. He assumes that once explanations are offered the false visions of Africa would change and people and powers would alter their attitudes towards Africa.

> *"Political interpretation, whatever its character, does not arise in a vacuum. It is intimately linked to the historical context within which it appears"* *(Chabal, 1993; p. 5).*

His understanding of the role of the researcher puts the analyst into subjective historical conditionality:

> *"We, political analysts are the products of our age"* *(Chabal, 1993; p. 9).*

The author does not deny his political engagement. Which tells us that the author has not denied that he is a part of the political discourse, playing an important role in shaping public opinion on Africa and the world at large. According to the author, the fact that he expresses ideological position is not a weakness of his work. It is what "needed to be said." And even if he had another wish, he could not change anything because

"There is no such thing as an "objective" analysis of an objective "reality" (Chabal, 1993; p. 9).

One has to understand that the book was written in the 90s, in the period of post-modernism in anthropology (as well as the popularity of scientism). But the author speaks about his findings as an objectivity, and about the situation of Africa as a fact. Why, then, methods and research tools allow themselves to be subjective?

The book "Power in Africa" is written in the context imposed on the main goal of the work. The author does not refer to Marcuse, but the method of his research suggests something similar to the positions, distortedly understood from the book "One-dimensional man." The political atmosphere does not allow the author to talk about Africa in a different context, except as the struggle between the oppressors and the oppressed. The author expresses the judgment, which is supported only by a modern political liberalism, but not rigourous theory and methods or the actual facts. Africa appears to us as an oppressed and colonized continent, which continues to remain so to this day. Patrick Chabal says that "someone" (certain powers) does not want to take Africa as an equal political player on the world stage. He does not say who is it, he does not mention any names. It is assumed that this is a natural fact, although his position has to be proved. But he does not prove it, only gives his political credo:

"I believe that thus to approach politics in Africa is to begin to take seriously its political life. It is to begin to move away from overwhelmingly powerful image narrowly restricted our understanding of the continent over the past century. It is, finally, to begin to understand the politics of contemporary Africa in terms which ought to be immediately familiar to anyone with an interest in politics" (Chabal, 1993; p. 9).

The author addresses the reader directly, and indicates what attitude the reader has to Africa, and what are the existing stereotypes about the continent in people's minds. He projects onto us the relation we should have with Africa: we should start to take Africa seriously. It is assumed that up to this point, the reader perceives Africa only in a superficial and prejudiced way.

In our understanding in this work of Chabal a distorted perception of Marcuse's ideas regarding the issue of the authorities that bring alienation and slavery emerged. Europe, according to the author, brought colonization to the pristine lands of Africa, and this has destroyed its environment and the opportunity for a unique path of development. The author presents it as a struggle of opposites, radically resisting each other, which in itself rejects the nature of the policy.

The study seems to be based not on facts but on the ideology that the author establishes – a struggle against the enslavement by Western civilization and the establishment of the dictatorship of the industrial society. The struggle in the book is presented not in an order to achieve a certain goal, but as a struggle for struggle. This is the mapping of the superficial perception of the philosophy of struggle as a dialectics of movement and an example of a failed attempt to raise questions.

Patrick Chabal immediately puts the distinction points to the "warring parties". We are back on the path of the struggle between good and evil, where capitalism is always on the side of "evil", while the oppressed are mysteriously just "good". A simplistic left-wing ideology is visible in this work where modern political correctness can call Africa an underdeveloped continent only in the context that it is European colonialism to blame for the incident. Here again we see what Marcuse had fought against: involuntary simplification of events, semi-christian views of human nature. Here again we see the struggle against the ideology through ideological thinking which Marcuse had already mapped. That is, being a part of the ideological discourse that Africa is a suffering continent after centuries of cruelty at the hands of the Europeans is itself the very ideological cliche, which serves only to destroy free, dialectical thinking. Creativity in free thinking mentioned by Marcuse is not here. There is only an understanding of the struggle for the rights of someone else.

Pierre Bourdieu:

Finally we will try to understand what traces of the Frankfurt School are visible in the work of Bourdieu. He, as well as Victor Turner, continues to develop Marcuse's concept of alienation and power, which directly leads to the key concept of Bourdieu himself, his notion of "symbolic power". Pierre Bourdieu was born in 1930 and died in 2002. He is a highly respected sociologist, philosopher and anthropologist and was a protagonist of the post-structuralist directions in the social sciences. Bourdieu developed his own theoretical and methodical positions which became a major influence in diverse social science but are certainly dominant in social anthropology up to the present. Among his central notions and concepts are "Habitus", "Capital", "Field", "Symbolic violence" and "Social space".

Bourdieu was interested in combining structuralism and constructivism in his social research, and he was (as many people of his generation) an interdisciplinary scientist. He was influenced by huge number of scientist, from Marx, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber to Claude Levi-Strauss and Martin Heidegger. Bourdieu introduced the concepts of social, cultural and symbolic capital, which play a crucial role in the social positions of men, which can be acquired only through social interactions. Moreover, there is total dependency between people's position in society and their views and tastes, which in turn are connected to social mobility. His notion of "symbolic violence" played an important role of the social views of post-structuralists, and remains so to this days. Among his seminal works are "*Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédé de trois études d'ethnologie kabyle*, (1972), Eng. "Outline of a Theory of Practice" (1977), "La Distinction" (1979), "*The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public" (1991), "On Television" (1999), "Practical Reason: On the theory of Action" (1998), "The Social Structures of the Economy" (2005).*

In the context of this work we will examine mainly one of his key works "*Social Space and Symbolic Power*" (2005) where he elaborates in depth several of his key terms.

He writes

> "*...symbolic capital, which is the form that the various species of capital assume when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate. Thus agents are distributed in the overall social space, in the first dimension, according to the overall volume*

of capital they possess and, in the second dimension, according to the structure of their capital, that is, the relative weight of the different species of capital, economic and cultural, in the total volume of their assets" (Bourdieu, 1989. p. 17).

Symbolic capital is a lever with which society could be influenced. Symbolic capital does not exist in the material world, but depends on it directly.

The main idea of Bourdieu's symbolic power is that the person or group of people no longer able to make their own decisions about their lives and their worldviews. In fact this issue remotely continues the theme of man's alienation from himself and from the surrounding society. However, even in such a situation, this alienation – a sort of imposed upon the pattern of behavior, which the individual is obliged to obey, not to be displaced beyond the «normal» society of total alienation.

According to Bourdieu

«power [is]… a 'circle whose centre is everywhere and nowhere» (Bourdieu, 1991 p. 163).

There is no existent person, the spokesman of social philosophy, but this philosophy is everywhere and everyone (one way or another) are under her close supervision. The authorities no longer need to watch for every person, and there is no need strictly monitor their activities. The power uses it's position that it decides on it own what will be called «bad» and «good,» and now in use only what society and public opinion deem to be bad.

Renegades will be punished, but not by the state machine. They will be punished by the citizens, who see power everywhere, and do not leave attempts to carry favor with the state apparatus. Durkheim's terminology, it can be described as «logical conformity. «Man forced to accept rules of the game, but it's hard to believe, that for this rules he was fighting, defending his civil rights? The situation is complicated because of the fact that not being the sole lawmakers, everyone in the society involved in the construction of a taboo of an almost pagan mythology, which refers to relatively strong and cruel government that oversees each of its citizens. And you can not blame the State that it only supported the game imposed by a mixture of human fears of «not keeping pace»

with the rapidly changing times and the forced acceptance of «symbol systems». According to Bourdieu, ideology serve the private interests that they are trying to present as universal interests, common to all groups. The basis of political correctness, for example, is not in the union, as it was before, when you create a totalitarian state, but in the non-separation. When politicians try to unite citizens in a similar cultural tradition, in general features, political correctness, as a kind of unifying factor leaves no choice. People can accept the values imposed on the system, or call it an alien. But in this case everyone should recognize that power. The man has no choice but to have no conflicts with all the people around him who are on similar ideological positions with him. People are required to maintain a stable government. Man is not free to interfere more, but not because he does not want to, but because there is no reason for this. From this viewpoint, humans have no choice. They simply cannot be separated.

Pierre Bourdieu expresses the viewpoint of Marcuse that the society is unable to have their own opinion, as has long been deprived itself of this right. Automatically a system of symbols recreates for to control the human beings. The symbols have become socially forming factor that solidarizes society:

«Symbolic struggles over the perception of the social world may take two different forms. On the objective side, one may act by actions of representation, individual or collective, meant to display and to throw into relief certain realities: I am thinking for instance of demonstrations whose goal is to exhibit a group, its size, its strength, its cohesiveness, to make it exist visibly… On the subjective side, one may act by trying to transform categories of perception and appreciation of the social world, the cognitive and evaluative structures through which it is constructed» (Bourdieu, 1989. p. 20).

The main in this symbolic pyramid building are the words that form a relationship

«the legitimate principle of vision and division, i.e., a struggle over the legitimate exercise of what I call the «theory effect" (Bourdieu, 1989).

Bourdieu expresses his attitude to the symbols, pointing to the fact that the symbolic power / capital / struggle are ways to consolidate the power of the group, which is building a system of symbols, conquering territories, because this power has established

rules of the game. Unlike Marcuse, in Bourdieu's theory a little less attention is paid to the person who created this system himself. Bourdieu paid more attention to the forces that took advantage of the situation to capture the symbolic areas:

«Objective relations of power tend to reproduce themselves in relations of symbolic power. In the symbolic struggle for the production of common sense or, more precisely, for the monopoly over legitimate naming, agents put into action the symbolic capital that they have acquired in previous struggle and which may be juridically guaranteed. Thus titles of nobility, like educational credentials, represent true titles of symbolic property which give one a right share in the profits of recognition. Here again, we must break away from marginalist subjectivism: symbolic order is not formed in the manner of a market price, out of the mere mechanical addition of individual orders» (Bourdieu, 1989. p. 21).

Marcusian marginals located in Bourdieus «subjectivism», because there wasn't any generally accepted symbolic capital that they could defend. Capital holders have lawmaking powers, by which they divide the world into «objectivism» and «subjectivism», where the holders are the guardians of objective values. Although, these values are beneficial to them and play them on hand.

«The legal concentration of symbolic capital confers upon a perspective an absolute, universal value, thus snatching it from a relativity that is by definition inherent in every point of view, as a view taken from a particular point in social space».

«Symbolic power, in this sense, is a power of «world-making» (Bourdieu, 1989. p. 22).

As the heir of the Frankfurt School, Bourdieu offers a simpler, and in a way, less philosophic approach to the problem of power. Having established laws, it requires their execution, but in an unusual way. It is not a requirement for direct, physical subjugation. This creation of distance between man and power, like a Kafkaesque doorkeeper hierarchy at the gates of the Law. Human alienate all possible ways of taking power by monopolizing it, creating a path to power, which is impossible to pass for most. What is difference between this power and the previous?

According to Bourdieu,

«symbolic violence, a gentle violence, imperceptible and invisible even to its victims, exerted for the most part through the purely symbolic channels of communication and cognition (more precisely, misrecognition), recognition, or even feeling» (Bourdieu, 2001. p. 1-2).

Most people support the power of the fact that both at home and in society continues to construct specific set of rules that he dare not break. Not so much because something is forbidden, but because it is not acceptable in society. People created the basis for the symbolic power, restricting themselves and others with fear of violation of the hard code of rules (as in orthodox religions). Opponents of the government are carriers of subjectivity and subjective feelings (envy, anxiety, struggle, rebellion, etc.).

Consequently from the foregoing it can be concluded:

«Symbolic power is power to make things with words» (Bourdieu, 1989. p. 23).

Upon closer examination symbolic power has all the usual features of power:

1) Applies to the whole society (without exception to all participants in the social space).

2) Acts on behalf of the whole society.

3) Operates in the public interest (declared so, at least).

4) Impersonal nature of power (Essentially every person is an agent of symbolic power and its impact on others as well as for himself.)

The phenomenon of Pierre Bourdieu, as the heir of Marcuse, is that he developed the idea of ideological pressure from the government to each person individually. Power passes from the structures to the citizens themselves, who always, throughout history, at some point became opponents of the regime. According to Bourdieu modern authority has acquired new features. Now people (not in a mass society, and each separately) themselves are active instruments of coercion as each person keeps track of cases of refusal to submit to the system and everyone is under constant control. Marcuse talked about this in his works by pointing out that the ideology leaves no personal space and forces man to be always on view. Ideology does not give a chance to escape. Only in

case of "the great refusal" there is a chance to overcome ideological influences, to understand where boundaries are and how to avoid pressure. Bourdieu develops some key concepts of Herbert Marcuse in his theory of "symbolic violence" with less focus on drama, as it exists in Marcuse's theories, but also in a more pessimistic direction. According to Bourdieu one can overcome ideology only in theory, almost no one knows where ideology begins and where it ends, where it is visible, and where hiding. Moreover, ideology forms and creates more laws, according to which a person operates in the universe. In fact, even those who are marginalized and outsiders, in whom Marcuse believed the driving elements against ideology are constituted, can not be simply free of it. Symbolic violence even creates the conditions for rebellion against itself and the conditions for the suppression of symbolic rebellion at the same time. The marginalized do not have "symbolic capital" in the same wayas those who create the ideological laws do possess it. Bourdieu in his work confirms the idea of Marcuse that ideology is rooted in people deeper than people themselves might have expected it to be.

This can be called Marcusian philosophy in pure form. By creating an ideology (just as "false consciousness") and symbols, power uses the process of moving in ideological (fictitious) space for its own purposes, because there is no need to share power with the people, who are only theoretical carriers of the democratic state.

Resume:

We can see that Marcuse had a different effect on each of these authors. For some of them he served as the impetus for the development of scientific activity. For others he became the ideological fundament on which their concepts, principles and ideology were built. Despite the obvious influence of his work on the authors we critically examined a problem of reference remains as the scholars themselves, albeit relying on the ideas of the Frankfurt school and especially Marcuse rarely directly acknowledge their intellectual indebtedness. But in the questions they pose and the problems they raise in their scientific discourse, we can clearly see the influence of the Frankfurt School.

Sometimes this is even theoretically denied, as by John Fiske for example, who refuses

to recognize the issue of alienation between the TV and the audience, as well as the alienation between the viewer and the consumed information. Fiske hopes that each person is able to choose his interpretation for himself of what he sees, which is doubtful from a more rigorous theoretical position. Also Patrick Chabal is most interesting in his research which relies on a distorted understanding of Marcuse, who given Chabal' axioms would probably be solely a fighter for civil rights. We can uncover the making of ideological frameworks and the imposing of self-restrictions in the works of the authors.

For the other scholars like Turner and Bourdieu the Frankfurt school and especially Marcuse yielded important axioms for the development of their own ideas and concepts. In the case of Michael Taussig the Frankfurt tradition seems to signify a philosophical and moral basis and at the same time a means to organize the world view of the researcher himself.

The attempted analysis of key texts allows us to see some of the quite diverse interpretations of the work of Marcuse that exist in current anthropology, particularly the impact and range of Marcuse and his colleagues on "symbolic violence" after the 60s.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of texts, which is already mentioned above, we can estimate the depth of the impact of the ideas of Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School on the scientific and philosophical discourse in general. His philosophy has left a legacy of the most diverse nature where each direction is different from each other descendant. There certainly is a huge influence on the occurrence of post-modernism in anthropology, whose precursors were scholars like Victor Turner or Clifford Geertz, who strongly influenced following generations of anthropologists like James Boon, James Clifford, George Marcus or Paul Rabinow. Marcuse had an impact on the philosophy of post-structuralism, to which (apart from Bourdieu, who was mentioned earlier) belonged Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Roland Barthes, the most influential phsychologist Jacques Lacan and many others. Marcuse has introduced an 'anti-scientist' development, which became a strong trend in the social sciences and in philosophy, which has been subjected to critical analysis in relation to the very structure of reality.

Being largely a critical anthropologist, Marcuse did not remain without «direct» descendants, such as Jürgen Habermas and C. Wright Mills.

Wright Mills represents a critical sociology, develops the theme of alienation in his theory of elites. He talked about the division of the world between the warring clans, the connection of the working class and bourgeois because of the fact that the working class has lost his opposition essence, becoming an appendage of the capitalist system. Wright Mills continues to set the emotional component at the heart of everything that is happening, adopting a revolutionary role in an attempt to understand the modernity with a critical position. He was trying to show the world as a struggle for power, as the struggle for power elites, regardless of the wishes of the people. He also spoke about the media, as a means of influencing people (Wright Mills, 1956). Trying to understand and realize the role of Marxism in the modern world, making him a direct follower of Frankfurters because the main undertows themes of his work remained the study of «closeness»(understanding this word as something is closed), which is necessary to open (and since he was also the heir to the philosophy of Max Weber, we can use the term demagification unreservedly.

Jürgen Habermas has developed the ideas of Herbert Marcuse in the civilizational way. Habermas can be described as a representative of the critical philosophy. As one of the most important philosophers of the Frankfurt School of «second generation», went on to develop the theory of social negation. He made an attempt to bring philosophy to a new level, to realize its importance to society. This has led his to criticism of «first generation's» philosophy of negativism which he judged pragmatically, realizing that people have to live in a society that may not be constantly criticized and from which people can not be all the time distance themselves. In the book, The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity, Habermas tries to combine the concept of society as an element of universal alienation, but, at the same time, the only objective way of human existence. Discrepancies were many key moments with his «senior mentors» and with many other inheritors of Frankfurt School – postmodernists, which Habermas blamed for their metaphysics and their refusal from the real, everyday life (Habermas 1985).

Marcuse had an enormous influence on the New Left, and revolutionaries of all stripes, ranging from fanatical and expressive Abbie Hoffman, ending with Angela Davis, whose activities and way of life is still causing controversy. Hoffman in these circumstances presented as a «fiery» revolutionary, whose life has been one huge protest from the beginning to the end. He protested against the system using obscene language and high-profile appearances, and with the help of disappearance to underground, and finally his own death. He is an example of the extreme Markusian wing, like Rudi Dutschke, who unexpectedly finds himself summed up in the desire of Frankfurters to deal with Christian humanist values. He suggested that his Christian views are nothing more than a dream of mankind for a better life. The life of Rudi Dutschke, like Abbie Hoffman's, like all real revolutionaries, was tragically cut short, as they both did not spare themselves in the pursuit of the very constant negation, which may well have undermined their strength in mid-life.

Angela Davis, with her most controversial actions is probably more a successor of the tendency of the revolution which, in the words of Georges Jacques Danton «devours its own children.» Davis repeatedly used her position of human rights defender, was a staunch Marxist and continues to defend the rights of ethnic and sexual minorities. She is opposed to the death penalty and has occasionally provided support to what are considered criminal elements by mainstream society – e.g. she was associated to the

«Black Panthers», a radical party that fought for Black Power and advocated violent means if necessary.

Angela Davis wrote in her essay «Marcuse's Legacy,» that he is not much studied anymore, almost neglected because he supposedly contributed solely to the influence on the era of the 60s (Davis 1998). Not all researchers (even a minority of them) accept the logic of Marcuse, because, as we can see, many have tried to capture the amazing «scientific poetry» of his works. Unfortunately, by this reason the majority of researchers limited themselves. And most of those whom we call the successors of Marcuse's dialogue, perceive only his revolutionary and uncompromising pathos. We need to understand in this context the word πάθος in native-Greek exalted notion.

Considering the philosophy of the Frankfurt School and its legacy at the end of the last century and now, what happened could be described with a foucauldian concept as a «game of truth» (Foucault, Michel; 1983). This proves the importance of the influence of Marcuse's theories, but does not exclude their vulgarization. It can be concluded that Marcuse (and with it his predecessors, Marx and Freud) developed as interpretations, according to the theory of Paul Ricoeur. He spoke of «the archeology of the subject,» which, in his understanding, is primary for the philosopher but secondary to his interpreters. This means, that Marx, Freud and Marcuse were not so much perceived as philosophers on their own terms but were transformed into victims of interpretations (Ricoeur, 1969). One can cite the example of Freud as the most popular vulgarized scientist, which is exploited by modern American and European radical feminists. Marcuse (and Marx) is aggressively vulgarized by left-radicals (and ironically by liberals), for which he is a comfortable image. Because of his mastery of poetic language he can be turned around and interpreted in any possible and desired direction. His successors are often located on diametrically opposed ideological and other positions, but they have one thing in common. They often repeat the names of the doctrinal authors, being very far away (symbolically speaking, «hundreds of miles») from the text and the author's logic. Quite different Marcuse himself, who deeply understood Freud and Marx, and saw in their theories the possible development of Marxism and Freudianism as a separate doctrine.

Nowadays, none of these three great thinkers are "not understood" by the majority. Like many original authors, they are inevitably exposed to the vulgarization, and are

regarded as the founders of universalistic worldviews.

To all of them the metaphor of Roland Barthes from his essay «Death of the author» can be applied and it can be concluded that Herbert Marcuse was much more the thinker, writer and author of ideas, than a scientist who can not and should not be responsible for interpretation of his works. He is the author in the highest sense, who gives us the possibility to read his works, bringing us the gift of his ideas and food for thought (Barthes, 1968). This, anyway, only concerns us when we are striving to anthropologically understand the ongoing reality and are scholars who seek for truth, in the philosophical sense, which is not, and cannot be located on the surface.

LITERATURE, WEBPAGES, MOVIES

Literature

Adorno, Theodor

1950 The Authoritarian personality. New York: Harper

Adorno, Theodor

1966 Negative Dialectics. London: Taylor and Francis

Adorno, Theodor with Hans Albert, Ralf Dahrendorf, Jürgen Habermas, Harald Pilot and Karl Popper

1976 The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Arendt, Hannah

2006 Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the Banality of Evil. London: Penguin Group

Barthes, Roland

1968 The Death of the Author. *In* Image-music-text. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux

Benjamin, Walter

2010 The work of art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. New York: Prism Key Press

Benjamin, Walter

1974 On the concept of history. Frankfurt-am-Main: Gesammelten Schriften I:2. Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bloch, Ernst

1995 The principle of Hope. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Bourdieu, Pierre

1989 Social space and Symbolic Power New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1991 Language and Symbolic power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard university press

Bourdieu, Pierre

1998 Masculine Domination.

Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001

Chabal, Patrick, and Jean-Pascal Daloz

1999 Africa Works: disorder as a political instrument. Oxford: International African Institute in association with James Currey

Chabal, Patrick

1993 Power in Africa. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Davis, Angela

1998 Marcuse's legacy. New York: Berkeley Books

Fairclough, Norman.

1992 Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fiske, John

1993 Power plays, power works. New York: Verso

Foucault, Michel

1983 Discourse and Truth: the Problematization of Parrhesia New York: Berkeley Books

Freud, Sigmund

1917 "Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's Gradiva" Moffat

Freud, Sigmund

2011 The Ego and the Id. Martino Publishing

Freud, Sigmund

1939 Moses and Monotheism. London: Hogarth Press,

Fromm, Erich

1941 Escape from Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Fukuyama, Francis

1992 The End of History and the last Man. New York: Free Press

Gadamer, Hans-Georg

2004 Thuth and Method. London: Continuum.

Geertz, Clifford

1973 The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays. New York: Basic Books

Habermas, Jürgen

1985 The philosophical Discourse of the Modernity. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno

1944 Dialectic of Enlightment. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press

Jorgensen, Marianne and Louise J. Phillips

2002 Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. London: Sage Publications

Kellner, Douglas

1984 Herbert Marcuse and the crisis of Marxism. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lotman, Yuri

2000 Universe of Mind: The semiotic theory of culture. Bloomington, IN: Indiana university press

Lukasc, Gyorgy

1971 History and class consciousness. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Marcuse, Herbert

1969 An Essay on Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press

Marcuse, Herbert

1972 Counterrevolution and Revolt. Oxford: Oxford university Press

Marcuse, Herbert

1987 Eros and civilization. London: Routledge

Marcuse, Herbert

1968 Negations; essays in the critical theory. Boston: Beacon Press

Marcuse, Herbert

1964 One-Dimensional man. Boston: Beacon Press

Marcuse, Herbert

1986 Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Ruse of Social Theory. London: Routledge

Marx, Karl

1915 Capital: The process of capitalist production. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & company

Marx, Karl

1969 Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. New York: International Publishers

Marx, Karl

1970 The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers

Merezhkovsky, Dmitry

1929 The Death of the Gods. Julian the Apostate. New York: The Modern Library

Renan, Ernest

1864 Life of Jesus. London: Trübner

Ricoeur, Paul

1969 The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press

Seymur, Keitlen

2003 The Oedipus Complex: A Philosophical Study. Virtualbookworm Publishing

Taussig, Michael

1987 Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Taylor, Frederick Winslow

1919 The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper & Brothers

Turner, Victor

1974 Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society" Ithaca, NY: Cornell University press

Turner, Victor

1969 From Ritual to theatre: the human seriousness of play. Cambridge, MA: Performing Art Journal Publications

Salat, Josef Ludwig

1976 "Hermeneutische Vernunft und ethnologische Forschung" Dissertation Universität Wien

Wright Mills, Charles

1956 The Power Elite. Oxford: Oxford University press

Zellinger, Michael

2012 Philosophische Hermeneutik in der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie. Eine Spurensuche. Diplomarbeit Universität Wien

Zizek, Slavoj

2000 The Fragile Absolute: Or, Why is the Christian Legacy Worth Fighting For? London: Verso.

Webpages

Marcuse, Herbert

1967 The End of Utopia. Free University of West Berlin.

http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/1967/end-utopia.htm,

accessed May 27, 2005

Marcuse, Herbert

1972 The Foundation of Historical Materialism. Beacon Press

http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/marcuse/works/historical-materialism/, accessed May 27, 2005

Mattick, Paul

1972 Critique of Marcuse: One Dimensional Man in Class Society. Merlin Press http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/2379/marcuse.htm

Geoffrey Caduceus & comrades

http://thenewdirectionoftime.com/2012/02/21/review-of-one-dimensional-man-by-herbert-marcuse/, accessed February 21, 2012

Newspaper "Pravda.ru"

http://www.pravda.ru/society/fashion/models/22-04-2011/1071922-marcuse_herbert-0/, accessed April 22, 2011

Movie

Fiennes, Sophie and Slavoj Zizek, dirs.

2012 The Pervert's Guide to Idelogy. 136 min. P Guide Productions

Curriculum vitae

Dmytro Bielobrov

Name   Dmytro Bielobrov

Date, Place of birth   01.01.1990 in Odessa

Nationality   Ukrainian

Professional Experience

2008-2011

Symposium NGO „Global Leadership".

Interpreter, Organisation of the Symposium, inviting of the guests, management to work with the clients

2007

Project manager, Bureau of marketing research, Odessa. organizing social and entrepreneurial projects in collaboration with other enterprises

2010

Seller in fashion store Sarah Pacini,

client-oriented work

Education

1996-2006

High School № 90

2006-2011

Masters degree, Nationale I.I. Metschnikov University, Odessa, Sociology Faculty

March 2011- till now

Master degree, Vienna University, Austria, Faculty

of cultural and social anthropology

Languages

Russian (native)

Englisch (excellent)

Ukrainian (excellent)

German (good)

Certificates

Three certificates of participaton in „Global Leadership" Symposium (2008-2011)

Certificate of listener in the Summer film school „EICAR" (Paris)

Additional experience:

2006-2008   Member of AIESEC, youth organisation, Odessa Local Committee, Ukraine

2010   Publication on the national Sociological conference in Zhitomir with the article "Transformation of the Ukrainian history in post-soviet times"

2000-2008   Independence theater on Natalia Prokopenko in Odessa, Ukraine.

Abstract of Master Thesis

Re-reading Marcuse and Frankfurt School in terms of an anthropological perspective

The aim of the thesis is to investigate if and what influence Herbert Marcuse and the members of the Frankfurt School had on social and cultural anthropology.

In the first part we present a theoretical overview of Marcuse's predecessors like Karl Marx or Sigmund Freud and some of his contemporaries like Walter Benjamin or György Lukács. We have traced the development of anti-ideological thinking in the mid-19th century to the early 70's of the 20th century, and found that the problem of ideology as a major issue is firmly entrenched in most social sciences.

The second part is dedicated to the influence of the anti-ideological turn of the social philosophy of cultural and social anthropology. Besides anthropologists we critically examined also selected representative authors who have worked in other disciplines but have been influential in the field of anthropology, and who have strongly felt the influence of ideas of the Frankfurt School

As a result, we came to the conclusion that Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School have left a deep mark in the history of anthropological discourse, and as a tradition of scientific thought their theories and methods are still fundamental for explanatory conclusions social scientists are making, up to the present and based on the results of their researches. This influence can not be characterized as positive or negative, but Marcuse and other Frankfurt scholars are of determining importance in the ways of scientific thinking about questions of power, ideology and consciousness, subordination or resistance and the issue of alienation.

Abstract der Master Thesis

Re-reading Marcuse and Frankfurt School in terms of an anthropological perspective/Marcuse und die Frankfurter Schule wieder lesen aus anthropologischer Sicht

Das Ziel dieser Arbeit ist eine Auseinandersetzung mit vorhandenen und möglichen Einflüssen von Herbert Marcuse und anderen Mitgliedern der Frankfurter Schule in der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie.

Einerseits präsentiert die Arbeit einen theoretischen Überblick zu den Vorgängern Marcuses wie Karl Marx und Sigmund Freud sowie dem Denken von Zeitgenossen wie Walter Benjamin oder György Lukács. In Folge wird die Entwicklung der Kritik der Ideologie von Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1970er Jahre betrachtet, wobei festgestellt werden konnte, dass das Problem der Ideologie als eine zentrale Thematik fest eingeschrieben bleibt in zahlreichen Sozialwissenschaften.

Der zweite inhaltliche Bereich ist die Auseinandersetzung mit Ideologiekritik in der sozialen Philosophie der Kultur- und Sozial Anthropologie. Neben den Protagonisten dieser kritischen Denktradition in der Anthropologie werden auch ausgewählte Repräsentanten anderer Disziplinen analysiert, die ihrerseits von großem Einfluss auf Theorie und Methode in der Anthropologie sind und sich ebenfalls unter dem Einfluss der Denktradition der Frankfurter Schule entwickeln.

Als Ergebnis dieser kritischen, diskursanalytischen Arbeit kann festgestellt werden, dass Herbert Marcuse und die Frankfurter Schule tatsächlich von grundlegender Bedeutung in der Geschichte des anthropologischen Diskurses sind. Als eine spezifische Tradition wissenschaftlichen Denkens spielen ihre Ansätze eine wichtige Rolle in explanatorischen Forschungsunterfangen und liefern theoretisch-methodische Werkzeuge und Erklärungsansätze. Dieser Einfluss kann nicht als positiv oder negativ charakterisiert werden, sondern als bestimmend für die wissenschaftliche Arbeit an Fragen von Macht, Gewalt, Ideologie und Bewusstsein, Unterwerfung oder Widerstand und dem Problem der Entfremdung.