"About the Current Moment" № 2 (74), February 2008

Authority as an obstacle for personal and social development

At the end of January – beginning of February 2008 "Russia" TV-channel has two times shown the film "The Fall of the Empire. The Byzantium Lesson", filmed by "the pastor" archimandrite Tikhon (Shevkunov, who has been raised to the rank of V. V. Putin's "personal confessor" by mass-media), and who has got a cinematographic education. According to the concept of Byzantium history stated in the film, in the history of Russian Empire – USSR – post-Soviet RusZionia those cultural and political mistakes, which by Tikhon's opinion have brought Byzantium to ruin, have been repeated in many aspects. The main mistake (in his representation) is the of Empire people's apostasy of the so-called "orthodox faith" that caused numerous mistakes – consequences of that "principal mistake".

In press (which in present RusZionia, as in 1980-90th, is still overwhelmed by the spirit of liberalism so the West is "all light in window" for them) all the discussion on film was reduced to the following. Reproaching Tikhon of tendentious interpretation of the history of the Byzantium society and its mutual relations with the outer world; indicating several actual mistakes and discrepancies; charging that the film groundlessly tries to convince RusZionian people that the West is the pathological enemy of Russia during all the history.

Actually the film has the indisputable advantage which hasn't been noticed by liberal critics. It states the question: What defects does the so-called "Orthodoxy" have? The defects, since which the Byzantium society, based on the "Orthodox" worldview and world-understanding , wasn't able to solve actual social and state problems in proper times and tried to find ready receipts at the West during thousand-year history of "East Rome empire"? In fact the, the same repeats as well in the history of Russia, which had accepted the **"main treasure"** of Byzantium – the so-called "Orthodox faith" (as it is stated in the film).

Without answering this question or without accusing its inconsistency perspectives of Russia's revival as the society *self-sufficient in the aspect of meaning of life* – are vague. I.e. "the Time of Troubles[1]" *as a crash of the historically formed culture* may repeat.

───────────

"A crowd of people behaves like a herd of rams. It blindly follows for one or two leaders not reflecting at all who these leaders are and where they conduct the crowd, writes 'The Daily Telegraph'.

Unusual discovery has been made by scientists from Leeds University. They conducted a series of experiments: volunteers were to wander in a big hall without talking one to another. Some persons were chosen from the participants. They were given more precise instructions about the route they were to keep. (For the full Russian text look InoPressa.ru).

The published report has shown that "the informed minority" (only 5% at all) can set direction for a group of at least 200 persons. Remained "herd" unconsciously follows leaders. Researchers approve this as precise parallels with the behaviour of groups of animals.

Examinees developed common decision during experiments, though they were not allowed to talk or to communicate with gestures. In most cases participants of experiment were not realizing at all that someone was conducted them.

That study has some in common with investigations of scientists from Utrecht University.

They proved, that the majority of people prefers to follow the leader, even if their conductor himself does not know where to go"

---

[1] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Time_of_Troubles

("Scientists found out, that people can be 'rams' and blindly follow for one, which became the leader: http://www.newsru.com/world/15feb2008/sheep_print.html (in Russian)).

It would be an exaggeration to tell, that scientists from Leeds and Utrecht have made discovery. Because since ancient times it is known, that the behaviour of group can be indistinguishable from herds and packs of animals. However it is known as well that it can differ…

So the obvious achievement of both research groups, useful for their participants, is that scientists got some grants or "sawed the budget".

And the mass-media informing about these "discoveries" have benefited the society by stating a question once again: Is the described herd-pack behaviour of people in the society a norm? Or does it show that the individuals, who behave like that, haven't actualized themselves as real Humans due to some defects of culture which they have grown in?

———————

Indeed, such behaviour is specific for people not only for psychological experiments spent indoor, but also for real life. It gave the basis for V. G. Belinsky to write: "the crowd is assembly of people living by tradition and judging by authority..."[1] This phrase in COB (COB – is transliteration of the Russian abbreviation for the Conception of Social Security) *became an actual interpretation of the term "crowd" describing the certain way of life of a society* – crowd-"elitism", at which the society consists of two differently organized crowds – so-called "common people" and *more or less authoritative* "elite". The same phrase contains the substantial description of such public phenomenon as "authority": an accepted source of information; a conclusive statement or decision that may be taken as a guide or precedent; the power to determine, adjudicate; a person in whom authority is vested[2]. And though the word "authority" is not Russian, but came from the West, it has got accustomed in Russian language. And it is adequate at the present historical stage of Russian culture development: i.e. personal subjective images connected with this word correspond to the phenomenon, and for the majority of people its meaning "stands to reason".

The definitions of the word "authority" placed above show, that if society doesn't not represent the crowd (according to definition by V. G. Belinsky), there will not be an authority. That is, social phenomenon of the authority accompanies another phenomenon – the crowd.

Some faultfinders of COB during all the time after "The Dead Water" was published in 1992, stated displeasure on definition of the crowd, especially in regards to that in COB the so-called "social elite" is described with the same term.

These attacks are based on that according to faultfinders' opinion it is possible to distinguish the "true elite" and "pseudo-elite", which mimicries under the "true elite" and appropriates its name – "elite", in the social structure.

Just several years ago altercations on this question were typical mostly only for those web sites and web forums on which participants were familiar with COB and well-grounded or groundless considered themselves to be adherents of COB (at least for that period of their life). And at present:

---

[1] V. V. Odintsov "Linguistic paradoxes" – Moscow: Prosveshenie, 1988, p.33 (in Russian).
[2] http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/authority

- this theme has vanished from discussions at COB-sites;

- but it begins to emerge on those sites which ignore the existence of COB. For example: the article by S. Valtsev "Elite and domination" (site "Internet versus TV-screen", Feb.07, 2008, http://contrtv.ru/print/2599/).

S. Valtsev started his article with:

"To answer the question on reasons of society degradation it is necessary for us to gain an understanding of:
first, what is a society;
second, how does a society development mechanism work.
A society is a historically developing system consisting of people and relationships between them and serving as an effective mean of satisfying material and spiritual needs of people.
Relations with other people bring the person material benefits which can be divided in two groups.
The first one – benefits from joint actions: for example, one person can't shift stirring stone, but two persons can. By jointing efforts people dig channels, raise buildings and do many other things that one person can't do.
The second group – benefits of specialization. Hardly a doctor should try to understand the device of TV-set – it's much easier to call for a TV-master. In turn, TV-master hardly should try to treat illness – it's better to call for a doctor.
The society also plays important role in satisfying of person's spiritual needs. Person can't be a person without other persons; he becomes a person in a society. Finally, self-actualization is disclosing of inner "me" for others. Really, why to write verses if no one reads them, why to draw pictures if no one sees them?
A man can't be without society; therefore no one interrupts contacts with society voluntarily".

As to last statement, such cases happened repeatedly, though it is a specific theme. And as for whole we are agree with what S. Valtsev told in that fragment. After it, S. Valtsev continues:

"The society is always guided by ruling class. In general it is obvious: never a more or less large collective is guided by everybody, whether it would be a large enterprise or State Duma.
In relation to this it is possible to completely agree with elitologists, exactly with one of forefathers of elitology – Italian sociologist G. Mosca, who formulated his credo as follows:
'One thing becomes obvious even at the most superficial sight. In all societies, since hardly coming nearer civilization and finishing with modern advanced and powerful, two classes always appear – the class which guides and the class which is guided. First class, always less numerous, carries out all political functions, monopolizes power, while other class, more numerous, is guided and controlled by first class in way, providing functioning of political organism'.
As we shall see further, ruling class and elite – are not the same. In the beginning, we shall define what 'ruling class' is.
A ruling class is the layer of society which really rules the society outside of any moral or other qualitative characteristics. Nominally, main social functions of ruling class are tactical management, strategic forecasting, formation of spiritual sphere of society; and main social objects are – consolidation of society for protection of society from external aggression and with a view of material and spiritual perfection of society".

And further S. Valtsev names three reasons, which cause a society to have such character of organization. However we shall describe them ourselves: 1) the dilettantism in ruling of the vast majority of people, 2) the procedural difficulty of organizing everyone's participation in current ruling, 3) the absence of interest of the vast majority to problems and real society ruling process. However, actually it is not absolutely so.

Above all, if look at society life corresponding with DOTU (DOTU – is transliteration of Russian abbreviation for the Sufficiently General Theory of Ruling)[1] and its section "The Theory of Supersystems", then one of quality ratios of ruling the supersystem, staying in interaction with environment, is the supersystem's stability reserve, expressed as an amount of free elements, which do not act in current interaction of the supersystem and environment, provided that the quality of this interaction admits as satisfactory.

According to this circumstance, the problem is not with organization of everybody's participation in *ruling the society as a whole (a ruling of all-supersystem level)*, but with uselessness and harm of such organization: any kind of activity should be extremely effective, including ruling activity. And for the maintenance of supersystem's stability reserve minimally necessary amount of elements should be borrowed in any activity. It also concerns the sphere of ruling.

The history gives numerous examples confirming this position practically: flourishing of persistent mass-meeting subcultures through society entails crises which lead to social disasters, until there are professional rulers resolutely stopping mass-meetings up to application of brute force, or a "meeting" stops by itself in the shortest terms with 1) allocation of professional rulers from "meeting" environment or invitation them from aside, 2) *granting them powers and as well recognizing them to have rights and status of heads for not fixed time or due to the next "meeting".*

S. Valtsev writes the following about the division of societies into professional rulers and people borrowed in other fields of activity, caused by these reasons:

"The certain layer of people exists in society, which to the greatest degree approach for a role of a dominating class. Functions and tasks executed by a dominating class are the most important for society normal life. Therefore the best members of society can execute these functions and tasks. This society layer got name 'social elite', or in brief – 'elite'.

Elite is a layer of society whose main task is care of safety, material and spiritual perfection of society. Elite does its task by means of tactical management, strategic planning of society development and formation of ethical and aesthetic bases of society culture.

In real life people, to the greatest degree corresponding for execution of given functions, don't really always execute these functions. But it happens so, that if not best players gather in national football team, then this circumstance is not so pitiable for society as if ruling class consists not of elite but of casual people.

In any big enough society there exists elite-imperious misbalance.

Elite-imperious misbalance – is an indicator, showing the discrepancy of elite position in relation to a ruling class. Part of elite, which is part of ruling class, may be dominating elite. Part of elite, which doesn't enter the ruling class and often stays in opposition to dominating elite, may be named counter-elite. Part of ruling class, not being elite, but at the same time being at authority, may be named pseudo-elite.

The basic distinction between elite and pseudo-elite: pseudo-elite operates a society proceeding from own interests, while elite – proceeding from society interests.

It is possible to say, that pseudo-elite lifestyle is 'the society for me', and elite's principle is 'me for the society'".

S. Valtsev tries to assign on "real elite" those functions, which it basically can't bear, since he doesn't know what the total function of ruling[2] is and thereof doesn't understand how it is allocated between public and state institutes. The "real elite" grammatically is a "collective

---

[1] Look at books by IP USSR "The Dead Water" and "The Sufficiently General Theory of Ruling" (DOTU). These and other works by IP USSR, necessary for understanding of some specific terms of COB and COB as a whole, are published on several sites: dotu.ru, vodaspb.ru, mera.com.ru, etc.

[2] Total function of ruling is the term of The Sufficiently General Theory of Ruling (DOTU). It includes successive sequence of different quality actions: revealing of environmental factor affecting the subject-ruler and causing need for ruling; goals designation concerning this factor and all other further actions necessary for achieving the planned goals.

name", instead of really existing social group, which representatives realize both generality and mission, which S. Valtsev assigns to it. In the basis of this there is an autocratic character of conceptual power[1] and a support from Above for those bearers of it, which orient themselves to creation the God's Kingdom on the Earth with efforts of people and God's guidance. As it is said in Koran "God knows better where to put His embassy". I.e. there can be claims on mission of "real elite", but if they are not supported from Above, then the more active claimers are – the larger will be bubble of unrealizable and the heavier will be consequences.

After the above printed fragment about problems of "real elite" S. Valtsev passes to the description of society development algorithms, which he calls "society development mechanism" once again mixing in his world-understanding these two different phenomena[2]:

"During quantitative and qualitative growth of society elite appears in it, which later takes on itself professional execution of society management process.

People have needs. It is a starting point in the analysis of the mechanism of creation, functioning and development of society. Needs may be material and spiritual. Society needs are formed owing to interaction of two factors – internal and external. The internal factor it is dominating value orientations, which form the worldview of society. The external factor is a concrete historical situation. The majority of people appreciate safety (it is worldview aspect), during war a threat to this safety appears (it is situational aspect). As a result the society demands from elite organization of repulse to external aggression. Elite tries to organize people for decision of this problem.

If elite is not capable of doesn't want to resolve problems which life puts to society, then society not always degrades, because new elite appears, which is adequate to the certain stage of society development. So, such is the society development mechanism. People[3] themselves are capable for revolutionary actions, but these actions never are successful, whether it was the riot of Spartak or Stepan Razin's revolt. Only when the need for changing the society institutes is realized by some part of elite, it becomes possible to overthrow the old elite and transform the society. As a rule, an appearance of new elite refers to the breaking of stability in society. But it is often the unique way to rescue the society from degradation. The algorithm of society development is presented illustratively[4].

If elite is not capable to resolve problems facing the society and there is no new elite, the society degrades. Degradation process can be long enough, but, as rule, an external force – another nation – finishes this process".

S. Valtsev completed his article with this conclusion.

––––––––––––

The main flaw of such approach to consideration of social development and social crises problems, which S. Valtsev has followed, consists of that the contextually caused sense of the words given by him, suppresses and deforms their dictionary values that are more of less in general use. Such an expression of author's own ideas causes an ambiguity of the text and speech understanding and it doesn't allow to understand an essence of processes and actions considered by him.

––––––––––––

[1] Conceptual power – the term of Conception of Social Safety (COB):

first meaning – power of people, which are capable to elaborate the concept of society life organization and to introduce it in real process of public self-management;

second meaning – power of concept itself upon society.

[2] Of course, there are certain interrelations between "algorithms" and "mechanism"; however it is not the same phenomenon.

[3] In this case, it is not pertinent to refer to "people", but it would be better to use the term "crowd".

[4] The illustration is absent in the quoted publication on site www.contrtv.ru (IP USSR).

The same concerns using ready wordings, by which this approach was expressed, while citing as well (in the present case – Italian "elitologist" G. Mosca): it is a reliable way to become a hostage of mistakes done by other people.

In particular, the term "elite" isn't monosemantic, even in its dictionary value:

- elite in general – selected as the best[1];

- in relation to a society: 1) A group or class of persons or a member of such a group or class, enjoying superior intellectual, social, or economic status; 2) The best or most skilled members of a group[2] (all definitions are taken from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/elite).

I.e. primordially the use of term "elite" assumes subjectivity of choice caused by morality and world understanding: 1) the certain set of selection parameters, which should correspond to one or another objective circumstances; 2) in relation to each parameter – meanings of definitions "best", "surpassing others" of representatives of certain set on each selection parameter; 3) ordering of set of parameters on each of them importance priorities for the subject.

According to this status of word "elite" any society *objectively* is "poly-elite". Its poly-elitism is an objective basis of that the same social group in one's opinion is a "real elite", while for another it is a "pseudo-elite" or "counter-elite" or "a shame of mankind".

According to such historically steady meaning of the word "elite", to practice in definitions trying to differentiate "elite", "pseudo-elite", "counter-elite", "dominating class" and to present the received fictional definitions as an *authentic knowledge of the general cultural level*, – it is waste of time in attempt to overcome objective essence of Language.

For this reason in COB in the term crowd-"elitism" and all derivatives from word "elite" have been always written in quotes.

Besides that, *the word "elite" itself* doesn't mean at all that function of ruling the society is inalienable property or even right of this or that social "elite" being certain set whose representatives surpass other society members on some quality, including ability to exercise administrative functions of public importance.

What S. Valtsev calls "dominating class" that regardless of its morality and ethics some way carries out the ruling of a society, is one of many "elites", which representatives have won (or incessantly win) in struggle for possession of *such social status in internal society structure, with which indeed some power and a function of really carried out ruling of society as a whole or of regional importance in the historically formed structure of public relations are connected.*

In other words, the question is: which "elite" will win that status, S. Valtsev calls "dominating class" in the certain society. If they would be villains, whom S. Valtsev calls "pseudo-elite", then that means the only that the society is not able to grow up enough righteous people, which would not allow so-called "pseudo-elite" to seize the status of the so-called "dominating class". In this case the society doesn't and can't have any hopes that the "elite" villains and fools would realize their essence by themselves and would change to so-called "real elite": though some its representatives (under pressure of circumstances, sometimes rather severe) are capable to change their mind and pass from vile-corporative morality and ethics to more human ones.

Nevertheless, in society there is reproduced an amount of people, who are convinced as if they were really "the best", because they objectively surpass others, first of all with parameters

---

[1] WordNet® 3.0, © 2006 by Princeton University

[2] The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Copyright © 2006 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. All rights reserved.

of "intellectual power" and erudition. Thus they consider the power over the rest of society to be their inalienable right.

However, the history shows the following. In social corporations based on the conviction of their members in that "they are the best and thus have the right to …", the same laws of herd-pack behaviour works, which "were discovered" once again by scientists from Leeds and Utrecht, and on basis of which (not knowing about their "discovery") "the pastor" Tikhon Shevkunov wants to realize the plan of "Orthodox Renaissance" of RusZionia.

Therefore in our opinion, the estimation of so-called "social elite" as a crowd, *in sense of V. G. Belinsky's definition of this sociological term,* given in COB is adequate to what really occurs in life of crowd-"elitist" societies during all known history. And if not to think about yourself as about a representative of "the real elite", who can't rule the society because of preponderance of "the pseudo-elite" quantitatively overwhelming "the real elite", then there are no objective reasons to disagree with the estimation of "elite" in COB...

———————

If to speak about the manifestations of herd-pack behaviour of people, then, as the experiment in Leeds shows, the majority follows the "informed" minority in the case when representatives of this majority don't realize purposes of their activity and means of its realization.

If the sense of activity is not realized, the will that operates in individual psyche from the level of consciousness, may be activated only for searching the sense of activity. If the will isn't activated at all the control is transferred to unconscious levels of psyche, and instinctive algorithmic of herd-pack behaviour, which biologically is peculiar to human, may be activated.

Besides that, instinctive algorithmic of herd-pack behaviour may be activated also in cases when the will is suppressed (for example with psychotropic substances, alcohol, *other drugs, including moral and psychological pressure of some authorities on individual's psyche*), or volitional qualities of individual haven't been developed during his education.

In these variants, even with comprehension of sense of activity, absence of will in general or its depression dooms an individual (if circumstances gain to this) for participation in herd-pack behaviour. This is algorithmic of a greater part of teenage collective criminality: life-strategic interests were not formed by parents, school and TV; volitional qualities were not grown up; "kiddies" have nothing to do, but have too much energy. They drink – do foolish things, herd-pack algorithmic activates… and as a result – they commit a grave crime, which nobody of them in the majority of cases has planned to make. But the crime nevertheless is committed, since its morally caused algorithmic has been dispersed with its fragment between personal psyches of all the participants.

———————

Nevertheless, professional specialization, that divides society to professional rulers, working in state institutes and economic sphere, and to their subordinates, is inevitable with the reached level of personal culture of mental activity of the majority of adults, because to become socially comprehensible ruler it is necessary to possess certain psychical qualities and to be a carrier of knowledge in the subject domain which ruler is to rule.

According to that circumstance questions appear:

- How does the professional corporation of rulers attitude towards their subordinates – other people in society?

- On what basis do subordinates recognize the power of corporation of rulers?

- Whom and how does the professional corporation of administrators exclude from its ranks and whom and how does it recruit (and concerning the self-reproduction in change of generations as well)?

The history shows that *historically stable societies* in selection of rulers capable in relation to interests of society, or appearing to be incapacitated or abusing of power follow the principle "practice is a criterion of true" while reproducing the power in change of generations.

If the society doesn't follow this principle, then it perishes under influence of external factors, according to inadequacy of processes of ruling proceeding in it.

Actually, this is the reason of crash of Byzantium and the following assimilation of former "East Romans", who generated incapacitated crowd-"elitist" statehood, in other cultural-ethnic societies.

—————

However, the process of selection of rulers well-grounded in interests of society and incapacitated ones according to the principle "practice – criterion of true" proceeds in different ways in compactly living primitive community and in "a big society", which life is based on idea of generation of statehood and territorial differentiation of powers of authorities[1].

—————

The fundamental difference is that in a compactly living community "everyone knows everyone" so that judgments of people about the one who can be entrusted ruler and the one who can't has a deliberated character, directly based on experience of common activity.

As it can be seen from Edward B. Taylor's[2] book "Primitive culture" many primitive societies were so worried about forming the administrative body, that they searched for the most effective future rulers even among children, and in their culture there were subcultures (traditions, rituals), focused on revealing children, whose talents can be realized in sphere of ruling *for the good of the whole society*.

However, the ethics was the same for all members of community: both for those who became ruler and for those who became subordinates. Thus, both powerful chief (warrior or economic executive administrator) and common community member could be an authority in community in the sense that he was respected for his deeds (instead of present meaning of the word authority).

In these conditions everyone made his authority himself; and in his authority measure of understanding of his deeds importance for the community by associates was expressed; the same measure of understanding of former deeds also opened credit of trust for the future.

Thus in a compactly living community, in which everyone knew everyone, speed of information exchange processes, in which principle "practice is a criterion of true" was realized, was high enough to support an adequacy of administrative body to circumstances of community's life during change of generations.

---

[1] Look at treatment of the question in analytical note by IP USSR "Review of possible variants of events after 1995" (in Russian) (in Information Base of IP USSR).

[2] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Burnett_Tylor

And an authority of people in such community was based on principle "practice is a criterion of true", to which somehow everyone followed: both carriers of authority and others who recognized their authority.

———————

In a big society not everyone knows everyone. This, first of all, slows information exchange processes, in which the principle "practice is a criterion of true" is realized in relation to process of formation and reproduction of administrative body.

Thereof the maintenance of administrative body's adequacy to problems of social development becomes a problem if the administrative corps stands apart from other society on principles of corporate egoism and corporate ethics expressing this egoism, different from that ethics which dominating corporation offers to other society.

In such conditions as a rule it is impossible to base the authority of dominating corporation as a whole and its certain representatives on society's free recognition of advantage of their activity on the basis of principle "practice is a criterion of true".

Thereof in a crowd-"elitist" society the power has to create an authority artificially by means of:

- purposefully forming personal culture of mental activity, that generates in the dependent society perverting worldview and world-understanding. Representatives of ideological sphere (formerly dogma-teachers sold themselves to "powerful ones of this world") and educational system work on this;

- PR-technologies – a system of presenting information to other society so, that regardless of power's activity nature and its results, dependent society has a positive opinion about that power[1].

The first is a basis for the second, since the second indeed appears to be a concealment of truth, distribution of fragrant lie, inflating of significance of some events to distraction and turning values of really significant events down to a level of negligible. All its achieves its purposes only in the case, when in society it is spread widely enough such personal culture of mental activity, that generates inadequate worldview and world-understanding, on the basis of which: lie is undistinguishable from truth; socially useful thing appears harmful or *basically non-practicable*; insignificant seems to be great, great – insignificant, etc.

I.e. in big society, if it is crowd-"elitist", authority of the individual is not necessary caused by his personal qualities, potential, deeds and adequacy of world-understanding of those for whom he became the authority. This circumstance is a consequence of apostasy from principle "practice is a criterion of true" during the process of reproducing the professional ruling body.

---

[1] Though the term "PR" in Russian society has appeared rather recently, but the following anecdote about the power of PR was popular in the USSR:

Napoleon has been invited from the other world to parade on the Red Square in Moscow. He stands on the Mausoleum tribune, looks at parade and talks to L. I. Brezhnev. Brezhnev tells him: "If you had had such cannons and tanks you precisely would not have lost at Waterloo".

Napoleon answers: "Certainly, but if I had had such a newspaper as your 'Pravda' ('Truth'), nobody would have ever known that I had lost at Waterloo..."

And in general, Goebbels with his successful in many ways PR of Nazism and Hitlerism outside Germany became the strategic weapon, which allowed Hitler carry out blitzkriegs against states of bourgeois-liberal Europe freely: on January 2, 1939, already after "The Munich Deal" and the liquidation of Czechoslovakia, that became an actual beginning of the World War II the sanction to which had been given by the Great Britain, the editorial of "Time" (American magazine) declared A. Hitler as 1938 "Person of the Year".

_____

Presently, development of technique, means of communication, the main of which became TV and the Internet, creates an illusion of "a global village", in which it is possible if not "to touch" everything, but to see at least. However, in this global virtual village it doesn't met the main condition that provided the efficiency of principle "practice is a criterion of truth" in primitive community at reproduction of professional ruling body: in such global village there is no joint activity with direct dialogue of almost all members of global "community".

Such virtual globalization is the basis for mass-media to mould "images of authorities" to order. And moreover, development of computer graphics will allow in the nearest future to put fictional characters of "cartoons" in a rank of authorities for crowd: notorious "Masyanya" (flash-cartoon hero, very popular in Russian Internet several years ago – www.mult.ru) according to low level of anthropomorphism, certainly doesn't pull on this status, but technical progress, development of interactive TV and the Internet, together with presence of "social order", are able to generate not so comic virtual dolls, which will be capable to represent the so-called "real politics" for crowd. In other words, "Masyanya Glebovna Pavlovskaya" – may become a virtual reality, because a crowd is capable to accept even this authority as real leader and inspirer (Gleb Pavlovskiy is one of the most famous PR-specialist in Russia. He is the author of TV-program "Real Politics").

_____

If to correspond with types of psychical structure, then question about the so-called "real elite", "pseudo-elite", "counter-elite" appears absolutely in other light, instead of how it is represented nowadays by S. Valtsev (chess grandmaster, known at COB forums in the Internet under the nickname "Kotovskiy" (named after hero of Civil War in Russia 1918-1922)).

All cultures, in which irreversible stable human type of psychical structure is not regarded as the only norm for any adult individual and in which it is not achieved by the overwhelming majority of people up to beginning of their youth, are *immature and perverted*.

Disputes about who is "real elite" and who is not; whose authority is real and whose one is "artificial" and so on take place only in them, since:

- on the basis of human type of psychical structure collectivity develops:

- and within the collectivity:

- everyone possesses equal human dignity, thus keeping and developing personal originality;

- and all deeds of various people in collectivity are mutually necessary and mutually supplement each other in course of God's of God's Providence.

In such conditions disputes on who is "real elite"; whose authority is valid and whose is false, are simply impossible, as it would be dropout of collectivity, because of loss of human type of psychical structure.

In conditions of crowd-"elitism", reproduced by purposefully perverted culture in change of generations, system principles of erection of one or another social groups to the rank of "elite" or to the rank of "authority" are such, that bearers of human type of psychical structure can rest inside the "elite" or to be "authorities" in all layers of society, who are respected, supported and whose qualities people try to reproduce in themselves and in their children, only in contrary to these principles.

Bearers of human type of psyche system in crowd-"elitist" cultures are anti-system elements.

Thereof crowd-"elitism" in whole as a system of social relations is somehow hostile to a real human and to manifestations of humanity by members of society; though also in it bearers of other types of psychical structure (with all their defects) *have some human traits* indeed.

———————

In conditions of crowd-"elitism" the principle works: "Everyone works for himself in a measure of his understanding, and in a measure of his misunderstanding – for one who understands more". By virtue of that God understands more than any, crowd-"elitism" existing within the limits of God's permission at all gets rid of itself since it generates many insolvable within it problems, which are murderous for a society inflexibly devoted to it. As an example, take the history of Byzantium and the Russian Empire.

———————

According to the above-stated, purposeful overcoming of crowd-"elitism" by revealing and solving problems generated by it demands neither creation of some "real elite", nor revealing of some "positive persons" who would be erected in a rank of authorities for society, but personal self-development of many people with mutual help to each other in this task on the basis that for every human his own conscience is an absolute authority...

However it needs from many to find their conscience and will, to wake them up, to learn to distinguish the conscience and different prejudices and obsessions, and to control the will by the conscience…

———————

In a crowd-"elitist" society different "authorities" are not "locomotives" but obstacles for personal development of other people and, as a consequence, for the social development in whole.

It is objective reality, which concerns as "artificial" authorities, exaggerated by PR-managers from nothing, and also authorities of those who have really made something significant in aspect of profit for society development and thus have deserved recognition as high professionals in certain spheres of activity.

If harm of "artificial", inherently false, authorities is clear for majority, then harm of real authorities, well-deserved by deeds helpful for society, is much more difficult to understand.

The harm of real authorities consists of that others are so sure in efficiency of their deeds that express it not only in trust to authorities in some tasks, elaborating and making decisions or in more or less readiness to live and work under their control, but also *in shifting off their part of responsibility onto real authorities and in conscious (or unconscious) recognition of right for carelessness and irresponsibility for themselves.*

There is a widespread expression of this principle: "I'm a little man, it is no concern on mine and nothing depends from me". But there is no understanding that with such relation to Life nothing will depend from him.

As a matter of fact this means that, erecting somebody in a rank of authority, crowd-"elitist" society dooms him to loneliness, thus refuses him for support.

It seems paradoxical at first sight, but people admiring authority and relying on him in all tasks actually refuse him in support. The reason is that nobody immunes against mistakes; many tasks can't be done by single man, but demand for collective initiative (*but not only executive*) activity. And having made someone to be an authority, having declined all responsibility and

having refused from own initiative in task, coordinated by real authority, people make act of apostasy from him or her, whom they worship at and whom they feel high respect for (as they sincerely convince).

And the most dangerous is that:

- near to authority there are many creeping toadies and probably fair but non-initiative executors;

- but there are extremely few of those, who can check faultlessness of authority's actions and take the initiative in those aspects of common task, which authority has no time for or which appear outside of sphere of his world-perception, world-understanding and, as a consequence, out of his administrative competence (which is fraught with great troubles for a society).

——————

In essence, the told above lets understand, that not only Judas have given up from the Christ, but also other apostles have given up. *Though they made it a little differently, instead of how Judas did.*

Concerning Joseph Stalin "true Stalinists", as a matter of fact, behaved in the same way. Peoples of ex-USSR already more than half a century have been disentangling consequences of that. And apparently they will do it for several decades more, in spite of someone has already paid attention to that after 1991.

Muhammad (Mohammed) moved away from his authority during lifetime. But after his death in historically real Islam the worship on prophet's authority changed that doctrine which was opened through the prophet: otherwise the leadership of Muslim culture in global civilization construction would proceed till now.

But to take admirers of authorities down a peg and to compel them to become responsible for themselves and initiative in a common task is not a simple problem, because admirers of authorities in a crowd-"elitist" society are more troublesome than blowflies. Frankly envious persons in comparison to them are less harmful in aspect of common task's damage and distortion, than admirers can be...

However, many former admirers, having disappointed on former idol-authority under influence of their (i.e. admirers) own incapacity, realize their envy to former authorities in becoming their slanderers and active opponents.

——————

But also "struggle against authorities" is yet one of specific features of crowd-"elitism". It can proceed in different forms.

- Nihilism expressed in slogan "I'm the enemy of all so-called 'authorities'". Finally it leads to groundless refusal of trust to other people on the basis of own biases concerning them and on the basis of circulating through society *gossips - i.e. another's fictions, extended and accepted as true, and also inadequate subjective interpretation of real events.* Nihilism *as a version of social idiocy*[1] - dooms everyone captured by it on fruitlessness in deeds.

- Competition with authority for its status possession in society. Inherently the competition is directed to dethrone the authority in minds of associates and to replace it by competitor himself or by those, in whose hands ambitious competitor is a pawn.

---

[1] Look at first wording of "The Dead Water" 1992 (in Russian).

- If competition is directed to dethrone of exaggerated authority, "artificially" created or arisen due to *misunderstanding of someone recognizing* somebody's authority, – then this is inherently aimless work, which, in case of success, reaches following results: former barren is substituted for several time by another barren.

- If competition is directed to deprivation of trust and respect of person doing something really socially useful, and reaches success, then society gets harm; if it doesn't reach success, than "fighters against authority" discredit themselves in opinion of others. In any of two variants someone would regret with time about "swoop" on person making good deeds, if not initiators of "swoop", then those who hold with initiators.

Actually authorities of crowd-"elitism" disappear in joint initiative creative activity, based on common ethics, uniting both "authorities" and other participants of common action.

Therefore it's not necessary to find out whose authority is a "blown" and whose is "true" (there can't be "true" authorities) for dethroning of "blown" authorities and supporting "true" ones.

It is necessary to make relations with people on principles of humanity, accepting people such as they are: with all their merits and demerits (including displayed by an "aggregorial haze", which activity is caused by characteristics of unconscious levels of human psyche[1]), helping them to release from oppression of peculiar for them problems. Then mutual respect will unite people, and joint actions will be basis for this respect, but not crowd-"elite" relations of trade and conflicts (even unconscious) of self-estimates like "I'm so good and clever - so why I'm not a boss?" and reciprocal: "I'm boss, therefore I'm good and clever, and you are obliged to respect me, to submit me implicitly, to guess for and to embody my thoughts before I shall announce them[2], to care for be and to cherish".

––––––––––––

According to the told above, in order to avoid thoughtless subordination to heaven knows how appeared or purposefully created authority of one or another person, to avoid inattention when considering "non-authorities'" opinions, when expressing opinions on problematic of conceptual power and other sociological themes in written form, – we accepted anonymity. In our opinion, anonymity of statements should remove prejudicialness, in order that everyone voluntarily thinking perceived text by his own conscience and could correct mistakes without psychological pressure of names of those, whose opinion he used to perceive as undoubtedly authoritative. For people, for a society of humans it is important the result of a deed but not persons who reach this result: if deed is good, then one doing it loses nothing; if deed is evil, then nobody would escape from God's retribution, even he or she wants. This caused anonymity for Internal Predictor of USSR – group of developers of Concept of Social Safety (COB)[3].

––––––––––––

Nevertheless, aspiration to erect somebody in rank of authority by COB or to refuse of that rank to those or other persons have been *existing all the time since first COB materials had been announced in society* among those who considered themselves as true supporters of COB. All

––––––––––––

[1] In COB-materials this theme is considered more detailed in book by IP USSR "From corporationism under a cover of ideas to collectivity in God's Ruling" (About psychological underlying reason of person and its purposeful change) (in Russian).

[2] In essence, this is requirement for subordinates to be more clever than the chief, but don't show obviously it to him to save their chief from "inferiority complex" and not to deprive him of his authority.

[3] This paragraph with some changes repeats written in 1994 at the very beginning of book by IP USSR "Questions to Metropolitan of St. Peterburg and Ladoga Ioann and to hierarchy of Russian Orthodox Church".

such activity, whether it is realizably-planned or unconsciously-personal (including unconsciously-aggregorial), directed to erection of some persons in rank of authorities and also to dethroning authorities, of which someone have been disappointed, lays outside of COB's course and outside of its promotion through society algorithmic.

<div align="right">

Internal Predictor of the USSR
February 16–18, 2008
Specifications and addictions:
March 1–2[1], 2008

</div>

---

[1] March 2, 2008 – President Elections day in Russia.